



**PROJECT REPORT No. 29**

**COMMERCIAL GRAIN STORES  
1988/89,  
ENGLAND AND WALES  
PEST INCIDENCE AND  
STORAGE PRACTICES - PART 2**

**MARCH 1991**

**PRICE £25.00  
(PARTS 1 & 2)**



**HGCA PROJECT REPORT No 29**

**COMMERCIAL GRAIN STORES 1988/1989**

**ENGLAND AND WALES**

**PEST INCIDENCE AND STORAGE PRACTICE - PART 2**

**edited by**

**A J PRICKETT and J MUGGLETON**

**March 1991**

Final report of a one year project at the ADAS Central Science Laboratory, London Road, Slough, SL3 7HJ. The work commenced in September 1988 and was jointly funded by the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (Crop Protection Commission Programme B3, Project CP38) and by a grant of £101,869 from the Home-Grown Cereals Authority (Project No 0004/1/88).

Whilst this report has been prepared from the best available information, neither the authors nor the Home-Grown Cereals Authority can accept any responsibility for any inaccuracy herein or any liability for loss, damage or injury from the application of any concept or procedure discussed in or derived from any part of the Report.

Reference herein to trade names and proprietary products without special acknowledgement does not imply that such names, as defined by the relevant protection laws, may be regarded as unprotected and thus free for general use. No endorsement of named products is intended nor is any criticism implied of other alternative, but unnamed products.

**C O N T E N T S**

**Part 2**

**List of Tables**

**Tables**

## LIST OF TABLES

**Chapter 2. Sites visited  
Results from part A of the fact sheet.**

<i>Table</i>	<i>Title of table and number of question on fact sheet</i>	
1	Number and general description of sites visited.	(11)
2	Date of first visit to each site.	(10)
3	Use of sites visited.	(12)
4	Potentially infestable commodities other than cereal grain that had been stored on site in the last 12 months.	(13)
5	Intended fate of grain present on site, including whether it was in Intervention.	(15)
6	Source of grain present on site.	(14)
7	Number of sites with floor-stores, internal bins or external bins for grain storage.	(16)
8	Total storage capacity in floor-stores, internal bins and external bins at time of visits.	(16)
9	Quantity of grain in floor-stores, internal bins and external bins at time of visits.	(17)
10	Grain throughput at sites visited - either in last 12 months or in last trading year.	(18)
11	Transport used to deliver grain to the site.	(20)
12	Number of sites where the grain was examined for infestation upon intake.	(21,21a)
13	Methods used to examine grain for infestation upon intake at each site.	(21a)
14	Number of samples of grain per lorry or trailer load taken for examination for infestation upon intake at each site.	(21b)
15	Level of pest numbers acceptable in grain upon intake.	(22)
16	Grain rejected on intake because of infestation in last 12 months.	(23,23a,b)
17	Sites where grain cleaners were used in last 12 months.	(24)
18	Sites where grain dryers were used in last 12 months.	(25)
19	Sites where grain coolers were used in last 12 months.	(26)
20	Total capacity for grain cooling	(27a)

21	Method of fan control at sites where grain cooler used.	(27b)
22	Sites which said they had had insect or mite infestation at some time within the last 12 months.	(28,29)
23	Insects said to have been present in infestations within the last 12 months.	(28)
24	Site managers' views as to the seriousness of infestation by insects and mites if it were to occur.	(30)
25	Insects which site managers considered to be the most significant potential pest.	(31)
26	Insect detection methods used at sites in last 12 months - individual methods.	(32)
27	Insect detection methods used at sites in last 12 months - grain sampling and insect trapping.	(32)
28	Number of sites where the fabric of the store or machinery in them had been treated with insecticide in the last 12 months, and the reason for these treatments.	(33,33a)
29	Insecticides used at sites to treat the fabric of the store or machinery.	(33b)
30	Number of sites where some or all of the grain had been treated with insecticide in last 12 months.	(34)
31	Reasons given by site managers for grain treatments.	(34a)
32	Estimated quantity of grain treated with insecticide in last 12 months at sites visited.	(34b)
33	Insecticides used on grain in last 12 months at sites visited.	(34c)
34	Method by which the grain was admixed at sites treating the grain with contact insecticide.	(34d)
35	Who carried out the insecticide treatment at each site.	(35)
36	Summary of number of sites where fabric and/or some or all grain was treated with insecticide in last 12 months.	(33,34)
37	Insecticides used on fabric or grain at each site in last 12 months.	(33b,34c)
38	Number of sites said to have had a rodent infestation in last 12 months.	(36)
39	Number of sites where rodenticide treatment had been undertaken in last 12 months.	(37,37a)
40	Rodenticides used at sites in last 12 months.	(37e)

41	Who carried out rodenticide treatment at each site.	(37b)
42	Cost of rodenticide treatments at each site in last 12 months.	(37d,b)
43	Site managers' views of the effectiveness of rodenticide treatments carried out in last 12 months.	(37f,b)
44	Combinations of rodenticides used at each site, and the managers' views of the effectiveness of treatments.	(37e,f)
45	Additional methods used to control rodents in last 12 months.	(37g)
46	Number of sites said to have had a bird infestation in last 12 months.	(38)
47	Number of sites where bird control had been undertaken in last 12 months.	(39)
48	Bird control methods used at each site and the site managers' views of their effectiveness.	(39a,b,d)
49	Sources from which advice was sought and/or gained on grain storage in last 12 months.	(40)

**Chapter 3. Stores inspected  
Results from part B of the fact sheet**

<i>Table</i>	<i>Title of table and number of question on fact sheet</i>	
50	Number of storage structures inspected by WSB Advisers at each site visited.	(41)
51	Sites visited but not inspected.	( - )
52	Number and capacity of stores inspected.	(49)
53	Fabric of internal bins in stores inspected.	(49,50)
54	Type of floor-stores inspected.	(49,51a)
55	Presence and fabric of grain-walling in floor-stores inspected.	(51b)
56	Number of inspected stores with grain surcharged above grain walling.	(51b)
57	Quantity of grain present in floor-stores and internal bins at time of inspection.	(52a)
58	Potentially infestable commodities other than cereal grain present in stores inspected.	(52b)
59	Number of stores inspected in which the grain had been cooled.	(53)

- 60 Number of stores inspected that monitored the temperature of the grain present. (54,54a,b,c)
- 61 Number of stores inspected that monitored the moisture content of the grain present. (55,55a,b,c)
- 62 Number of stores inspected that monitored the grain present for insects or mites. (56,56a,b,c)
- 63 Insect detection methods used in stores inspected - grain sampling and insect trapping. (56,56a)
- 64 Number of stores where the manager was aware of the presence of pests. (57)
- 65 Number of stores where the fabric of the store or machinery in it had been treated with insecticide in last 12 months, and the reason for these treatments. (58,58a)
- 66 Insecticides used to treat the fabric of the store or machinery in stores inspected. (58b)
- 67 Number of stores where some or all of the grain present had been treated with insecticide in last 12 months. (59)
- 68 Reasons given by store managers for grain treatments. (59a)
- 69 Insecticides used within last 12 months on grain in stores inspected. (59c)
- 70 Method by which the grain in store was admixed. (59d,c)
- 71 Number of stores that treated the fabric and/or some or all of the grain with insecticide. (58,59)
- 72 Insecticides used in stores treating fabric and/or grain. (58b,59c)
- 73 Number of sites and stores in which *Oryzaephilus surinamensis* (saw-toothed grain beetle) was detected. (60+idents)
- 74 Number of sites and stores in which *Cryptolestes ferrugineus* (rust-red grain beetle) was detected. (60+idents)
- 75 Number of sites and stores in which *Sitophilus spp.* (grain weevils) was detected. (60+idents)
- 76 Sites and stores where *O. surinamensis*, *C. ferrugineus* or *Sitophilus spp.* were detected. (60+idents)
- 77 Number of sites and stores in which *Ahasverus advena* (foreign grain beetle) was detected. (60+idents)

78	Number of sites and stores in which <i>Typhaea stercorea</i> (hairy fungus beetle) was detected.	(60+idents)
79	Number of sites and stores from which <i>Cryptophagus</i> spp. (mould beetles) were collected.	(idents)
80	Sites and stores where <i>A. advena</i> , <i>T. stercorea</i> or <i>Cryptophagus</i> spp. occurrence was confirmed.	(60+idents)
81	Number of sites and stores in which Ptinidae (spider beetles) were detected.	(60+idents)
82	Number of sites and stores in which Moth pests were detected.	(60+idents)
83	Number of sites and stores in which Psocoptera (psocids or book-lice) were detected.	(60+idents)
84	Number of sites and stores where Mites of the genera <i>Acarus</i> , <i>Glycyphagus</i> or <i>Tyrophagus</i> were detected.	(60+idents)
85	Species identifications of the mites detected - sites and stores.	(60+idents)
86	Number of sites and stores where rodents or birds were detected.	(61)
87	Comparison of whether store managers were aware of the presence of rodents, and whether rodents were detected during inspection.	(57,61)

**Chapter 4. The distribution of beetles and moths in commercial grain stores**

*Table Title of table*

88	Ranking of the five MAFF Regions according to the frequency with which <i>Oryzaephilus</i> , <i>Cryptolestes</i> and <i>Sitophilus</i> occurred in commercial grain stores. Results of the 1987 farm grain store exercise are given also.
----	---

**Chapter 5. The use of sampling methods and static traps for the detection of insects in commercial grain stores**

*Table Title of table*

89	Insect detection methods used by storekeepers in commercial stores where a) none of the major grain beetle pests were detected by WSB Advisers and b) one or more of the major pests were detected.
90	Frequency of use of insect detection methods by storekeepers in commercial stores where a) none of the major grain beetle pests were detected by WSB Advisers and b) one or more of the major pests were detected.



- 91 Methods used by WSB Advisers to detect the major grain pest beetle species *O. surinamensis*, *C. ferrugineus* and *S. granarius* in stores.
- 92 Frequency of use of Pitfall and Probe static traps by storekeepers in stores where the storekeepers used these methods and WSB Advisers detected one or more of the major beetle pests.
- 93 Method by which WSB Advisers detected the major beetle pests in stores where static traps had been used by storekeepers.
- 94 Detection of the three major beetle pest species by WSB Advisers. Number of stores where all trap methods were used, but only one type detected the insects.
- 95a Methods by which WSB Advisers detected three minor beetle pests.
- 95b Detection of three minor pest beetle species by WSB Advisers. Number of stores where all trap methods were used, but only one type detected the insects.

**Chapter 6. The Psocoptera found in commercial grain stores**

*Table Title of Table*

- 96 The change in sex ratio of *Lepinotus patruelis* collected from commercial grain stores between October 1988 and March 1989.

**Chapter 7. The distribution of mites in commercial grain stores**

*Table Title of Table*

- 97 For each mite genus, the number of stores with the various combinations of each species present.
- 98 A comparison of the percentage of species found at commercial sites and stores, and in farm grain stores in 1987 and 1973.
- 99 The combinations of mite genera present at commercial sites and stores, and at farm grain stores in 1987 and 1973.
- 100 The presence and absence of each mite genus in commercial stores, related to insecticide usage.

**Chapter 8. Insecticide and fumigant resistance - commercial grain stores**

*Table Title of table*

- 101 The discriminating doses used to detect resistance to insecticides.

- 102 The discriminating doses used to detect resistance to fumigants.
- 103 The results of discriminating dose tests on strains of *O. surinamensis* collected from commercial grain stores.
- 104 Results of discriminating dose tests on strains of *C. ferrugineus* collected from commercial grain stores.
- 105 Results of discriminating dose tests on strains of *S. granarius* and *S. oryzae* collected from commercial grain stores.
- 106 The number of sites and stores in each MAFF Region and in Wales with populations of *O. surinamensis* resistant to various pesticides.
- 107 The number of sites and stores in each MAFF Region and in Wales with populations of *C. ferrugineus* resistant to various pesticides.
- 108 The number of sites and stores in each MAFF Region and in Wales with populations of *S. granarius* resistant to various pesticides.
- 109 The combinations of insecticide resistance found in populations of *O. surinamensis* from commercial grain stores.
- 110 The percentage of farm stores, commercial sites and commercial stores where resistance to each insecticide and fumigant was detected in *O. surinamensis*.
- 111 The five strains of *O. surinamensis* showing multiple organophosphate resistance, listed in order of their knockdown to malathion.
- 112 The percentage of all commercial stores using various insecticide treatments compared to the percentage of stores with *O. surinamensis* using the same treatments.
- Chapter 9. The incidence of resistance to pirimiphos-methyl in stored product mites collected from commercial grain stores.
- Table Title of table
- 113 The percentage of pirimiphos-methyl resistant populations of mites at those sites where mites were tested for resistance.

- 114 The percentage of pirimiphos-methyl resistant populations of mites at those stores where mites were tested for resistance.
- 115 The results of pirimiphos-methyl discriminating dose tests on strains of *A. siro*, *G. destructor*, *T. putrescentiae* and *T. longior* from commercial grain stores.
- 116 The number of sites with each of the combinations of pirimiphos-methyl resistant mite species.

Table 1. Number and general description of sites visited.

Type of Site	Region						Total Sites	Percent of Total
	N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Wales		
Commercial trading	30	14	64	13	10	-	131	76.6
Co-operative	1	2	2	6	3	-	14	8.2
Comm. + Co-op	2	-	1	-	3	2	8	4.7
Comm. + other type	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.6
Other type	1	1	-	-	-	-	2	1.2
Government owned	2	2	1	1	-	-	6	3.5
Gov. + Comm.	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.6
Port	-	-	1	-	2	-	3	1.8
Port + Comm.	1	-	-	-	1	1	3	1.8
Port + Co-op	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.6
Port + Comm. + Co-op	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.6
<hr/>								
Total Sites	39	19	71	20	19	3	171	
Percent of total	22.8	11.1	41.5	11.7	11.1	1.8		
<hr/>								

Note: The 5 MAFF Regions are Northern; Midlands and Western; Eastern; South Eastern; and South Western. The boundaries are shown in Figure 1.

Sites were classified as one or more of the following:- commercial trading; co-operative; Government owned; associated with a port; or 'other type'.

Table 2. Date of first visit to each site

<u>Month and year</u>	<u>Region</u>						<u>Total Sites</u>	<u>Percent of total</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>M+W</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>SE</u>	<u>SW</u>	<u>Wales</u>		
September 88	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.6
October 88	9	7	22	4	2	-	44	25.7
November 88	13	6	30	8	10	-	67	39.2
December 88	16	6	12	3	2	3	42	24.6
January 89	-	-	3	5	4	-	12	7.0
February 89	-	-	2	-	1	-	3	1.8
March 89	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	1.2
<hr/>								
Total Sites	39	19	71	20	19	3	171	

Table 3. Use of sites visited

Use of Site	Region						Total Sites	Percent of total
	N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Wales		
Solely grain storage	24	15	50	13	15	1	118	69.0
Storage plus other uses*	15	4	21	7	4	2	53	31.0
*Other uses:								
Milling	6	-	3	3	3	2	17	9.9
Malting	2	1	-	-	-	-	3	1.8
Seed cleaning	7	1	12	4	1	-	25	14.6
Other than above	4	2	7	1	1	1	16	9.4

(Note: More than one use may occur at each site)

Table 4. Potentially infestable commodities other than cereal grain that had been stored on site in the last 12 months.

Commodity	Region						Total Sites	Percent of sites
	N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Wales		
None (cereal only)	13	8	30	5	7	1	64	37.6
Other infestable commodities*	26	11	41	15	11	2	106	62.4
*Other commodities:								
Rape	24	9	25	13	7	1	79	46.5
Peas or beans	14	7	30	12	9	1	73	42.9
Carobs	-	-	1	-	1	1	3	1.8
Other than above	7	6	13	9	4	2	41	24.1

(Note: More than one commodity may occur at each site.

No answer from one site in SW).

Table 5. Intended fate of grain present on site, including whether it was in Intervention storage.

Intended fate	Region						Total Sites	Percent of sites
	N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Wales		
Export	31	11	36	15	13	1	107	66.5
Sell into Intervention	12	-	9	4	5	-	30	18.6
Already in Intervention	9	6	26	4	3	-	48	29.8
Food manufacture	9	-	8	9	3	-	29	18.0
Flour mill	18	5	24	11	8	-	66	41.0
Feed mill	32	9	39	13	10	2	105	65.2
Seed	4	-	7	4	2	-	17	10.6
Malting	13	2	26	13	6	-	60	37.3
Back to farm	8	-	8	4	7	-	27	16.8
To other grain stores	6	-	15	6	7	-	34	21.1
Other fate	-	2	2	2	1	-	7	4.3
Number of sites	38	18	67	19	16	3	161	

Note: More than one fate was specified at most sites.  
 No cereal grain was present at four sites.  
 No answer for six sites.

Table 6. Source of grain present on site.

Source of grain	N	M+W	Region			Wales	Total Sites	Percent of sites
			E	SE	SW			
Home-grown from:-								
a) farms	37	18	66	20	18	3	162	98.2
b) other stores	14	5	22	7	4	2	54	32.7
Imports	3	-	4	-	2	-	9	5.5
<hr/>								
Number of sites	38	18	67	20	19	3	165	

Note: Sites may receive grain from more than one source  
 No cereal grain was present at four sites  
 No answer for two sites



Table 7. Number of sites with floor-stores, internal bins or external bins for grain storage.

Type of storage at each site	Region						Total Sites	Percent of sites
	N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Wales		
Floor-stores only	19	11	37	6	9	1	83	48.5
Internal bins only	1	-	2	4	1	1	9	5.3
External bins only	2	-	2	1	4	-	9	5.3
Floor + int. bins	5	2	9	3	1	-	20	11.7
Floor + ext. bins	5	4	11	2	3	1	26	15.2
Int. + ext. bins	1	-	1	1	-	-	3	1.8
Floor + int. + ext. bins	6	2	9	3	1	-	21	12.3
<hr/>								
Total sites	39	19	71	20	19	3	171	
<hr/>								
Total with floor- stores	35	19	66	14	14	2	150	87.7
Total with int. bins	13	4	21	11	3	1	53	31.0
Total with ext. bins	14	6	23	7	8	1	59	34.5
<hr/>								

**Table 8. Total storage capacity in floor-stores, internal bins and external bins at sites visited**

Region	Floor-stores		Internal bins		External bins		Total
	No. floors	capacity tonnes	No. bins	capacity tonnes	No. bins	capacity tonnes	capacity tonnes
N	87	735,515	335	40,545	164	146,795	922,855
M+W	37	578,900	76	8,500	73	47,760	635,160
E	176	1,705,750	472	37,480	224	172,400	1,915,630
SE	28	275,000	349	30,500	202	81,285	386,785
SW	36	293,400	165	38,000	131	102,220	433,620
Wales	3	13,530	14	300	122	24,000	37,830
<b>Total</b>	<b>367</b>	<b>3,602,095</b>	<b>1,411</b>	<b>155,325</b>	<b>916</b>	<b>574,460</b>	<b>4,331,880</b>
Percent of total capacity		83.2		3.6		13.3	

Table 9. Quantity of grain in floor-stores, internal bins and external bins at time of visits.

Region	Floor-stores		Internal bins		External bins		Total	Total
	No. sites	content tonnes	No. sites	content tonnes	No. sites	content tonnes	No. Sites	content tonnes
<b>WHEAT</b>								
N	25	140,379	6	13,455	10	45,540	32	199,374
M+W	14	116,920	3	2,340	3	19,580	16	138,840
E	46	580,261	10	6,264	16	46,995	55	633,520
SE	11	62,113	9	6,293	6	30,248	17	98,654
SW	11	80,146	3	20,081	7	35,278	17	135,505
Wales	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	107	979,819	31	48,433	42	177,641	137	1,205,893
Percent of wheat		81.3		4.0		14.7		
<b>BARLEY</b>								
N	27	200,125	6	11,439	9	41,064	35	252,628
M+W	15	185,310	4	2,245	4	26,515	17	214,070
E	35	347,948	14	11,039	16	53,325	48	412,312
SE	6	65,542	9	8,599	6	22,586	19	96,727
SW	9	56,737	3	4,058	7	32,350	14	93,145
Wales	2	11,250	-	-	1	16,300	2	27,550
Total	94	866,912	36	37,380	43	192,140	135	1,096,432
Percent of barley		79.1		3.4		17.5		

(continued)

Table 9. (continued) - Quantity of grain in floor-stores, internal bins and external bins at time of visits.

Region	Floor-stores		Internal bins		External bins		Total	Total
	No. sites	content tonnes	No. sites	content tonnes	No. sites	content tonnes	No. Sites	content tonnes
<b><u>OTHER GRAIN</u></b>								
N	5	4,955	-	-	-	-	5	4,955
M+W	-	-	1	180	-	-	1	180
E	2	340	3	688	2	720	6	1,748
SE	1	90	5	474	2	569	7	1,133
SW	2	317	1	200	1	1,200	2	1,717
Wales	1	30	1	300	-	-	2	330
<hr/>								
Total	11	5,732	11	1,842	5	2,489	23	10,063*
Percent of 'other grain'		57.0	18.3		24.7			
*8,235 tonnes oats, 1,360 maize, 468 rye								
<b><u>TOTAL GRAIN</u></b>								
N	33	345,459	8	24,894	12	86,604	38	456,957
M+W	18	302,230	4	4,765	4	46,095	19	353,090
E	59	928,549	18	17,991	20	101,040	68	1,047,580
SE	13	127,745	10	15,366	7	53,403	20	196,514
SW	14	137,200	3	24,339	7	68,828	19	230,367
Wales	2	11,280	1	300	1	16,300	3	27,880
Total	139	1,852,463	44	87,655	51	372,270	167	2,312,388
Percent of total grain		80.1	3.8		16.1			

Note: Four sites had no grain at the time of visit

Table 10. Grain throughput at sites visited - either in last 12 months or in last trading year.

Region	Wheat		Barley		Other specified grain	
	No. sites	Throughput tonnes	No. sites	Throughput tonnes	No. sites	Throughput tonnes
N	31	587,226	34	716,456	2	4,560
M+W	11	125,750	13	226,040	1	500
E	57	884,576	44	623,074	7	6,760
SE	18	187,650	19	152,136	9	2,702
SW	16	285,139	12	209,969	5	8,630
Wales	2	11,000	3	250,000	1	500
Total	135	2,081,341	125	2,177,675	25	23,652*

\*All oats except for 360 tonnes maize and 300 rye.

Region	Total specif. grain		Total unspecif. grain		Total grain	
	No. sites	Throughput tonnes	No. sites	Throughput tonnes	No. sites	Throughput tonnes
N	37	1,308,242	-	-	37	1,308,242
M+W	15	352,290	2	74,000	17	426,290
E	64	1,514,410	3	82,045	67	1,596,455
SE	19	342,488	1	42,000	20	384,488
SW	16	503,738	-	-	16	503,738
Wales	3	261,500	-	-	3	261,500
Total	154	4,282,668	6	198,045	160	4,480,713

Note: Five sites holding intervention grain had nil throughput  
Six sites did not disclose their throughput

Table 11. Transport used to deliver grain to the site.

Transport	N	M+W	Region				Total sites	Percent of sites
			E	SE	SW	Wales		
Own lorry only	-	1	1	-	-	-	2	1.2
Contractor's lorry only	13	8	13	7	3	1	45	27.1
Tractor/trailer only	-	-	-	3	-	-	3	1.8
Own lorry + contractor's	4	-	10	-	2	-	16	9.6
Own lorry + trailer	-	2	3	-	1	-	6	3.6
Own lorry + other	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.6
Contractors's lorry + trailer	15	2	15	5	7	1	45	27.1
Own + contractor + trailer	6	6	19	5	6	1	43	25.9
Own + trailer + other	-	-	3	-	-	-	3	1.8
Own + contractor + trailer + other	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	1.2
<hr/>								
Total sites	38	19	67	20	19	3	166	
<hr/>								
Total own lorry	10	9	39	5	9	1	73	44.0
Total contractor's lorry	38	16	59	17	18	3	151	91.0
Total tractor/trailer	21	10	42	13	14	2	102	61.4
Total other transport	-	-	6	-	-	-	6	3.6

Note: 'Other transport' was farmer's lorry.  
 Transport not specified for the four sites with no grain at the time of visit.  
 No answer for one site in E.

Table 12. Number of sites where the grain was examined for infestation upon intake.

	Region						Total Sites	Percent of sites
	N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Wales		
Grain examined on intake:-								
before unloading	36	17	61	17	9	2*	142	85.5
before and during	-	1	1	-	5	-	7	4.2
during unloading	1	-	-	-	2	-	3	1.8
Total sites examining								
	37	18	62	17	16	2	152	91.6
Sites not examining								
	1	1	5	3	3	1	14	8.4
Total sites								
	38	19	67	20	19	3	166	

\*At one of these sites grain was examined on farm before transporting.

Note: Four sites with no grain and one site no answer.

Table 13. Methods used to examine grain for infestation upon intake at each site.

Sampling methods	N	M+W	Region				Total Sites	Percent of examining sites
			E	SE	SW	Wales		
Spear/sieve only	5	5	11	4	3	-	28	18.4
Spear + visual	7	3	13	4	1	1	29	19.1
Spear + visual + other	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.7
Spear + sieve	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.7
Spear + sieve + visual	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	1.3
Spear + other	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.7
Vacuum/sieve only	5	8	12	3	4	1	33	21.7
Vacuum + visual	8	1	15	2	5	-	31	20.4
Vacuum + Visual + other	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	1.3
Vacuum + sieve + visual	1	-	-	-	2	-	3	2.0
Spear + vacuum	-	-	3	1	-	-	4	2.6
Spear + vacuum + visual	6	-	3	1	-	-	10	6.6
Spear + vacuum + sieve + visual	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.7
Visual only	1	1	1	2	-	-	5	3.3
Other method	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	0.7
<hr/>								
Total sites	37	18	62	17	16	2	152	
<hr/>								
Total spear sampling	20	8	34	10	4	1	77	50.7
Total vacuum sampling	22	9	34	7	11	1	84	55.3

Note: At one spear only and one vacuum only site the samples were examined visually, not by sieving.



Table 14. Number of samples of grain per lorry or trailer load taken for examination for infestation upon intake at each site.

Intake unit	No. of Samples	Region						Total Sites	Percent of sites
		N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Wales		
Own lorry	1 or 2	2	1	10	1	1	-	15	22.7
	3 or 4	2	1	11	1	1	-	16	24.2
	5 or 6	2	3	6	-	4	-	15	22.7
	7 or 8	2	3	8	3	-	-	16	24.2
	>8	1	-	2	-	1	-	4	6.1
Total Sites		9	8	37	5	7	-	66	
Contractor's lorry	1 or 2	4	2	14	3	1	-	24	17.6
	3 or 4	6	-	6	2	3	1	18	13.2
	5 or 6	8	2	10	3	6	-	29	21.3
	7 or 8	13	8	18	5	3	-	47	34.6
	>8	6	2	6	3	1	-	18	13.2
Total Sites		37	14	54	16	14	1	136	
Tractor/Trailer	1 or 2	4	4	9	4	5	-	26	30.6
	3 or 4	7	1	13	2	3	-	26	30.6
	5 or 6	7	3	10	3	2	-	25	29.4
	7 or 8	1	-	3	1	-	-	5	5.9
	>8	-	-	2	-	1	-	3	3.5
Total Sites		19	8	37	10	11	-	85	

Table 15. Level of pest numbers acceptable in grain upon intake.

Region	Insects			Mites			Total Sites
	Nil	Small nos.	Large nos.	Nil	Small nos.	Large nos.	
N	36	2	1	1	37	1	39
M+W	17	2	-	5	13	1	19
E	65	1	4	7	58	5	70
SE	15	2	2	5	12	2	19
SW	13	3	-	4	12	-	16
Wales	3	-	-	3	-	-	3
Total	149	10	7	25	132	9	166
Percent of sites	89.8	6.0	4.2	15.1	79.5	5.4	

Note: No answer for five sites.

Table 16. Grain rejected on intake because of infestation in last 12 months.

Region	Grain rejected?		Total quantity rejected		Source of rejected grain		
	Yes	No	No. sites	tonnes	Farms	Stores	Unknown
N	27	11	25	5,967	22	8	1
M+W	9	10	9	810	8	1	-
E	41	28	32	5,655	31	10	2
SE	11	9	11	3,650	9	3	-
SW	9	9	9	2,170	8	1	-
Wales	2	1	2	600	2	-	-
Total sites	99	68	88	18,852	80	23	3
Percent	59.3	40.7			80.1	23.2	3.0

Note: No answer for rejection at four sites; quantity rejected not known for 11 sites; more than one source for some sites - percentage of 99 sites.

Table 17. Sites where grain cleaners were used in last 12 months.

Region	Cleaner used?		Type of cleaner used			Other Type
	Yes	No	Aspirated	Sieve	Aspirated Sieve	
N	23	16	5	6	20	2
M+W	8	11	5	4	4	-
E	40	30	3	5	33	3
SE	16	4	5	4	13	1
SW	11	7	3	1	7	-
Wales	2	1	-	-	2	-
<hr/>						
Total sites	100	69	21	20	79	6
Percent of total	59.2	40.8				
Percent of those sites that used cleaner			21.0	20.0	79.0	6.0

Note: No answer whether cleaner used at two sites  
Some sites used more than one type of cleaner

Table 18. Sites where grain dryers were used in last 12 months.

Region	Dryer used?		Type of dryer used				Dehumidifier bulk
	Yes	No	Heated continuous	batch	(near)-ambient bulk	bin	
N	26	13	24	4	2	2	-
M+W	14	5	12	2	3	-	-
E	44	26	35	13	3	-	1
SE	14	6	12	2	2	1	-
SW	11	7	9	3	-	-	-
Wales	2	1	1	-	-	1	-
<hr/>							
Total Sites	111	58	93	24	10	4	1
Percent of							
total	65.7	34.3					
Percent of those sites							
that used dryer			83.8	21.6	9.0	3.6	.0.9

Note: No answer whether dryer used at two sites  
Some sites used more than one type of dryer

Table 19. Sites where grain coolers were used in last 12 months.

Region	Cooler used?		Type of cooler used				Total ducted or ventilated
	Yes	No	Refrig- erated	Spearator	Ducted system	Ventilated floor	
N	35	4	1	5	28	10	35
M+W	18	1	-	3	17	1	18
E	68	3	2	3	64	22	68
SE	19	1	1	-	11	10	19
SW	12	6	-	1	8	4	11
Wales	2	1	-	-	2	-	2
<hr/>							
Total sites	154	16	4	12	130	47	153
Percent of total	90.6	9.4					
Percent of those sites that used cooler			2.6	0.8	84.4	30.5	99.4

Note: No answer whether cooler used at one site  
Some sites used more than one type of cooler

Table 20. Total capacity for grain cooling.

	No sites	Capacity tonnes	Percent of capacity
Total storage capacity of all sites visited	171	4,331,880	
Capacity where unknown if cooler used	1	12,900	
Capacity where known if cooler used	170	4,318,980	
Capacity where cooler used	154	4,185,820	96.9
Capacity where cooler not used	16	133,160	3.1
Capacity where quantity of grain that can be cooled at one time was not specified	26	821,610	
Capacity of sites where quantity that can be cooled was specified	128	3,364,210	
Total that can be cooled at one time	128	2,857,460	84.9
Storage capacity greater than cooling capacity		506,750	15.1

Table 21. Method of fan control at sites where grain cooler used.

Region	No. Sites	Method of fan control						Total Automatic sites
		Manual	Normal thermostat	Differential thermostat	Combination of thermostat and humidistat	Timer	Other method	
N	35	32	1	1	1	-	-	3
M+W	18	15	3	-	3	-	-	6
E	68	59	1	1	14	4	3	19
SE	19	17	-	-	7	1	-	7
SW	11	4	6	1	1	-	-	8
Wales	2	2	1	-	-	-	-	1
Total Sites	153	129	12	3	26	5	3	44
Percent of total		84.3	7.8	2.0	17.0	3.3	2.0	28.8

Note: At one site method of control not stated.  
 At the three 'other automatic method' sites, two used humidistats and one not known.  
 Some sites used more than one type of control.

Table 22. Sites which said they had had insect or mite infestation at some time within the last 12 months.

Region	Insect infestation?		Mite infestation?		Insects or mites	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
N	7	32	19	18	22	17
M+W	2	17	7	9	8	11
E	17	54	31	38	40	31
SE	7	13	5	15	9	11
SW	7	11	3	15	7	11
Wales	-	3	-	3	-	3
Total	40	130	65	98	86	84
Percent	23.5	76.5	39.9	60.1	50.6	49.4

Note: No answer for insects at one site and for mites at eight sites.



Table 23. Insects said to have been present in infestations within the last 12 months.

Insects	N	M+W	Region				Total Sites	Percent of occurrences
			E	SE	SW	Wales		
<i>Oryzaephilus</i> only	1	1	7	3	1	-	13	32.5
<i>Cryptolestes</i> only	-	-	1	2	-	-	3	7.5
<i>Sitophilus</i> only	1	-	6	-	4	-	11	27.5
<i>Oryzaephilus</i> + <i>Cryptolestes</i>	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	2.5
<i>Oryzaephilus</i> + <i>Sitophilus</i>	-	-	1	-	2	-	3	7.5
<i>Cryptolestes</i> + <i>Sitophilus</i>	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	2.5
<i>Oryzaephilus</i> + <i>Cryptolestes</i> + <i>Sitophilus</i>	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	2.5
<i>Tribolium</i>	1	-	-	1	-	-	2	5.0
<i>Ptinidae</i>	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	2.5
<i>Psocoptera</i>	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	2.5
<i>Endrosis</i>	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	2.5
Unknown	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	5.0
<hr/>								
Total sites	7	2	17	7	7	-	40	
<hr/>								
Total <i>Oryzaephilus</i>	2	2	8	3	3	-	18	45.0
Total <i>Cryptolestes</i>	1	1	1	3	-	-	6	15.0
Total <i>Sitophilus</i>	2	-	7	1	6	-	16	40.0
Total <i>Oryzaephilus</i> or <i>Cryptolestes</i> or <i>Sitophilus</i>	3	2	15	6	7	-	33	82.5

Note: See glossary for insect common names.

Table 24. Site managers' views as to the seriousness of infestation by insects and mites if it were to occur.

Perception	N	M+W	Region			Wales	Total Sites	Percent of sites
			E	SE	SW			
<u>Insect infestation</u>								
Very serious	34	12	61	19	9	3	138	81.2
Serious	4	2	8	-	8	-	22	12.9
Of some concern	1	3	-	-	1	-	5	2.9
Of little concern	-	2	2	1	-	-	5	2.9
<hr/>								
Total Sites	39	19	71	20	18	3	170	
<u>Mite infestation</u>								
Very serious	10	2	10	12	3	2	39	22.9
Serious	22	2	25	5	5	1	60	35.3
Of some concern	5	10	30	3	10	-	58	34.1
Of little concern	2	5	6	-	-	-	13	7.6
<hr/>								
Total Sites	39	19	71	20	18	3	170	

Note: No view was expressed at one site.

Table 25. Insects which site managers considered to be the most significant potential pest.

Insects	Region						Total Sites	Percent of sites
	N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Wales		
<i>Oryzaephilus</i>	21	13	54	5	5	-	98	64.9
<i>Sitophilus</i>	10	6	15	3	8	-	42	27.8
<i>Cryptolestes</i>	3	1	6	2	-	-	12	7.9
<i>Ahasverus</i>	2	-	3	-	-	-	5	3.3
<i>Tribolium</i>	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.7
Mites	-	-	-	4	-	-	4	2.6
'Weevils'	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	0.7
'Any grain pest'	-	-	5	2	4	-	11	7.3
Total sites	35	16	70	15	15	-	151	

Note: No answer for 20 sites.

Some sites specified more than one pest.

Although the question referred to insects, 'mites' were specified at four sites.

Table 26. Insect detection methods used at sites in last 12 months - individual methods.

Methods used	N	M+W	Region				Wales	Total Sites	Percent of sites
			E	SE	SW				
Spear/sieve	33	16	61	14	9	1	134	78.8	
Vacuum/sieve	9	3	10	6	5	1	34	20.0	
Sieve	10	2	6	3	-	1	22	12.9	
Probe trap	10	9	23	2	3	-	47	27.6	
Pitfall trap	4	5	19	2	3	-	33	19.4	
Bait bag	8	3	11	2	2	-	26	15.3	
Visual	26	5	45	15	14	-	105	61.8	
Other methods	1	1	4	2	2	-	10	5.9	
NONE	1	1	6	-	1	1	10	5.9	
<b>Total Sites</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>170</b>		

Note: No answer at one site.  
 One 'vacuum/sieve' was examined visually rather than by sieving.  
 Other methods were:- temperature - 7 sites  
                           smell              - 3 sites  
                           sticky trap - 1 site  
   (total 10 sites)

Table 27. Insect detection methods used at sites in last 12 months - grain sampling and insect trapping.

Methods used	N	M+W	Region				Total Sites	Percent of total sites
			E	SE	SW	Wales		
<u>Grain sampling</u>								
Spear only	25	14	51	9	8	1	108	63.5
Vacuum only	1	1	-	1	4	1	8	4.7
Spear + vacuum	8	2	10	5	1	-	26	15.3
<hr/>								
Total sampling	34	17	61	15	13	2	142	83.5
<u>Insect trapping</u>								
Probe trap only	6	4	7	2	-	-	19	11.2
Pitfall trap only	2	1	4	-	-	-	7	4.1
Baitbag only	5	-	2	-	-	-	7	4.1
Probe + pitfall	1	2	8	-	2	-	13	7.6
Probe + baitbag	2	1	2	-	1	-	6	3.5
Pitfall + baitbag	-	-	1	2	1	-	4	2.4
Probe + pitfall + baitbag	1	2	6	-	-	-	9	5.3
<hr/>								
Total trapping	17	10	30	4	4	-	65	38.2
<hr/>								
Total sampling or trapping	38	17	61	15	14	2	147	86.5
Sieving only	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	0.6
Visual only	-	1	4	4	3	-	12	7.1
NONE	1	1	6	-	1	1	10	5.9
<hr/>								
Total sites	39	19	71	20	18	3	170	

Note: No answer at one site.

Table 28. Number of sites where the fabric of the store or machinery in them had been treated with insecticide in last 12 months, and the reason for these treatments.

Region	Fabric treated?		Reason for treatment		
	Yes	No	Prophylaxis	Prophylaxis and infestation	Known infestation
N	34	5	33	1	-
M+W	17	2	15	2	-
E	59	11	55	1	3
SE	18	2	17	1	-
SW	16	2	13	-	3
Wales	1	2	1	-	-
<hr/>					
Total sites	145	24	134	5	6
Percent of total sites	85.8	14.2			
Percent of treated sites			92.4	3.4	4.1

Note: No answer at two sites

Table 29. Insecticides used at sites to treat the fabric of the store or machinery.

Insecticide and formulation	Region						Total Sites	Percent of treated sites
	N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Wales		
<u>Pirimiphos-methyl</u>								
EC	22	9	29	12	8	-	80	55.2
WP	2	3	2	-	2	-	9	6.2
Unknown spray	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	1.4
dust	8	2	13	4	5	-	32	22.1
smoke	7	5	14	11	5	-	42	29.0
fog	-	1	1	-	-	-	2	1.4
Total PM sites	28	14	39	15	13	-	109	75.2
<u>Chlorpyrifos-methyl</u>								
EC	3	4	8	2	-	-	17	11.7
unknown spray	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.7
dust	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.7
smoke	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.7
Total CPM sites	3	4	10	2	-	-	19	13.1
<u>Etrimfos</u>								
EC	5	2	6	2	2	-	17	11.7
WP	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	1.4
dust	2	-	1	-	2	-	5	3.4
smoke	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.7
Total Etrimfos sites	5	2	8	2	2	-	19	13.1

(continued)

Table 29. (continued) - Insecticides used on fabric.

Insecticide and formulation	Region						Total Sites	Percent of treated sites
	N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Wales		
<u>Methacrifos</u>								
EC	-	-	4	1	1	-	6	4.1
<u>Fenitrothion</u>								
EC	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.7
WP	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	1.4
total Fen. sites*	3	-	-	-	-	-	3	2.1
<u>Pyrethroids (including mixtures with OPs.)</u>								
Turbair GSI (Fen + pyr.)	2	2	10	-	-	-	14	9.7
Multispray (pyr. + OP)	1	-	1	-	1	-	3	2.1
ULV500 (pyr.)	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	0.7
Pybuthrin fog	-	-	1	-	1	-	2	1.4
Pyrethroid WP	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	0.7
total pyrethroid sites	3	2	12	1	1	1	20	13.8
<u>Phosphine</u>	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.7
<u>Unknown insecticide</u>	1	1	4	-	1	-	7	4.8
Total treated sites	34	17	59	18	16	1	145	
Average number of formulations used per treated site	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.9	1.0	1.7	

Note: EC = emulsifiable concentrate; WP = wettable powder; OP = organophosphorous insecticide; GSI = grain store insecticide  
 \*the 'total Fenitrothion sites' does not include the sites where this compound was used in a mixture with pyrethroids - see Turbair GSI.



Table 30. Number of sites where some or all of the grain had been treated with insecticide in the last 12 months.

Region	Contact insecticide			Fumigant		Insecticide or fumigant used	
	Amount of grain treated			Amount treated		Yes	No
	All	Part	None	Part	None		
N	10	18	11	3	36	30	9
M+W	5	6	8	1	18	12	7
E	18	26	26	7	63	48	22
SE	9	7	4	1	19	16	4
SW	9	6	3	1	17	15	3
Wales	-	-	3	-	3	-	3
Total Sites	51	63	55	13	156	121	48
Percent of total sites (n = 169)	30.2	37.3	32.5	7.7	92.3	71.6	28.4

Note: no answer at 2 sites

Table 31. Reason given by site managers for grain treatments.

Region	Contact insecticide Reason for treatment			Pumigant Reason for treatment		Total sites treated for infestation
	Prophylaxis	infestation and Prophylaxis	Known infestation	Prophylaxis	Known infestation	
N	17	-	10	1	2	12
M+W	5	2	3	-	1	6
E	31	2	11	-	7	20
SE	11	2	3	-	1	6
SW	9	2	4	-	1	6
Wales	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Sites	73	8	31	1	12	50
Percent of treated sites (n = 112)	65.2	7.1	27.7	-	-	42.0 (n=119)

Note: no reason given for treatment with contact insecticide at two sites

Table 32. Estimated quantity of grain treated with insecticide in last 12 months at sites visited.

Region	Wheat		Barley		Oats		Total grain	
	No. sites	tonnes	No. sites	tonnes	No. sites	tonnes	No. sites	tonnes
N	17	145,235	22	295,926	1	4,500	28	445,661
M+W	4	48,300	9	146,543	-	-	10	194,843
E	36	246,609	22	196,091	1	700	46	443,400
SE	9	120,565	12	118,352	3	1,050	14	239,967
SW	13	78,700	10	121,700	4	6,050	15	206,450
Wales	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Sites	79	639,409	75	878,612	9	12,300	113	1,530,321

Note: Quantity treated not specified at eight sites

Average quantity of grain treated per site = 13,543 tonnes

Table 33. Insecticides used on grain in last 12 months at sites visited.

Insecticide and formulation	N	Region					Wales	Total Sites	Percent of treated sites
		M+W	E	SE	SW				
<u>Pirimiphos-methyl</u>									
spray	13	3	11	6	6	-	39	32.2	
dust	11	5	22	7	13	-	58	47.9	
smoke	2	-	-	-	1	-	3	2.5	
total PM sites	24	8	29	13	14	-	88	72.7	
<u>Chlorpyrifos-methyl</u>									
spray	7	6	8	3	1	-	25	20.7	
<u>Etrinfos</u>									
spray	1	1	5	-	2	-	9	7.4	
dust	1	1	3	2	1	-	8	6.6	
smoke	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	0.8	
total Etrinfos sites	2	1	8	2	2	-	15	12.4	
<u>Methacrifos</u>									
spray	1	-	5	-	-	-	6	5.0	
dust	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	0.8	
unknown	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.8	
total Methacrifos sites	1	-	6	-	1	-	8	6.6	
<u>Fumigants</u>									
Methyl bromide	1	-	3	-	1	-	5	4.1	
Phosphine	1	-	3	1	-	-	5	4.1	
Liquid fumigant	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	0.8	
Unknown fumigant	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	1.7	
total fumig. sites	3	1	7	1	1	-	13	10.7	
Total treated sites	30	12	48	16	15	-	121		
Average number of formulations used per treated site	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.8	-	1.4		

Table 34. Method by which the grain was admixed at sites treating the grain with contact insecticide.

Region	Method			Unknown	Total sites where grain treated
	Bulk by machine	Surface treatment	Other method		
N	19	7	3	-	28
M+W	6	2	3	-	11
E	27	15	3	1	44
SE	11	4	3	-	16
SW	7	5	8	-	15
Wales	-	-	-	-	-
<hr/>					
Total sites	70	33	20	1	114
Percent of sites	61.4	28.9	17.5	0.9	

Table 35. Who carried out the insecticide treatments at each site.

Treatment and operator	Region						Total Sites	Percent of sites
	N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Wales		
<u>Fabric treatment</u>								
own staff only	23	12	28	16	13	1	93	84.5
other operator only	4	-	9	1	1	-	15	13.6
own + other	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	1.8
total sites	27	12	39	17	14	1	110	
<u>Grain admixture</u>								
own staff only	21	9	29	14	12	-	85	98.8
own + other	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.2
total sites	22	9	29	14	12	-	86	
<u>Grain surface</u>								
own staff only	7	2	14	4	4	-	31	93.9
other operator only	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	3.0
own + other	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	3.0
total sites	7	2	15	4	5	-	33	
<u>Fumigation</u>								
own staff only	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	
other operator only	2	1	7	-	1	-	11	
total sites	2	1	7	1	1	-	12	

Note: No answer for fabric treatment (35 sites); admixture (4 sites); fumigation (1 site)

Table 36. Summary of number of sites where fabric and/or some or all grain was treated with insecticide in last 12 months.

<u>Treatment</u>	<u>Region</u>						<u>Total Sites</u>	<u>Percent of total sites</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>M+W</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>SE</u>	<u>SW</u>	<u>Wales</u>		
Fabric only	8	5	18	3	3	1	38	22.4
Fabric and grain	26	12	40	15	13	-	106	62.4
Grain only	4	-	7	1	2	-	14	8.2
Fabric, but grain unknown	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.6
Grain, but fabric unknown	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.6
<hr/>								
Total treated sites	38	17	67	19	18	1	160	94.1
Untreated sites	1	2	4	1	-	2	10	5.9
<hr/>								
Total sites	39	19	71	20	18	3	170	
<hr/>								
Total fabric	34	17	59	18	16	1	145	85.3
Total grain	30	12	48	16	15	-	121	71.2

Note: No answer for fabric and grain treatment at one site

Table 37. Insecticides used on fabric or grain at each site in last 12 months.

Insecticide and formulation	Region						Total Sites	Percent of treated sites
	N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Wales		
<u>Pirimiphos-methyl</u>								
spray	26	12	31	14	13	-	96	60.0
dust	17	5	30	10	13	-	75	46.9
smoke	7	5	14	11	6	-	43	26.9
fog	-	1	1	-	-	-	2	1.3
total PM sites	35	15	50	18	17	-	135	84.4
<u>Chlorpyrifos-methyl</u>								
spray	8	7	10	3	1	-	29	18.1
dust	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.6
smoke	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.6
total CPM sites	8	7	11	3	1	-	30	18.8
<u>Etrimfos</u>								
spray	6	2	12	2	2	-	24	15.0
dust	2	1	3	2	2	-	10	6.3
smoke	-	-	1	-	1	-	2	1.3
total Etrimfos sites	6	2	12	3	2	-	25	15.6
<u>Methacrifos</u>								
spray	1	-	6	1	1	-	9	5.6
dust	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	0.6
unknown	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.6
total Methacrifos sites	1	-	7	1	2	-	11	6.9
<u>Fenitrothion</u>								
spray	3	-	-	-	-	-	3	1.9
mixture with pyrethroids	2	2	10	-	-	-	14	8.8
total Fen. sites	5	2	10	-	-	-	17	10.6
<u>Pyrethroids</u>	3	2	12	1	1	1	20	12.5
<u>Fumigants</u>	3	1	7	1	1	-	13	8.1
<u>Unknown insectide</u>	1	1	4	-	1	-	7	4.4
Total treated sites	38	17	67	19	18	1	160	



Table 38. Number of sites said to have had a rodent infestation in last 12 months.

Region	Infestation?		Total sites	Rodent	
	Yes	No		Rats	Mice
N	30	9	39	24	28
M+W	17	2	19	14	17
E	42	29	71	33	40
SE	17	3	20	16	16
SW	14	5	19	13	10
Wales	3	-	3	3	2
Total sites	123	48	171	103	113
Percent of sites	71.9	28.1		60.2	66.1

Table 39. Number of sites where rodenticide treatment had been undertaken in last 12 months.

Region	Treatment?		Total sites	Target rodent	
	Yes	No		Rats	Mice
N	38	1	39	32	35
M+W	18	1	19	16	17
E	70	1	71	64	68
SE	20	-	20	18	19
SW	18	1	19	18	12
Wales	3	-	3	3	2
Total sites	167	4	171	151	153
Percent of sites	97.7	2.3		88.3	89.5

Table 40. Rodenticides used at sites in last 12 months.

Rodenticide and formulation	N	M+W	Region				Total sites	Percent of treated sites
			E	SE	SW	Wales		
<u>Bromadiolone</u>								
grain	17	3	10	9	2	-	41	
gel	19	2	-	-	-	-	21	
pellet	1	-	-	-	1	-	2	
wax	-	-	3	-	-	-	3	
liquid	-	-	3	-	-	-	3	
paste	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	
lard	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	
sachet	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	
bait	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	
unknown	-	-	1	-	1	-	2	
Total Bromad. sites	25	5	17	10	4	-	61	36.5
<u>Calciferol</u>								
grain	3	4	8	4	-	-	19	
wax	1	-	3	-	-	-	4	
block	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	
canary seed	1	-	-	1	-	-	2	
meal	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	
unknown	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	
Total Calcif. sites	5	4	12	7	-	-	28	16.8
<u>Chlorophacinone</u>								
grain	5	2	9	2	-	-	18	
pellet	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	
liquid	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	
Total Chlor. sites	6	2	11	2	-	-	21	12.6
<u>Coumatetralyl</u>								
grain	1	1	4	-	-	-	6	
pellet	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	
dust	-	1	1	-	-	-	2	
sachet	-	-	3	-	-	-	3	
Total Coum. sites	2	2	8	-	-	-	12	7.2
<u>Difenacoum</u>								
grain	4	6	9	6	-	1	26	
pellet	1	5	1	-	1	1	9	
dust	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	
wax	-	-	2	1	-	1	4	
liquid	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	
unknown	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	
Total Difen. sites	5	11	14	7	1	1	39	23.4

(continued)

Table 40. (continued) - Rodenticides used at sites in last 12 months.

Rodenticide and formulation	Region						Total sites	Percent of treated sites
	N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Wales		
<u>Warfarin</u>								
grain	4	-	4	-	3	-	11	
dust	3	1	-	-	2	-	6	
liquid	5	-	2	2	1	-	10	
Total Warf. sites	11	1	6	2	5	-	25	15.0
<u>Brodifacoum</u>								
grain	-	-	2	1	-	-	3	
wax	2	-	2	-	-	-	4	
Total Brodif. sites	2	-	4	1	-	-	7	4.2
<u>Alphachloralose</u>								
grain	-	-	4	-	-	-	4	2.4
<u>Flocoumafen</u>								
grain	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.6
<u>Lindane</u>								
gel	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	
dust	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	
Total Lind. sites	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.6
Sodium cyanide	-	1	1	2	-	-	4	2.4
Aluminium phosphide	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	0.6
Zinc phosphide	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.6
<u>Unknown rodenticide</u>								
grain	1	-	15	1	9	-	26	
dust	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	
pellet	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	
wax	-	-	2	1	2	-	5	
liquid	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	
paste	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	
lard	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	
sachet	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	
tubes	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	
unknown	-	2	12	-	2	2	18	
Total 'unknown' sites	1	2	31	2	11	2	49	29.3
<hr/>								
Total treated sites	38	18	70	20	18	3	167	
Average number of formulations per site	1.9	1.6	1.8	1.8	1.3	1.7	1.7	

Note: No distinction has been made between the use of a mixture of compounds and the use of more than one compound.

Table 41. Who carried out rodenticide treatment at each site.

Region	Operator					Total sites
	Own Staff	Contractor	Local authority	Own and Contractor	Own and Local	
N	12	20	1	3	2	38
M+W	10	7	1	-	-	18
E	20	42	-	5	1	70
SE	5	11	3	1	-	20
SW	4	9	2	2	-	17
Wales	-	2	-	-	1	3
Total Sites	51	91	7	11	4	166
Percent of sites	30.7	54.8	4.2	6.6	2.4	1.2

Note: no answer at one site

Table 42. Cost of rodenticide treatments at each site in last 12 months.

Region	Own Staff		Operator		Own and Contractor		Own and Local		Contractor and Local	Total		
	No. sites	total cost £	No. sites	total cost £	No. sites	total cost £	No. sites	total cost £				
N	8	1,810	19	8,209	1	250	2	480	1	230	31	10,979
M+W	9	2,646	6	3,082	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	5,728
E	15	6,475	27	13,334	-	-	5	2,560	-	-	2	23,141
SE	4	270	7	5,272	3	537	1	900	-	-	15	6,979
SW	4	1,110	7	1,230	2	227	-	-	-	-	13	2,567
Wales	-	-	1	1,200	-	-	-	-	1	400	2	1,600
Total	40	12,311	67	32,327	6	1,014	8	3,940	2	630	2	50,994
average cost per site	£ 308	£ 482	£ 169	£ 493	£ 315	£ 386	£ 408					

Note: No estimate of cost was given for 42 sites

Table 43. Site managers' views of the effectiveness of rodenticide treatments carried out in last 12 months.

Region	Effectiveness	Own		Contractor		Operator		Own and Contractor		Total
		Staff	Local authority	Contractor	Local authority	Contractor	Local authority	Contractor	Local authority	
N	very	8	17	1	1	1	1	1	1	28
	partially	4	3	2	2	2	1	1	1	10
M+W	very	6	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	11
	partially	3	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	6
E	very	11	21	-	2	2	1	1	2	37
	partially	9	21	-	3	3	-	-	-	33
SE	very	4	6	2	1	-	-	-	-	13
	partially	1	5	1	-	-	-	-	-	7
SW	very	3	6	1	2	-	-	-	-	12
	partially	1	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	5
Wales	very	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	partially	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Total	very	32	57	4	6	2	2	2	2	103
	partially	18	34	3	5	2	2	2	-	62
Total sites		50	91	7	11	4	4	2	2	165
Percent of sites	very	64.0	62.6	57.1	54.5	50.0	50.0	100	-	62.4
	partially	36.0	37.4	42.9	45.5	50.0	50.0	-	-	37.6

Note: No answer for two sites  
None of the sites judged the treatment to be 'ineffective'

Table 44. Combinations of rodenticides used at each site, and the managers' views of the effectiveness of treatments.

<u>Rodenticide</u>	<u>Effectiveness</u>		<u>Total sites</u>
	<u>very</u>	<u>partially</u>	
<u>Bromadiolone sites</u>			
Bromad only	17	7	24
Bromad + Calcif	3	2	5
Bromad + Chlor	2	-	2
Bromad + Coum	1	-	1
Bromad + Difen	3	1	4
Bromad + Warf	6	2	8
Bromad + Brodif	-	1	1
Bromad + Calcif + Difen	1	2	3
Bromad + Chlor + Coum	1	1	2
Bromad + Chlor + Difen	2	-	2
Bromad + Chlor + Warf	1	2	3
Bromad + Coum + Difen	1	-	1
Bromad + Difen + Lindane	1	-	1
Bromad + Unknown	3	1	4
Total Bromad sites	42	19	61
<u>Calciferol sites</u>			
Calcif only	6	2	8
Calcif + Bromad	3	2	5
Calcif + Coum	-	1	1
Calcif + Difen	3	1	4
Calcif + Warf	1	1	2
Calcif + Floc	-	1	1
Calcif + NaCN	1	-	1
Calcif + Bromad + Difen	1	2	3
Calcif + Chlor + Alpha	1	-	1
Calcif + Difen + Wharf	2	-	2
Total Calcif sites	18	10	28

(continued)

Table 44. (continued) - Combinations of rodenticides used at each site, and the managers' views of the effectiveness of treatments.

Rodenticide	Effectiveness		Total sites
	very	partially	
<u>Chlorophacinone sites</u>			
Chlor only	-	2	2
Chlor + Bromad	2	-	2
Chlor + Coum	1	-	1
Chlor + Difen	2	-	2
Chlor + Brodif	1	-	1
Chlor + Alpha	-	1	1
Chlor + Bromad + Coum	1	1	2
Chlor + Bromad + Difen	2	-	2
Chlor + Bromad + Warf	1	2	3
Chlor + Calcif + Alpha	1	-	1
Chlor + Difen + NaCN	1	-	1
Chlor + Brodif + Alpha	2	-	2
Chlor + Difen + Warf + NaCN + ALPH	1	-	1
Total Chlor Sites	15	6	21
<u>Coumatetralyl sites</u>			
Coum only	2	1	3
Coum + Bromad	1	-	1
Coum + Calcif	-	1	1
Coum + Chlor	1	-	1
Coum + Difen	2	-	2
Coum + Bromad + Chlor	1	1	2
Coum + Bromad + Difen	1	-	1
Coum + Unknown	-	1	1
Total Coum Sites	8	4	12

(continued)



Table 44. (continued) - Combinations of rodenticides used at each site, and the managers' views of the effectiveness of treatments.

<u>Rodenticide</u>	<u>Effectiveness</u>		<u>Total sites</u>
	<u>very</u>	<u>partially</u>	
<u>Difenacoum sites</u>			
Difen only	8	8	16
Difen + Bromad	3	1	4
Difen + Calcif	3	1	4
Difen + Chlor	2	-	2
Difen + Coum	2	-	2
Difen + Bromad + Calcif	1	2	3
Difen + Bromad + Chlor	2	-	2
Difen + Bromad + Coum	1	-	1
Difen + Bromad + Lindane	1	-	1
Difen + Calcif + Warf	2	-	2
Difen + Chlor + NaCN	1	-	1
Difen + Chlor + Warf + NaCN + ALPH	1	-	1
<b>Total Difen Sites</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>39</b>
<u>Warfarin sites</u>			
Warf only	2	4	6
Warf + Bromad	6	2	8
Warf + Calcif	1	1	2
Warf + Brodif	1	1	2
Warf + Bromad + Chlor	1	2	3
Warf + Calcif + Difen	2	-	2
Warf + Difen + Chlor + NaCN + ALPH	1	-	1
<b>Warf + Unknown</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Total Warf Sites</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>25</b>

(continued)

Table 44. (continued) - Combinations of rodenticides used at each site, and the managers' views of the effectiveness of treatments.

<u>Rodenticide</u>	<u>Effectiveness</u>		<u>Total sites</u>
	<u>very</u>	<u>partially</u>	
<u>Brodifacoum sites</u>			
Brodif only	1	-	1
Brodif + Bromad	-	1	1
Brodif + Chlor	1	-	1
Brodif + Warf	1	1	2
<u>Brodif + Chlor + Alpha</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>2</u>
Total Brodif Sites	5	2	7
<u>Alphachloralose sites</u>			
Alpha + Chlor	-	1	1
Alpha + Calcif + Chlor	1	-	1
<u>Alpha + Chlor + Brodif</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>2</u>
Total Alpha Sites	3	1	4
<u>Flocoumafen sites</u>			
<u>Floc + Calcif</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>

Note: No distinction has been made between formulated mixtures and the use of more than one compound.

Sites using more than one active ingredient occur in each of the relevant site categories.

A total of 124 sites are represented in this table; of the other 43 treated sites, one used zinc phosphide plus an 'unknown' rodenticide, and 42 were totally 'unknown'.

Abbreviations:

Alpha = Alphachloralose	Coum = Coumatetralyl
ALPH = Aluminium phosphide	Difen = Difenacoum
Brodif = Brodifacoum	Floc = Flocoumafen
Bromad = Bromadiolone	Lindane = Lindane
Calcif = Calciferol	NaCN = Sodium cyanide
Chlor = Chlorophacinone	Warf = Warfarin

Table 45. Additional methods used to control rodents in last 12 months.

Region	Method						Total sites using additional method
	Ultrasonics	Trap	Shoot	Cat	Dog	Other Method	
N	-	3	1	2	3	2	12
M+W	-	1	-	-	2	-	3
E	2	6	4	7	1	2	18
SE	1	4	2	3	2	-	9
SW	-	-	2	4	-	-	6
Wales	-	-	1	2	-	-	2
<hr/>							
Total sites	3	14	10	18	8	4	50

Note: Method not specified at one N site  
 Some sites used more than one additional method  
 All sites used rodenticide

Table 46. Number of sites said to have had a bird infestation in last 12 months.

Region	Infestation?		Total Sites	Bird			
	Yes	No		Pigeon	Sparrow	Starling	Other
N	23	16	39	19	12	1	4
M+W	18	1	19	14	6	-	-
E	30	41	71	22	18	1	1
SE	5	15	20	4	2	-	-
SW	13	6	19	12	1	2	-
Wales	2	1	3	1	-	-	1
<hr/>							
Total sites	91	80	171	72	39	4	6
Percent of sites	53.2	46.8		42.1	22.8	2.3	3.5

Note: 'Pigeon' includes collared dove

Table 47. Number of sites where bird control had been undertaken in last 12 months.

Region	Bird control undertaken?				Total 'yes'	Total 'no'	Total sites
	At sites where infestation reported*		At sites where no infestation reported				
	Yes	No	Yes	No			
N	11	12	1	15	12	27	39
M+W	9	9	-	1	9	10	19
E	16	14	9	32	25	46	71
SE	2	3	-	15	2	18	20
SW	6	6	-	6	6	12	18
Wales	2	-	-	1	2	1	3
<hr/>							
Total sites	46	44	10	70	56	114	170
Percent of sites					32.9	67.1	

Note: No answer at one site (at which infestation reported)

\* ie said to have had a bird infestation in last 12 months

Table 48. Bird control methods used at each site and the managers' views of their effectiveness.

Method of bird control	Bird infestation in last 12 months	Effectiveness and operator						Total Sites
		own	very cont.	own partially cont.	own ineffective cont.	own	cont.	
Proofing only	Pigeon	2	1	1	1	-	-	5
	Sparrow	-	-	1	3*	-	-	4
	Pigeon + Sparrow	2	-	1	-	-	-	3
	Sparrow + Starling	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
	Other bird	-	-	-	-	-	-	1**
	None	7	-	1	1	-	-	9
Shooting only	Pigeon	11	1	5	5	-	-	23
	Pigeon + Starling	7	1	6	-	3	-	17
	Pigeon + Sparrow	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
	Pigeon + Sparrow + Other	1	-	1	-	-	-	1
	None	9	1	7	-	4	-	21
Baiting only	Pigeon	-	1	-	1	-	-	2
	Pigeon + Sparrow	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Bait + Shoot	Pigeon	-	-	-	1	-	1	2
	Pigeon + Sparrow	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Proof + Shoot	Pigeon + Sparrow	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
	Sparrow	1	-	1	-	-	-	2
Proof + Nest Removal	Pigeon + Sparrow	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
	Pigeon	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Shoot + Trap	Pigeon	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
	Pigeon + Sparrow + Other	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
'Good Hygiene'	Pigeon + Sparrow	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
	Total Sites	25	3	14	7*	4	2	56

\* One of these was both 'own' and 'cont.' (own staff and contractor)

\*\* Effectiveness and operator not specified

Table 49. Sources from which advice was sought and/or gained on grain storage in last 12 months.

Source	N	M+W	Region				Wales	Total Sites	Percent of all Sites (n = 171)
			E	SE	SW				
<u>Advice on pest control</u>									
Chemical Company	8	2	24	3	2	-	39	22.8	
Agricultural Company	1	1	1	-	1	-	4	2.3	
ADAS Staff	6	1	16	2	5	1	31	18.1	
ADAS Leaflets	5	-	5	-	2	-	12	7.0	
Total ADAS	9	1	17	2	5	1	35	20.5	
Consultants	1	-	7	1	2	-	11	6.4	
Other source	7	4	11	5	4	-	31	18.1	
Total Sites Advised	21	7	48	10	10	1	97	56.7	
<u>Other advice</u>									
Chemical Company	1	-	3	-	5	-	9	5.3	
Agricultural Company	3	-	1	-	3	-	7	4.1	
ADAS Staff	2	1	9	2	5	-	19	11.1	
ADAS Leaflets	3	-	2	2	6	-	13	7.6	
Total ADAS	4	1	10	3	8	-	26	15.2	
Consultants	3	-	1	-	4	-	8	4.7	
Other source	6	2	13	2	4	-	27	15.8	
Total Sites Advised	15	3	23	5	12	-	58	33.9	
<u>All advice</u>									
Chemical Company	8	2	26	3	5	-	44	25.7	
Agricultural Company	4	1	2	-	3	-	10	5.9	
ADAS Staff	6	2	20	4	7	1	40	23.4	
ADAS Leaflets	6	-	5	2	6	-	19	11.1	
Total ADAS	10	2	21	5	9	1	48	28.1	
Consultants	3	-	7	1	4	-	15	8.8	
Other source	9	5	14	6	4	-	38	22.2	
Total Sites Advised	25	9	52	12	14	1	113	66.1	
<hr/>									
TOTAL SITES	39	19	71	20	19	3	171		

**Table 50. Number of storage structures inspected by WSB Advisers at each site visited.**

Region	No. of stores inspected per site					Total sites visited	Total sites inspected	Total stores inspected
	0	1	2	3	4			
N	2	18	7	11	1	39	37	69
M+W	-	11	3	4	1	19	19	33
E	7	31	18	13	2	71	64	114
SE	1	11	4	2	2	20	19	33
SW	4	7	4	1	3	19	15	30
Wales	-	2	1	-	-	3	3	4
Total Sites	14	80	37	31	9	171	157	
Total Stores	-	80	74	93	36			283

Note: WSB = Wildlife and Storage Biology Discipline of ADAS.

**Table 51. Sites visited but not inspected.**

Type of site	No. of sites	Reason not inspected	
		External bins only	Other reasons
Commercial trading	6	2	4
Co-operative	5	5	-
Comm. + Co-op.	2	1	1
Comm. + Co-op. + Port	1	1	-
Total	14	9	5

Note: Use of site - 12 sites solely grain storage  
 1 site storage and seed cleaning  
 1 site storage and milling



Table 52. Number and capacity of stores inspected.

Region	Total		Floor-stores		Internal bins		Total Capacity Tonnes
	no. of Sites	no. of Stores	No. Sites	No. Floors	No. Bins	Capacity Tonnes	
N	37	69	34	62	11	287	645,465
M+W	19	33	19	30	2	40	543,160
E	64	114	62	108	8	103	1,279,185
SE	19	33	13	17	11	349	250,500
SW	15	30	14	26	3	165	294,550
<b>Wales</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>300</b>
Total	157	283	144	246	36	958	3,026,690
Percent*	91.8	-	96.0	67.0	67.9	67.9	77.7

Note: \* The percentages are of totals for all 171 sites visited. (See Table 8).  
External bins were not inspected.

**Table 53. Fabric of internal bins in stores inspected.**

<u>Fabric of bin</u>	<u>No. of sites</u>	<u>No. of bins</u>	<u>Percent of bins</u>	<u>Capacity tonnes</u>	<u>Percent of bin capacity</u>
Metal	19	426	44.5	29,185	24.2
Metal + Wood	1	52	5.4	1,000	0.8
Concrete	10	360	37.6	75,040	62.1
Brick + Wood	1	3	0.3	3,800	3.1
Wood + asbestos	1	16	1.7	1,200	1.0
Mesh + lining	1	42	4.4	4,200	3.5
Unknown	3	59	6.2	6,320	5.2
<hr/>					
Total	36	958		120,745	

Table 54. Type of floor-stores inspected.

Region	Purpose-Built			Hangar			Other Type		
	No. of Sites	No. of Stores	Capacity Tonnes	No. of Sites	No. of Stores	Capacity Tonnes	No. of Sites	No. of Stores	Capacity Tonnes
N	23	38	262,800	3	7	98,000	12	17	253,715
M+W	10	15	153,400	7	13	312,000	2	2	71,500
E	35	60	583,450	19	28	293,600	15	20	387,400
SE	10	12	125,000	3	3	30,000	1	2	65,000
SW	7	14	57,650	3	6	170,000	5	6	28,900
<b>Totals</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>13,500</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>1,195,800</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>903,600</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>806,545</b>
<b>Percent</b>	<b>60.4</b>	<b>57.3</b>	<b>41.2</b>	<b>24.3</b>	<b>23.2</b>	<b>31.1</b>	<b>25.0</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>27.8</b>

Note: Some sites had more than one type of floor-store.

Table 55. Presence and fabric of grain walling in floor-stores inspected.

	N	M+W	Region				Wales	Total Stores	Percent of stores
			E	SE	SW				
<u>Grain walling present?</u>									
Yes	41	26	97	15	22	2	203	82.5	
No	21	4	11	2	4	1	43	17.5	
Total	62	30	108	17	26	3	246		
<u>Fabric of walling</u>									
Metal	15	15	60	7	2	-	99	48.8	
Metal + Wood	2	1	7	1	-	-	11	5.4	
Metal + Wood + Straw	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	0.5	
Concrete	6	-	4	1	6	-	17	8.4	
Concrete + Metal	-	-	-	3	-	1	4	2.0	
Concrete + Wood	2	1	2	-	3	1	9	4.4	
Brick	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.5	
Brick + Metal	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	1.0	
Brick + Metal + Wood + Asbestos	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	0.5	
Wood	11	7	21	3	11	-	53	26.1	
Wood + Asbestos	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.5	
Mesh + Lining	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.5	
Total	38	26	97	15	22	2	200		

Note: Fabric of walling not specified for three floor-stores.

Table 56. Number of inspected floor-stores with grain surcharged above grain walling.

Region	Stores with walling	Walling but no grain	Walling and grain present	Grain surcharged?	
				Yes	No
N	41	3	38	30	7
M+W	26	2	24	15	6
E	97	6	91	83	8
SE	15	-	15	12	3
SW	22	1	21	17	4
Wales	2	-	2	2	-
Total	203	12	191	159	28
Percent				85.0	15.0

Note: Not known whether grain surcharged in four floor-stores

Table 57. Quantity of grain present in floor-stores and internal bins at time of inspection.

Region	Floor-stores		Internal bins		Total Content	
	No. Stores	Content Tonnes	No. Stores	Content Tonnes	No. Stores	Content Tonnes
<b>WHEAT</b>						
N	31	137,560	6	11,930	36	149,490
M+W	14	79,820	2	2,025	16	81,845
E	54	474,323	4	3,214	56	477,537
SE	13	57,005	15	6,293	28	63,298
SW	12	61,846	4	20,081	16	81,927
Wales	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	124	810,554	31	43,543	152	854,097
Percent*		82.7		89.9		70.8
<b>BARLEY</b>						
N	34	180,575	7	10,739	40	191,314
M+W	21	188,880	3	1,773	24	190,653
E	55	293,468	8	6,284	62	299,752
SE	7	65,542	12	8,599	19	74,141
SW	16	47,837	4	4,058	20	51,895
Wales	2	11,250	-	-	2	11,250
Total	135	787,552	34	31,453	167	819,005
Percent*		90.8		84.1		74.7

(continued)

Table 57. (continued) - Quantity of grain present in floor-stores and internal bins at time of inspection.

Region	Floor-stores		Internal bins		Total Content	
	No. Stores	Content Tonnes	No. Stores	Content Tonnes	No. Stores	Content Tonnes
<b><u>OTHER GRAIN</u></b>						
N	5	5,385	-	-	5	5,385
M+W	-	-	-	-	-	-
E	1	240	3	648	4	888
SE	1	90	5	474	6	564
SW	2	317	1	200	3	517
Wales	1	30	1	300	2	330
Total	10	6,062	10	1,622	20	7,684**
Percent*		100***		88.1		76.4
<b><u>TOTAL GRAIN</u></b>						
N	56	323,520	9	22,669	62	346,189
M+W	28	268,700	3	3,798	31	272,498
E	100	768,031	9	10,146	106	778,177
SE	17	122,637	16	15,366	33	138,003
SW	24	110,000	4	24,339	28	134,339
Wales	3	11,280	1	300	4	11,580
Total	228	1,604,168	42	76,618	264	1,680,786
Percent*		86.6		87.4		72.7

NOTE: \* The percentages are of totals for all 171 sites visited (see Table 9)  
 \*\* Total 'other grain'=5,796 tonnes oats, 1,360 maize, 528 rye.  
 \*\*\*Unresolved discrepancy of 430 more tonnes of 'other grain' in N region than shown in Table 9

19 stores contained no grain at time of inspection

Table 58. Potentially infestable commodities other than cereal grain present in stores inspected.

Commodities	N	M+W	E	Region			Total Stores	Percent of Stores
				SE	SW	Wales		
<u>Stores with grain</u>								
None	43	22	91	21	23	2	202	72.1
Rape only	4	2	7	-	-	-	13	4.6
Peas/beans only	8	4	3	3	2	-	20	7.1
Rape + peas/beans	2	2	-	5	-	-	9	3.2
Rape + other	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.4
Peas/beans + other	3	-	-	1	-	-	4	1.4
Rape + peas/beans + other	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	0.4
Rape + peas/beans + carobs + other	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	0.4
Other commodities only	1	1	3	2	2	1	10	3.6
	62	31	104	33	27	4	261	93.2
<u>Stores with no grain</u>								
None	2	1	5	-	2	-	10	3.6
Rape only	4	-	1	-	-	-	5	1.8
Peas/beans only	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.4
Rape + peas/beans + other	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	0.4
Other commodities only	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	0.7
	7	2	8	-	2	-	19	6.8
<u>Total Stores</u>								
None	45	23	96	21	25	2	212	75.7
Rape only	8	2	8	-	-	-	18	6.4
Peas/beans only	8	4	4	3	2	-	21	7.5
Rape + peas/beans	2	2	-	5	-	-	9	3.2
Rape + other	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.4
Peas/beans + other	3	-	-	1	-	-	4	1.4
Rape + peas/beans + other	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	0.7
Rape + peas/beans + carobs + other	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	0.4
Other commodities only	2	1	4	2	2	1	12	4.3
	69	33	112	33	29	4	280	100
Total rape	11	5	8	6	-	1	31	11.1
Total peas/beans	13	7	4	10	2	1	37	13.2
Total other commodities	6	2	4	4	2	2	20	7.1

Note: No answer for three stores



Table 59. Number of stores inspected in which the grain had been cooled.

	N	M+W	Region				Wales	Total Stores	Percent of Stores
			E	SE	SW				
<u>Grain Present?</u>									
Yes	62	31	106	33	28	4	264	93.3	
No	7	2	8	-	2	-	19	6.7	
Total	69	33	114	33	30	4	283		
<u>Cooling System Present?</u>									
Yes	55	26	99	30	11	1	222	84.7	
No	7	5	7	3	15	3	40	15.3	
Total	62	31	106	33	26	4	262		
<u>Grain Cooled?</u>									
Yes	53	26	89	29	9	1	207	93.7	
No	2	-	9	1	2	-	14	6.3	
Total	55	26	98	30	11	1	221		

Note: Each question refers only to the stores answering 'Yes' to the questions above.  
 No answer to 'cooling system present' at two stores.  
 No answer to 'grain cooled' at one store.

Table 60. Number of stores inspected that monitored the temperature of the grain present.

	Region						Total Stores	Percent of Stores
	N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Wales		
<u>Is temperature measured?</u>								
Yes	54	28	93	16	16	3	210	80.5
No	8	3	13	17	9	1	51	19.5
Total	62	31	106	33	25	4	261	
<u>How is it measured?</u>								
Fixed sensors	19	8	33	6	6	-	72	34.8
Fixed + spot	5	3	13	4	2	-	27	13.0
Spot measuring	29	17	46	6	8	2	108	52.2
Total	53	28	92	16	16	2	207	
<u>Was it measured on intake?</u>								
Yes	32	21	78	12	11	3	157	76.6
No	20	7	14	4	3	-	48	23.4
Total	52	28	92	16	14	3	205	
<u>How often measured after intake?</u>								
Daily	18	11	28	7	3	-	67	32.1
Weekly	16	4	44	5	9	1	79	37.8
Monthly	14	10	9	4	2	1	40	19.1
Less than monthly	5	3	11	-	1	-	20	9.6
Never	1	-	1	-	-	1	3	1.4
Total	54	28	93	16	15	3	209	

Note: No answer to 'is temperature measured?' for three stores.  
 No answer to 'how measured?' for three stores.  
 No answer to 'measured on intake?' for five stores.  
 No answer to 'how often measured?' for one store.

Only those stores which answered 'Yes' to 'Is temperature measured?' are included in the subsequent questions.

Table 61. Number of stores inspected that monitored the moisture content of the grain present.

	Region						Total Stores	Percent of Stores
	N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Wales		
<u>Is moisture content measured?</u>								
Yes	61	31	104	32	24	3	255	97.3
No	1	-	2	1	2	1	7	2.7
Total	62	31	106	33	26	4	262	
<u>How is it measured?</u>								
Oven	-	4	-	-	-	-	4	1.6
Oven + meter	24	4	18	8	2	-	56	23.0
Meter	36	22	83	20	19	3	183	75.0
Other method	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	0.4
Total	60	30	101	28	22	3	244	
<u>Was it measured on intake?</u>								
Yes	60	30	101	31	22	3	247	99.6
No	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.4
Total	60	30	102	31	22	3	248	
<u>How often measured after intake?</u>								
Daily	-	-	2	2	-	-	4	1.6
Weekly	21	12	42	6	8	-	89	35.0
Monthly	23	9	38	15	4	1	90	35.4
Less than monthly	12	5	17	4	5	-	43	16.9
Never	5	5	5	5	6	2	28	11.0
Total	61	31	104	32	23	3	254	

Note: No answer to 'is moisture content measured?' for two stores.  
 No answer to 'how measured?' for eleven stores.  
 No answer to 'measured on intake?' for seven stores.  
 No answer to 'how often measured?' for one store.

Only those stores which answered 'Yes' to 'Is moisture content measured?' are included in the subsequent questions.

Table 62. Number of stores inspected that monitored the grain present for invertebrate pests.

	N	M+W	Region			Wales	Total Stores	Percent of Stores
			E	SE	SW			
<u>Is grain checked for pests?</u>								
Yes	59	30	97	32	20	3	241	92.0
No	3	1	9	1	6	1	21	8.0
Total	62	31	106	33	26	4	262	
<u>How is it checked?</u>								
Spear/sieve	52	25	90	18	7	1	193	82.8
Vacuum/sieve	8	1	9	5	6	1	30	12.9
Sieve	8	1	9	4	-	-	22	9.4
Probe trap	12	10	26	3	5	-	56	24.0
Pitfall trap	1	4	16	2	2	-	25	10.7
Bait bag	7	2	2	2	3	-	16	6.9
Visual	26	3	55	24	13	1	122	52.4
Other	-	1	1	1	3	-	6	2.6
Total Stores	58	29	95	32	17	2	233	
<u>Was it checked on intake?</u>								
Yes	59	30	89	25	19	3	225	94.1
No	-	-	7	6	1	-	14	5.9
Total	59	30	96	31	20	3	239	
<u>How often checked after intake?</u>								
Daily	1	-	4	5	-	-	10	4.2
Weekly	20	12	48	14	5	-	99	41.9
Monthly	28	11	28	12	4	-	83	35.2
Less than monthly	8	3	15	1	3	1	31	13.1
Never	2	4	2	-	3	2	13	5.5
Total	59	30	97	32	15	3	236	

Note: No answer for two, eight, two and five stores respectively.

Only those stores which answered 'Yes' to 'Is grain checked for pests?' are included in the subsequent questions.

Table 63. Insect detection methods used in stores inspected - grain sampling and insect trapping.

Methods used	N	M+W	Region					Total Stores	Percent of Stores
			E	SE	SW	Wales			
<u>Grain sampling</u>									
Spear only	46	24	81	13	7	1	172	67.7	
Vacuum only	2	1	-	-	6	1	10	3.9	
Spear + Vacuum	6	1	9	5	-	-	21	8.3	
Total Sampling	54	26	90	18	13	2	203	79.9	
<u>Insect trapping</u>									
Probe trap only	11	6	12	3	-	-	32	12.6	
Pitfall trap only	-	-	3	-	-	-	3	1.2	
Bait bag only	6	-	-	-	-	-	6	2.4	
Probe + pitfall	-	2	12	-	2	-	16	6.3	
Probe + bait bag	-	-	1	-	3	-	4	1.6	
Pitfall + bait bag	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	0.8	
Probe + pitfall + bait bag	1	2	1	-	-	-	4	1.6	
Total Trapping	18	10	29	5	5	-	67	26.4	
Total Sampling or Trapping	56	26	90	18	13	2	205	80.7	
Sieving only	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	0.4	
Visual only	2	3	5	13	1	-	24	9.4	
Other method only	-	-	-	-	3	-	3	1.2	
None	3	1	9	1	6	1	21	8.3	
Total Stores	61	30	104	33	23	3	254		

Note: No grain present in 19 stores.  
No answer for a further 10 stores.

Table 64. Number of stores where the manager was aware of the presence of pests.

	N	M+W	Region		SW	Wales	Total Stores	Percent of Stores
			E	SE				
<u>Insects present?</u>								
Yes	4	1	5	1	3	-	14	5.0
No	65	31	107	32	26	4	265	95.0
Total Stores	69	32	112	33	29	4	279	
<u>Mites present?</u>								
Yes	11	14	26	11	-	1	63	22.5
No	58	19	87	22	28	3	217	77.5
Total Stores	69	33	113	33	28	4	280	
<u>Rodents present?</u>								
Yes	45	25	46	18	19	1	154	55.2
No	23	8	67	15	10	2	125	44.8
Total Stores	68	33	113	33	29	3	279	
<u>Birds present?</u>								
Yes	19	18	18	5	18	3	81	28.9
No	49	15	95	28	11	1	199	71.1
Total Stores	68	33	113	33	29	4	280	
<u>Any of the above pests present?</u>								
Yes	54	27	65	22	23	4	195	69.4
No	15	6	48	11	6	-	86	30.6
Total Stores	69	33	113	33	29	4	281	

Note: No answer for four, three, four, three, two stores respectively.

Table 65. Number of stores where the fabric of the store or machinery in it had been treated with insecticide in last 12 months, and the reason for these treatments.

Region	Fabric Treated?		Prophylaxis	Reason for Treatment	
	Yes	No		Prophylaxis and infestation	Known infestation
N	58	11	55	1	-
M+W	24	9	21	2	1
E	86	27	84	-	2
SE	30	3	29	1	-
SW	21	7	17	-	4
<u>Vales</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
Total Stores	220	60	207	4	7
Percent of Total Stores	78.6	21.4			
Percent of Treated Stores			95.0	1.8	3.2

Note: No answer to whether fabric treated for three stores.  
 No answer to reason for treatment for two stores.

Table 66. Insecticides used to treat the fabric of the store or machinery in stores inspected.

Insecticide and formulation	N	M+W	E	Region			Total Stores	Percent of treated Stores
				SE	SW	Wales		
<u>Pirimiphos-methyl</u>								
EC	38	13	45	23	8	-	127	57.7
WP	1	5	2	-	5	-	13	5.9
Unknown spray	-	-	-	-	3	-	3	1.4
Dust	12	1	17	8	4	-	42	19.1
Smoke	9	4	14	18	1	-	46	20.9
Fog	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	0.5
Total PM Stores	45	20	56	26	17	-	164	74.5
<u>Chlorpyrifos-methyl</u>								
EC	1	3	12	3	-	-	19	8.6
WP	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.5
Unknown spray	-	-	3	-	-	-	3	1.4
Smoke	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.5
Total CPM Stores	2	3	16	3	-	-	24	10.9
<u>Etrimfos</u>								
EC	8	2	8	2	-	-	20	9.1
WP	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	0.9
Dust	3	-	1	-	-	-	4	1.8
Smoke	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.5
Total Etrimfos Stores	9	2	10	2	-	-	23	10.5

(continued)



Table 66. (continued) - Insecticides used to treat the fabric of the store or machinery in stores inspected.

Insecticide and formulation	N	M+W	Region				Total Stores	Percent of treated Stores
			E	SE	SW	Wales		
<u>Methacrifos</u>								
EC	-	-	5	1	1	-	7	3.2
<u>Fenitrothion</u>								
EC	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.5
WP	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	0.9
Total Fen. Stores*	3	-	-	-	-	-	3	1.4
<u>Pyrethroids</u> (including mixtures with OPs)								
Turbair GSI (Fen + Pyr)	4	2	12	-	-	-	18	8.2
Multispray (Pyr + OP)	-	-	1	-	1	-	2	0.9
Pybuthrin fog	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	0.5
Pyrethroid WP	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	0.5
Total Pyrethroid Stores	4	2	13	-	1	1	21	9.5
<u>Fumigants</u>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
<u>Unknown insecticide</u>	4	1	3	-	2	-	10	4.5
<hr/>								
Total Treated Stores	58	24	86	30	21	1	220	
Average number of formulations per treated store	1.4	1.3	1.5	1.8	1.2	2.0	1.5	

Note: EC = emulsifiable concentrate; WP = wettable powder; OP = organo-phosphorus insecticide; GSI = grain store insecticide.

\* the 'total Fenitrothion stores' does not include the use of this compound in a mixture with pyrethroids - see Turbair GSI.

Table 67. Number of stores where some or all of the grain present had been treated with insecticide in last 12 months.

Region	Contact insecticide			Fumigant		Insecticide or fumigant used?	
	All	Part	None	Part	None	Yes	No
N	19	15	28	-	62	34	28
M+W	7	4	20	1	30	12	19
E	31	23	52	1	105	54	52
SE	12	2	19	-	33	14	19
SW	12	5	9	-	26	17	9
<u>Wales</u>	-	-	4	-	4	-	4
Total Stores	81	49	132	2	260	131	131
Percent of Stores	30.9	18.7	50.4	0.8	99.2	50.0	50.0

Note: No answer for 2 stores.

No grain present in 19 stores.

Table 68. Reason given by store managers for grain treatments.

Region	Contact insecticide		Fumigant		Total stores treated for infestation	Total stores with grain
	Prophylaxis and infestation	Prophylaxis Known infestation	Known infestation	Known infestation		
N	25	-	9	-	9	62
M+W	10	-	1	1	2	31
E	49	-	5	1	6	106
SE	11	1	2	-	3	33
SW	11	1	5	-	6	26
<u>Wales</u>	-	-	-	-	-	4
Total Stores	106	2	22	2	26	262
Percent of treated stores	81.5	1.5	16.9		19.8	
Percent of stores with grain	40.5	0.8	8.4	0.8	9.9	

Note: Not known whether insecticide used at two stores with grain.

Table 69. Insecticides used within the last 12 months on grain in stores inspected.

Insecticide and formulation	N	M+W	Region				Wales	Total Stores	Percent of treated Stores
			E	SE	SW				
<u>Pirimiphos-methyl</u>									
Spray	13	1	13	6	3	-	36	27.5	
Dust	13	2	23	7	15	-	60	45.8	
Smoke	2	-	-	1	-	-	3	2.3	
Total PM Stores	28	3	32	13	17	-	93	71.0	
<u>Chlorpyrifos-methyl</u>									
Spray	8	7	11	2	2	-	30	22.9	
<u>Etrimfos</u>									
Spray	-	1	7	-	-	-	8	6.1	
Dust	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	1.5	
Total Etrimfos Stores	-	1	8	1	-	-	10	7.6	
<u>Methacrifos</u>									
Spray	-	-	4	-	-	-	4	3.1	
'Liquid'	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.8	
Total Methac. Stores	-	-	5	-	-	-	5	3.8	
<u>Fumigants</u>									
Methyl bromide	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.8	
Liquid fumigant	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	0.8	
Total Fumigant Stores	-	1	1	-	-	-	2	1.5	
Total Treated Stores	34	12	54	14	17	-	131		
Average number of formulations per treated Store	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.2	-	1.1		

Table 70. Method by which the grain in store was admixed.

Method of admixture	Region						Total Stores	Percent of admixing Stores
	N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Wales		
<u>Bulk by machine</u>								
Spray	18	8	25	7	2	-	60	48.4
Dust	1	-	6	2	1	-	10	8.1
Spray + dust	-	-	4	-	-	-	4	3.2
<u>Bulk by machine and by hand</u>								
Spray + dust	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	0.8
<u>Bulk by hand and other method</u>								
Dust	6	1	2	2	9	-	20	16.1
<u>Bulk by machine and surface treatment</u>								
Spray + dust	2	-	1	-	2	-	5	4.0
<u>Bulk by other method and surface treatment</u>								
Spray + dust	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	0.8
<u>Surface only</u>								
Spray	-	-	3	-	-	-	3	2.4
Dust	4	1	11	2	2	-	20	16.1
Total Stores	31	10	52	14	17	-	124	100
<u>Other stores treating grain</u>								
Spray - method unknown	1	1	2	-	-	-	4	
Smoke through floor	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	
Fumigation only	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	
Total stores treating grain	34	12	54	14	17	-	131	

Table 71. Number of stores that treated the fabric and/or some or all of the grain with insecticide

Treatment	N	M+W	Region				Total Stores	Percent of Stores
			E	SE	SW	Wales		
<u>Stores with grain</u>								
Fabric only	23	11	37	17	4	1	93	33.1
Fabric and grain	29	12	42	13	15	-	111	39.5
Grain only	5	-	11	1	2	-	19	6.8
Grain (fabric unknown)	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.4
Total treated	57	23	91	31	21	1	224	79.7
untreated	5	8	15	2	5	3	38	13.5
Total with grain	62	31	106	33	26	4	262	93.2
<u>Stores without grain</u>								
Fabric treated	6	1	7	-	2	-	16	5.7
untreated	1	1	1	-	-	-	3	1.1
Total without grain	7	2	8	-	2	-	19	6.8
<u>All stores</u>								
Fabric only	29	12	44	17	6	1	109	38.8
Fabric and grain	29	12	42	13	15	-	111	39.5
Grain only	5	-	11	1	2	-	19	6.8
Grain (fabric unknown)	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.4
Total treated	63	24	98	31	23	1	240	85.4
untreated	6	9	16	2	5	3	41	14.6
Total stores	69	33	114	33	28	4	281	100

Note: Not known whether two stores with grain were treated.

Table 72. Insecticides used in stores treating fabric and/or grain.

Insecticide and formulation	Region						Total Stores	Percent of treated Stores
	N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Wales		
<u>Pirimiphos-methyl</u>								
Spray	41	18	48	25	16	-	148	61.7
Dust	25	3	37	14	16	-	95	39.6
Smoke	9	4	14	19	1	-	47	19.6
Fog	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	0.4
Total PM Stores	55	20	69	29	22	-	195	81.3
<u>Chlorpyrifos-methyl</u>								
Spray	8	8	16	3	2	-	37	15.4
Smoke	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.4
Total CPM Stores	8	8	17	3	2	-	38	15.8
<u>Etrimfos</u>								
Spray	8	2	14	2	-	-	26	10.8
Dust	3	-	2	1	-	-	6	2.5
Smoke	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.4
Total Etrimfos Stores	9	2	14	3	-	-	28	11.7
<u>Methacrifos</u>								
Spray	-	-	7	1	1	-	9	3.8
<u>Fenitrothion</u>								
Spray	3	-	-	-	-	-	3	1.3
<u>Pyrethroids (including mixtures with OPs)</u>								
	4	2	13	-	1	1	21	8.8
<u>Fumigants</u>								
	-	1	1	-	-	-	2	0.8
<u>Unknown insecticide</u>								
	2	1	1	-	-	-	4	1.7
<hr/>								
Total treated stores	63	24	98	31	23	1	240	100
untreated stores	6	9	16	2	5	3	41	

Note: Not known whether two stores were treated.  
See note to Table 66 for pyrethroid mixture containing Fenitrothion.  
More than one formulation may be used in each store.

**Table 73. Number of sites and stores in which *Oryzaephilus surinamensis* (saw-toothed grain beetle) was detected.**

<i>O. surinamensis</i>	Region							Total	Percent of inspections
	N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Wales			
No. of sites (157 inspected)	3	7	9	4	7	1	31	19.7	
No. of stores (283 inspected)	4	9	10	6	11	1	41	14.5	
<u>Method by which detected</u>									
Baitbag on grain	4	4	5	2	6	1	22		
Pitfall trap	1	5	4	3	3	-	16		
Probe trap	2	8	5	5	9	-	29		
Baitbag on structure	-	3	1	4	7	-	15		
Visual on structure	-	3	1	1	2	-	7		
Sieve	-	1	-	1	3	-	5		
Unknown method	-	-	1	-	-	-	1		
<u>No. of stores where detected:-</u>									
In grain	4	8	8	5	9	1	35	12.4	
On structure, not grain	-	1	1	1	2	-	5	1.8	
Unknown where	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.4	

Note: All stores where *O. surinamensis* was detected contained grain.

Note: Although there was a standard protocol for inspecting the stores, it was not possible to use all detection methods in some stores. Therefore direct comparisons of the relative effectiveness of different detection methods is not valid. The occurrences 'in grain' include the results of baitbags on grain, pitfall traps and probe traps; the sieving of residues is not included.



Table 74. Number of sites and stores in which *Cryptolestes ferrugineus* (rust-red grain beetle) was detected.

<i>C. ferrugineus</i>	Region							Total	Percent of inspections
	N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Vales			
No. of sites (157 inspected)	1	8	9	6	2	1	27	17.2	
No. of stores (283 inspected)	1	8	11	7	2	1	30	10.6	
<u>Method by which detected</u>									
Baitbag on grain	-	2	3	1	1	-	7		
Pitfall trap	1	4	-	2	-	-	7		
Probe trap	1	5	5	2	1	-	14		
Baitbag on structure	-	2	1	4	-	-	7		
Visual on structure	-	2	-	-	-	-	2		
Sieve	-	-	-	2	-	-	2		
Unknown method	-	1	2	-	1	1	5		
<u>No. of stores where detected:-</u>									
In grain	1	6	8	3	1	-	19	6.7	
On structure, not grain	-	1	1	4	-	-	6	2.1	
Unknown where	-	1	2	-	1	1	5	1.8	

Note: One store in which *C. ferrugineus* was detected contained no grain.

Note: Although there was a standard protocol for inspecting the stores, it was not possible to use all detection methods in some stores. Therefore direct comparisons of the relative effectiveness of different detection methods is not valid. The occurrences 'in grain' include the results of baitbags on grain, pitfall traps and probe traps; the sieving of residues is not included.

Table 75. Number of sites and stores in which *Sitophilus* spp. (grain weevils) were detected.

<i>Sitophilus</i> spp.	Region						Total	Percent of inspections
	N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Wales		
<i>S. granarius</i>								
No. of sites	2	5	9	3	5	3	27	17.2
No. of stores	2	6	10	3	5	3	29	10.2
<i>S. oryzae</i>								
No. of sites	-	1	-	1	1	-	3	1.9
No. of stores	-	1	-	1	1	-	3	1.1
<u>Species not identified</u>								
No. of sites	1	-	5	-	-	-	6	3.8
No. of stores	1	-	5	-	-	-	6	2.1
<u>Total Sitophilus</u>								
No. of sites	3	6	14	4	5	3	35	22.3
No. of stores	3	7	15	4	5	3	37	13.1
<u>Method by which detected</u>								
Baitbag on grain	1	-	3	-	-	-	4	
Pitfall trap	2	3	11	-	2	-	18	
Probe trap	-	-	5	-	1	2	8	
Baitbag on structure	-	2	2	2	2	-	8	
Visual on structure	-	3	-	1	1	-	5	
Sieve	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Unknown method	-	1	-	2	-	1	4	
<u>No. of stores where detected:-</u>								
In grain	3	3	15	-	3	2	26	9.2
On structure, not grain	-	3	-	2	2	-	7	2.5
Unknown where	-	1	-	2	-	1	4	1.4

Note: All stores where *Sitophilus* was detected contained grain.  
Both *S. granarius* and *S. oryzae* were detected in one store.

Note: Although there was a standard protocol for inspecting the stores, it was not possible to use all detection methods in some stores. Therefore direct comparisons of the relative effectiveness of different detection methods is not valid.

The occurrences 'in grain' include the results of baitbags on grain, pitfall traps and probe traps; the sieving of residues is not included.

Table 76. Sites and stores where *O. surinamensis*, *C. ferrugineus* or *Sitophilus* spp. was detected.

	N	M+W	E	Region			Total	Percent of inspections
				SE	SW	Wales		
<u>Sites</u>								
<i>O. surinamensis</i> only	3	1	6	1	3	-	14	8.9
<i>C. ferrugineus</i> only	1	2	4	2	-	-	9	5.7
<i>Sitophilus</i> spp. only	3	1	10	2	1	2	19	12.1
<i>O. sur.</i> + <i>C. fer.</i>	-	1	1	2	-	-	4	2.5
<i>O. sur.</i> + <i>Sitophilus</i>	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	1.3
<i>C. fer.</i> + <i>Sitophilus</i>	-	-	2	1	-	-	3	1.9
<i>O. sur.</i> + <i>C. fer.</i> + <i>Sitoph.</i>	-	5	2	1	2	1	11	7.0
<i>O. sur.</i> or <i>C. fer.</i> or <i>Sitoph.</i>	7	10	25	9	8	3	62	39.5
<u>Stores</u>								
<i>O. surinamensis</i> only	4	2	6	3	6	-	21	7.4
<i>C. ferrugineus</i> only	1	2	5	3	-	-	11	3.9
<i>Sitophilus</i> spp. only	3	1	11	2	1	2	20	7.1
<i>O. sur.</i> + <i>C. fer.</i>	-	1	2	2	1	-	6	2.1
<i>O. sur.</i> + <i>Sitophilus</i>	-	1	-	-	3	-	4	1.4
<i>C. fer.</i> + <i>Sitophilus</i>	-	-	2	1	-	-	3	1.1
<i>O. sur.</i> + <i>C. fer.</i> + <i>Sitophilus</i>	-	5	2	1	1	1	10	3.5
<i>O. sur.</i> or <i>C. fer.</i> or <i>Sitophilus</i>	8	12	28	12	12	3	75	26.5

Note: 283 stores inspected at 157 sites.

Table 77. Number of sites and stores in which *Ahasverus advena* (foreign grain beetle) was detected.

A. advena	Region						Total	Percent of inspections
	N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Wales		
<u>Sites</u>								
Ident. confirmed	-	5	2	3	1	1	12	7.6
unconfirmed	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	1.3
<u>Stores</u>								
Ident. confirmed	-	5	2	3	1	1	12	4.2
unconfirmed	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	0.7
<u>Method by which detected*</u>								
Baitbag on grain	-	2	-	-	1	-	3	
Pitfall trap	-	2	-	-	1	-	3	
Probe trap	-	4	2	2	-	1	9	
Baitbag on structure	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	
Visual on structure	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	
Sieve	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Unknown method	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	
<u>No. of stores where detected*:-</u>								
In grain	-	4	2	2	1	1	10	3.5
On structure, not grain	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Unknown where	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	0.7

\* confirmed identifications only

Note: 283 stores inspected at 157 sites.

Note: Although there was a standard protocol for inspecting the stores, it was not possible to use all detection methods in some stores. Therefore direct comparisons of the relative effectiveness of different detection methods is not valid. The occurrences 'in grain' include the results of baitbags on grain, pitfall traps and probe traps; the sieving of residues is not included.

Table 78. Number of sites and stores in which *Typhaea stercorea* (hairy fungus beetle) was detected.

<i>T. stercorea</i>	Region						Total	Percent of inspections
	N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Wales		
<u>Sites</u>								
Ident. confirmed	1	7	5	1	-	-	14	8.9
unconfirmed	2	-	6	1	-	-	9	5.7
<u>Stores</u>								
Ident. confirmed	2	8	5	2	-	-	17	6.0
unconfirmed	3	-	6	1	-	-	10	3.5
<u>Method by which detected*</u>								
Baitbag on grain	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	
Pitfall trap	2	5	4	1	-	-	12	
Probe trap	1	4	-	1	-	-	6	
Baitbag on structure	-	-	2	1	-	-	3	
Visual on structure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Sieve	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Unknown method	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	
<u>No. of stores where detected*:-</u>								
In grain	2	7	4	1	-	-	14	4.9
On structure, not grain	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	0.7
Unknown where	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	0.4

\* confirmed identifications only

Note: Although there was a standard protocol for inspecting the stores, it was not possible to use all detection methods in some stores. Therefore direct comparisons of the relative effectiveness of different detection methods is not valid.

The occurrences 'in grain' include the results of baitbags on grain, pitfall traps and probe traps; the sieving of residues is not included.

Table 79. Number of sites and stores from which *Cryptophagus* spp. (mould beetles) were collected.

<i>Cryptophagus</i> spp.	Region						Total	Percent of inspections
	N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Wales		
No. of sites	5	2	18	1	5	-	31	19.7
No. of stores	5	3	24	1	5	-	38	13.4

<u>Identifications</u>	<u>Species</u>	<u>No. of sites</u>	<u>No of stores</u>
	<i>C. acutangulus</i>	1	1
	<i>C. dentatus</i>	4	4
	<i>C. distinguendus</i>	2	3
	<i>C. laticollis</i>	2	2
	<i>C. pseudodentatus</i>	1	1
	<i>C. pilosus</i>	1	1
	<i>C. saginatus</i>	3	5
	<i>C. scanicus</i>	1	1
	<i>C. scutellatus</i>	1	1
	<i>C. simplex</i>	1	1
	Total where identified to species	13*	16*
	Identified to genus only	18	22

\* At four sites and stores two species were identified.

Note: *Cryptophagus* spp were not included in the check-list in question 60 on the fact sheet, but occurred frequently enough in the samples to warrant inclusion in this report. Consequently, the above data are probably an under-estimate of their actual occurrence.

Table 80. Sites and stores where *A. advena*, *T. stercorea* or *Cryptophagus* spp. occurrence was confirmed.

Sites	Region							Total	Percent of inspections
	N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Wales			
<i>A. advena</i> only	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	3	1.9
<i>T. stercorea</i> only	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	3	1.9
<i>Cryptophagus</i> spp. only	4	-	13	-	4	-	21	21	13.4
<i>A. adv.</i> + <i>T. ster.</i>	-	3	-	1	-	-	4	4	2.5
<i>A. adv.</i> + <i>Crypto.</i> spp.	-	-	1	1	1	-	3	3	1.9
<i>T. ster.</i> + <i>Crypto.</i> spp.	1	-	4	-	-	-	5	5	3.2
<i>A. adv.</i> + <i>T. ster.</i> + <i>Crypto.</i> spp.	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	2	1.3
<i>A. adv.</i> or <i>T. ster.</i> or <i>Crypto.</i> spp.	5	7	20	3	5	1	41	41	26.1
<b>Stores</b>									
<i>A. advena</i> only	-	-	2	1	-	-	1	4	1.4
<i>T. stercorea</i> only	1	2	2	1	-	-	6	6	2.1
<i>Cryptophagus</i> spp. only	4	-	21	-	4	-	29	29	10.2
<i>A. adv.</i> + <i>T. ster.</i>	-	3	-	1	-	-	4	4	1.4
<i>A. adv.</i> + <i>Crypto.</i> spp.	-	-	-	1	1	-	2	2	0.7
<i>T. ster.</i> + <i>Crypto.</i> spp.	1	1	3	-	-	-	5	5	1.8
<i>A. adv.</i> + <i>T. ster.</i> + <i>Crypto.</i> spp.	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	2	0.7
<i>A. adv.</i> or <i>T. ster.</i> or <i>Crypto.</i> spp.	6	8	28	4	5	1	52	52	18.4

Note: 283 stores inspected at 157 sites.

Table 81. Number of sites and stores in which *Ptinidae* (spider beetles) were detected.

<i>Ptinidae</i>	Region						Total	Percent of inspections
	N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Wales		
<u>Sites</u>								
Confirmed identification								
<i>Ptinus fur</i> only	2	4	30	6	3	-	45	28.7
<i>Ptinus tectus</i> only	2	-	2	2	2	1	9	5.7
<i>Ptinus pusillus</i> only	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	1.3
<i>P. fur</i> + <i>P. tectus</i>	-	2	7	-	3	-	12	7.6
<i>P. fur</i> + <i>P. pusillus</i>	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	0.6
<u>Unconfirmed</u>	5	3	-	-	-	-	8	5.1
Total sites	10	10	40	8	8	1	77	49.0
<u>Stores</u>								
Confirmed identification								
<i>Ptinus fur</i> only	2	6	36	9	4	-	57	20.1
<i>Ptinus tectus</i> only	2	-	2	2	2	1	9	3.2
<i>Ptinus pusillus</i> only	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	0.7
<i>P. fur</i> + <i>P. tectus</i>	-	2	7	-	3	-	12	4.2
<i>P. fur</i> + <i>P. pusillus</i>	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	0.4
<u>Unconfirmed</u>	9	4	4	1	2	-	20	7.1
Total stores	14	13	50	12	11	1	101	35.7
<u>Method by which detected</u>								
Baitbag on grain	5	4	14	1	2	-	26	
Pitfall trap	11	10	44	6	5	-	76	
Probe trap	1	1	8	1	-	1	12	
Baitbag on structure	2	3	15	6	3	1	30	
Visual on structure	-	2	1	-	1	1	5	
Sieve	1	-	3	-	1	1	6	
Unknown method	-	1	-	2	1	-	4	
<u>No. of stores where detected:-</u>								
In grain	12	10	46	7	7	1	83	29.3
On structure, not grain	2	2	4	3	3	-	14	4.9
Unknown where	-	1	-	2	1	-	4	1.4

Note: Although there was a standard protocol for inspecting the stores, it was not possible to use all detection methods in some stores. Therefore direct comparisons of the relative effectiveness of different detection methods is not valid.

The occurrences 'in grain' include the results of baitbags on grain, pitfall traps and probe traps; the sieving of residues is not included.



Table 82. Number of sites and stores in which Moth pests were detected.

*Ephestia elutella* (cacao moth)  
*Endrosis sarcitrella* (white-shouldered house moth)  
*Hofmannophila pseudospretella* (brown house moth)

	Region						Total	Percent of inspections
	N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Wales		
<u>Sites</u>								
Confirmed identification								
<i>Ephestia elutella</i>	-	1	1	-	1	-	3	1.9
<i>Endrosis sarcitrella</i>	1	5	4	-	-	-	10	6.4
<i>H. pseudospretella</i>	-	2	8	1	1	-	12	7.6
Any of the above three	1	6*	13	1	2	-	23	14.7
Unconfirmed	10	-	6	-	-	3	19	12.1

Stores

Confirmed identification								
<i>Ephestia elutella</i>	-	1	1	-	1	-	3	1.1
<i>Endrosis sarcitrella</i>	1	5	4	-	-	-	10	3.5
<i>H. pseudospretella</i>	-	3	9	1	1	-	14	4.9
Any of the above three	1	8*	14	1	2	-	26	9.2
Unconfirmed	12	1	7	-	-	3	23	8.1

\* Two sites and one store had two species of moth.

<u>Method by which detected*</u>	<u>Ephestia</u>	<u>Endrosis</u>	<u>Hofmannophila</u>	<u>Total Stores</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Baitbag on grain	1	1	-		
Pitfall trap	2	7	-		
Probe trap	1	1	1		
Baitbag on structure	-	5	8		
Visual on structure	-	1	2		
Sieve	-	1	1		
Unknown method	1	3	5		

No. of stores where detected:-

In grain	2	8	1	10	3.5
On structure, not grain	-	1	9	10	3.5
Unknown where	1	1	4	6	2.1

\* confirmed identifications only

Note: Although there was a standard protocol for inspecting the stores, it was not possible to use all detection methods in some stores. Therefore direct comparisons of the relative effectiveness of different detection methods is not valid.

The occurrences 'in grain' include the results of baitbags on grain, pitfall traps and probe traps; the sieving of residues is not included.

Table 83. Number of sites and stores in which *Psocoptera* (psocids or book-lice) were detected.

<i>Psocoptera</i>	Region						Percent of Total inspections	
	N	M+W	E	SE	SW	Wales		
<u>Sites</u>								
Confirmed identification	18	11	43	9	7	1	89	56.7
Unconfirmed	6	1	2	1	2	1	13	8.3
Total sites	24	12	45	10	9	2	102	65.0

Stores

Confirmed identification	21	18	59	20	11	1	130	45.9
Unconfirmed	11	3	6	1	2	2	25	8.8
Total stores	32	21	65	21	13	3	155	54.8

SPECIES

Sites

<i>Lepinotus patruelis</i>	12	9	31	7	3	-	62	39.5
<i>Lachesilla pedicularia</i>	6	9	26	8	3	1	53	33.8
<i>Ectopsocus briggsi</i>	1	1	6	4	-	-	12	7.6
<i>Liposcelis bostrychophila</i>	-	1	1	-	-	-	2	1.3
<i>Liposcelis entomophila</i>	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	0.6
<i>Liposcelis corrodens</i>	1	-	2	-	1	-	4	2.5
<i>Liposcelis decolor</i>	1	1	2	-	1	-	5	3.2

Stores

<i>Lepinotus patruelis</i>	15	14	38	11	3	-	81	28.6
<i>Lachesilla pedicularia</i>	6	12	32	16	5	1	72	25.4
<i>Ectopsocus briggsi</i>	1	1	7	7	-	-	16	5.7
<i>Liposcelis bostrychophila</i>	-	2	1	-	-	-	3	1.1
<i>Liposcelis entomophila</i>	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	0.7
<i>Liposcelis corrodens</i>	1	-	2	-	1	-	4	1.4
<i>Liposcelis decolor</i>	1	1	3	-	1	-	6	2.1

WHERE DETECTED

(confirmed identifications.)

Sites

In grain	12	11	34	8	6	1	72	45.9
On structure, not grain	4	-	8	1	1	-	14	8.9
Unknown where	2	-	1	-	-	-	3	1.9

Stores

In grain	13	16	45	18	8	1	101	35.7
On structure, not grain	6	2	12	1	1	-	22	7.8
Unknown where	2	-	2	1	2	-	7	2.5

Note: 283 stores inspected at 157 sites.

Table 84. Number of sites and stores where mites of the genera *Acarus*, *Glycyphagus* or *Tyrophagus* were detected.

Mites Sites	N	M+W	E	Region			Wales	Total	Percent of inspections
				SE	SW				
<i>Acarus</i> only	7	1	7	1	1	-	17	10.8	
<i>Glycyphagus</i> only	3	4	5	2	-	-	14	8.9	
<i>Tyrophagus</i> only	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	0.6	
<i>Acarus</i> + <i>Glycyph.</i>	13	4	16	4	5	2	44	28.0	
<i>Acarus</i> + <i>Tyroph.</i>	1	-	5	-	1	-	7	4.5	
<i>Glycyph.</i> + <i>Tyroph.</i>	1	-	-	-	-	1	2	1.3	
<i>Acarus</i> + <i>Glycyph.</i> + <i>Tyroph.</i>	7	6	21	5	1	-	40	25.5	
Unidentified mites	3	1	3	2	3	-	12	7.6	
Total with mites	35	16	57	14	12	3	137	87.3	
Total <i>Acarus</i>	28	11	49	10	8	2	108	68.8	
Total <i>Glycyphagus</i>	24	14	42	11	6	3	100	63.7	
Total <i>Tyrophagus</i>	9	6	26	5	3	1	50	31.8	
<u>Stores</u>									
<i>Acarus</i> only	12	4	20	3	5	-	44	15.5	
<i>Glycyphagus</i> only	8	5	15	3	-	-	31	11.0	
<i>Tyrophagus</i> only	-	1	-	-	1	-	2	0.7	
<i>Acarus</i> + <i>Glycyph.</i>	17	7	19	8	8	2	61	21.6	
<i>Acarus</i> + <i>Tyroph.</i>	2	2	7	2	1	-	14	4.9	
<i>Glycyph.</i> + <i>Tyroph.</i>	2	-	1	2	-	1	6	2.1	
<i>Acarus</i> + <i>Glycyph.</i> + <i>Tyroph.</i>	9	5	28	6	1	-	49	17.3	
Unidentified mites	8	2	5	2	5	1	23	8.1	
Total with mites	58	26	95	26	21	4	230	81.3	
Total <i>Acarus</i>	40	18	74	19	15	2	168	59.4	
Total <i>Glycyphagus</i>	36	17	63	19	9	3	147	51.9	
Total <i>Tyrophagus</i>	13	8	36	10	3	1	71	25.1	

Table 85. Species identifications of the mites detected - sites and stores

Mite species Sites	N	M+W	Region				Wales	Total	Percent of Inspections
			E	SE	SW				
<i>Acarus siro</i>	28	11	49	10	8	2	108	68.8	
<i>A. farris</i>	1	1	1	1	1	-	5	3.2	
<i>A. immobilis</i>	1	-	2	1	-	-	4	2.5	
Total with <i>Acarus</i>	28	11	49	10	8	2	108	68.8	
<i>Glycyphagus destructor</i>	24	14	41	11	6	3	99	63.1	
<i>G. domesticus</i>	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	1.3	
Total with <i>Glycyphagus</i>	24	14	42	11	6	3	100	63.7	
<i>Tyrophagus longior</i>	6	4	18	4	1	1	34	21.7	
<i>T. putrescentiae</i>	6	6	11	3	2	-	28	17.8	
<i>T. palmarum</i>	-	1	1	2	-	-	4	2.5	
Total with <i>Tyrophagus</i>	9	6	26	5	3	1	50	31.8	

Stores

<i>Acarus siro</i>	40	18	74	19	14	2	167	59.0
<i>A. farris</i>	1	1	1	1	1	-	5	1.8
<i>A. immobilis</i>	1	-	2	1	-	-	4	1.4
Total with <i>Acarus</i>	40	18	74	19	15	2	168	59.4
<i>Glycyphagus destructor</i>	36	17	61	19	9	3	145	51.2
<i>G. domesticus</i>	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	0.7
Total with <i>Glycyphagus</i>	36	17	63	19	9	3	147	51.9
<i>Tyrophagus longior</i>	8	5	25	5	1	1	45	15.9
<i>T. putrescentiae</i>	7	6	13	6	2	-	34	12.0
<i>T. palmarum</i>	-	1	1	2	-	-	4	1.4
Total with <i>Tyrophagus</i>	13	8	35*	10	3	1	70*	24.7

\* One fewer than shown in Table 84 since species not determined.

Table 86. Number of sites and stores where rodents or birds were detected.

		Region					Total	Percent of Inspections	
		N	M+W	E	SE	SW			Wales
<u>Rodents</u>									
Rat	sites	13	12	23	7	9	-	64	40.8
	stores	19	16	38	8	13	-	94	33.2
Mouse	sites	34	17	41	15	7	-	114	72.6
	stores	52	27	63	21	10	-	173	61.1
Rat or mouse	sites	34	19	42	17	12	-	124	79.0
	stores	57	31	71	25	18	-	202	71.4
<u>Birds</u>									
Pigeon*	sites	16	12	26	6	8	1	69	43.9
	stores	17	14	41	6	16	1	95	33.6
Sparrow	sites	9	6	25	4	2	-	46	29.3
	stores	11	7	38	6	5	-	67	23.7
Starling	sites	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	1.3
	stores	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	0.7
Any of above three birds	sites	21	13	42	8	8	1	93	59.2
	stores	24	16	64	10	16	1	131	46.3

\* Includes collared dove.

Note: 283 stores inspected at 157 sites.

Table 87. Comparison of whether store managers were aware of the presence of rodents, and whether rodents were detected during inspection.

Region	Manager aware of presence of rodents?									
	Rodents detected?					Stores				
	Yes	No	No Answer	Total Sites	Yes	No	No Answer	Total Stores		
N	Yes	25	8	1	34	40	16	1	57	
	No	1	2	-	3	5	7	-	12	
	Total	26	10	1	37	45	23	1	69	
M+W	Yes	17	2	-	19	25	6	-	31	
	No	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	
	Total	17	2	-	19	25	8	-	33	
E	Yes	24	18	-	42	31	40	-	71	
	No	8	14	-	22	15	27	1	43	
	Total	32	32	-	64	46	67	1	114	
SE	Yes	11	6	-	17	16	9	-	25	
	No	1	1	-	2	2	6	-	8	
	Total	12	7	-	19	18	15	-	33	
SW	Yes	9	3	-	12	13	5	-	18	
	No	2	1	-	3	6	5	1	12	
	Total	11	4	-	15	19	10	1	30	
Wales	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	No	1	1	1	3	1	2	1	4	
	Total	1	1	1	3	1	2	1	4	
TOTAL	Yes	86	37	1	124	125	76	1	202	
	No	13	19	1	33	29	49	3	81	
	Total	99	56	2	157	154	125	4	283	
PERCENT	Yes	54.8	23.6	0.6	79.0	44.2	26.9	0.4	71.4	
	No	8.3	12.1	0.6	21.0	10.2	17.3	1.1	28.6	
	Total	63.1	35.7	1.3	100	54.4	44.2	1.4	100	

Table 88. Ranking of the five MAFF regions according to the frequency with which *Oryzaephilus*, *Cryptolestes* and *Sitophilus* occurred in commercial grain stores. Results of the 1987 farm grain store exercise are given in brackets.

Ranking	<i>Oryzaephilus</i>		<i>Cryptolestes</i>		<i>Sitophilus</i>		Any of the three Regions	
	Region	%	Region	%	Region	%	Regions	%
1	N	6 (1.8)	N	1 (2.3)	N	4 (0.5)	N	12 (3.1)
2	E	9 (1.9)	SW	7 (6.6)	SE	12 (0)	E	25 (5.5)
3	SE	18 (7.4)	E	10 (1.7)	E	13 (3.6)	SE	36 (10.7)
4	M+W	27 (7.2)	SE	21 (4.2)	SW	17 (9.1)	M+W	36 (16.0)
5	SW	37 (9.0)	M+W	24 (9.2)	M+W	21 (6.7)	SW	40 (15.9)
Overall		14.5 (4.8)		10.6 (4.6)		13.1 (4.2)		26.5 (9.7)

Note: Number of commercial stores = 283.

Number of farm stores = 742 (stratified sample).

*The farm data are given to illustrate the similarity in ranking. Direct comparison of percentages should not be made between the two studies because they differed in some important aspects, as outlined in the text.*

Table 89. Insect detection methods used by storekeepers in commercial stores where a) none of the major grain beetle pests were detected by WSB Advisers and b) one or more of the major pests were detected.

a) Stores where no pests were detected (183 stores).

Method	Number of stores	Percent of stores
Not checked*	30	16
Spear/vacuum only	100	55
Static traps**	53	29
All detection methods	153	84

a) Stores where pests were detected (71 stores).

Method	Number of stores	Percent of stores
Not checked*	19	27
Spear/vacuum only	38	54
Static traps***	14	20
All detection methods	52	73

\* Includes visual checks only.

\*\* Only one store used only static traps (probe traps).

\*\*\* No stores used static traps on their own.



**Table 90. Frequency of use of insect detection methods by storekeepers in commercial stores where a) none of the major grain beetle pests were detected by WSB Advisers and b) one or more of the major pests were detected.**

**a) Stores where no major pests were found (175 stores - 30 of these (17%) were not checked).**

Method	Frequency of use			Total stores	Percent stores
	More often than monthly	Monthly	Less often than monthly		
Spear alone	41	29	15	85	49
Vacuum alone	2	1	0	3	2
Spear + Vacuum	3	3	0	6	3
Spear + Static	16	18	2	36	21
Vacuum + Static	3	0	0	3	2
Spear + Vacuum + Static	6	6	0	12	7
<b>Total stores</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>145</b>	
<b>Percent stores</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>10</b>		

**b) Stores where major pests were found (64 stores - 16 of these (25%) were not checked).**

Method	Frequency of use			Total stores	Percent stores
	More often than monthly	Monthly	Less often than monthly		
Spear alone	15	13	5	33	52
Vacuum alone	0	1	0	1	2
Spear + Vacuum	0	0	0	0	0
Spear + Static	5	5	1	11	17
Vacuum + Static	0	0	0	0	0
Spear + Vacuum + Static	1	2	0	3	5
<b>Total stores</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>48</b>	
<b>Percent stores</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>9</b>		

Table 91. Methods used by WSB advisers to detect the 3 major grain pest beetle species *O. surinamensis* (Os), *C. ferrugineus* (Cf) and *S. granarius* (Sg) in stores (total = 73 stores).

a) Each species

Method	No. Stores*			No. Detected**			% Detected		
	Os	Cf	Sg	Os	Cf	Sg	Os	Cf	Sg
Visual	28	17	20	7	2	5	25	12	25
Sieve	21	16	20	5	2	0	24	13	0
Bait bag on structure	34	22	27	15	7	8	44	32	30
Bait bag on grain	38	27	30	22	7	4	58	26	13
Pitfall trap	31	28	34	16	7	18	52	25	53
Probe trap	35	27	30	29	14	8	83	52	27
Pitfall or Probe	35	28	34	29	16	23	83	57	68

b) All species combined.

Method	No. Stores*	No. Detected**	% Detected
Visual	45	9	20
Sieve	39	7	18
Bait bag on structure	57	21	37
Bait bag on grain	65	29	45
Pitfall trap	62	35	56
Probe trap	63	41	65
Pitfall or Probe	68	52	76

\* Number of stores where a major pest was detected and the method had been used.

\*\* Number of stores where the major pest was detected by that method.

**Table 92. Frequency of use of Pitfall and Probe static traps by storekeepers in 14 stores where the storekeepers used these methods and WSB Advisers detected one or more of the major grain beetle pests.**

Trap type	Frequency with which traps were checked		
	More often than monthly	Monthly	Less often than monthly
Pitfall	0	2	0
Probe	5	0	0
Both Pit & Probe	7	0	0

**Table 93. Method by which WSB Advisers detected the major beetle pests in 14 stores where static traps had been used by storekeepers.**

Species	Visual	Bait Bag		Pitfall	Probe
		on structure	on grain		
<i>O. sur.</i>	0	0	1	0	1
<i>C. ferr.</i>	0	0	1	1	1
<i>S. gran.</i>	1	3	1	6	2
<hr/>					
Total	1	3	3	7	4

Table 94. Detection of the three major beetle pest species by WSB Advisers. Number of stores where all trap methods were used, but only one type detected the insects.

Method	<i>O. surinamensis</i>	<i>C. ferrugineus</i>	<i>S. granarius</i>
Bait bag on structure	3	4	6
Bait bag on grain	2	3	2
Pitfall trap	0	1	12
Probe trap	3	7	0
Pitfall and/or probe	5	10	15

Table 95a. Methods by which WSB Advisers detected three minor beetle pests (number of stores).

Method	<i>A. advena</i>	<i>T. stercorea</i>	<i>Ptinus spp</i>
Visual	1	0	5
Sieve	0	0	6
Bait bag on structure	1	3	30
Bait bag on grain	3	1	26
Pitfall trap	3	12	76
Probe trap	9	6	12

Table 95b. Detection of three minor pest beetle species by WSB Advisers. Number of stores where all trap methods were used, but only one type detected the insects.

Method	<i>A. advena</i>	<i>T. stercorea</i>	<i>Ptinus spp</i>
Bait bag on grain	0	0	2
Pitfall	1	9	36
Probe	5	5	0

Table 96. The changes in sex ratio of *Lepinotus patruelis* collected from commercial stores between October 1988 and March 1989.

Date	numbers of		ratio
	males	females	
Mid-October to Mid-November	90	164	1:1.8
Mid-November to Mid-December	96	293	1:3.1
Mid-December to Mid-January	64	378	1:5.9
Mid-January to Mid-February	80	550	1:6.9
Mid-February to Mid-March	184	997	1:5.4

Table 97. For each mite genus the number of stores with the various combinations of each species present.

	Number of stores
<i>Acarus</i>	
<i>siro</i> only	157
<i>farris</i> only	1
<i>immobilis</i> only	0
<i>siro</i> + <i>farris</i>	3
<i>siro</i> + <i>immobilis</i>	3
<i>farris</i> + <i>immobilis</i>	0
<i>siro</i> + <i>farris</i> + <i>immobilis</i>	1
<i>Glycyphagus</i>	
<i>destructor</i> only	144
<i>domesticus</i> only	2
<i>destructor</i> + <i>domesticus</i>	0
<i>Tyrophagus</i>	
<i>longior</i> only	34
<i>palmarum</i> only	1
<i>putrescentiae</i> only	22
<i>longior</i> + <i>palmarum</i>	1
<i>longior</i> + <i>putrescentiae</i>	10
<i>palmarum</i> + <i>putrescentiae</i>	2
<i>longior</i> + <i>palmarum</i> + <i>putrescentiae</i>	0

Table 98. A comparison of the percentage of species found at commercial sites and stores, and in farm grain stores in 1987 and 1973. The 1973 data have been calculated from the original data sheets (see Lynch and Muggleton, 1990).

Species	Commercial		Farm Store	
	site	store	1987	1973
<i>A. siro</i>	68.8	59.0	72.0	48.0
<i>A. farris</i>	3.2	1.8	7.0	37.9
<i>A. immobilis</i>	2.5	1.4	3.2	7.9
<i>G. destructor</i>	63.1	51.2	42.0	89.4
<i>G. domesticus</i>	1.3	0.7	12.1	11.0
<i>G. ornatus</i>	0	0	1.6	0.8
<i>G. michaeli</i>	0	0	0.8	0.4
<i>T. longior</i>	21.7	15.9	18.1	37.0
<i>T. palmarum</i>	2.5	1.4	12.7	8.4
<i>T. putrescentiae</i>	17.8	12.0	3.8	8.4
<i>T. similis</i>	0	0	0	0.8
<i>T. sp. nov.</i>	0	0	1.9	1.6
<hr/>				
Number where no mites were found	20	53	238	9
Number where mites not identified	12	23	133	0
Number where mites were identified	125	207	371	227
<hr/>				
Total inspected	157	283	742	236

Table 99. The combinations of mite genera present at commercial sites and stores, and at farm grain stores in 1987 and 1973.

Genera	Commercial		Farm Store	
	sites	stores	1987	1973
<i>Acarus</i> only	17	44	135	9
<i>Glycyphagus</i> only	14	31	41	36
<i>Tyrophagus</i> only	1	2	19	6
<hr/>				
Total single genus occurrences	32	77	195	51
<hr/>				
<i>Acarus</i> + <i>Glycyphagus</i>	44	61	76	55
<i>Acarus</i> + <i>Tyrophagus</i>	7	14	28	6
<i>Glycyphagus</i> + <i>Tyrophagus</i>	2	6	19	9
<i>Acarus</i> + <i>Glycyphagus</i> + <i>Tyrophagus</i>	40	49	53	69
<hr/>				
Total mixed genus occurrences	93	130	176	139

Table 100. The presence and absence of each mite genus in commercial stores, related to insecticide usage. The number of occurrences for each genus includes all those mites identified to species level together with unidentified mites that had been assigned to that genus.

Genus		Number of stores		Number of stores	
		fabric treated	fabric not treated	grain* treated	grain not treated
<i>Acarus</i>	present	153	32	89	87
	absent	67	30	41	46
		$chi^2 = 6.893, P < 0.01$		$chi^2 = 0.276, ns$	
<i>Glycyphagus</i>	present	130	32	68	88
	absent	92	28	62	47
		$chi^2 = 0.528, ns$		$chi^2 = 4.536, P < 0.05$	
<i>Tyrophagus</i>	present	69	9	35	39
	absent	151	50	95	98
		$chi^2 = 5.994, P < 0.025$		$chi^2 = 0.079, ns$	

\* All or part of the grain treated; some stores were empty so totals of mite occurrences will be lower than for the fabric comparisons.



Table 101. The discriminating doses used to detect resistance to insecticides. Five hour exposure period unless stated otherwise. (Concentration = % in oil; deposit = mg/m<sup>2</sup>.)

Compound	<i>O. surinamensis</i>		<i>C. ferrugineus</i>		<i>S. granarius</i>		<i>S. oryzae</i>	
	Conc.	Deposit	Conc.	Deposit	Conc.	Deposit	Conc.	Deposit
Malathion	0.3	78	1.0	260	0.4+	104	1.5++	390
Fenitrothion	0.5	130	0.2	52	-	-	-	-
Pirimiphos-methyl	0.6	156	0.5	130	-	-	-	-
Chlorpyrifos-methyl	1.0	260	0.5	130	0.05+	13	0.05+	13
Methacrifos	0.4*	104	-	-	-	-	-	-
Etrimfos	0.2	52	0.15	39	-	-	-	-

\* in polyethylene glycol  
 + 24 hour exposure period  
 ++ 6 hour exposure period

Table 102. The discriminating doses used to detect resistance to fumigants.

Species	Fumigant (mg/l)	
	Methyl Bromide (5 hour exposure)	Phosphine (20 hour exposure)
<i>O. surinamensis</i>	9	0.05
<i>C. ferrugineus</i>	-	0.06
<i>S. granarius</i>	9	0.07
<i>S. oryzae</i>	6	0.04

Table 103. The results of discriminating dose tests on strains of *O. surinamensis* collected from commercial stores. The figures are percentage knockdown. \*Grain or store treated with an insecticide during the previous twelve months. No fumigants had been used in these stores in the twelve months.

Ref	mal	fen	p-m	cp-m	etr	meth	PH <sub>3</sub>	MeBr
3002/1*	100	100	100	67.6	59.4	100	100	100
3002/2*	88.7	100	100	80.7	70.9	100	100	100
3015/1*	100	100	92.0	60.6	53.5	100	100	100
4003/1*	100	100	97.9	78.2	73.2	100	100	100
4008/1*	100	100	94.9	65.1	54.5	98.2	100	100
4009/1*	100	100	97.4	91.7	40.0	100	100	100
4009/2*	100	100	96.8	92.3	60.3	100	96.3	100
4009/3*	100	100	98.0	93.7	67.0	100	100	100
4012/1*	100	100	100	63.2	75.7	96.9	100	100
4016/2*	100	100	92.2	41.9	79.0	100	100	100
5009/1*	52.3	67.7	73.6	88.7	21.7	100	100	100
5019/1	100	100	92.3	86.6	74.5	100	98.3	100
5065/2*	100	100	100	67.0	68.0	100	98.4	100
6010/1*	100	100	78.6	73.5	61.8	100	100	100
6010/2*	100	100	98.4	85.2	95.7	100	100	100
6010/3*	100	100	100	92.2	98.5	100	100**	100
6013/3*	100	100	91.1	41.5	79.8	100	98.9	100
6017/1*	100	100	94.9	75.5	53.9	94.4	100	100
6018/1*	22.7	51.1	55.6	83.8	10.4	100	100	100
7002/1*	4.5	14.4	7.2	65.3	1.9	100	100	100
7005/1*	100	100	94.8	93.1	59.0	100	98.2	100
7005/2	100	100	92.1	97.8	62.6	100	100	100
7009/1*	92.4	100	91.0	85.3	38.4	100	97.2	100
7012/1*	11.8	32.6	6.0	22.6	0	8.3	98.9	100**
7014/1*	83.1	98.9	90.1	89.5	67.4	95.7	100	100
7022/1	100	100	97.2	55.1	83.5	92.9	100	100
7022/3*	100	100	92.1	63.7	78.1	93.6	100	100
7022/4*	100	100	91.4	72.4	82.5	98.0	97.7	100

\*\* less than 1% survival, test not repeated.

Table 104. Results of discriminating dose tests on strains of *C. ferrugineus* collected from commercial grain stores. Figures are percentage knockdown. \*Grain or store treated with an insecticide during the previous twelve months. + fumigant used on grain during the previous twelve months.

Ref.	mal	fen	p-m	cp-m	etr	PH <sub>3</sub>
3021/3	100	100	100	100	100	100
4003/1*	100	100	100	100	100	100
4008/1*	100	100	100	100	100	100
4009/2*	100	100	100	100	100	100
4011/1*	100	83.9	100	100	100	100
4012/1*	100	100	100	100	100	97.8
4016/2*	100	100	100	100	100	100
5006/1*+	100	100	100	100	100	100
5009/1*	100	100	100	100	100	100
5012/2*	100	100	100	100	100	100
5050/2*	100	100	100	100	100	100
5055/1*	100	100	100	100	97.8	100
5072/2*	100	100	100	100	100	100
5075/1	100	100	100	100	100	100
6005/1*	100	100	100	100	100	100
6012/1*	72.0	100	100	100	100	100
6013/3*	100	100	100	100	100	100
6017/1*	74.0	100	100	100	100	100
7005/1*	85.6	100	100	100	100	100
7012/1*	100	100	100	100	100	98.3
8002/1	100	100	100	100	96.5	100

Table 105. Results of discriminating dose tests on strains of *S. granarius* and *S. oryzae* collected from commercial grain stores. Figures are percentage knockdown. \*grain or store treated with insecticide during the previous twelve months. + fumigant used on grain during the twelve months.

Ref.	mal	cp-m	PH <sub>3</sub>	MeBr	species
3030/1*	100	100			<i>granarius</i>
4009/2*	100	100			<i>granarius</i>
4009/3*	100	100	100**	100	<i>granarius</i>
4011/1*	100	100	100	100	<i>granarius</i>
4012/1*	100	100			<i>granarius</i>
4016/2*	97.0	100	100**	100	<i>granarius</i>
5006/1*+	100	100			<i>granarius</i>
5010/1*	100	100	100	100	<i>granarius</i>
5012/3*	100	100	100	100	<i>granarius</i>
5054/1*	100	100	100	100	<i>granarius</i>
6004/1*	100	100	100	100	<i>granarius</i>
7001/1*	100	90.4	100	100	<i>granarius</i>
7012/1*	100	100	100	100	<i>granarius</i>
8001/2	100	100	100	100	<i>granarius</i>
8003/1*	100	100	97.0	100	<i>granarius</i>
4008/1*	100	100	100	100	<i>oryzae</i>
6018/1*	100	91.3	100	100	<i>oryzae</i>

\*\* less than 1% survival, test not repeated.

Table 106. The number of (a) sites and (b) stores in each MAFF Region and in Wales with populations of *O. surinamensis* resistant to various pesticides.

Region	no. with <i>O. sur.</i>	no. tested	mal	fen	p-m	cp-m	etr	meth	PH <sub>3</sub>	MeBr
(a) Sites										
North	3	2	1	0	1	2	2	0	0	0
M & W	7	5	0	0	4	5	5	2	1	0
East	9	3	1	1	2	3	3	0	2	0
SE	4	4	1	1	4	4	4	1	1	0
SW	7	6	4	3	6	6	6	3	4	0
Wales	1	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>All</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>% Res.</b>			<b>35</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>
(b) Stores										
North	4	3	1	0	1	3	3	0	0	0
M & W	9	7	0	0	6	7	7	2	1	0
East	10	3	1	1	2	3	3	0	2	0
SE	6	6	1	1	5	6	6	1	1	0
SW	11	9	4	3	9	9	9	5	4	0
Wales	1	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>All</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>% Res.</b>			<b>25</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 107. The number of (a) sites and (b) stores in each MAFF Region and in Wales with populations of *C. ferrugineus* resistant to various pesticides.

Region	no. with <i>C. ferr.</i>	no. tested	mal	fen	p-m	cp-m	etr	PH <sub>3</sub>
(a) Sites								
North	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
M & W	8	6	0	1	0	0	0	1
East	9	7	0	0	0	0	1	0
SE	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	0
SW	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	1
Wales	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
<b>All</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>% Res.</b>			<b>14</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
(b) Stores								
North	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
M & W	8	6	0	1	0	0	0	1
East	11	7	0	0	0	0	1	0
SE	7	4	2	0	0	0	0	0
SW	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	1
Wales	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
<b>All</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>% Res.</b>			<b>14</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>

Table 108. The number of (a) sites and (b) stores in each MAFF Region and in Wales with populations of *S. granarius* resistant to various pesticides.

Region	no. with <i>S. gran.</i>	no. tested	mal	cp-m
--------	-----------------------------	------------	-----	------

(a) Sites

North	2	1	0	0
M & W	5	4	1	0
East	9	4	0	0
SE	3	1	0	0
SW	5	2	0	1
Wales	3	2	0	0
<u>All</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
* Res.			7	7

(b) Stores

North	2	1	0	0
M & W	6	5	1	0
East	10	4	0	0
SE	3	1	0	0
SW	5	2	0	1
Wales	3	2	0	0
<u>All</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
* Res.			7	7

Table 109. The combinations of insecticide resistance found in populations of *O. surinamensis* from commercial grain stores.

Insecticide	Combinations (R = resistant, S = susceptible)												
	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	S
Chlorpyrifos-methyl	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	S
Methacrifos	R	R	R	R	S	S	R	S	S	S	S	S	S
Etrimfos	R	R	R	R	R	R	S	S	S	R	R	R	S
Pirimiphos-methyl	R	R	R	S	R	S	S	S	S	R	S	R	S
Malathion	R	R	S	S	S	S	S	R	S	R	R	R	S
Fenitrothion	R	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	R	S	S	S
no. of strains with each combination	2	0	5	1	12	3	0	0	0	3	1	1	0

Table 110. The percentage of farm stores, commercial sites and commercial stores where resistance to each insecticide and fumigant was detected in *O. surinamensis*.

Insecticide	Farm stores	Commercial sites	Commercial stores
Malathion	13.0	35.0	25.0
Fenitrothion	3.0	25.0	17.8
Pirimiphos-methyl	27.0	85.0	82.1
Chlorpyrifos-methyl	100.0	100.0	100.0
Etrimfos	60.0	100.0	100.0
Methacrifos	77.0	30.0	28.6
Phosphine	10.0	40.0	28.6
Methyl Bromide	27.0	0	0

Table 111. The five strains of *O. surinamensis* showing multiple organophosphate resistance, listed in order of their percentage knockdown by malathion.

Strain	mal	fen	p-m	etr	cp-m	meth
7002/1	4.5	14.4	7.2	1.9	65.3	100.0
7012/1	11.8	32.6	6.0	0	22.6	8.3
6018/1	22.7	51.1	55.6	10.4	83.8	100.0
5009/1	52.3	67.7	73.6	21.7	88.7	100.0
7014/1	83.1	98.9	90.1	67.4	89.5	95.7

Table 112. The percentage of all commercial stores using various insecticide treatments compared to the percentage of stores with resistant *O. surinamensis* using the same treatments. The number of stores is shown in parenthesis.

% stores that treated	all stores	stores with resistant strains
Fabric only	38.8 (109)	38.4 (10)
Fabric & grain	39.5 (111)	46.2 (12)
Grain only	6.8 ( 19)	7.8 ( 2)
Grain*	0.4 ( 1)	0 ( 0)
Neither	14.6 ( 41)	7.8 ( 2)

\* No details of whether or not the fabric was treated in this store.

Table 113. The percentage of pirimiphos-methyl resistant populations of mites at those sites where mites were tested for resistance.

Region	No of sites sent mites	No of sites mites tested	No of sites with resistant mites	% with mites resistant
Northern	35	30	17	56.7
Mid & West	15	14	11	78.6
Eastern	55	52	37	72.5
S. East	13	12	11	91.7
S. West	12	9	7	77.8
Wales	3	3	2	-
Totals	133	119	85	71.4

Table 114. The percentage of pirimiphos-methyl resistant populations of mites at those stores where mites were tested for resistance.

Region	No of stores sent mites	No of stores mites tested	No of stores with resistant mites	% with mites resistant
Northern	53	46	23	50.0
Mid & West	25	21	14	66.7
Eastern	98	83	53	63.9
S. East	26	24	20	83.3
S. West	20	15	10	66.7
Wales	3	3	2	-
Totals	225	192	122	63.5

Table 115. The results of pirimiphos-methyl discriminating dose tests on strains of *A. siro*, *G. destructor*, *T. putrescentiae* and *T. longior* from commercial grain stores.

Species	no. tested	no. resistant	% resistant
<i>A. siro</i>	155	110	71.0
<i>G. destructor</i>	92	10	10.9
<i>T. putrescentiae</i>	28*	28	100.0
<i>T. longior</i>	14**	0	0

\* Three were mixed strains of *T. putrescentiae* and *T. palmarum*, only the *T. putrescentiae* survived.

\*\* One of these was a mixed strain of *T. longior* and *T. palmarum*.

Table 116. The number of sites with each of the combinations of pirimiphos-methyl resistant mite species. A = *A. siro*, T = *T. putrescentiae*, G = *G. destructor*.

Region	A only	T only	G only	A+T	A+G	T+G	A+T+G
Northern	12	0	0	4	1	0	0
Mid & West	6	0	2	2	0	0	1
Eastern	26	0	1	9	0	0	1
S. East	6	1	1	2	1	0	0
S. West	4	1	0	1	1	0	0
Wales	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
<hr/>							
Totals	<u>56</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
	62				21		2