

## TRAPPING PROGRAM WORKING WALL MAP

1. This map will be useful in initially setting up the trapping program, determining accurate personnel needs (based on realistic trapper workload), and making the route adjustments that are required during the course of the season as a result of increased/decreased workload.
2. The map, covering all of the trappable areas in the county and located on the wall of the trapping office, should be of sufficient scale (at least 2" to the mile) to legibly enter trap numbers.
3. The map is overlaid with non-glare mylar. Non-permanent markers are used to note trap densities and temporary route boundaries directly on the map. Use 1/16" graphic tape to mark permanent route boundaries once they are established.
4. Along the western border of each square mile, projected trap totals (as pre-determined by the trapping supervisor) are indicated in the order listed in the example (page v). These figures act as a "placement assignment" from the supervisor to the trapper, shifting the responsibility for adequate trap density from the trapper to the supervisor, where it belongs. This placement assignment is then transferred from the map to a written document, lending itself to be more easily utilized by the trapper in the field.
5. The number in the center of each square mile is the projected number of total trap servicings required per week for that square mile. For example: if five MF Jackson, five McPhail, two ChamP™, 5 OF Jackson, 5 ML Jackson, two JB and two GM traps are projected for a square mile and five of those traps are on a weekly servicing schedule while the others are on a bi-weekly schedule, the number of projected servicings per week would be 15.5.
6. Using only the projected servicings per week number in the center of each square mile, the trapping supervisor can easily determine how many and which square miles need to be grouped together into one day's work (based on an acceptable number of trap servicings per day) and from there into one week's work (i.e. one trapper's "route").
7. As the trapper deploys traps in the field, the eastern side of the square mile is filled in by the trapper at the end of each day to reflect the actual number of traps, of each type, in each square mile. Comparing the "projected" to the "actual" numbers will give the supervisor an idea as to whether the right number of traps are being deployed. If the "projected" does not match the "actual" (which is probable in some situations), the supervisor then needs to question the trapper and determine that either the "projected" or the "actual" is more realistic and/or attainable.
8. Once the trapping supervisor determines the final number in each square mile, and the trapper has deployed traps and noted them on the eastern side of the square mile to match that determination, the "projected" and the "actual" numbers should match. This can be achieved by adjusting either of the two numbers, whichever is appropriate.
9. Current trap locations (distribution) would not be required on this map. Distributions would still be maintained on the field route map or the square mile map (updated daily) associated with each route binder.



## **MORE EXAMPLES OF HOW TO DETERMINE “PROJECTED TRAP SERVICINGS/WEEK”**

The projected trap servings per week will change based on the projected number of traps allocated for each square mile and/or a change in the servicing interval required for each of the trap types.

Using the projected trap numbers from the sample square mile (page v), assume that all of the traps are on a weekly servicing cycle. If so, the projected trap servings per week would be the total number of traps projected for that square mile: 26.

Using the same trap numbers, assume that all of the traps are on a bi-weekly servicing cycle. The projected trap servings per week would then be the total number of traps projected for that square mile divided by two: 13.

Using the same trap numbers, assume that 5 MP traps are on a weekly servicing cycle; 5 MF, 2 CP, 5 OF, 5ML, 2 GM and 2 JB traps are on a bi-weekly servicing cycle. The projected trap servings per week would be the sum of the two different servicing cycles: (a) the total of the weekly servings: 5; and (b) the total of the bi-weekly servicing cycles divided by two: 10.5. Adding these two different figures together would result in a projected trap servings per week of 15.5.

**NOTE:** When determining “projected trap servings per week,” the most frequent servicing schedule is the unit of time that should be used as the basis for the determination. For example, if your program has traps that need to be serviced weekly, then “...servings per week” need to be figured. If, on the other hand, your program only has traps that are serviced every two weeks, then “...servings per two weeks” need to be figured.

## HOW TO PIGGYBACK TRAPS

Piggybacking of traps (more than one type of trap on the same property) has several economic advantages. Any biological limitations can be minimized if the following guidelines are followed:

1. Plan well in advance the trap groupings which will be acceptable. Several considerations are:
  - a. The property to be trapped must meet the host needs for all traps which will be piggybacked (e.g., gypsy moth, apple maggot, and Japanese beetle traps grouped together or Medfly and Oriental fruit fly trap groupings).
  - b. Use of adjoining properties as trap sites is acceptable and is nearly as efficient as piggybacking.
  - c. Maintain an even distribution of traps, provided hosts are available.
  - d. Avoid competition between different attractants. A distance of 10 feet or more separating traps with male attractants should be maintained.
  - e. Do not place any fruit fly trap onto a property on which a similar fruit fly trap was placed within the last 12 months if other acceptable sites are available.
2. A few examples of piggybacking traps within a one-square-mile urban area are detailed in Figures 1-4. Keep in mind that the McPhail, ChamP™ and AM traps can also function as general purpose fruit fly traps, particularly for females, immature flies, or other fruit fly species for which there is no specific trap. By not using them on the same properties as the medfly, oriental, or melon fly traps, the trap density is increased for these three flies. McPhail traps are not to be piggybacked with other fruit fly traps in “other urban areas”, except as directed in the specific sections.

## HOST SELECTION

Front yard hosts for trap placement are frequently selected over back yard hosts because of easier access for the trapper. This practice is acceptable, providing that the best host is utilized. The best host can be defined by the criteria in this guide for the specific pest. Convenience is a factor only if all criteria are equal between hosts. Earlier detection may be compromised by favoring front yard hosts at the exclusion of better hosts in back yards. Traps shall be placed in the best host available.

## DEFINITIONS

**Urban** - areas with more than 500 homes per square mile.

**Rural Residential** - areas with 25 to 500 homes per square mile in a scattered distribution.

**Rural** - areas with less than 25 homes per square mile in a scattered distribution.

To determine the trapping season and the trap density, the following geographic areas have been designated.

**Southern California** - Coastal San Diego County, Orange County, Riverside County west of Banning, Los Angeles County except for the Antelope Valley, Ventura County except the mountains, coastal Santa Barbara County, southern coastal San Luis Obispo County, and the Chino Plain area of San Bernardino County (generally this is metropolitan San Bernardino County up to the forest line).

**Southern San Francisco Bay Area** - Urban areas in the counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, San Benito, San Mateo, and Santa Clara.