

Forest Health Technology Enterprise Team

TECHNOLOGY
TRANSFER

Mating Disruption

A REVIEW OF THE USE OF MATING DISRUPTION TO MANAGE GYPSY MOTH, *LYMANTRIA DISPAR* (L.)



**KEVIN THORPE, RICHARD REARDON, KSENIA TCHESLAVSKAIA,
DONNA LEONARD, AND VICTOR MASTRO**

The Forest Health Technology Enterprise Team (FHTET) was created in 1995 by the Deputy Chief for State and Private Forestry, USDA, Forest Service, to develop and deliver technologies to protect and improve the health of American forests. This book was published by FHTET as part of the technology transfer series.

<http://www.fs.fed.us/foresthealth/technology/>

Cover photos, clockwise from top left: aircraft-mounted pod for dispensing Disrupt II flakes, tethered gypsy moth female, scanning electron micrograph of 3M MEC-GM microcapsule formulation, male gypsy moth, Disrupt II flakes, removing gypsy moth egg mass from modified delta trap mating station.

Information about pesticides appears in this publication. Publication of this information does not constitute endorsement or recommendation by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, nor does it imply that all uses discussed have been registered. Use of most pesticides is regulated by State and Federal law. Applicable regulations must be obtained from appropriate regulatory agencies.

CAUTION: Pesticides can be injurious to humans, domestic animals, desirable plants, and fish or other wildlife if not handled or applied properly. Use all pesticides selectively and carefully. Follow recommended practices given on the label for use and disposal of pesticides and pesticide containers.

The use of trade, firm, or corporation names in this publication is for information only and does not constitute an endorsement by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, or marital or family status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at 202-720-2600 (voice and TDD).

To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20250-9410 or call 202-720-5964 (voice and TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

A REVIEW OF THE USE OF MATING DISRUPTION TO MANAGE GYPSY MOTH, *LYMANTRIA DISPAR* (L.)

Kevin Thorpe

*USDA Agricultural Research Service, Insect Biocontrol Laboratory, Beltsville,
Maryland*

Richard Reardon

*USDA Forest Service, Forest Health Technology Enterprise Team, Morgantown,
West Virginia*

Ksenia Tcheslavskaia

Department of Entomology, Virginia Technical University, Blacksburg, Virginia

Donna Leonard

USDA Forest Service, Forest Health Protection, Asheville, North Carolina

Victor Mastro

*USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Pest Survey Detection and
Exclusion Laboratory, Otis Air National Guard Base, Massachusetts*

For additional copies of this publication or information concerning the use of mating disruption for gypsy moth, contact Kevin Thorpe in Beltsville, Maryland, at (301) 504-5139 (e-mail: thorpek@ba.ars.usda.gov), Donna Leonard in Asheville, North Carolina, at (828) 257-4329 (e-mail: dleonard@fs.fed.us), Richard Reardon in Morgantown, West Virginia, at (304) 285-1563 (e-mail: rreardon@fs.fed.us), Lenora MacNevin at the Otis Air National Guard Base, Massachusetts, at (508) 563-9303 x0 (e-mail: Lenora.MacNevin@aphis.usda.gov), or the local Cooperative Extension Service office.

PREFACE

This review is published as part of a joint USDA program conducted by three of its agencies — Forest Service (FS), Agricultural Research Service (ARS), and Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS)—to develop specific methods for managing sparse-density populations of the gypsy moth, *Lymantria dispar* (L.). The program is supported through the efforts of these agencies and private industry.

Field and laboratory studies are conducted to solve problems associated with the use of mating disruption to manage sparse-density gypsy moth populations. Also provided is technical assistance to improve the quality of operational programs involving the aerial application of pheromones for managing gypsy moth.

This publication (August 2006), A Review of the Use of Mating Disruption to Manage Gypsy Moth, *Lymantria dispar* (L.), is an update of handbook FHTET-98-01 printed in January 1998 (Reardon et al. 1998). It contains all of the information included in the January 1998 handbook as well as the results of studies conducted through 2005.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We express our appreciation to the USDA Forest Service Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry, Appalachian Integrated Pest Management (AIPM) Gypsy Moth Project for major funding from 1988 through mid-1993, the National Center of Forest Health Management from mid-1993 through 1994, the Forest Health Technology Enterprise Team from 1995 through 2002, the Slow-the-Spread Program from 1998 to the present, and the Gypsy Moth Mating Disruption Working Group. The authors thank Ralph Webb and Barbara Leonhardt for their early contributions to the development of mating disruption for gypsy moth, Win McLane, Steve Talley, Dave Cowan, Tim Murray, and Dee Dee Sellers for their assistance during numerous field trials, and Tim Roland and Bruce Radsick, APHIS pilots. Thanks also to USDA APHIS personnel responsible for rearing the gypsy moths used in this project through the years, including Gary Bernon, Frank Martin, John Tanner, Christine Lokerson, Hanna Antell, Susan Lane, Alyssa Pierce, Carrie Reidel, and many others. We also thank field personnel from various agencies and locations including Andrea Hickman, Sam Newcomer, Peggy Leasure, Robert Bennett, Geoff White, Tod Sukontarak, Gleb Tcheslavski, Kim Murphy, Michael Merz, Ken Klein, and a great many others. Finally, we thank Gary Heiser, Gary Spires, Tim Tigner, Vance Coffey, Terry Brennen, Mike Womack, and Tammy Ingle for providing access to and assistance with study sites, Priscilla Maclean (Hercon Environmental), Grant Oliver (3M Canada), Reg Coler (ISCA Technologies), and Greg Stamm (Shin-Etsu Chemical), Al's Aerial Spraying, Dave Devilbiss for analysis of disparlure samples, and Alexei Sharov for various scientific input. Finally, thanks to Mark Riffe for editing and layout.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
MATING BIOLOGY OF THE GYPSY MOTH.....	2
MATING DISRUPTION OF THE GYPSY MOTH	2
ASSESSING BIOLOGICAL EFFECTIVENESS OF MATING DISRUPTION.....	3
DEVELOPMENT OF MATING DISRUPTION, 1971 THROUGH 1989.....	4
Before 1989—Initial Development and Application	4
1989—A Transitional Year.....	5
Efficacy	6
Deposition.....	7
Residual Activity	7
Summary of 1989 Results	8
SECOND STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT AND APPLICATION, 1990-1997.....	8
1990—A New Bead Formulation	8
Disrupt II	10
Efficacy	10
Residual Activity	11
Bead Formulation	12
Efficacy	12
Residual Activity	12
Deposition.....	14
Laboratory Evaluations.....	14
Summary of 1990 Results	14
1991—Methods Development for the Bead Formulation	15
Bead Formulation	15
Airport Trials	15
Efficacy	15
Deposition.....	16
Residual Activity	16
Flake Dispersal System	18
Summary of 1991 Results	18
1992—Dose-Response Evaluations	20
Airport and Laboratory Trials.....	20
Efficacy	21
Deposition.....	22
Residual Activity	22
Flake Dispersal System	22
Summary of 1992 Results	22
1993—Reduced Doses of Disparlure.....	23
Efficacy	23
Deposition and Residual Activity	24
Summary of 1993 Results	25

1994—Increased Doses of Disparlure	25
Efficacy	25
Summary of 1994 Results	26
1995—Monitoring of Blocks Treated in 1994	27
Summary of 1995 Results	27
1996—Evaluation of Additional Tank Mixes.....	27
Airport Trials	28
Field Trials	28
Summary of 1996 Results	29
1997—Additional Trials of Flake Formulations	29
Efficacy	29
Alternative Tank Mix	30
Summary of 1997 Results	30
THIRD STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT AND APPLICATION, 1998-2005	31
1998—Re-evaluation of the Need for Sticker	31
Efficacy of Flakes Without Sticker	31
Flake Slurry Formulation.....	32
Deposition and Weathering	33
Loss of Disparlure While in Contact With Sticker.....	34
Continued Improvements to the Flake Pods	34
Evaluation of a New Pheromone Flake Dispersal System	35
Non-target Concerns.....	36
Summary of 1998 Results	36
1999—Direct Measurement of Atmospheric Pheromone Concentrations	37
Portable Electroantennogram Devices.....	37
Koch EAG.....	37
Syntech Portable EAG.....	39
Evaluation of Schiffer Flake Dispersal System.....	41
3M Canada Company Microcapsule Slow-Release Formulation.....	41
Flake Slurry Formulation	41
Pheromone Dispersion in a Hardwood Forest	42
Summary of 1999 Results	42
2000—A New Microcapsule Formulation.....	43
Field Tests of 3M Sprayable Microcapsules and Reduced Rates of Hercon Disrupt II Flakes.....	43
Tethered Females Versus Mating Stations.....	44
Treatment Effects Beyond Treated Areas	44
Trap Catch Versus Mating Success in Southern Wisconsin	45
Portable EAG Measurements of Pheromone in Treated Plots.....	46
New Pheromone Flake Dispersal System	46
Implementation of the ‘Slow the Spread of the Gypsy Moth’ Project.....	47
Summary of 2000 Results	47

2001—Skipped Swath Tests	48
Skipped Swaths - 90 m Skips	48
Dose Response Test With 3M Sprayable Microcapsules.....	48
Treatment Effects Beyond Treated Areas: Part II.....	49
EAG Measurement of Pheromone Concentrations in Treated Plots	50
Additional <i>Daphnia</i> Tests	50
Summary of 2001 Results	50
2002—Disrupt II Dose Response Test	51
Standard Study Plot Layout and Methodology	51
Shin-Etsu Sprayable Formulation	53
Skipped Swaths - 30 m Skips	53
Summary of 2002 Results	54
2003—Experimental Formulations	54
Screening of New Experimental Formulations.....	54
Draft Criteria For New Mating Disruption Formulations	56
Conditions for Participation in Gypsy Moth Mating Disruption Trials	56
Criteria for Determining Suitability for Operational Use	56
Trap Capture Versus Mating Success in Northern Wisconsin	57
Diffusion of Pheromone in a Forest Canopy	57
Mating Disruption With ExoSex Dispensers	58
Summary of 2003 Results	58
2004—Effect of Female Moth Deployment Method on Mating Success.....	59
3M MEC-GM Sprayable Pheromone for Gypsy Moth	61
Effect of Moth Density on Effectiveness of Mating Disruption Treatments	62
Residual Effects of Previous Year’s Treatment	63
Efficacy of Mating Disruption Treatments in Open Landscapes.....	64
Efficacy of Mating Disruption Treatments When Male and Female Gypsy Moths Emerge Close Together	64
Air Sampling of Disparlure.....	65
Disparlure Toxicity to <i>Daphnia</i>	66
Summary of 2004 Results	66
2005—Persistence of Effects of Mating Disruption Treatments.....	67
Multi-year Residual Effects of Mating Disruption Treatments	67
3M Sprayable Pheromone.....	67
Shin-Etsu Sprayable Formulation	67
Season-Long Trap Catch Versus Mating Success	69
Mating Success of Irradiated Females.....	71
Ground Application of Disrupt II Flakes.....	72
Paintball Mating Disruption Formulation.....	73
Summary of 2005 Results	74

QUALITY ASSURANCE AND CONTROL OF PHEROMONE PRODUCTS.....	75
CURRENT DISPARLURE FORMULATIONS AND USE	75
Disrupt II	75
Other Formulations	76
Decoy GM.....	76
3M MEC-GM Sprayable Pheromone for Gypsy Moth	77
Shin-Etsu Sprayable Formulation	77
SPLAT	77
Operational Use	77
Effects on Nontarget Organisms	77
CONCLUSIONS.....	78
SUMMARY.....	79
Mating Biology of the Gypsy Moth	79
Mating Disruption of the Gypsy Moth	79
Development of Mating Disruption, 1971 through 2005	79
Current Disparlure Formulations and Use	81
REFERENCES CITED.....	82
APPENDICES	87
Disrupt II Label.....	87
Disrupt II MSDA	87
GELVA 2333 MSDA.....	87

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Acres of treatment with disparlure flakes, Disrupt II, for eradication and slow-the-spread of the gypsy moth (STS).	9
--	---

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Specialized application equipment mounted under the wing of a Cessna 206 for dispensing the flake formulation of racemic disparlure (Disrupt II).	6
Figure 2. Flakes and sticker are mixed in a chamber then dispensed through a spinner.	6
Figure 3. Deposition of green plastic laminated flakes on foliage.	7
Figure 4. Flake deposition after application of 10 times normal Disrupt II in Giles County, Virginia, 1989. The ground level was sampled on all dates. The canopy was sampled only on July 25, August 1, and September 12.....	7
Figure 5. Modified delta trap used as a mating station for monitor adult females.....	10
Figure 6. Release rates of disparlure from Disrupt II flakes produced in 1989 and 1990.	11
Figure 7. Disparlure content in (A) AgriSense beads and (B) Disrupt II flakes picked from spray cards aged in the field, Rockbridge County, Virginia, 1990.....	13
Figure 8. Uneven deposition of flakes beneath application aircraft.	15
Figure 9. CP nozzle with check valve used to apply bead formulation of racemic disparlure.	16
Figure 10. Size distribution of beads produced (A) in 1990 and (B) in 1991.	17
Figure 11. Release rates of disparlure from three sizes of beads.....	18
Figure 12. Disparlure content (A) of flakes and (B) of beads recovered from spray cards and foliage.....	19
Figure 13. Average disparlure emitted from flakes and from a single (A) or double (B) application of beads, Rockbridge County, Virginia, 1991.	20
Figure 14. Micronair AU-5000 atomizer (A) with cage screen used to apply insecticides and (B) without cage screen used to apply the bead formulation of racemic disparlure.....	27
Figure 15. Schematic diagram of string rigging used to pull pheromone traps and delta trap mating stations into the canopy to evaluate the effectiveness of Disrupt II flakes applied without sticker.	30
Figure 16. A compound bow was used to shoot an arrow attached to a fishing reel into the canopy. The string rigging was pulled into place with the fishing line.	30
Figure 17. Male trap catch (a) and female mating success (b) in plots treated with Disrupt II flakes with and without sticker.	32
Figure 18. Male trap catch (a) and female mating success (b) in plots treated with Disrupt II flakes in a standard pod application or a slurry applied through modified Micronair atomizers.	33
Figure 19a. Persistence of Disrupt II flakes on understory foliage after standard application using pods (Gelva 2333) or in a slurry (LI-108).....	34
Figure 19b. Number of Disrupt II flakes remaining on foliage in a forest canopy after standard application using pods (Gelva 2333) or in a slurry (LI-108).	34
Figure 20. New flake dispersal system (Prototype II) installed on Air Tractor 402. Flakes were dispensed onto a rotating cone attached to a wind-driven propeller and coated with sticker emitted from flat fan nozzles.....	35
Figure 21. Dr. Uwe Koch and his portable electroantennogram sensor, used to measure atmospheric pheromone concentration in plots treated with disparlure.	38
Figure 22. Effect of wind speed and height above ground on relative disparlure concentration measured with a portable electroantennogram sensor in a plot treated with a 10x application of Disrupt II flakes... ..	38
Figure 23. Portable electroantennogram sensor supplied by Jan van der Pers to measure atmospheric pheromone concentration in areas treated with Disrupt II flakes.....	39
Figure 24. Severed male gypsy moth antenna placed across electrical contacts of the portable electroantennogram sensor. The magnitude of electrical impulses from the antenna increase with increasing pheromone concentration.	40

Figure 25. Relative disparlure concentration, as measured by a portable electroantennogram sensor, and mating success in plots treated with various mating disruption treatments. 40

Figure 26. One of a series of syringe samplers used to collect air samples containing a tracer gas to model the movement and distribution of pheromone in a hardwood forest. 42

Figure 27. Gypsy moth trap catch in plots treated with Disrupt II flakes at 30.4 and 15.2 g AI/acre and microcapsules applied at 30.4 g AI/acre. 44

Figure 28. Female gypsy moth tethered with a thread to a tree trunk to measure mating success. 45

Figure 29. Gypsy moth trap catch at increasing distances from plot edge. 45

Figure 30. Relationship between gypsy moth mating success and daily trap catch in southern Wisconsin. 46

Figure 31. Relative disparlure concentration at ground level and in the canopy in plots treated with Disrupt II flakes at 15.2 and 30.4 g AI/acre. 46

Figure 32. Gypsy moth trap catch within and between swaths treated with Disrupt II flakes. 48

Figure 33. Gypsy moth trap catch (a) and female mating success (b) in plots treated with the 3M sprayable microcapsule formulation at dosages ranging from 0 to 30.4 g AI/acre. 49

Figure 34. Relative disparlure concentration in plots treated with the 3M sprayable microcapsule formulation at dosages from 0 to 30.4 g AI/acre. 50

Figure 35. Effect of dosage of Disrupt II flakes on gypsy moth trap catch. 51

Figure 36. Schematic of standard study plot layout for gypsy moth mating disruption research. 52

Figure 37. Shin-Etsu sprayable gypsy moth mating disruption formulation. 53

Figure 38. Gypsy moth trap catch within and between swaths treated with Disrupt II flakes. 54

Figure 39. Fertilizer spreader modified to apply mating disruption formulations by helicopter. 55

Figure 40. Scentry hollow fiber dispensers containing racemic disparlure. 55

Figure 41. Gypsy moth trap catch in plots treated with various mating disruption formulations at 6 and 15.2 g AI/acre. 55

Figure 42. Co-located SF₆ detector and portable electroantennogram sensor used to verify that the tracer gas, SF₆, is a realistic model for the movement of disparlure in a hardwood forest. 58

Figure 43. Gypsy moth female mating success in plots treated with ground-applied (ExoSex) and aerially-applied (Disrupt II) mating disruptants. 58

Figure 44. Trunk barrier constructed of duct tape and a polybutene pest barrier to keep monitor female gypsy moths from climbing tree trunks. 60

Figure 45. Gypsy moth mating success when females were deployed using different methods in plots treated with Disrupt II flakes at 0.06 g AI/acre and untreated. 61

Figure 46. Gypsy moth trap catch (a) and female mating success (b) in plots treated with 3M MEC-GM sprayable pheromone and Disrupt II flakes. 62

Figure 47. Gypsy moth trap catch (a) and trap catch as a percentage of controls (b) in plots treated with Disrupt II flakes under low and high (50 and 150 males/release) simulated moth densities. 63

Figure 48. Gypsy moth trap catch (a) and female mating success (b) in plots treated the previous year with Disrupt II flakes. 63

Figure 49. Gypsy moth female mating success in wooded and open areas treated with Disrupt II flakes or untreated. 64

Figure 50. Gypsy moth female mating success in plots treated at pheromone dosages ranging from 0 to 15.2 g AI/acre when males were released at 3 different positions relative to females. 65

Figure 51. Gypsy moth trap catch (a) and female mating success (b) in plots treated one and two years previously with Disrupt II flakes. 68

Figure 52. Gypsy moth trap catch (a) and female mating success (b) in plots treated with Disrupt II flakes and Shin-Etsu sprayable formulation. 68

Figure 53a. Gypsy moth female mating success and male trap catch throughout the flight period at a location with a season-long trap capture (SLTC) of 64. 70

Figure 53b. Gypsy moth female mating success and male trap catch throughout the flight period at a location with a season-long trap capture (SLTC) of 8. 70

Figure 54. Gypsy moth female mating success and season-long trap catch (SLTC) of males. 71

Figure 55. Mating success of normal and irradiated gypsy moth females. 72

Figure 56. Modified hydroseeder used to apply a tank mix containing Disrupt II flakes to individual trees. ... 72

Figure 57. Gypsy moth female mating success on individual trees treated with a ground-based application of Disrupt II flakes. 73

Figure 58. Paintball guns and paintballs loaded with a SPLAT formulation of racemic disparlure for ground-based application for gypsy moth mating disruption. 73

Figure 59. Gypsy moth trap catch (a) and female mating success (b) in plots treated with SPLAT gypsy moth mating disruption formulation and delivered through paintball guns. 74

Figure 60. Plastic laminated flake product, Disrupt II. 76

INTRODUCTION

Semiochemicals, also called behavior-modifying chemicals, are chemicals emitted by organisms to transmit information to other individuals. Allelochemicals (e.g., allomones, which benefit the species emitting the signal, and kairomones, which benefit the receiving species) are a subset of semiochemicals that operate interspecifically, whereas pheromones are a subset of semiochemicals that operate intraspecifically. Pheromones that act as attractants cause an organism to move towards the chemical source.

Insect pheromones that act as sex attractants show promise for suppressing pest populations through mating disruption. The idea behind mating disruption is to create interference with the sex pheromone emitted by the female to a level at which the male has difficulty locating her.

Mating disruption is accomplished by adding artificial pheromone sources to the environment. The effect is the creation of an atmosphere concentrated with the attractive material or containing many odor sources. Consequently, the males become confused and are prevented from finding female moths.

Scientists first learned how to synthesize many pheromones in sufficient quantities for field evaluations in the early 1970s. In Europe, experiments using pheromones to control major insect pests in fruit orchards were started in 1975. In the United States, the first pheromone registered for use as a mating disruptant was for control of the pink bollworm, *Pectinophora gossypiella* (Saunders), in 1978. Ridgway et al. (1990) did an in-depth review of a wide range of uses for pheromones and other behavior-modifying chemicals.

Preliminary demonstrations of the effectiveness of mating disruption were shown for several forest pests—the Douglas-fir tussock moth, *Orgyia pseudotsugata* (McDunnough); western pine shoot borer, *Eucosma sonomana* Kearfott; ponderosa pine tip moth, *Rhyacionia zozana* (Kearfott); several bark beetles; and the gypsy moth, *Lymantria dispar* (L.).

In the late 1980s the trend towards using more environmentally friendly control agents and developing prevention strategies for managing the gypsy moth resulted in greater emphasis on the development of mating disruption. Concurrently, the 5-year congressionally mandated Appalachian Integrated Pest Management (AIPM) Gypsy Moth Project (Reardon 1991) was initiated in a 38-county area in West Virginia and Virginia. A major emphasis of this project was developing technology, including mating disruption, for managing sparse gypsy moth populations (less than ten egg masses per acre). The AIPM Project (1988 to mid-1993) was followed by the Gypsy Moth Slow-the-Spread Project (1999 to the present), which was initially implemented in nine states (Sharov et al. 2002b). The major emphasis of the Slow-the-Spread Project (STS) is to manage sparse gypsy moth populations to slow the rate of spread of the expanding gypsy moth population front.

This review is a compilation of historical and current information on the use of mating disruption to manage sparse-density populations of the European strain of the gypsy moth. Included is information on development, registration, and formulations of the synthetic pheromone disparlure, as well as effects on non-target organisms. Previously unpublished studies of efficacy, deposition, and residual activity of disparlure are reported.

MATING BIOLOGY OF THE GYPSY MOTH

In the European strain of the gypsy moth, the adult male is guided to the flightless adult female primarily by pheromone, identified by Bierl et al. (1970) as Z-7,8-epoxy-2-methyloctadecane, also called disparlure. Only the (+) enantiomer (enantiomers are molecular structures with a mirror-image relationship) of the cis form of the molecule is attractive to male moths. Although zig-zag flight along the plume of disparlure is the primary mechanism for initial orientation, other behavioral cues are important for successful location and recognition of a mate. Visual cues, principally those presented by tree trunks, are important in inducing landing and the walking search for a female. Recognition at close range and mating are evoked by contact cues such as wing tip touching. Thus, although location of the female over long distances is mediated by pheromone, additional visual and contact stimuli are critical to successful reproduction (Charlton and Carde 1990).

The gypsy moth is univoltine, that is, has one generation per year, and the mating season occurs over a 3-6 week period in mid- to late summer. Some males mate more than once, and some of the males do not mate at all (Proshold 1995). A small portion (about 20 percent) of the females in dense populations, and an unknown but probably small percentage in sparse populations, mate more than once. Females release an average of 8 nanograms of (+)-disparlure per hour (Charlton and Carde 1982). Once mated, females stop releasing pheromone and begin ovipositing (Giebultowicz et al. 1991). Unmated females near the end of their life will lay unfertilized eggs. When daily trap catch of males in pheromone traps is low (<1 male per trap per day), which indicates a relatively low population density, corresponding female mating success is generally below 20 percent (Sharov et al. 1995).

MATING DISRUPTION OF THE GYPSY MOTH

The synthetic version of the gypsy moth sex pheromone used in mating disruption is structurally similar to the pheromone produced by the female gypsy moth. The racemic form of disparlure, a 50:50 mixture of the (+) and (-) enantiomers, has been applied using ground and aerial application methods. In both methods, dispensers impregnated with racemic disparlure release it slowly into the environment.

The ideal formulation of disparlure would release the pheromone at a constant rate and discharge all of the active ingredient in a specified period of time. The physical characteristics of the formulation and tank mix adjuvants have an effect on the discharge of disparlure. However, variable meteorological conditions, such as temperature and relative humidity, can exert unpredictable influences on disparlure release from a formulation.

For mating disruption to be effective, the synthetic pheromone must be present in sufficient quantities for the entire mating period. Since disparlure is volatile, denser than air, and dispersed by air currents, complete initial coverage of an area is probably not essential. However, because of the vertical distribution of females on tree trunks, there is a need to vertically distribute the pheromone.

Failure of males to locate mates in air permeated with disparlure probably results from desensitization of the chemoreceptors in the males' antennae, as well as from disorientation

by following false pheromone trails or leaving the pheromone treated area (Carde and Minks 1995).

The mating disruption technique is more effective at lower gypsy moth population densities because males locate females primarily by the pheromone (Beroza and Knipling 1972, Knipling 1979). At high population densities, males can more easily locate females using visual cues, as well as by chance encounters.

The gypsy moth is not an ideal candidate for mating disruption because of the high fecundity of females which produce 300-1200 eggs per mass, the polygamous nature of males, and the clumped or aggregated distribution pattern of adult females, which is probably due to their sedentary nature and the congregation of larvae at suitable resting and pupation sites. Nevertheless, some characteristics of the European strain of the gypsy moth are suited to the use of mating disruption, including the flightlessness of females, limited dispersal of the majority of males beyond a few hundred meters, low mating success at sparse densities, and the characteristic of having only one generation per year. Unlike the European strain, some recently introduced gypsy moth females of the Asian strain are capable of strong flight, and how this characteristic would influence the usefulness of the mating disruption technique is unknown.

ASSESSING BIOLOGICAL EFFECTIVENESS OF MATING DISRUPTION

The effectiveness of mating disruption of the gypsy moth is assessed biologically using several techniques, alone or in combination: counting life stages under bands around tree boles, monitoring flight of males, monitoring females for mating success, examining eggs for embryonation, and conducting egg mass surveys.

Counting life stages under bands. Life stages (larvae, pupae, adults, and egg masses) under bands (such as burlap) on tree boles at breast height are counted. A decrease in abundance or the absence of larvae and pupae as compared with levels in the previous year indicates effectiveness of mating disruption in the previous year. A decrease in abundance or the absence of viable egg masses in the treated area as compared with an untreated area indicates the effectiveness of mating disruption in the year of treatment. Bands around tree boles tend to bias numbers upward when compared to numbers of egg masses determined using $\frac{1}{40}$ -acre plots (see below) (Liebhold et al. 1986).

Monitoring male trap catch. Traps are baited with 500 μg of (+) - disparlure to attract males during the flight period and deployed at varying densities. If mating disruption is effective, resident (wild) or laboratory-reared (lab) males will not be caught because they will not be able to locate the pheromone in the trap, just as they will not be able to locate females. In the year disparlure is applied, the number of males captured does not provide an estimate of population density but rather a measure of the effectiveness of communication disruption.

Monitoring females for mating success. Virgin 1-day-old females are placed untethered in shelters—such as modified delta traps (triangular cardboard traps usually used to capture adult male gypsy moths) or exposed on tree boles either tethered or untethered. A sticky trunk barrier band is sometimes used to restrict the female's movement up or down the

bole. The inability of males to locate monitor females in shelters or on tree boles, or resident wild females under bands, indicates effectiveness of mating disruption. Recent research (see section 2004—Effect of Female Deployment Method on Mating Success, p. 59) revealed that mating rates in untreated plots are severely reduced in shelters, so their use is no longer recommended.

Examining eggs for embryonation. Egg masses are collected from monitor females and resident wild females under bands, held an additional 30 days in an outdoor insectary under ambient conditions, and then examined for the presence or absence of embryos. The absence of embryos indicates effectiveness of mating disruption. Egg masses produced by females in treated areas sometimes contain only a small number of embryonated eggs. Since such females, even though they have mated, contribute very few progeny to the next generation, females are usually not considered successfully mated unless they produce egg masses containing at least 5 percent embryonated eggs.

Conducting egg mass surveys. A visual search for egg masses is conducted and egg masses are counted. Absence of egg masses or their presence in lower numbers indicates effectiveness of mating disruption. A guide for conducting a systematic egg mass survey can be found in Liebhold et al. (1994).

Traps baited with disarlure may have some competitive advantage over females in that traps emit pheromone continuously over the entire mating season. Traps do not, however, present all of the orientation and recognition cues that females do. Even though reduction in the number of males trapped after application of various disarlure formulations has been equated with reduction in mating success, monitor females are generally thought to provide a more direct measure of mating success at low population densities. Trap capture has not been directly related to changes in density of native egg masses, mainly because no accurate technique has been developed for quantifying egg mass densities in sparse populations.

DEVELOPMENT OF MATING DISRUPTION, 1971 THROUGH 1989

BEFORE 1989—INITIAL DEVELOPMENT AND APPLICATION

Federal and state agencies and private companies have attempted to use mating disruption to manage populations of the gypsy moth since 1971 (e.g., Granett and Doane 1975, Schwalbe et al. 1974, Stevens and Beroza 1972, Webb et al. 1988). Before 1989 various entities conducted mating disruption activities independently, with mixed results. Many research and operational trials of mating disruption were complicated by numerous problems, such as inconsistent formulations of disarlure, relatively insensitive evaluation techniques, and lack of data on seasonal release rates of disarlure. Nevertheless, the following generalizations were derived from these early efforts at mating disruption (Kolodny-Hirsch and Schwalbe 1990): (1) a direct dose-response relationship exists both for disruption of mating communication and for disruption of mating (Webb et al. 1988), (2) the degree of mating reduction is inversely related to male population density (Webb et al. 1988), and (3) a peak in mating occurs during peak male flight. In addition, in 11 of 15 mating disruption trials with the gypsy moth published between 1972 and 1988, evidence for mating disruption was based entirely on the reduction of male moths caught in traps and on the mating success of laboratory-reared or field-collected

females placed in the test plots. In only one report were changes in native population trends statistically tested and shown to be significant (Beroza et al. 1974). In later trials, Webb et al. (1988) demonstrated more consistent efficacy by the use of 75 g active ingredient (AI) per ha (30.4 g AI/acre) of racemic disparlure applied aurally to disrupt mating.

Numerous formulations containing the active ingredient disparlure were evaluated during these early years, for example, hollow plastic fibers (Conrel Inc.), gelatin microcapsules (National Cash Register Capsular Products, Stauffer Co., Penwalt Co.), and plastic laminated flakes (Hercon Environmental Inc.). In general, these formulations provided a relatively uniform distribution of pheromone under laboratory conditions. In field tests, however, the disparlure was inefficiently released, and major problems were encountered in the aerial application of these formulations due to the spray systems available for aircraft at the time.

In earlier trials, results were inconsistent and discouraging. From 1983 to 1989, only one commercial product containing racemic disparlure, the plastic laminated flakes (Disrupt II, Hercon Environmental Inc., Emigsville, Pennsylvania), was registered by the US EPA for use in mating disruption. Therefore, operational use of mating disruption was limited to use of these layered plastic flakes.

1989—A TRANSITIONAL YEAR

In July 1989, an eradication program was conducted in Giles County, Virginia, with the aerial application of the bacterial insecticide *Bacillus thuringiensis* variety *kurstaki* (B.t.) and the growth regulator diflubenzuron as the primary treatments. In addition, disparlure in the form of Disrupt II was applied to approximately 2,500 acres at a dose of 30.4 g AI/acre (Leonard et al. 1992). The cost of the Disrupt II with customer-supplied racemic disparlure was approximately \$50/acre. The mating disruption technique was selected for that portion of the project area where the National Science Foundation had an ongoing study on behavior of dark-eyed junco (*Junco hyemalis hyemalis*). Since part of their diet is lepidopteran larvae, B.t. or diflubenzuron could not be used.

The project area included uninhabited forest land ranging in elevation from 1,000 to 1,300 m, with oak as the primary overstory vegetation and gypsy moth populations below 10 egg masses per acre. An adjacent untreated area was used for comparison.

The mating disruption portion of this eradication effort used previously developed technology for dispensing and evaluating disparlure, but also acquired new data on vertical deposition and release rates of Disrupt II.

Specialized, unmodified equipment developed in the 1970s by Schweitzer Aircraft for applying flakes at the rate of 5-10 g AI/acre for control of pink bollworm and patented in 1984 was mounted, one pod on each side, under the wings of a Cessna 206 (Fig. 1). The dispensing rate of the flakes was controlled by an auger, and the sticker was controlled by a pump and tubing system. The flakes and sticker were mixed in a chamber and then dispensed through a spinner (Fig. 2). During gypsy moth suppression projects using an aqueous insecticide formulation, this aircraft typically was assigned a 75-foot swath width, but due to the inability of the motor controlling the auger on each pod to deliver sufficient flakes, a 45-foot swath was assigned to realize the desired deposit rate of approximately 160,000 flakes per acre, or 40 flakes per square meter (3.7 flakes per square foot).



Figure 1. Specialized application equipment mounted under the wing of a Cessna 206 for dispensing the flake formulation of racemic disparlure (Disrupt II).



Figure 2. Flakes and sticker are mixed in a chamber then dispensed through a spinner.

During characterization trials, the flake deposition pattern within the swath was uneven, with peaks occurring directly under the pods and valleys under the fuselage and wing tips. Additionally, the pod motors for augering the flakes and pumping the sticker malfunctioned periodically, and bridging (binding) of the flakes in the hopper was a constant problem. During applications, a total of 165 g of flakes (dose of 30.4 g AI), talc powder to prevent bridging of the flakes, and 4 oz of the sticker-extender Gelva-1990 (Monsanto, St. Louis, Missouri) to adhere the flakes to the foliage, were mixed and applied per acre. The flake treatment was initiated in July just before anticipated adult male flight. The size of the flake hoppers limited treatment to 125 acres per load at the 30.4 g AI dose.

Efficacy

No egg masses were found before treatment (spring 1989) in the pheromone treated and untreated areas, and both areas had similar male moth catches (summer 1988). In 1989 after treatment, no males were captured in the treated area and 26 percent of the traps captured male moths in the untreated area. Pheromone traps placed on a 250 m grid for two years after treatment (1990 and 1991) captured a total of one moth on the edge of the pheromone treated area in 1991 and an average of four moths per trap in the untreated area. Both of these areas were trapped from 1992 through 1995 on a maximum spacing of a 1-km grid. In 1995 the pheromone treated area was still relatively free of male moths, while populations in the untreated area had received insecticide treatment in 1993.

Laboratory-strain, 10 Krad-irradiated sterile gypsy moth females (male parent was irradiated with 10 Krads of gamma radiation as a pupa) were used as monitor females. Sterile females were used to satisfy regulatory concerns because the project was located outside the quarantine regulated area. When mated with a normal male, these sterile females produce an egg mass that embryonates, but most eggs do not hatch. If these sterile females do not mate, an egg mass can be produced but it will not embryonate. Monitor females were deployed at 100 stations twice weekly for three weeks coinciding with male moth flight. They were left overnight and retrieved the next day. None of the monitor females were mated in the treated or untreated areas. This led to speculation that sterile females were not appropriate for use as monitors and plans to test an escape resistant mating station in which fertile females could be deployed when working outside of the quarantine regulated area were formulated.

Deposition

In addition to the efficacy results, a bucket truck and ground tarps were used to evaluate deposition of 10 times the normal application of flakes (1 x dose flakes containing disparlure and 9 x dose of blank flakes) applied to a 4 ha (10 acre) site within the disparlure-treated area. This high application rate was used to ensure detection of a sufficiently high number of flakes. Twenty overstory and twenty understory trees were sampled. Flakes were deposited throughout all layers of the canopy, including the understory foliage (Fig. 3). Flakes were inventoried at 160 sampling points in the canopy and in 40 ground deposit nets. At application, only 10 percent of the flakes penetrated all levels of foliage and were deposited on the ground beneath the forest. Over six weeks, an additional 6 percent of the flakes fell to ground level, indicating excellent performance of the sticker (Fig. 4).

Residual Activity

During aerial application, sections of black roofing paper were placed on the ground in open areas to collect flakes for release rate analysis. These flakes were weathered on the roofing paper placed beneath the forest canopy and collected weekly for eight weeks. Initially, the



Figure 3. Deposition of green plastic laminated flakes on foliage.




Figure 4. Flake deposition after application of 10 times normal Disrupt II in Giles County, Virginia, 1989. The ground level was sampled on all dates. The canopy was sampled only on July 25, August 1, and September 12.

flakes contained 17 percent disparlure by weight. Results of gas chromatographic analysis of the flakes indicated that they lost approximately 65 percent of their disparlure content over the first 10 days, 10 percent over the next 20 days, and 12 percent in the last 26 days of the test. Moth flight started approximately 15 days after application. This rapid initial release of lure from the flakes was unexpected and prompted additional sampling to confirm suspicions that elevated temperatures on the dark surface of the roofing paper from which the flake samples were collected had increased the release of disparlure. On day 100 after treatment, 20 flake samples were collected from foliage in the sun, foliage in the shade, and roofing paper. On average the flakes collected from foliage contained twice as much lure as the flakes aged on and collected from the roofing paper.

Summary of 1989 Results

The Giles County project was considered a success as only one male moth was recovered from the pheromone treated area in the two years after treatment (1990 and 1991). These efficacy results were better than anticipated based on the inconsistent operability of the pods and the non-uniform distribution of flakes. More importantly, the Giles County project renewed interest in the use of mating disruption to manage sparse- and low-density populations of gypsy moth. However, a number of serious problems with the flake application equipment were identified.

SECOND STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT AND APPLICATION, 1990-1997

Even though the Giles County project was considered a success, it was obvious that a large cooperative effort needed to be initiated for methods development and operational evaluation of mating disruption. This need led in fall 1990 to the formation of the Gypsy Moth Mating Disruption Working Group, which was composed of members from Federal, State, and county governmental agencies and private companies.

The newly-formed Working Group proposed a series of methods improvement projects for implementation over the next seven years. The broad objectives of these efforts were to (1) refine techniques for evaluating efficacy and equipment for applying Disrupt II, (2) quantify the lowest efficacious dose and number of applications of Disrupt II, and (3) develop an additional formulation of disparlure that could be applied through conventional boom and nozzle spray systems. Therefore, unlike the activities conducted from 1971 through 1989 by individual agencies, activities from 1990 through 1997 represented a coordinated effort among three USDA agencies (Agricultural Research Service, Forest Service, and Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service) and industry. Methods improvement trials are discussed by year in the following sections. Operational uses of Disrupt II are summarized in Table 1.

1990—A NEW BEAD FORMULATION

The studies initiated in 1990 had two specific objectives: (1) to evaluate the impact of a single application of disparlure applied yearly for each of four years and of an initial double application of disparlure on gypsy moth mating success and population trends over five years, and (2) to field test an additional commercial disparlure formulation that could be applied

Table 1. Acres of treatment with disparlure flakes, Disrupt II, for eradication and slow-the-spread of the gypsy moth (STS). Application rates for eradication varied. Application rates for STS initially were 30.4 g AI/acre, but later were reduced to 15.2 or 6 g AI/acre. Years prior to 1983 and unlisted years received no mating disruption treatments. (Source: Eradication - USDA 2006; STS – STS Treatment Database).

Year	Number of acres treated			
	Eradication	STS		
		Application rate (g AI/acre)		
		30.4	15.2	6.0
1983	8,302	0	0	0
1989	5,100	0	0	0
1990	460	0	0	0
1991	7,800	0	0	0
1993	0	3,027	0	0
1994	0	5,804	0	0
1995	0	1,518	0	0
1996	5,352	12,215	0	0
1997	0	10,813	0	0
1998	7,120	20,183	0	0
1999	38,980	29,386	0	0
2000	7,988	64,892	27,849	0
2001	0	4,354	208,414	0
2002	650	0	97,997	461,301
2003	0	0	89,392	473,146
2004	250	0	152,707	439,255
2005	0	0	131,601	140,792
2006	0	0	75,245	352,568
Total – all years	82,002	152,192	783,205	1,867,062
Total acres of mating disruption since 1983				2,884,440

through conventional boom and nozzle systems. Rockbridge and Augusta Counties in Virginia were selected as the project area for these method improvement evaluations for these reasons: (1) this area was within the AIPM project 2-km grid of pheromone traps and male moth data were available for 1989 (average 27 moths per trap, range from 11 to 200 per trap); (2) county technical support personnel were already in place; and (3) isolated woodlots were abundant.

DISRUPT II

Three woodlots (each 35-160 acres) were treated with two applications of flakes (Disrupt II) in 1990 only, each at a dose of 30.4 g AI/acre per application. The cost of the Disrupt II with customer-supplied racemic dispartlure was \$25/acre. Treatments were applied just before anticipated initial male flight (June 17) and before anticipated peak flight (July 20). Three additional woodlots were treated just before male flight in 1990 and again every year from 1991 through 1993 with a single application of flakes (Disrupt II) at a dose of 30.4 g AI/acre. An additional three woodlots were not treated. All flakes were applied at 165 g per acre with 4 oz of Gelva-1990 as a sticker and talc to prevent bridging.

Gypsy moth population density was estimated yearly using three techniques: surveying pre- and post-treatment egg masses (1/40 acre subplots on uniform 50-m grids); surveying larval, pupal and egg mass densities under burlap bands (checked when most gypsy moth caterpillars reached late instar and pupal stages, and again after the male flight period); and trapping male moths (one trap per 15 acres, with a minimum of three traps in woodlots smaller than 45 acres). To monitor mating success, laboratory-strain females were placed in modified delta trap (not coated on the inside with adhesive, ends open, and female placed on a piece of burlap inside) mating stations (Fig. 5) in each woodlot at the rate of 30 females three times a week for three weeks during the peak moth flight period. In addition to the laboratory-strain females placed in mating stations for monitoring, resident wild females under bands were monitored, and their egg masses collected and assessed for fertility within treated and untreated woodlots. A total of 1,165 1/40-acre subplots (about 4 percent of total woodlot area) was established for egg mass surveys (Leonhardt et al. 1996).



Figure 5. Modified delta trap used as a mating station for monitor adult females.

To assess relative competitiveness, laboratory-strain and resident wild females were deployed in a moderately dense population of gypsy moth located to the north of the study woodlots in Rockbridge County.

Efficacy

Population densities were significantly reduced by either the double application in 1990 or single application every year from 1991 through 1993. Compared with untreated woodlots,

the abundance of immature life stages and fertilized egg masses under burlap bands, the percentage of mating success of monitor females, and the number of trapped adult males all remained low in woodlots treated yearly with one application of 30.4 g AI/acre (Leonhardt et al. 1996). The low degree of mating success in monitor and wild females indicated there was significant mating disruption in those treated woodlots in all four years of treatment. Although monitor females were not deployed in these woodlots in 1994, the year after the last pheromone treatment, all of the other measures of assessment showed that the gypsy moth population remained suppressed. In the woodlots receiving a double application, all measures of population density were low in the year of treatment (1990) and one year after treatment (1991). However, in 1992 the population began an upward trend, although at a reduced rate of increase as compared with the untreated woodlots (Leonhardt et al. 1996). The evaluation of resident wild and laboratory-strain females in 1990 demonstrated similarity in their attractiveness, behavior and mating success. Therefore, only laboratory-strain females were recommended for use in all future work.

Residual Activity

To evaluate the consistency of Disrupt II over years, the release rates for the 1989 (used in Giles County) and 1990 (used in Rockbridge County) Disrupt II products were determined after multiple passes in Virginia over 23 by 30 cm (9 by 12 inch) white canvas-coated paper cards (Strathmore Paper Co., Westfield, Massachusetts) placed on the ground in an open area at the airport. The cards were allowed to dry and were hung vertically on string beneath the forest canopy for aging. The amount of disparlure per flake was determined as a function of duration of exposure. Using these data, the calculated release rates for both products were slow and uniform over time and did not differ significantly (Fig. 6). Both the 1989 and 1990 Disrupt II products had released only approximately 50 percent of their racemic disparlure content after 42 days, which is the approximate duration of the male moth flight period. This works out to an average release of 360 mg of disparlure per acre per day over the first 42 days. However, the release rate is not constant over time – it is more rapid during the first day or two after application, after which it flattens out.




Figure 6. Release rates of disparlure from Disrupt II flakes produced in 1989 and 1990.

BEAD FORMULATION

AgriSense (Fresno, California) developed a new polymeric flowable bead formulation (beads were 400 to 800 microns in diameter) for mating disruption of pink bollworm in cotton. To determine the release characteristics of this bead formulation containing disparlure bound in an acrylic polymer matrix, laboratory evaluations were conducted by Leonhardt (ARS, Beltsville, Maryland) in 1990. The bead formulation released disparlure at a faster rate than did the flakes, but field release and efficacy data were needed to support laboratory results.

Efficacy

A field test was proposed using this flowable bead formulation containing disparlure (AGRIS-1029). The bead formulation was applied to a 10-acre woodlot to evaluate efficacy, deposition, and release rate profiles on foliage. A similar 10-acre woodlot was treated with flakes (1990 Disrupt II). The beads contained 40 percent AI (by weight), and ranged in diameter from 50 to 800 microns with a volume median diameter (VMD)—the droplet size that divides the spray volume in half—of 275 microns. The tank mix consisted of 75 g of beads, 124 oz water, and 2 percent (by volume) Gelva- 1990, applied at 1 gal per acre, to yield a dose of disparlure of 30.4 g AI/acre.

The application was attempted with a small fixed wing aircraft (Ag Cat) equipped with standard spray booms and flat fan nozzles. This aircraft spray configuration had been used effectively to apply the flowable bead formulation for pink bollworm. However, the desired dose rate of 30.4 g AI/acre of disparlure required the application of between 21 to 53 times the amount of beads per gallon of tank mix as had been used effectively for pink bollworm.

Numerous problems were encountered during airport characterization trials: (1) beads collected on the flat fan diaphragms, and the nozzles would not shut off, (2) beads clumped together clogging the nozzles, boom and pump motor, and (3) beads would not stay suspended in the tank mix. Eventually the proposed 10-acre treatment had to be abandoned and a few trees near the airport were sprayed.

Residual Activity

To characterize release rates, approximately fifty 23 by 30 cm (9 by 12 inch) canvas coated paper cards were placed on the ground in an open area at the airport in Virginia, and each group of 50 was sprayed repeatedly with the bead or flake formulation. The cards were allowed to dry and were hung vertically on string beneath the forest canopy for aging. Samples (three to five cards) were taken after 0, 3, 7, 14, 21, 28, 42, and 56 days. Analyses were conducted on a Model 6C-9A gas chromatograph (Shimadzu Instruments, Columbia, Maryland) with results calculated as micrograms per flake or per bead. Residual disparlure in beads and flakes recovered from the spray cards showed that the bead formulation delivered about 3-4 times as much disparlure to the air over the 42 days of the test than did the flakes (Fig. 7). Although the beads released considerably more lure than the flakes, more than 70 percent of it was discharged prior to the start of male flight (day 10). The accumulated disparlure delivered by both formulations showed the beads released 22 percent of their content and the flakes 14 percent of their content during peak moth flight.




Figure 7. Disparlure content in (A) AgriSense beads and (B) Disrupt II flakes picked from spray cards aged in the field, Rockbridge County, Virginia, 1990.

Over 42 days, the beads released more than 90 percent of their total disparlure content, but the release was not at a constant rate. Over the same time period the flakes released 23 percent of their total lure at a slow but constant rate.

Deposition

During the airport trials, a few trees were sprayed with the bead formulation to evaluate its adhesion to foliage. Of the total number of beads that originally adhered to foliage, only approximately 20 percent remained 18 days after application.

Laboratory Evaluations

In fall 1990, an evaluation was conducted in the laboratory (APHIS Otis Methods Development Center) using the bead formulation to identify a suitable viscosity modifier (Soilserve, Surfex, Induce, Blendex, Penetration, Polyox, Nalquatic, StaPut, Van-Gel B, Mist Control, Rhodopol, and Natrosol) to suspend the beads in the tank and a sticker (Bivert, Poly AG, Clear Spray, No Foam, Bond, and Spray Fuse) to adhere the beads to foliage. Various tank mixes were applied to potted red oak seedlings and allowed to dry for various times before the application of simulated rain. Before and between the rain events, the number of beads present within marked areas on replicate leaves were counted visually under a microscope.

The viscosity modifiers Nalquatic and StaPut (Nalco Chemical Co., Naperville, Illinois) provided favorable suspension of the beads. Nalquatic and StaPut acted as thickening agents and, when each was combined with 2 percent Bond sticker (Loveland Industries, Greeley, Colorado), made the most promising tank mixes.

After the most promising tank mixes were identified, additional laboratory tests were conducted to determine if any of the tank mix additives significantly affected release of disparlure from the beads. All of the additives slightly reduced the initial release rate from the beads but there was no significant differences in release rates between the additives.

Additionally, the influence of bead size on release rate was investigated. As expected, the smaller beads released disparlure faster than did the larger beads.

SUMMARY OF 1990 RESULTS

Results of trials conducted during 1990 indicated that the flakes were efficacious, releasing disparlure at a constant but slow rate. Problems persisted (e.g., bridging of flakes, uneven deposition of flakes beneath the aircraft) (Fig. 8) using the unmodified application equipment. The flowable bead formulation released disparlure erratically and too fast, probably because the majority of the beads were too small (106-205 microns). The rapid release of lure documented in 1990 led to the conclusion that double applications of beads, 10 to 14 days apart, would be required in all subsequent applications to cover the entire flight period with adequate disparlure to disrupt mating. The bead tank mix plugged standard aircraft boom and nozzle systems (e.g., accumulated under the nozzle diaphragm, and beads did not remain suspended). Subsequent laboratory tests identified 2 percent Bond sticker combined with either Nalquatic or StaPut as promising tank mixes. All additives slightly reduced the initial release of lure, but there were no differences in release among the tank additives.




Figure 8. Uneven deposition of flakes beneath application aircraft.

1991—METHODS DEVELOPMENT FOR THE BEAD FORMULATION

BEAD FORMULATION

Airport Trials

In January 1991, a series of field trials were conducted at the APHIS Aircraft Operations facility in Mission, Texas. The objectives of the trials were to evaluate (1) tank mixes that provided favorable deposition, rainfastness and suspendability of beads in laboratory evaluations in 1990, and (2) various types of dispensers for application of the beads.

The viscosity modifiers Nalquatic (0.25 percent) and StaPut (20 percent) with Bond sticker (2 percent) provided favorable suspendability and deposition of beads when tank mixes were aerially applied to 23 by 30 cm (4 by 5 inch) Kromekote paper spray cards. Several nozzle systems (e.g., hollow cone, open pipes extending from the boom) were evaluated for sprayability of beads with CP nozzles (C and E Enterprises, Mesa, Arizona), and all performed with minimal clogging (Fig. 9).

Efficacy

In June and July 1991, six blocks, each approximately 50 acres, were treated in Rockbridge County, Virginia: three blocks with a double application (12 days apart) of beads containing 40 percent racemic disparlure at a dose of 30.4 g AI/acre per application (75 g beads per hectare per application) and three blocks with a double application of Disrupt II at 30.4 g AI/acre per application (165 g flakes per acre per application). The beads were applied using a Cessna 188 (AgTruck) equipped with six CP nozzles, 75 ft swath, and tank mix consisting of 20 percent StaPut, 3 percent Bond, and 77 percent water. A Cessna 206 equipped with two

Figure 9. CP nozzle with check valve used to apply bead formulation of racemic disparlure.



pods was used to apply the flakes using a 45 ft swath and tank mix consisting of 4 oz of Gelva-1990 per acre. Three additional blocks were used as untreated controls.

Prior to 1991, the diatomaceous earth that Hercon adds to the flakes to reduce static electricity during the manufacturing process was sifted out prior to final packaging of the Disrupt formulation. Starting in 1991, some of the diatomaceous earth (12-14 percent by weight) was left in the flakes to prevent bridging of the flakes in the hoppers. This eliminated the need to add talc (12 oz. talc/10 Kg flakes) to the hoppers.

AgriSense adjusted the bead size so that there were fewer beads in the 106-250 micron range and more beads in the 300-425 micron range (Fig. 10). The objective was to reduce the release rate of disparlure from the beads (Fig. 11) without creating so large a bead that they clogged the spray system or had difficulty adhering to foliage.

The 1991 post-treatment efficacy results for the bead treatment indicated that it was effective, as no fertilized egg masses were found under burlap bands or in 1/40-acre subplots and none of the monitor females were mated.

The 1991 posttreatment efficacy results for the flake treatment were complicated by gypsy moth populations expanding in the general area surrounding the northernmost block (fertile egg masses were recovered in and surrounding the treated block while no fertile egg masses were recovered in the other two flake-treated blocks). Also, none of the monitor females in the flake-treated blocks were mated.

Deposition

As part of the 1991 evaluations, two forested sites received 10 times the normal application of flakes or beads to allow recovery for determination of sticker performance on foliage. The formulations were applied in the same tank mixes used on the efficacy blocks. On day 12, coinciding with the start of peak flight, 79 percent of the flakes and 68 percent of the beads remained attached to foliage. On day 56 after application, only 59 percent of the flakes and only 28 percent of the beads remained attached to the foliage, indicating a failure of the sticker.

Residual Activity

Emission rates of disparlure from beads or flakes were essentially the same whether the sample was collected from foliage or canvas coated cards. On day 42 after application, the flakes still contained about 60-70 percent of their original disparlure content (Fig. 12A) and on day 88 in




Figure 10. Size distribution of beads produced (A) in 1990 and (B) in 1991.

late September the flakes still contained 40 percent of their original lure content. Additional analysis showed that 2.5 μg per flake of disparlure or about 2 percent of the original dose remained after 12 months of exposure in the field. In contrast, on day 42 after application, the beads still contained about 10-15 percent of their original disparlure content (Fig. 12B). Although the release rate from the beads was relatively rapid, the new formulation of larger beads was effective in slowing the release of lure when compared with the 1990 formulation. The two applications provided high amounts of disparlure during peak male moth flight. However, the amount of disparlure released over 90 days from the beads was 3-fold that from the flakes (Fig. 13A). At peak moth flight, the beads released a maximum of approximately 1.9 g per day per acre while the double application of flakes released 0.6 g per day per acre




Figure 11. Release rates of disparlure from three sizes of beads.

(Fig. 13A). Although the beads are more efficient than flakes at discharging lure, the rate of discharge is not constant over time. The discharge rate from a single application (Fig. 13B) of beads drops from about 1.4 g per day per acre initially to about 0.8 g per day per acre after one month (June 17 - July 18). In comparison, the release rate from the laminate flakes over the same period in 1991 was nearly constant at 0.3 g per day per acre from a single application (Leonhardt et al. 1992).

FLAKE DISPERSAL SYSTEM

In November 1991, a contract for \$2,000 was awarded to K&K Aircraft (Bridgewater, Virginia) to modify the flake dispensers or develop another system for use on larger aircraft.

SUMMARY OF 1991 RESULTS

Results of trials conducted during 1991 indicated that standard spray booms with CP nozzles were usable for applying beads, and the 20 percent StaPut and 3 percent Bond tank mix provided improved suspendability and adhesion of the beads to foliage (over the Gelva- 1990 tank mix), although additional carriers needed to be evaluated for use with the beads. The flakes were not sticking to foliage as well as in the past, probably due in part to the increased volume of diatomaceous earth (12-14 percent by weight) which was effective in preventing bridging in the Disrupt II formulation. Also, the unmodified pod application equipment continued to perform erratically in spite of minor mechanical adjustments to upgrade the augering systems and in spite of the application of a Teflon coating to the spinner blades on each auger to prevent buildup of flakes and sticker. The larger beads produced for the 1991 season were effective in slowing the release of disparlure. The more efficient release profile of the beads compared with flakes means there is potential for reducing the total dose of beads while maintaining a daily emission rate equivalent to the standard lure (30.4 g AI) of flakes. Results of trials conducted during 1991 indicated that the flakes and beads were efficacious in the year of treatment.




Figure 12. Disparlure content (A) of flakes and (B) of beads recovered from spray cards and foliage.

Although the flakes still contained 40 percent of their disparlure after 88 days in the field, at the start of the next year they contained only 2 percent of their original disparlure content and were assumed not to emit enough disparlure to affect mating in the year after application. However, direct monitoring of mating success and trap catch in treated plots in 2004 and 2005 proved this assumption to be wrong. Sampling from cards yielded the same release rates as sampling from foliage, therefore all subsequent tests used card samples only.

All lab and field trials prior to and including 1991 used previously produced racemic disparlure provided to Hercon by USDA, ARS and APHIS and the Virginia Department of Agriculture. The supply of “old” disparlure was depleted; therefore, in 1992, a contract was awarded to MTM Corporation, Columbus, Ohio, to produce “new” racemic disparlure.




Figure 13. Estimated rates of disparlure emission from double (A) or single (B) applications of beads and flakes (30.4 g AI per acre per application). Estimated per acre emission rates are based on release rates of samples of beads and flakes applied in Rockbridge County, Virginia, 1991.

1992—DOSE-RESPONSE EVALUATIONS

Airport and Laboratory Trials

In April 1992, the previously used viscosity modifying agent StaPut at 20 percent volume with 3 percent Bond sticker and another sticker-extender, TX-7719 (Nalco Chemical Co.), at 10 percent volume without Bond, were each mixed with the beads to evaluate ease of mixing, suspendability of beads, and sprayability and weathering on spray cards and potted oak seedlings. These studies were conducted at the APHIS Aircraft Operations facility. The results showed that TX-7719 provided suspension of the beads comparable to that provided by StaPut, but more importantly, once the TX-7719 had dried, wash-off was minimal (less than 5 percent), even with rainfall events of more than 1 inch. The effect of TX-7719 on the discharge of disparlure from beads was evaluated in the laboratory, and results indicated that beads mixed with TX-7719 release disparlure at the same rate as when mixed with StaPut or water when held in an environmental chamber at 35° C for 30 days. Plugging of the CP

nozzles occurred, and to prevent this, the CP nozzles had to be attached directly to the boom (no restrictors between the boom and nozzles).

Efficacy

A pre-season (June) evaluation of dose versus degree of mating disruption (dose-response) was set up to determine the minimum rate of disparlure (grams per day per acre) that is effective in disrupting mating. The doses of racemic disparlure were 30, 15, 6 and 3 g AI/acre, with one application per block per dose. One block was not treated. Of the average block size of 200 acres, only the center 20 acres were used for evaluation. The bead formulation (instead of the flake formulation) was selected for evaluation because of its rapid release characteristics and because it would provide more “point sources” of pheromone than would the flake formulation at a given dose. An AgTruck equipped with six CP nozzles was used to apply the beads in a 60 ft swath at 1 gal per acre (90 percent water and 10 percent Nalco TX-7719). Over the course of the 8-week evaluation a simulated population of 10 gypsy moth mating pairs per acre (10 mating pairs per acre at each of four times over a 2-week interval) was created by deployment of newly emerged adults from laboratory-strain pupae supplied by APHIS and held outdoors at the evaluation site until eclosion. Males were released on tree boles and females were placed in mating stations (Leonard 1994).

All doses appeared to suppress mating to a similar extent. Only 0.05 percent of the egg masses recovered from the treated blocks were fertile while 24 percent of those recovered from the untreated block were fertile. These results were unanticipated and confusing based on the wide range of doses and previous efficacy results of other investigators, although the combination of an evenly distributed simulated low population versus a clumped or aggregate distribution in nature and cold rainy weather probably limited adult activity and confounded the sensitivity of the evaluation. Of the 720 males released into the untreated block only 67 (9.3 percent) were recaptured. No males were captured in any of the treated blocks.

Under more typical summer weather conditions, the test was repeated with essentially the same results.

A post-season (August) dose-response evaluation was repeated using doses of 30, 15, 6, and 3 g AI/acre. The percentage of fertile egg masses recovered was 0.69 percent in the treated blocks and 43 percent in the untreated block. Of the 720 males released into the untreated block only 139 (19.3 percent) were recaptured. No males were captured in any of the treated blocks.

Based on later studies (section 2001—Dose Response Tests With 3M Sprayable Microcapsules, p. 48; section 2002—Disrupt II Dose Response Tests, p. 51), we now know that the lowest dose used in these tests (3g AI/acre) was sufficiently high to disrupt mating under the ideal conditions and extremely sparse simulated populations that were present.

An additional efficacy evaluation was conducted during the gypsy moth mating season (July) to determine whether two applications of beads at 6 g AI/acre would disrupt mating. This dose was selected based on 1991 release rates: an application of beads at 6 g AI/acre initially released disparlure at the same rate as an application of flakes at 30.4 g AI/acre and was more cost effective. A second application of beads, 10-14 days after the first application, was needed to augment the dose of racemic disparlure since the beads release their pheromone

content quickly. Also, the 6 g AI/acre dose for each of two applications was considered economically competitive (\$8 - \$13 for AI and formulation for 12 g dose) with other operational control options (\$15 per application per acre for the gypsy moth nucleopolyhedrosis virus product Gypchek and \$5 per application per acre for B.t.). Six blocks (three treated and three untreated) were established in Rockbridge County, Virginia.

In 1992, fertile egg masses per acre were 0 in all three treated blocks compared with an average of 3.6 fertile egg masses in all three untreated blocks. The percentage of monitor females mated was substantially reduced by the treatment, but mating was not entirely disrupted as fertile egg masses were recovered from under burlap bands in one of the bead plots in the year of treatment. In 1993, two of the treated blocks had 0 fertile egg masses per acre and the other 12.6, whereas the untreated blocks averaged 28 egg masses per acre.

Deposition

Sticker performance of two bead tank mixes (10 percent TX-7719, and 20 percent StaPut and 3 percent Bond) and one flake tank mix (Gelva- 1990 at an increased rate of 6 oz per acre) was evaluated on blocks treated at 30.4 g AI/acre. Each tank mix was applied multiple times to ensure good coverage. Eight days after treatment and coinciding with the start of moth flight, 80 percent of the beads and TX-7719; 89 percent of the beads, StaPut and Bond; and 93 percent of the flakes remained adhered to foliage. At the conclusion of the test (44 days after treatment), 63 percent of the beads and TX-7719; 60 percent of the beads, StaPut and Bond; and 71 percent of the flakes remained adhered to foliage.

Residual Activity

Sets of 35 canvas coated cards were sprayed with beads mixed with 10 percent TX-7719, or with 20 percent StaPut and 3 percent Bond, and hung in the woods for periodic collection to determine disparlure release rates. The beads in both tank mixes released lure at approximately the same rate and at a slightly slower rate than in 1991, probably due to the fact that the bead size distribution had again shifted slightly upwards. Both tank mixes released approximately 50 percent of the lure by day 20 and 70 percent of the lure by day 42.

Flake Dispersal System

In March 1992, the newly developed system was evaluated on a Twin-Beech aircraft. The deposition and functioning of the prototype unit was promising; therefore, another \$2,000 was awarded to K&K Aircraft (April 1992) to continue the development of this prototype flake application system. An additional spinner unit needed to be added beneath the fuselage.

Summary of 1992 Results

In and out of season tests using simulated populations of 10 mating pairs per acre indicated that a 3 g AI/acre dose of beads was equally effective as a 30 g AI/acre dose in disrupting mating. The beads applied at 6 g AI/acre for each of two applications during the normal gypsy moth mating season provided mating disruption. Results of trials conducted during 1992 demonstrated that the sticker-extender TX-7719 provided adequate suspension of beads and provided equal adhesion of beads to foliage and release rates as did the 20 percent StaPut and

3 percent Bond mixture. For all subsequent tests with beads, TX-7719 was used as the sticker-extender because less volume is required which results in less cost. The bead size shifted unpredictably upward again in 1992 bringing to attention the fact that different bead lots are not exactly repeatable in terms of bead size distribution or release rates.

The unmodified application pods used to apply the flakes continued to malfunction. The new system being developed by K&K Aircraft to apply the flakes from small (e.g., AgCat) and large (e.g., Twin Beech) aircraft was evaluated and, given promising results, an additional contract was awarded to K&K.

Flakes applied in 1992 were mixed with 6 oz (instead of 4 oz as in the past) Gelva-1990 per acre based on 1991 results that the flakes were not sticking as well as in the past, perhaps due to the 12-14 percent (by weight) diatomaceous earth. This reduction in diatomaceous earth (now 5 percent by weight) and increase in sticker volume improved the adhesion of flakes to foliage when compared with flakes applied in 1991.

Hercon Environmental received re-registration for its Disrupt II Gypsy Moth Mating Disruptant (EPA Reg. No. 8730-55) in March 1992. Previously registered Disrupt II (EPA Reg. No. 8730-46) was cancelled on October 10, 1989, for non-payment of fees. All applications of Disrupt II from 1990 through 1991 were performed under EUPs.

In 1992, costs for the operational use of Disrupt II were for sticker (18¢/acre), flakes (customer-supplied disparlure) (\$7.20/acre), application costs (\$4.23/acre), and an observation plane (50¢/acre).

1993—REDUCED DOSES OF DISPARLURE

Efficacy

To determine the efficacy of reduced doses of disparlure, a trial was conducted in Rockbridge County, Virginia, using a total of 12 blocks: four blocks treated with beads applied at 6 g AI/acre (i.e., 15 grams of 40 percent AI formulation per acre) in each of two applications (six CP nozzles without in-line screens, 90 percent water and 10 percent TX-7719 for a total spray of 1 gallon per acre); four blocks treated with flakes at 20 g AI/acre with approximately 5 percent diatomaceous earth and 6 percent Gelva-1990 in one application; and four blocks untreated. The 6 g AI/acre per application dose of beads applied in two applications was used because results were favorable in 1992. The treatments were blocked on the basis of population density (numbers of immature life stages under burlap just prior to treatment). Two of the four replicates in each treatment had more dense populations than would normally be selected for mating disruption.

Mating was disrupted in all treated blocks (greatest in the two replicates with lowest pretreatment densities) when compared with untreated blocks, although fertile egg masses were recovered in two flake-treated blocks and three bead-treated blocks. An average of one male moth per trap was captured in the flake-treated blocks, three male moths per trap in the bead-treated blocks, and 200 male moths per trap in the untreated blocks. In general, there were no differences in efficacy between the bead and flake treatments. Post-treatment egg mass surveys conducted in 1993 yielded an average of 28, 6.7 and 4.4 egg masses per acre respectively in the untreated, flake and bead treated blocks (Thorpe et al. 1999). In 1994,

the gypsy moth populations in the untreated blocks continued to increase above 1993 levels (average 402 males per trap and 63 egg masses per acre) and increases also occurred in the treated blocks (an average 38 males per trap and 13.9 egg masses per acre in flake-treated blocks, and an average 107 males per trap and 11 egg masses per acre in bead-treated blocks). In 1995 populations in all treated and untreated blocks decreased sharply, probably as a result of the increased incidence of the fungus *Entomophaga maimaiga* and nucleopolyhedrosis virus in the general area (Thorpe et al. 1999).

Deposition and Residual Activity

Release rates were evaluated in Virginia by aerially applying flakes with 6 oz of several sticker-extendors (Gelva-1990, Gelva-2333) and a Nalco product (RA-8554) to 23 by 30 cm (9 by 12 inch) canvas coated cards for analysis of residual disparlure content and to foliage for sticker performance. Monsanto management decided not to manufacture Gelva-1990 beyond 1993; therefore, evaluation of other products was needed. Gelva-2333 is an acrylic multipolymer emulsion that has two major components: 1) an adhesive agent and 2) a surfactant. These components are designated “exempt from the requirement of tolerance when used as an inert ingredient in a pesticide formulation applied to growing crops,” which is an important consideration for the broad application of Disrupt II. The cards were hung in a nearby wooded area for aging. Periodically, three to five replicate cards for each treatment were removed for determination of residual disparlure content in the flakes and beads. Beads applied at 1 gal per acre with 10 percent TX-7719 were sprayed on canvas-coated cards for analysis of residual disparlure content as well as on foliage to evaluate adhesion.

Gelva-2333 was selected to replace Gelva-1990 based on good performance as a sticker and no noticeable changes in release characteristics. At 13 and 47 days after treatment, 90 percent and 84 percent of the flakes and Gelva-2333 still adhered to foliage. This compared favorably with the flakes and Gelva-1990 mix where 88 percent and 72 percent still adhered to foliage on days 13 and 47. The Nalco product (RA-8554) did not perform well, with only 51 percent and 28 percent of the flakes remaining at days 13 and 47. The beads and TX-7719 mix did not perform as well as in the past with only 57 percent and 31 percent of the beads still adhered 13 and 47 days after treatment.

Shin-Etsu Chemical Co. (Tokyo, Japan) provided a batch of an experimental slow release “gypsy moth powder” formulation and a commercially produced carrier for mixing with the powder in the aircraft hopper. The tank mix was foamy and the formulation powder appeared to float on top. The powder contained racemic disparlure (9.5 percent AI) and was evaluated only for release rates on canvas cards.

In April 1993, the original unmodified pod units were modified by Harold Miller of Harold’s Flying Service (Leland, Illinois) and evaluated for uniformity of deposition of flakes across the swath and uniformity of flow rate. Additional modifications to the system were needed prior to use in the field.

The K&K Aircraft prototype application system for dispensing the flakes, which now consisted of one augering unit mounted beneath each front wing and one unit beneath the fuselage, was developed for use on a Twin Beech with the potential of carrying sufficient flakes

to treat approximately 3,000 acres per aircraft load. The system was evaluated at their facilities in February 1993. The swath width was 125 feet with peaks and valleys of deposition beneath the aircraft. This system needed 1) additional development to prevent clogging of the auger with flakes and sticker, and 2) larger holding tanks for the sticker in the fuselage.

Since Disrupt II was being applied to large acreages, a question was raised about its toxicity to aquatic invertebrates. In the original disparlure registration submission, dated December 1, 1978, Hercon had requested a waiver for the acute invertebrate (*Daphnia*) toxicity study. The registration was granted in August 1979 with the waiver request accepted. Hercon products containing disparlure that followed were based on the original submission. This includes Disrupt II, which did not have a *Daphnia* toxicity study. Plans were made to conduct a *Daphnia* toxicity study.

Summary of 1993 Results

Results of trials conducted during 1993 demonstrated that lower doses of disparlure (beads applied at 6 g AI/acre in each of two applications and flakes applied at 20 g AI/acre in one application) suppressed mating when compared with untreated blocks but did not prevent the production of some fertile egg masses in the blocks with higher population densities. Therefore, there was a need to reevaluate these doses of disparlure against low density populations. Gelva-2333 was selected to replace the soon to be discontinued Gelva-1990 as a sticker for the flakes. Suspension of the Shin-Etsu powder when mixed with the carrier and water in the tank was unsatisfactory. Also, the pheromone release rate from the powder was more rapid than the release rate from beads. These unfavorable characteristics resulted in a request to Shin-Etsu to modify their formulation and carrier before the initiation of future trials. The prototype system for dispensing flakes from large aircraft developed by K&K Aircraft needed extensive modification (e.g., to widen the effective swath and achieve a more uniform distribution of flakes across the swath), but the modification was not pursued due to anticipated limited use of large aircraft to apply Disrupt II over large areas in the next five years. As a result, dispenser development by K & K Aircraft was discontinued.

1994—INCREASED DOSES OF DISPARLURE

Efficacy

Twelve blocks, four per treatment, were established farther south in Rockbridge County, Virginia, where there were less dense gypsy moth populations as determined by the capture of fewer male moths. These blocks were not isolated woodlots as were used in the past, but part of the general forest. Each block was approximately 100 acres with only the center 20 acres used for evaluation. The treatments were (1) beads at 15.2 g AI/acre with 10 percent TX-7719 (now designated Biogrip or 93SD155) in 1 gal per acre for each of two applications; (2) flakes at 30.4 g AI/acre (165 g of flakes and 5 g of diatomaceous earth per acre) with 6 oz Gelva-2333 per acre for one application; and (3) untreated. Increased doses for both flakes and beads were used in 1994 because in 1993, even though lower doses of disparlure in both flakes and beads suppressed mating, fertile egg masses were produced in blocks with higher population densities. The beads manufactured for use in 1994 again increased in size. This emphasized the continuing problem of variability in bead size distribution among manufacturing lots.

The treatment blocks were established based on the number of life stages found under burlap bands just prior to treatment.

The 1994 post-treatment results indicated that gypsy moth populations were effectively suppressed by both formulations; however, neither treatment was 100 percent effective in all blocks (Thorpe et al. 1999).

Deposition and Residual Activity. The release rate and stickability of the larger beads were compared with the 1993 beads for release rate of disparlure on canvas cards and for adhesion to foliage. The beads were applied at the 30.4 g AI/acre dose in 1 gallon per acre with 10 percent Biogrip.

No differences were detected in the percentage of disparlure released over 30 days for “old” beads (77 percent) and “new” beads (74 percent). Also, there was no detectable difference in adhesion to foliage.

In 1994, some nozzle clogging was encountered using the larger beads. After each load the CP nozzles were cleaned, and usually at least one of the outer nozzles was completely plugged.

In 1994, the US EPA adopted a new policy allowing the testing of pheromones in solid matrix dispensers on no more than 250 acres to proceed without the need for an EUP (the previous limit was 10 acres). Unfortunately, pheromone products formulated in beads or flakes and intended for broadcast application are not covered by the rule because of the potential for specific environmental concerns.

Summary of 1994 Results

Results of methods improvement trials conducted during 1994 demonstrated that the bead and flake treatments suppressed populations in the treatment year (1994) as determined by the number of fertile egg masses and egg masses per acre recovered in the treated versus untreated blocks (Leonhardt et al. 1995). There were no detectable differences between the 1993 beads and the 1994 beads based on release rates and adhesion to foliage. Unfortunately, the 1994 beads applied at 15.2 g AI with 10 percent Biogrip clogged CP nozzles. Preliminary thoughts concerning the cause of this problem were larger sized beads, unpublished change in the Biogrip additive, pH of the water in the tank mix, or a combination of these factors. Biosys is now the producer of the beads (Agris-1029), and AgriSense is a division of Biosys. The original unmodified pods manufactured for Hercon by Schweitzer aircraft in the 1970s were no longer reliable for use. The flake applications for the methods improvement trials were plagued with breakdowns, primarily of the motors and motor controls for the flake augers. This performance of the original unmodified pods was in contrast to more efficient performance of a much modified set of pods (i.e., with new motors and motor controls, a different design of augers, and larger flake hoppers) developed and used by Harold's Flying Service to apply the flakes to operational blocks. In spite of these improvements, the flake application system still needed additional modifications: 1) a larger capacity motor on the flake auger system so that it can put out a greater volume of flakes per minute; 2) additional volume capacity for the flake hopper; 3) a flake hopper that can slide back from under the aircraft for ease of loading, and 4) a lightweight sticker container to replace the present cardboard box containers.

1995—MONITORING OF BLOCKS TREATED IN 1994

No new efficacy and residue trials were initiated in 1995. Monitoring continued in blocks treated in 1994. The bead and flake treatments provided comparable population suppression (as compared with untreated plots), but results were complicated by an increased incidence of the fungus *Entomophaga maimaiga* and nucleopolyhedrosis virus, which also suppressed the gypsy moth populations in the treated and untreated blocks (Thorpe et al. 1999).

In response to plugging of CP nozzles by beads in 1994, a contract was developed with Al's Aerial Spraying (Ovid, Michigan) to apply several tank mixes containing the bead formulation (now produced by Biosys) from equipment that simulated spray boom and nozzle systems used for aerial application and from the air. Several nozzle/atomizers (e.g., flat fan, hollow cone, Micronair) were used to apply the bead formulation. Micronair AU-5000 atomizers (without screens) (Fig. 14) performed well and did not plug during ground and aerial trials. The other nozzle systems (including the CP nozzles) plugged during application. Also, the Biogrip sticker droplets left a milky stain on car finishes that required buffing or compounding to remove.




Figure 14. Micronair AU-5000 atomizer (A) with cage screen used to apply insecticides and (B) without cage screen used to apply the bead formulation of racemic disparlure.

Summary of 1995 Results

The increasing incidences of gypsy moth fungus and virus throughout Rockbridge and Augusta Counties, Virginia, further complicated the 1994 efficacy trials. It was decided not to initiate additional trials in 1996 until another area could be located with suitable low density gypsy moth populations. Modifications were completed to equipment for applying the flakes, and nozzles and tank mixes for applying the beads were reevaluated. AgriSense (United Kingdom) submitted a registration package to the US EPA for their bead formulation for gypsy moth, which was designated Decoy GM Beads. Biosys also provided a new microsponge formulation for evaluation, but it had suspendability problems. Shin-Etsu provided another chip formulation with release rates determined under laboratory conditions.

A contract was awarded to Sumitomo Chemical Company, Tokyo, Japan, to produce racemic disparlure.

1996—EVALUATION OF ADDITIONAL TANK MIXES

In the laboratory (APHIS Otis Methods Development Center), bead tank mixes were deposited on seasoned foliage of potted red oak seedlings, and the plants were exposed to

accumulated simulated rainfall totaling 5.0 inches. An additional tank mix was needed for the beads because the surfactant, TX-8815 (now designated Nalco-8815), that had earlier shown promise in preliminary tests in preventing clogging of nozzles and aiding in mixing, did not by itself appreciably contribute to suspendability of the tank mixes, and substantially increased wash-off of the standard tank mix (Biogrip). Of the tank mixes tested, the following four combinations with beads were most resistant to wash-off: (1) Biogrip, Nalquatic, and Nalco-8815, (2) Biogrip and Nalquatic, (3) Bond and Nalquatic, and (4) Bond, Biogrip, Nalquatic, and Nalco-8815.

Airport Trials

At the airport (APHIS Aircraft Operations, Mission, Texas), the Bond and Nalquatic tank mix (with and without 0.5 percent Nalco-8815) were selected for evaluation in an aircraft based on performance during laboratory trials. Nalco-8815 did not aid in keeping beads in suspension once mixed but did aid in the initial mixing of beads into a slurry. The Micronair atomizers without cages did not malfunction using these tank mixes.

Field Trials

An AgTruck was used to aerially apply large volumes of several tank mixes to experimental blocks in Rockbridge County, Virginia, in July 1996. The Bond and Nalquatic mix was chosen as the basis for evaluation due to its higher resistance to wash-off as compared with the standard (Biogrip). Each tank mix was applied through CP nozzles and AU-5000 Micronair atomizers. Mixes were evaluated with and without Nalco-8815.

Clogging did not occur in CP nozzles or Micronair atomizers with any of the tank mixes. Past efficacy trials in which clogging occurred used CP nozzles with stainless steel bodies. These trials used CP nozzles with plastic bodies. Flow dynamics of the bead mixes through plastic bodies is different than through steel bodies (discussion with C and E Enterprises, Mesa, Arizona). Further evaluation of the types of nozzle bodies is needed.

Both types of nozzles were configured to deliver a range of droplet sizes. Over an 8-week period after spraying, beads on foliage were counted to determine wash-off. None of the tank mixes applied through Micronair atomizers performed well. The best performing mix was 0.75 percent Nalquatic, 3 percent Bond, and 0.5 percent Nalco-8815 in water. When applied through CP nozzles set at maximum deflection and at maximum orifice size, this mix resulted in greater retention of beads on foliage than when applied through Micronair atomizers set at VRU of 12 and 90° blade angle with cages removed.

Retention of beads on foliage:

Days after application	CP nozzle	Micronair atomizer
14	90%	71%
28	80%	55%
42	50%	31%
56	35%	1%

The addition of Nalco-8815 surfactant did not cause undue foaming and appeared not to have increased wash-off of beads from foliage.

Summary of 1996 Results

Increased incidence of the gypsy moth fungus dramatically reduced gypsy moth populations throughout Rockbridge County, Virginia and continued to complicate evaluation of previous efficacy trials. Evaluations of various tank mixes showed that combinations of Nalquatic, Bond, and bead mixes in water, with and without Nalco-8815, could be applied through CP nozzles with plastic bodies and Micronair atomizers without cages with no clogging.

Wash-off data for the Nalquatic, Bond, and Nalco-8815 tank mix compared favorably with the original 1993 wash-off data for the Biogrip tank mix.

Harold's Flying Service redesigned and further modified the pheromone flake application equipment in anticipation of use during the operational program in Virginia. The sticker and flake containers that were modified previously needed a separate control unit for each sticker and flake unit so that they could be controlled and calibrated separately.

1997—ADDITIONAL TRIALS OF FLAKE FORMULATIONS

Efficacy

Because of concerns over anticipated delay of US EPA registration of the bead formulation, focus shifted back to evaluation of the flake formulation. Based on results of earlier tests with hand-applied pheromone dispensers (Kolodny-Hirsch and Schwalbe 1990), it was originally concluded that any successful pheromone dispenser must be distributed throughout the forest canopy to be effective. The effect of dispenser distribution on the efficacy of mating disruption, however, had never been determined experimentally for the Hercon flakes.

Twelve blocks that supported very low gypsy moth populations were established in the northern half of Rockbridge County, Virginia. Four of these blocks were treated with the standard flake tank mix, which consisted of Disrupt II at 30.4 g AI in 6 oz of Gelva-2333 per acre. Four blocks were treated with flakes at the same dose without sticker, and four controls were left untreated.

USDA milk carton traps to catch males and delta traps to deploy monitor females were placed both at ground level (2.5 m) and in the forest canopy (approximately 19 m) using string rigging that allowed traps and mating stations to be pulled into the canopy (Figs. 15 and 16). Burlap bands and pre-season and post-season $1/40$ -acre egg mass surveys were used to evaluate population levels and trends.

Communication between males and females was suppressed but not severed on treatment plots as measured by the number of males caught per trap per day. Average capture was 0.00013 males/trap/day on plots with sticker, 0.02 males/trap/day with no sticker, and 0.25 males/trap/day on control plots. Communication suppression was more successful in plots treated with sticker than in plots with no sticker. Mating success, as measured by the percent of fertile egg masses recovered from deployed females, was substantially higher in control plots (9.3 percent) than in either treatment (1.9 percent in plots with no sticker, and 1.4 percent in plots with sticker), and there appeared to be no difference between treatments. These

Figure 15. Schematic diagram of string rigging used to pull pheromone traps and delta trap mating stations into the canopy to evaluate the effectiveness of Disrupt II flakes applied without sticker.




Figure 16. A compound bow was used to shoot an arrow attached to a fishing reel into the canopy. The string rigging was pulled into place with the fishing line.

combined data were ambiguous in that they did not show clear differences between the sticker and no-sticker treatments.

Alternative Tank Mix

Although the flakes have consistently been shown to adequately disrupt mating in efficacy trials in the past, the unmodified application equipment used to apply the flakes (dispenser pods developed in the 1970s by Schweitzer Aircraft and variously modified by Hercon Environmental, APHIS, and Harold's Flying Service) was expensive, specialized, and performed inconsistently. A slurry of flakes in an appropriate carrier that could be applied with conventional spray equipment would offer an advantage.

In 1997, field trials evaluated a tank mix slurry using a new carrier, LI108 (Loveland Industries, Greeley, Colorado). LI108 is both a thickening agent and adhesive; therefore, no other adjuvants were used in this mix. The slurry was pumped through (1) special pinch valves and 8050 Tee Jet flat fan tips fitted to adjustable stainless steel bodies and (2) large diaphragm check valves with 8085 Tee Jet flat fan tips and round orifices. Some clogging did occur in the stainless steel valve bodies, and boom pressures were lower than desired; however, the slurry passed through both nozzle configurations and there was positive shutoff. Unfortunately, when the flakes remain in the slurry there is a release of pheromone from the flakes into the slurry and, subsequently, to the air.

Summary of 1997 Results

Results of the sticker versus no-sticker efficacy tests were inconclusive, but provided some evidence that it may not be critical for pheromone dispensers (e.g., flakes) to be applied to a target area in such a way that they adhere to foliage. Under some circumstances it may be possible to simplify application procedures and reduce application costs by using a tank mix with no sticker. Additional testing was identified as a high priority for 1998.

The no-sticker mix was successfully applied using the pods except that, despite initial attempts to calibrate the system, the pods appeared to be putting out the total amount of material before the plot was actually finished. Although no specific factor could be identified as causative, a combination of factors could have contributed: 1) slight changes in calibration, 2) inaccurate acreage estimates, 3) delayed initiation or termination of pod auger operation or both, 4) flake dribbling after shutoff, and 5) overlap of previous swaths (the aircraft was fitted with a global positioning guidance system, but it was not functioning properly at the time of application).

Preliminary tests of an alternative tank mix (LI108-flake slurry) applied through specially designed nozzles attached to conventional spray equipment were encouraging, although the rapid leaching of pheromone from the flakes into the slurry needed to be resolved.

On January 20, 1997, Thermo Ecotek Corporation announced that its subsidiary, Thermo Trilogy Corporation, acquired Biosys Inc., including AgriSense-BCS, Ltd., a United Kingdom company. Discussions with Thermo Trilogy Corporation personnel indicated that they were going to continue to pursue the registration of the bead formulation with the US EPA.

THIRD STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT AND APPLICATION, 1998-2005

From 1990-1997, methods development projects conducted under the direction of the Gypsy Moth Mating Disruption Working Group facilitated the development of mating disruption as a reliable and effective tool for managing low density gypsy moth populations. During this period, a federal strategy to slow the spread of the gypsy moth into new areas was under development by the USDA Forest Service. In 1992, the Slow the Spread of the Gypsy Moth (STS) pilot project was initiated, and in 2000 STS became fully operational. In recognition of the importance of the STS program in protecting forest resources, and the potential importance of mating disruption as a treatment tactic in STS, additional resources and attention were focused on research intended to improve the cost-effectiveness of gypsy moth mating disruption and the confidence of STS program managers in the use of this target species specific tactic.

1998—RE-EVALUATION OF THE NEED FOR STICKER

Efficacy of Flakes Without Sticker

Because the results obtained in 1997 were inconclusive, the efficacy of Disrupt II flakes applied without sticker was tested again in 1998 (Thorpe et al. 2000). Twelve 250-acre study plots were established within a continuously-forested area in Augusta and Rockbridge counties, Virginia. As before, four study plots were treated with Disrupt II at 30.4 g AI in 6 oz of Gelva-2333 per acre, four plots were treated at the same rate but without the Gelva-2333 sticker, and four plots were untreated controls. Biological efficacy was measured with standard USDA milk carton traps and daily deployment of laboratory-reared female gypsy moths. Traps and females were deployed at heights of 1.5 m above the ground and in the canopy using pulley systems. A total of 60 naturally-occurring egg masses was found and evaluated to determine if they were fertile.

In both 1997 and 1998, trap catch and mating success of deployed females were higher in the plots treated with flakes without sticker compared to the plots in which sticker was used, but the differences were not statistically significant (Fig. 17 a and b). When the results from both years were combined, trap catch was reduced by 67 percent compared to controls in plots treated with flakes without sticker and by 90 percent in plots treated with flakes with sticker. Mating success was reduced by 89 percent compared to controls in plots treated with flakes without sticker and by 99.5 percent in plots treated with flakes with sticker. Furthermore, 55 percent of the naturally-occurring egg masses that were found in the plots treated without sticker in 1998 were fertile, compared to 2.9 percent in the plots treated with sticker.




Figure 17. Male trap catch (a) and female mating success (b) in plots treated with Disrupt II flakes with and without sticker.

While the addition of the sticker did not result in a statistically significant increase in treatment effectiveness, suppression of trap catch and mating success in the plots with sticker were greater each of the two years of the study. This trend is further supported by the finding in 1998 of substantially higher fertilization rates among naturally-occurring egg masses in plots treated without sticker. Therefore, to achieve maximum efficacy with flakes, a sticker should be used. However, in situations where the use of a sticker may be problematic, such as in residential areas, a high level of mating disruption can be expected to occur with the application of flakes without sticker.

Flake Slurry Formulation

Efforts continued in 1998 to develop a slurry formulation that could deliver flakes using more conventional hydraulic application equipment. Andy Trent (USDA, Forest Service, Missoula Technology and Development Center, Missoula, Montana) developed an application system consisting of modified Micronair AU-5000 atomizers (Trent and Thistle 1999). Larger holes were drilled in both the inner and outer cages to prevent clogging. Initial tests were conducted at Covington, Virginia to assess swath patterns at different application volumes. At application volumes of 0.5 gallon and 1 quart per acre there was no clogging, and the distribution of flakes across a 75-foot swath was fairly uniform. Clogging did occur at an application volume of 1 pint per acre because of the low pressure (2 psi) required for the low volume output.

In June of 1998, four 250-acre plots in Rockbridge County, Virginia, were treated with the flake slurry formulation using the modified Micronair system (two AU-5000 atomizers, 3-inch blades set for maximum RPM) at an application volume of 0.5 gallons per acre and at a

dosage of 30.4 g AI/acre. Each nozzle was fed from the end of the boom through a 0.5-inch (inside diameter) plastic tube. This eliminated the possible build-up of air in the end of the boom. Both cages were used on the atomizer, but the inner cage was modified with larger openings. This eliminated the build-up of flakes and allowed more sticker to adhere to the flakes (i.e., since the cages turned at high RPMs, the sticker spun off the flakes). An additional four plots were treated with a standard flake application at the same dosage using pods, and four plots were untreated controls. Standard methods were used to evaluate the biological efficacy of the treatments. Compared to the control plots, male trap catch was reduced by 85 percent in the standard flake plots and by 61 percent in the flake slurry plots (Fig. 18a). The percentage of deployed females producing fertile egg masses (with more than 5 percent fertile eggs) was zero in the standard flake plots and was reduced by 94 percent in the flake slurry plots (Fig. 18b). These results indicate that, while the flake slurry formulation was highly effective, there appeared to be a slight decrease in effectiveness compared to the standard flake application.




Figure 18. Male trap catch (a) and female mating success (b) in plots treated with Disrupt II flakes in a standard pod application or a slurry applied through modified Micronair atomizers.

Deposition and Weathering

Because the flake slurry formulation used a different adhesive than was used in standard flake applications, tests were conducted to compare the deposit and weatherability of flakes applied using each of the systems. A 10x application of flakes using each of the application systems was made to oak trees along the edge of the Virginia Tech Shenandoah Valley Agricultural Research and Extension Center at Steeles Tavern, Virginia. A total of 250 flakes for each system was located, marked, and checked each week for eight weeks to determine washoff rate. At the end of the evaluation period, 149 flakes from those that were applied using the pods remained (40 percent loss) and 117 flakes that were applied with the slurry system remained (53 percent loss). In addition, a bucket truck was used to collect foliage from the canopies of plots treated with each of the application systems to compare the number of flakes remaining eight weeks after application. About 50,000 leaves were collected from foliage sprayed with each system. A total of 160 flakes was present on the foliage sprayed with the pods, and 112 was present on foliage sprayed with the slurry (Fig. 19a). This works out to about 0.003 flakes per leaf, or about 400 leaves per flake (Fig. 19b). The difference in the number of flakes between the two application systems was similar in the two tests (the number of flakes remaining after the slurry treatment was 21 and 31 percent lower than the number remaining after the pod treatment in the first and second tests, respectively). Clearly,




Figure 19a. Persistence of Disrupt II flakes on understory foliage after standard application using pods (Gelva 2333) or in a slurry (LI-108).




Figure 19b. Number of Disrupt II flakes remaining on foliage in a forest canopy after standard application using pods (Gelva 2333) or in a slurry (LI-108).

while the weatherability of the flakes applied using the slurry system was good, there was greater loss of applied flakes using the slurry system.

Loss of Disparlure While in Contact With Sticker

During a standard outdoor release rate test it was noticed that the initial disparlure content of flakes mixed with the stickers Gelva-2333 (flake application using pods) and LI-108 (flake application in slurry) was lower than that in flakes not mixed with sticker. To determine the effect of exposure to stickers on disparlure content, a laboratory test was conducted. Flakes were mixed with three aqueous dilutions (50, 75, and 100 percent sticker) of both stickers. Five time periods of exposure to the stickers were tested: 5, 20, 60, 240, and 1,440 minutes. After the flakes were removed from the sticker, excess sticker was wiped off and the flakes were placed on a screen to dry for 24 hours, after which time they were analyzed for disparlure content. There was no clear effect of exposure to any of the stickers or dilutions on disparlure content for the first four hours of exposure. However, the flakes exposed for 24 hours to 75 percent or 100 percent concentrations of both stickers had substantially less disparlure than did flakes not exposed to sticker. These results indicate that, under normal mixing conditions, there is no meaningful loss of disparlure from the flakes into the sticker. However, if the flakes are mixed with concentrated sticker but not used within the next four hours, there may be loss of disparlure into the sticker. If and at what rate the disparlure would be released from the dried sticker is unknown.

Continued Improvements to the Flake Pods

In 1998, Harold's Flying Service continued to improve the capacity and operability of their previously modified pods. Both the 502 and 503 (two seats) Turbine Air Tractors were assigned swaths of 75 feet at 140 mph.

Evaluation of a New Pheromone Flake Dispersal System

Al's Aerial Spraying of Ovid, Michigan, was awarded a three-year Technology Development contract (\$100,000, 50 percent to be distributed in 1998, 25 percent in 1999, and 25 percent in 2000) in 1998 to develop a new pheromone flake dispersal system to replace the Hercon pods. Contract specifications required the design, development, and demonstration of a new dispersal system for pheromone flakes. The new system was to be similar to the pods in that it must: 1) disperse the flakes and sticker at a specified rate, 2) coat the flakes with sticker to adhere to forest canopy, and 3) disperse the flakes and sticker uniformly over the treated area. In addition, the new system was required to 1) provide easy loading and cleaning of equipment, 2) provide increased flow rates that support wider swaths and faster airspeeds to increase production, 3) deposit flakes on at least 90 percent of the swath, and 4) be usable on a wider variety of aircraft.

All rights, patents, and intellectual property would be maintained in the public domain by both the contractor and federal government. A technical team of personnel was organized to review the progress of the contract: Dr. Gary VanEe, agricultural engineer at Michigan State University; Dr. Andy Trent, mechanical engineer at the Missoula Technology Development Center; and Win McLane and Tim Roland, agriculturist and Chief Pilot for USDA-APHIS, respectively.

By November 1998, a prototype system based on an air blast spreader concept was designed, and preliminary airport trials were conducted (Fig. 20). The new dispersal system was attached to the boom area of an Air Tractor 402. The system consisted of eight ports (four on each wing), and each port consisted of an open tube (1 inch diameter) with two flat fan nozzles directed toward the tube opening. The flakes were metered from the hopper to the manifold, which was divided into eight areas, each area connected to tubing. The flakes were pushed through the tubing by the air intake of the aircraft and out of the tube opening between the flat fan nozzles. One end of the tubing extended from the manifold area and the other end of the tubing was secured between the nozzles at each port on the boom. The sticker was metered by separate pumps to each wing through tubing to the flat fan nozzles at each port.



Figure 20. New flake dispersal system (Prototype II) installed on Air Tractor 402. Flakes were dispensed onto a rotating cone attached to a wind-driven propeller and coated with sticker emitted from flat fan nozzles.

Overall, the spray swath looked good (flakes were evenly distributed across the tarp with no gaps beneath the aircraft); however, the flakes were not adequately coated with sticker. Al's Aerial Spraying realized that there wasn't sufficient sticker to coat the flakes and made arrangements to work with Andy Trent of Missoula Technology and Development Center to look at the dispersal of the flakes and sticker.

Non-target Concerns

In the fall of 1998, it was decided that, since the aerial application of Disrupt II to large forested areas included streams, ponds, and other small bodies of open water beneath the hardwood foliage, a 48-hour static renewal acute toxicity test should be conducted with the Cladoceran *Daphnia magna* under the standard industry protocol known as Good Laboratory Practices. A contract was awarded to Wildlife International Ltd. (Easton, Maryland) to conduct this study using Disrupt II flakes, blank Disrupt II flakes (i.e., without racemic disparlure or a chemical stabilizer to keep the pheromone from leaching out too rapidly), racemic disparlure, and a negative control (water). The test concentrations were 39, 65, 108, 180, and 300 mg Disrupt II flakes and 300 mg blank flakes/liter of well water. The test was completed in April 1999. Daphnids in the negative and blank flake controls appeared normal and healthy. Daphnids in the 39, 65, 108, and 180 mg Disrupt II/L treatment groups also appeared normal and healthy. After 48 hours of exposure, mortality/immobility in the 300 mg Disrupt II/L treatment group was 80 percent. The results for the 300 mg Disrupt II/L treatment group were unexpected, but we suspected that the higher levels of the chemical stabilizer designed for the PVC compound to assist in weathering was the cause of the mortality. Following this effort, Hercon removed the stabilizer from the Disrupt II product. It was decided to re-run the test with the new Disrupt II product.

Summary of 1998 Results

Evaluations of the effect of sticker on flake efficacy were completed. While high levels of mating disruption occurred when flakes were applied without sticker, maximum efficacy requires the distribution of the flakes throughout the canopy. The slurry formulation of flakes was hard to mix and clogging of the atomizers was encountered. However, good efficacy was achieved in study plots. The rate of movement of disparlure from the flakes into the sticker used in the slurry formulation (LI-108) and the standard flake sticker (Gelva-2333) was undetectable until after 4 hours of contact with concentrated sticker. There was no difference between stickers.

In the fall of 1998, racemic disparlure was forwarded to 3M Canada Company (London, Ontario, Canada) to formulate into their microcapsule formulation for release rate evaluations in the laboratory. Their product contained 20 percent AI racemic disparlure. Al's Aerial Spraying was awarded a three-year contract to develop a new aerial flake dispersal system. Initial evaluations indicated that the flakes were deposited in a good swath pattern, but that there was insufficient coverage of the flakes with sticker. To address non-target concerns, a contract was awarded to Wildlife International Ltd. to conduct tests of the toxicity of flakes and disparlure to *Daphnia*. Mortality occurred in the highest concentration treatment (300 mg of Disrupt II flakes/liter of water) after 48 hours. Suspecting that the results may have been caused by the stabilizer, Hercon removed this component from the Disrupt II product.

1999—DIRECT MEASUREMENT OF ATMOSPHERIC PHEROMONE CONCENTRATIONS

Portable Electroantennogram Devices

Most attempts to measure the atmospheric concentration of insect pheromones resulting from mating disruption treatments have relied on the use of air sampling over a period of several hours or days to capture enough pheromone for analysis (Caro et al. 1981). Because of the extended time required to collect enough pheromone for analysis, estimates of pheromone concentration represent averages at the sampling location over the sampling period. Thus, any short-term fluctuations in pheromone concentration resulting from wind currents or other relatively rapid changes in atmospheric conditions are obscured. Rapid and sensitive detection of pheromone is possible with the use of an electroantennogram sensor (EAG), which uses amplified electrical impulses from chemoreceptors in a living insect antenna to indicate the presence of pheromones or other semiochemicals. At first, the only EAGs available were expensive and bulky, and not suited for use outside of the laboratory. A portable EAG was developed (Koch 1990) and used to measure atmospheric pheromone concentrations resulting from mating disruption treatments against a variety of pests in various crops (Sauer et al. 1992, Suckling et al. 1994, Färbert et al. 1997). The availability of a reliable and sensitive EAG would provide a direct means to measure atmospheric pheromone concentrations in test plots, which could reduce the need for lengthy and expensive biological evaluations of treatment efficacy. In 1999 two EAG devices were tested.

Koch EAG

One of the pioneers in the development of a portable EAG device is Dr. Uwe Koch, Department of Physics, University of Kaiserslautern, in Kaiserslautern, Germany. Dr. Koch traveled to the United States with the device to participate in our 1999 mating disruption efforts (Fig. 21). The objectives of the work with the Koch EAG sensor were to determine if it was possible to detect disparlure in the air in treated plots and to examine the effects of height above the ground and meteorological conditions on pheromone concentrations. The EAG work was done from August 15-20, which was 55 days after the treatment was applied. To ensure adequate concentrations of pheromone in the air, a site that was treated with approximately 10 times as many flakes as in a normal application at 30.4 g AI/acre was used for this test. The site was at the Virginia Tech Shenandoah Valley Agricultural Research and Extension Center at Steeles Tavern, Virginia. There was little undergrowth and a relatively low density of trees, with some openings in the canopy (avg. leaf area index = 2.1). To determine if detectable concentrations of disparlure were present under normal application conditions, samples were also taken in a plot treated with flakes with sticker and in a plot treated with an experimental microencapsulated formulation (3M Canada Company), both at a rate of 30.4 g AI/acre.

To operate the EAG sensor, a male moth antenna was severed and placed across electrical contacts. The electrical impulses from the antenna were input into a computer and analyzed in the field in real time. The readings from the EAG sensor were expressed as values relative to an internal baseline generated by exposing the antenna to three different concentrations of pheromone. To sample at different heights above the ground, a rope was tied to the EAG sensor and looped over a branch near the top of the canopy. This permitted the EAG sensor to be



Figure 21. Dr. Uwe Koch and his portable electroantennogram sensor, used to measure atmospheric pheromone concentration in plots treated with disparlure.

pulled to any desired height between 0 and 15 m. Meteorological conditions were continuously measured at a meteorological station erected adjacent to the EAG sampling site.

Average relative disparlure concentrations were 4.0 in the plot treated at 1x with microcapsules, 9.0 in the plot treated at 1x with flakes, and 25.5 at the site treated at 10x with flakes. These results demonstrated that it is possible to detect pheromone in treated plots with the EAG sensor even eight weeks after the treatment. At the 10x site, EAG readings were consistently highest at a height of 30 cm above the ground regardless of wind speed. Readings dropped by almost 50 percent when the EAG sensor was raised to 3 m, again independent of wind speed (Fig. 22). In the canopy (10 m and 15 m), readings were twice as high under low (<1 m/sec) compared to high (>1 m/sec) wind speeds. In general, it appears that under still conditions, pheromone concentrations are fairly uniform with respect to height, possibly with lower concentrations just beneath the canopy. When wind speed is greater than 1 m/s, pheromone concentrations tend to decrease with increasing height.




Figure 22. Effect of wind speed and height above ground on relative disparlure concentration measured with a portable electroantennogram sensor in a plot treated with a 10x application of Disrupt II flakes.

Syntech Portable EAG

While the EAG sensor developed by Koch was portable and capable of providing reliable measurements of pheromone concentrations, it was bulky and its set-up and use required the attention of a specialist. A more compact and user-friendly portable EAG sensor was introduced in 1998 (van der Pers and Minks 1998) (Fig. 23). This instrument was used in the present study to measure the atmospheric concentration of gypsy moth pheromone in forest plots treated with the Disrupt II. The objectives of this study were 1) to determine the feasibility of using this portable EAG sensor to measure atmospheric disparlure concentrations in treated plots, 2) to determine the vertical profile of pheromone in a forest canopy, and 3) to attempt to correlate pheromone concentration with biological efficacy as measured by suppression of moth capture in pheromone-baited traps and female mating success.

Six 250-acre plots were established in Rockbridge County, Virginia, in late June, 1999. Each plot received one of the following treatments: 1) Disrupt II flakes with sticker; 2) Disrupt II flakes without sticker; 3) Disrupt II flakes in a flake slurry formulation; 4) an experimental microcapsule formulation developed by 3M Canada Company and applied using conventional hydraulic nozzles; 5) Luretape GM (Hercon Environmental) applied by hand; and 6) an untreated control. All treatments were applied at a dosage of 30.4 g AI/acre. Treatments 1–4 were aerial applications. The Luretape was made from the same material as the flakes, but was cut into long, ½ inch wide ribbons. The ribbons were cut into 8-foot lengths, each containing 3 g of AI, and the individually stapled or tied to 25 trees per hectare (about 10 trees per acre) arranged in a uniform grid. Standard methods were used to evaluate biological efficacy of the treatments.

Figure 23. Portable electroantennogram sensor supplied by Jan van der Pers to measure atmospheric pheromone concentration in areas treated with Disrupt II flakes.



The EAG sensor provided by Jan van der Pers of Syntech (Hilversum, The Netherlands), weighed about 4 kg. A detailed description of the device can be found in van der Pers and Minks (1998). To prepare the EAG sensor for use, a male gypsy moth antenna was severed and connected using electrically-conductive gel to electrical contacts in the EAG sensor (Fig. 24). When air samples were drawn past the antenna, electrical impulses from the antenna were recorded. The responses were expressed relative to baseline responses of the antenna when exposed to a standard reference chemical (hexyl acetate). Vertical stratification of pheromone was measured at three heights (5, 10, and 20 m) in each of the plots from the extended bucket of an aerial lift truck.




Figure 24. Severed male gypsy moth antenna placed across electrical contacts of the portable electroantennogram sensor. The magnitude of electrical impulses from the antenna increase with increasing pheromone concentration.

The treatments reduced moth capture by greater than 98 percent in all treated plots compared to that in control plots. While no egg masses with greater than 5 percent fertile eggs were produced by deployed females in any of the treated plots, the percentage of fertilized females, as indicated by the presence of at least one fertile egg, varied from 0.6 percent to 2.6 percent in the treated plots (Fig. 25). Average relative atmospheric pheromone concentration ranged from 1.04 in the untreated plot to 1.85 in the plot treated with flakes with sticker. Pheromone concentrations were significantly higher in the flakes with sticker, flakes in slurry, and microcapsule treatments compared to the flakes without sticker, hand-applied Luretape, and control treatments. There was no significant difference among the three heights at which pheromone concentrations were measured. However, in each of the three treatments with the higher pheromone concentrations, the concentrations increased with increasing height. There was a significant negative correlation between average pheromone concentration in a plot and percent fertilization. The three plots with significantly higher pheromone concentrations (flakes with sticker, flakes in slurry, microcapsules) were also the plots with the highest levels of mating suppression.




Figure 25. Relative disparlure concentration, as measured by a portable electroantennogram sensor, and mating success in plots treated with various mating disruption treatments.

This test showed that the EAG sensor was capable of detecting biologically meaningful differences in pheromone concentrations resulting from different mating disruption formulations. It is important to note that all treatments eliminated the production of egg masses with more than 5 percent fertile eggs. This variable is now considered to be the best indicator of the success of a mating disruption treatment, because mated females that produce fewer than 5 percent fertile eggs make little biological contribution to the next generation. Therefore,

this suggests that the atmospheric concentration of pheromone required for successful mating disruption is below that required for EAG detection by the sensor as it was used in this study. If so, the usefulness of this EAG sensor as a tool for predicting treatment success may be limited. On the other hand, an EAG measurement from a treated area that is significantly higher than that from untreated areas may indicate that a sufficient concentration of pheromone is present to successfully disrupt mating.

Evaluation of Schiffer Flake Dispersal System

Under the Slow-the-Spread Program, the use of mating disruption to manage low-density populations of gypsy moth increased dramatically. However, only one formulation, Disrupt II (flakes), was registered for use using aircraft application. Flakes were applied using pods that had numerous mechanical problems (e.g., auger binding, motor failure, pump failure, flake bridging). Over the years, a number of slow-release formulations were evaluated in the hopes that one with the desired release rate could be applied using standard agricultural spray systems. To date, none have met this requirement.

In March of 1999, Andy Trent (USDA Forest Service, Missoula Technology and Development Center, Missoula, Montana) used a digital camera with high speed flash in wind-tunnel tests to look at sticker and flakes being dispensed under near-operational conditions using the prototype system under development by AI's Aerial Spraying. Photographs taken in the wind tunnel showed the flakes flowing through a plume of sticker emitted by the nozzles. Also, evaluations were conducted to quantify the deposition and stickability of flakes on tarps and red oak seedlings.

The conclusions from these evaluations of the prototype system were that it still did not adequately coat the flakes with sticker. The flakes were not being coated when they passed through the sticker plume. Possibly, the flakes were moving too fast to get coated with sticker, or the sticker was being atomized into such small droplets that it evaporated before coating the flakes.

3M Canada Company Microcapsule Slow-Release Formulation

In March 1999, a microcapsule (20-50 micron) formulation of racemic disparlure developed by 3M Canada Company was tested for mixing and handling characteristics at APHIS Aircraft Operations. A total of one pint per acre of total mix (154 ml 3M product and 319 ml water) resulting in 30.4 g AI/acre was evaluated. The best equipment for applying the microcapsules were two flat fan nozzles with 8010 tips without nozzle or in-line screens.

Flake Slurry Formulation

An evaluation was conducted at APHIS Aircraft Operations to test the slurry/flake application system using a mixture of flakes and sticker at an output of 1 pint/acre (1 quart/acre was used in 1998 tests). The same hardware as before was used, but larger holes were drilled in the inner screen and Tygon tubing was run from the main pump outlet to the Micronair atomizers (i.e., bypassing the boom). The system performed well, but a drawback of the system was the need to thoroughly mix the flakes and sticker so that no clumps could get lodged in the fittings.

Pheromone Dispersion in a Hardwood Forest

A pheromone-dispersion project was conducted in an oak-hickory forest in the Appalachian highlands west of Staunton, Virginia, on 19-27 August, 1999. The objective of the project was to attempt to understand the effective dispersion distance of a tracer gas released in the canopy trunk space. Sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6) was used as the tracer gas as it is an easily detectable surrogate that can indicate dispersion patterns of insect pheromones. By measuring the horizontal dispersion of SF_6 , effective radii can be calculated for the dispersion of pheromone from passive dispersal release agents such as flakes or beads.

The study site was arrayed with 50 syringe samplers (Fig. 26) in three concentric circles with radii of 5, 10, and 30 m. The syringe samplers recorded ½-hour samples for 4 ½ hours per trial. Nine trials were conducted, yielding nearly 4,000 1-hour chemical samples. Meteorological and canopy architectural data were also collected. Analysis of the data indicated very narrow meandering plumes of SF_6 with very steep concentration gradients near the plume edges, which were a function of both wind speed and stability. (When the surface layer is stable, the tracer plume remains relatively concentrated and shows consistency in direction due to the suppression of turbulent mixing in the stable layer.) Also, there was loss of tracer gas from the top of the canopy under neutral to moderately unstable conditions and very low wind speeds (Thistle et al. 2004).



Figure 26. One of a series of syringe samplers used to collect air samples containing a tracer gas to model the movement and distribution of pheromone in a hardwood forest.

Summary of 1999 Results

Work began to investigate the use of portable electroantennogram devices to measure atmospheric pheromone concentrations resulting from mating disruption treatments. Two separate devices were tested, with promising results. The vertical distribution of pheromone in a forest canopy was found to be affected by wind currents, and in another study pheromone concentration was found to be negatively correlated with mating success. It appears that the atmospheric concentration of pheromone necessary to disrupt gypsy moth mating is below the level of detection by these EAG sensors, which may limit their usefulness as a substitute for biological efficacy testing procedures.

In late 1999, Hercon Environmental was sold to the company's management and named Aberdeen Road Company, but it continues to do business as Hercon Environmental.

2000—A NEW MICROCAPSULE FORMULATION

In April of 2000, 3M Canada Company sprayable microcapsules were evaluated for flow rate and overall handling characteristics at Al's Aerial Spraying, Ovid, Michigan. The microcapsules were applied through 8010 and 8015 nozzle tips and Maynard Lund (ML) nozzles (Lund Flying Service, Ritzville, Washington) at 1 pint per acre. All nozzle or in-line screens were removed. Also, an aging study was conducted with 3M sprayable microcapsules on white canvas hung in a greenhouse to determine if the 3M product has a release rate suitable for gypsy moth mating disruption, to compare it to the release rate of Disrupt II, and to determine washoff.

The Hercon Disrupt II and 3M sprayable microcapsules, Phase III, were similar in their initial concentration (100 µg/flake or drop) and loss of disparlure through twenty-one days. The release rate of the Disrupt II slowed after day 21, and by day 63 the flakes had released about 65 percent of their initial disparlure content. The 3M sprayable microcapsules showed a steady and rapid decline in µg disparlure/drop up to day 42, at which time they had released about 90 percent of their disparlure content. Release rate slowed after day 42, and by day 63 the microcapsules had released essentially all of their disparlure.

The 3M sprayable microcapsules, Phase III, had a faster release rate than the Hercon Disrupt II. This could result in too low of a concentration of disparlure during the end of adult gypsy moth flight. Experiments were planned for the summer of 2000 to aid in determining the efficacy of this formulation.

If the release rate of the 3M sprayable microcapsules proved to be sufficient for gypsy moth mating disruption, it could provide an alternative treatment method. In 2000, Hercon Disrupt II was the only product available for aerial application of gypsy moth pheromone. The Hercon product requires a unique application method (pods attached under the wing) or specially designed systems. The pods and special systems were limited to only a handful of applicators and were not commercially available.

The 3M sprayable microcapsules could be applied by any applicator through conventional aerial application systems, resulting in a greater number of applicators able to bid on work in gypsy moth mating disruption projects, which could lower application cost.

Field Tests of 3M Sprayable Microcapsules and Reduced Rates of Hercon Disrupt II Flakes

Prior to 2000, all flake applications in STS were at a rate of 30.4 g AI/acre. This rate was based on earlier dose response tests conducted under male moth densities that were much higher than those targeted for mating disruption in STS (Webb et al. 1988). Therefore, a field test was conducted in 2000 to determine the efficacy of flakes applied at 15.2 g/acre compared to those applied at 30.4 g/acre (Tcheslavskaia et al. 2005b). As part of the same test, 3M sprayable microcapsules were tested at 30.4 g AI/acre. Twelve 62-acre (25-ha) plots were established in the George Washington National Forest near Millboro Springs, Virginia. Four plots were treated with each of the three treatments and four plots were used as untreated controls. The 3M sprayable microcapsule formulation was applied using 4 ML tips directed straight back at

1 pint/acre. Moth capture was reduced by more than 98 percent in all treated plots compared to that in untreated plots (Fig. 27). In the control plots, 19.9 percent of the females were mated. No mating occurred in any of the treated plots. These results indicated that there would be no loss in efficacy at a 15.2 g AI/acre flake application rate under moderate moth density conditions (the traps in the control plots caught an average of 135 moths over the season). The microencapsulated product tested in this experiment performed as well as the flakes.




Figure 27. Gypsy moth trap catch in plots treated with Disrupt II flakes at 30.4 and 15.2 g AI/acre and microcapsules applied at 30.4 g AI/acre.

Tethered Females Versus Mating Stations

To measure the effects of mating disruption treatments on female mating success, laboratory-reared females are deployed in study plots and egg masses produced by those females are checked for the presence of fertile eggs. Since 1989, females were deployed in mating stations consisting of modified delta traps. This method was favored because, once the delta traps were in place, it was quick and easy to deploy and retrieve females. However, concern was raised that the traps may impede the ability of males to find and mate with females, resulting in artificially low levels of mating success. To test this, females were deployed in two different ways in the control plots of the test described above (Tcheslavskaja et al. 2005b). In each plot, nine females were deployed in mating stations and nine were tethered using a thread with one end tied around the base of the forewing and the other attached to the bole of a tree with a push pin (Fig. 28). To protect tethered females from predators, a circle of Tanglefoot pest barrier was applied around each female. The mean fertilization rate of tethered females was 15.6 percent, which was about twice that of females deployed in mating stations. These results clearly showed that the mating stations inhibit mating in untreated areas. Therefore, the use of mating stations for deployed females was discontinued in subsequent years.

Treatment Effects Beyond Treated Areas

A study was initiated in 2000 to examine treatment effects on trap catch and mating success beyond the edges of treated areas (Sharov et al. 2002a). Six 62-acre (25-ha) plots treated with flakes at either 15.2 or 30.4 g AI/acre or microcapsules at 30.4 g AI/acre in the George Washington National Forest near Millboro Springs, Virginia were utilized for this study. The plots were along a valley (600-730 m altitude) between two ridges (900-950 m altitude). A series of transects was placed from the edges of the treated plots to points either 1,800 m away (along the valley) or 500 m away (up the slopes). Standard USDA pheromone traps were

placed every 200 m (along the valley) or 100 m (up the slopes). Lines of 10 tethered females were also deployed every 200 m on the transects along the valley. After the end of natural flight, laboratory-reared male moths were released along these same transects.

The effects of the treatment on rates of capture of both feral and released moths were evident up to 250 m from the edge of the treated plots (Fig. 29). On one transect, which was oriented along the valley, effects were observed as far away as 600 m. Female mating success increased gradually with distance from the edges of treated plots along the valley. There was a significant relationship between capture of males in traps and female mating success, and the relationship was similar to that which occurs in untreated areas (Sharov et al. 1995). These results indicate that mating is disrupted up to 250 m from treated areas, and in some cases effects can be seen at distances up to 600 m. The close agreement of the trap catch and mating success values in both treated and untreated areas provides evidence that trap catch alone provides a useful measure of the effectiveness of mating disruption treatments.



Figure 28. Female gypsy moth tethered with a thread to a tree trunk to measure mating success.




Figure 29. Gypsy moth trap catch at increasing distances from plot edge.

Trap Catch Versus Mating Success in Southern Wisconsin

The rate of spread of gypsy moths, as measured in the STS program, has to date been greater in Michigan and Wisconsin than in Virginia and West Virginia (Whitmire and Tobin 2006). It was hypothesized that the difference in rate of spread could be the result of higher mating success of females in northern areas, leading to higher rates of population establishment and growth. To examine this possibility, an experiment was conducted in southern Wisconsin (Tcheslavskaja et al. 2002) to determine if the relationship between trap catch and mating success there was different than the same relationship that had been determined previously

in Virginia and West Virginia (Sharov et al. 1995). Seven plots were established in the Kettle Moraine State Forest and nearby forested areas in Waukesha and Walworth Counties. Each plot consisted of 20 tethered females and two USDA milk carton pheromone traps each placed 100 m from the line of females. Females were retrieved 24 hours after they were deployed and dissected to determine if they had mated. The relationship between trap catch and mating success did not differ significantly from that in the Virginia/West Virginia study, although mating success tended to be somewhat higher at a given trap catch value in Wisconsin (Fig. 30).




Figure 30. Relationship between gypsy moth mating success and daily trap catch in southern Wisconsin.

Portable EAG Measurements of Pheromone in Treated Plots

The Koch EAG was used again to measure relative atmospheric pheromone concentration in the plots described above that were treated with flakes at 30.4 and 15.2 g AI/acre. EAG measurements were taken during two consecutive days starting about 20 days after application. Measurements were taken both at ground level and in the canopy using a pulley system. Relative disparlure concentration was higher in the plot treated at 30.4 g AI/acre, and was higher in the canopy than at ground level (Fig. 31).




Figure 31. Relative disparlure concentration at ground level and in the canopy in plots treated with Disrupt II flakes at 15.2 and 30.4 g AI/acre.

New Pheromone Flake Dispersal System

In 2000, the final evaluations were made of the new flake dispersal system under development by AI's Aerial Spraying. Results from deposition trials conducted in June and September 1999 indicated that the problem persisted in that a high percentage of the flakes were without sticker, primarily in the center of the swath. Modifications were made to the system—the most significant being the replacement of the Duke metering gate (designed for larger quantities of materials; therefore, our desired flow rates were at the lower end of the calibration range) with a Transland metering gate. This system (Prototype III) was evaluated in the field and there was an even distribution of the flakes across the swath, although it did not coat more than 25 percent of the total flakes, which

negated its use as part of the new operational contract, which required that 75 percent of the flakes be coated with sticker. Furthermore, although a critical evaluation of the aerodynamics of the pod system was not conducted, there were indications that the configuration may have caused some instability.

Implementation of the ‘Slow the Spread of the Gypsy Moth’ Project

Since its introduction into Medford, Massachusetts around 1869, the gypsy moth infestation has expanded to the west and south at an average rate of 13 miles per year (Liebhold et al. 1992). The generally infested area currently extends northwest to Wisconsin and south to North Carolina (Sharov et al. 2002b). The expansion of its current range is expected to continue until the gypsy moth eventually occupies all areas of the U.S. containing favorable habitat. It has been estimated that the ultimate range of this pest will be three times greater than its current range (Liebhold et al. 1997). To address the economic and environmental impacts caused by the expanding range of the gypsy moth infestation, a national strategy was developed to manage gypsy moth populations along the leading edge of the infestation. The goal of this USDA Forest Service project, known as the ‘Slow the Spread of the Gypsy Moth’ (STS) program, is to intensively monitor populations along the leading edge and apply treatments such that the rate of expansion of the infested area is reduced by 50 percent. The STS program was pilot tested in 1993 and became fully implemented in 2000. Since 2000, 82 percent of the nearly 2.9 million acres treated in STS used mating disruption (USDA 2006). Mating disruption is a preferred tactic in STS because it is target specific, inexpensive (USDA 2004a), and effective (Sharov et al. 2002c). To date the program has exceeded its spread rate reduction goals, resulting in a benefit to cost ratio of 3:1. The program currently includes 10 states and nearly 100 million acres (Sharov et al. 2002b). A sophisticated internet-based data management system and decision algorithm are used to manage the volume of data collected in STS and to assist in decision making (Tobin et al. 2004).

Summary of 2000 Results

The 3M sprayable microcapsule formulation was field tested and found to be as effective as the flakes under the conditions of the test. The effects of mating disruption treatments on trap catch and mating success were found to extend up to 250 meters from the plot edge. In some situations (along a valley) the effects were evident up to 600 meters from the edge. Higher gypsy moth spread rates in Wisconsin compared to more southern regions prompted an experiment to compare mating success with trap capture in southern Wisconsin. The results did not differ significantly from those in a similar study conducted in Virginia and West Virginia, although mating success tended to be higher at a given trap catch in Wisconsin.

The contract with Al’s Aerial Spraying resulted in a prototype system that, while offering advantages over the original pod system, did not achieve the 75 percent coverage of flakes with sticker required for operational use. The Slow the Spread of the Gypsy Moth (STS) program was fully implemented in 2000, encompassing nine states from Wisconsin to North Carolina. Mating disruption was used on 53 percent of the nearly 178,000 acres treated by STS in 2000.

2001—SKIPPED SWATH TESTS

Skipped Swaths - 90 m Skips

The results of experiments started in 2000 indicated that the effects of mating disruption treatments extend well beyond the edges of treated areas. These findings suggest that it may not be necessary to apply mating disruption formulations uniformly over target areas, but rather that it may be possible to leave deliberate skips in coverage with no loss in efficacy. If so, this could lead to reductions in costs associated with fuel and flight time. To examine this, a series of field experiments was initiated in which Disrupt II flakes were applied by aircraft in alternating treated and untreated swaths (Tcheslavskaja et al. 2005a). In the first test, two 50-ha plots (1 x 0.5 km) were treated at an overall rate of 15.2 g AI/acre by alternating a single 30-m swath treated at 60.8 g AI/acre with three untreated swaths. One of the plots was located at the Appomattox-Buckingham State Forest, Virginia (ABSF), and the other was in the Goshen Wildlife Management Area, Virginia (GWMA). Within the ABSF plot, a line of 32 male moth release points was laid out perpendicular to the aircraft flight path. Two lines of pheromone-baited traps were located parallel to and 30 m to the east and west of this line. Male moths were released and traps were checked weekly during July and twice each week during August. At GWMA, natural populations were higher so no males were released. Two lines of pheromone traps and four lines of deployed females were laid out perpendicular to the aircraft flight line.

In the ABSF plot (see Fig. 32), moth capture was significantly lower in the treated swaths than in the untreated area between treated swaths. While moth capture was also lower in the treated swaths at the GWMA, the difference was not statistically significant. There was no difference in female mating success between the treated and untreated areas. Despite the lack of difference in mating success in the plot in which it was measured, the higher rates of moth capture in the untreated areas between treated swaths raised concerns that the untreated area was too wide (90 m) for adequate suppression of mating over the entire plot. Therefore, plans were made to repeat the test the following year with less distance between treated swaths.




Figure 32. Gypsy moth trap catch within and between swaths treated with Disrupt II flakes.

Dose Response Test With 3M Sprayable Microcapsules

The results of previous field tests showed that trap capture and female mating are suppressed by mating disruption treatments down to 15.2 g AI/acre. To provide a full picture of the

effectiveness of mating disruption treatments across a wide range of application rates, a dose response test was conducted in 2001. Since the effects of dosages of 15.2 g AI/acre and higher were known from previous tests, this test focused on the biological effects of low pheromone dosages. The 3M microcapsule formulation was used in this test because low dosages can be obtained by dilution without affecting application volume. Application rates of 0 (control), 0.06, 0.3, 1.2, 6.1, 15.2, and 30.4 g AI/acre were tested. The tests were conducted in the Cumberland and Appomattox-Buckingham State Forests in central Virginia. Plots were 500 x 500 m (25 ha) and contained primarily favored gypsy moth host trees. Applications of the sprayable product were conducted by Earl's Spray Service (Wheeler, Michigan) using an Air Tractor equipped with 4-D8 tips with #56 swirl plates pointed straight back. The 3M sprayable product was applied at the rate of 1 quart/acre. Laboratory-reared male moths were released as pupae (June 25 - July 27) or as adults (July 30 - August 13) to evaluate the effects of the treatments on trap catch and mating success.

During the first month after the treatments were applied, moth capture was greatly suppressed in all plots treated at rates greater than 1.2 g AI/acre (Fig. 33a). The effectiveness of the treatments declined with time, and by two months after treatment trap capture was relatively high at all dosages of the 3M formulation. Few moths were caught in the plots treated with flakes at 6 g AI/acre throughout the test. Female mating success at dosages of 1.2 or less g AI/acre was not significantly different from that in untreated plots (Fig. 33b). Mating success was greatly suppressed at all dosages greater than 1.2 g AI/acre. The results of this test indicate that, with the 3M sprayable microcapsule formulation, pheromone dosages greater than 1.2 g AI/acre are required for effective mating disruption. However, by two months after treatment, this formulation was no longer effective at any dosage. This could have resulted from too rapid release of pheromone from the formulation, inadequate resistance to wash-off in rain, or both.




Figure 33. Gypsy moth trap catch (a) and female mating success (b) in plots treated with the 3M sprayable microcapsule formulation at dosages ranging from 0 to 30.4 g AI/acre.

Treatment Effects Beyond Treated Areas: Part II

To support and extend the findings in 2000, additional tests were conducted in 2001. Study plots for the 3M sprayable microcapsule dose response test at the Appomattox-Buckingham State Forest (ABSF) (only plots treated at 30.4 g AI/acre were used) and the Skipped Swath test at the ABSF and the Goshen Wildlife Management Area (GWMA) (both plots were treated at an overall dosage of 15.2 g AI/acre) were utilized for this experiment. Laboratory-reared male moths were released at distances of 0, 100, 200, 500, and 1,000 m from the plot edges. Groups of four pheromone-baited traps were placed around every release point. The

traps were located at a distance of 25 m from the release point. The results of this test were very similar to those obtained the previous year. The effects of the treatment were observable up to 250 m from the edges of the treated areas (Sharov et al. 2002a).

EAG Measurement of Pheromone Concentrations in Treated Plots

The Syntech EAG sensor was used to measure pheromone concentrations in the plots treated for the 3M sprayable microcapsule dose response test. These plots were treated at dosages of from 0 to 30.4 g AI/acre. Strong suppression of trap catch and mating success occurred at all dosages above 1.2 g AI/acre. Relative disparlure concentration was higher in the 15.2 and 30.4 g AI/acre plots (0.90 and 0.78, respectively) than in the plots treated at 6 g AI/acre or less (relative disparlure concentration less than 0.6 in all plots) (Fig. 34). However, the variability in the measurements was very high, and the differences were not statistically significant. Based on these results, it seems likely that the Syntech EAG may not be sensitive enough to detect and quantify pheromone concentrations in plots treated at rates of less than 15.2 g AI/acre. This is a serious limitation, since an application rate of 6 g AI/acre is used operationally in STS.




Figure 34. Relative disparlure concentration in plots treated with the 3M sprayable microcapsule formulation at dosages from 0 to 30.4 g AI/acre.

Additional *Daphnia* Tests

In 2001, another 48-hour static-renewal acute toxicity test was conducted by Wildlife International (Easton, Maryland) on *Daphnia magna* using a negative control (water), blank flakes (417 mg/L), and Disrupt II flakes (130, 216, 360, 600, 1,000 mg/L). The only mortality (100 percent) was recorded for the blank flakes, which was surprising and thought to be due to the leaching of a particular ingredient from the flakes (this particular ingredient was increased to compensate for the loss of the racemic). Mortality was 5 percent in *Daphnia* exposed to 1,000 mg of flakes per liter of water. In the 1998 test, mortality was 80 percent among *Daphnia* exposed to 300 mg of flakes per liter of water.

Summary of 2001 Results

A dose response experiment was conducted to explore the possibility of using lower dosages in operational programs. The 3M sprayable formulation was used for this experiment because it could be easily diluted down to very low concentrations without affecting the number of droplets (= point sources) applied. While a clear relationship between dosage and trap catch

was not demonstrated, dosages below 6 g AI/acre were not effective. Based on previous experiments showing that the effects of mating disruption treatments extend up to 250 meters beyond the edges of treated areas, an experiment was conducted to determine if intentional gaps could be left between treated swaths without a reduction in efficacy. When 90 meter gaps (3 swaths) were placed between treated swaths, there were noticeable increases in trap capture between treated swaths. It was decided to repeat the experiment with 30 meter gaps.

Additional non-target toxicity tests by Wildlife International found 100 percent mortality among *Daphnia* exposed to blank flakes (without pheromone). No significant mortality occurred in treatments with Disrupt II flakes up to the highest dosage of 1,000 mg/liter of water. These results were unexpected, and thought to be due to the leaching of an ingredient from the blank flakes.

2002—DISRUPT II DOSE RESPONSE TEST

The dose response test conducted in 2001 used an experimental 3M sprayable microcapsule formulation. Since the only gypsy moth mating disruption product currently registered with US EPA is the Hercon Disrupt II flakes, another dose response test was conducted, this time with the flakes (Tcheslavskaja et al. 2005b). The study was conducted in the Cumberland and Appomattox-Buckingham State Forests in central Virginia. One plot (500 x 500 m) in each state forest was treated at a rate of 0 (control), 0.06, 0.3, 1.2, 6, or 15.2 g AI/acre. The 6 and 15.2 g AI/acre rates were obtained by adjusting the flow rate to deliver the specified volume of flakes per acre. Because of mechanical limitations, it was not possible to further reduce the flow rate to obtain the lower application rates. Instead, blank (without disparlure) flakes were mixed with loaded flakes to obtain the specified application rate when applied at the same flow rate as used for the 6 g AI/acre application. The effects of the treatments on recapture of released moths were measured in all plots. In addition, females were deployed in plots treated at 6 and 15.2 g AI/acre to measure mating success. Extra emphasis was placed on data collection in the 6 and 15.2 g AI/acre plots because in 2002 STS began operational use of flakes at 6 g AI/acre.

Male moth capture was reduced significantly in all treated plots compared to controls (Fig. 35). Moth capture was very low at both 6 and 15.2 g AI/acre, and increased with decreasing dosage. Moth capture increased with time since application at all dosages, but the increase was more pronounced at dosages less than 6 g AI/acre. Female mating success was nearly eliminated at both 6 and 15.2 g AI/acre. Based on these results, the efficacy of flake applications at 6 g AI/acre should be similar to that at 15.2 g AI/acre. However, application rates below 6 g AI/acre may not be effective, especially as the time since application increases.




Figure 35. Effect of dosage of Disrupt II flakes on gypsy moth trap catch.

Standard Study Plot Layout and Methodology

Starting in 2002, a standardized procedure was initiated for gypsy moth mating disruption tests in study plots. This procedure evolved from the many years of effort described in the

preceding pages, and has resulted in an experimental format that has consistently provided the ability to statistically separate treatment effects.

Starting in 2001 and continuing to the time of publication of this report, study plots are established in the Cumberland and the Appomattox-Buckingham State Forests in central Virginia. All treatments are replicated twice, with one set of treatments in each state forest. Study plots (500 x 500 m; 25 ha; 62 acres) are selected that consist of mixed hardwood forest type with less than 10 percent cleared areas anywhere within the plot. Plots are separated from adjacent plots by a minimum of 1 km. The plots are laid out as shown in Figure 36.




Figure 36. Schematic of standard study plot layout for gypsy moth mating disruption research.

Males are released at the plot center and at two additional points that are 150 m from the plot center and in opposite directions. A 50 m radius circle of 15 trees is laid out around the center release point on which females are deployed. Four standard milk carton pheromone traps are positioned around each of the other 2 release points, each at a distance of 25 m from the release point.

Most previous mating disruption field tests relied on native gypsy moth populations to provide males to test the treatment effects. Gypsy moth populations are highly variable in space and time, and it is very difficult to establish study plots in areas that contain populations high enough to produce sufficient mating pressure but low enough that the populations adequately represent those that are candidates for mating disruption treat-

ments. An even greater problem with natural populations is achieving uniform population densities across all plots. Because of the inevitable lack of uniformity in male moth density across plots, extensive replication was required to overcome this variability and separate treatment effects. Starting in 2002, all study plot work uses laboratory-reared males provided by USDA, APHIS, Otis Methods Development Center. This completely eliminates the problem of achieving uniform male moth density across plots, and has made it possible to separate treatment effects in most cases with only two replications. All males are marked either internally or externally with a dye so that released males can be distinguished from native males.

The following describes the standard procedure for conducting experiments in the study plots. Newly-emerged males, usually approximately 50 per release point (150 per plot), are carried to the release points and released twice per week. Females less than 24 hours old are placed individually on the 15 trees around the center release point. Females are removed the next day and replaced with new females. Collected females are placed in paper bags along with any egg masses they have laid. The bags are held for at least 30 days and then checked for embryonation. At the time of each male release, all pheromone traps are checked and all

males are placed in plastic bags. The male moths are frozen and later checked for the presence of dye to determine if they were released or native. Generally, releases are made on Mondays and Wednesdays, females are placed on Mondays through Thursdays, and on Friday females are collected but not deployed. This process starts immediately after treatment application and continues for 8 weeks, or a total of 16 release cycles.

Shin-Etsu Sprayable Formulation

Two study plots for evaluating a liquid sprayable formulation developed by Shin-Etsu (Fig. 37) were established and incorporated into the flake dose response test. The material was applied at 6 and 15.2 g AI/acre using D-3 hollow cone nozzles with no cores or screens and directed straight back. For the 15.2 g AI/acre application, the formulation was applied through four nozzles at a pressure of 26 psi. For the 6 g AI/acre rate, only the outer two nozzles were used and the pressure was reduced to 16 psi. Recapture of released male moths was used to evaluate treatment efficacy. During the first two weeks after application, moth capture was very low at both dosages, and was not significantly different from that in plots treated with flakes at the same dosages. However, after two weeks moth capture increased in the plots treated with the Shin-Etsu formulation, and by 50 - 56 days after application moth capture was significantly higher in the Shin-Etsu plots compared to the flake plots at the same dosages. It was clear that improvements in this Shin-Etsu formulation were needed to extend its period of effectiveness to a full eight weeks.



Figure 37. Shin-Etsu sprayable gypsy moth mating disruption formulation.

Skipped Swaths - 30 m Skips

Two plots (500 x 500 m) were treated at the Goshen Wildlife Management Area, Virginia, with Disrupt II flakes at an overall dosage of 15.2 g AI/acre by alternating treated swaths (30.4 g AI/acre) with untreated swaths (swaths were 30 meters wide). Two untreated plots of similar size were left untreated and served as controls. Three lines of 35 to 37 pheromone traps spaced 30 m apart were placed across each of the four plots. In the treated plots, the trap lines were perpendicular to the aircraft flight path. Traps were checked once each week for three weeks. Male moths were not released, so only native moths were used to evaluate the treatments.

Trap catch was reduced by 96 percent in the treated swaths and by 93 percent in the untreated swaths compared to trap catch in the untreated plots (Fig. 38). The difference in trap catch between treated and untreated swaths was not significant. It appears from this experiment that mating will be effectively disrupted in plots treated with flakes at 15.2 g AI/acre with alternating treated and untreated swaths (Tcheslavskaja et al. 2005a).

Summary of 2002 Results

Starting in 2002, a standardized protocol for mating disruption study plot work was established. It includes the use of 25 hectare (500 x 500 meter) plots, points at which laboratory-reared male moths are released (3 points per plot with releases made twice per week), and the regular deployment of laboratory-reared females and/or pheromone traps. Using this protocol, much of the experimental variability that has plagued past mating disruption field research is reduced, and it is usually possible to detect treatment differences with only 2 spatial replicates.

A dose response test was conducted, this time with Disrupt II flakes. Low dosages were achieved by incorporating blank flakes with loaded flakes. A very clear dose response trend was demonstrated. Trap catch began to decrease when application rates dropped below 6 g AI/acre. When a single swath (30 meters) was skipped between treated swaths, there was no detectable increase in trap catch between treated swaths, indicating that this application pattern may be a viable option for use in operational programs. By skipping swaths, there would be savings in flight time and fuel.

In April of 2002, Thorpe and Reardon visited 3M Canada Company in London, Ontario to discuss the results to date with their sprayable microcapsule product. Grant Oliver of 3M mentioned that the Phase III 3M sprayable microcapsules used in recent tests is the product that the company will register for gypsy moth control with the US EPA.

2003—EXPERIMENTAL FORMULATIONS

Screening of New Experimental Formulations

It has long been recognized that the availability of alternative mating disruption formulations could benefit STS by reducing costs and increasing flexibility in awarding contracts to applicators. In 2003, a number of candidate experimental formulations became available for field testing. The following six formulations were tested, each at application rates of 6 and 15.2 g AI/acre using standard study plot protocols:

1. Standard flakes (Hercon Environmental, Emigsville, Pennsylvania). This is the EPA-registered, commercially-available formulation (Disrupt II) consisting of plastic laminate flakes (1 x 3 mm) applied with a sticker and used operationally in STS.
2. Modified flakes (Hercon Environmental). This formulation is identical to the standard flakes except for proprietary changes in the manufacturing process.
3. Micro-flakes (Hercon Environmental). This formulation consists of smaller plastic laminate flakes mixed into a liquid slurry intended for application by helicopter (Fig. 39).
4. Hollow fibers (Scentry Biologicals, Billings, Montana). This formulation consists of hollow plastic fibers containing pheromone and mixed with a sticking agent (Fig. 40).




Figure 38. Gypsy moth trap catch within and between swaths treated with Disrupt II flakes.



Figure 39. Fertilizer spreader modified to apply mating disruption formulations by helicopter.



Figure 40. Scentry hollow fiber dispensers containing racemic disparlure.

5. Granules (Valent Biosciences, Long Grove, Illinois). This is a granular formulation intended for application by helicopter. A sticking agent was used at the 6 g rate but not at the 15.2 g rate.
6. 3M MEC (3M Canada Company, London, Ontario, Canada). This is the EPA-registered (2003) sprayable microcapsule formulation containing pheromone in a liquid carrier intended for application through conventional spray equipment.

More than five moths per trap per release were caught in the untreated control plots (Fig. 41). In plots treated with standard flakes, 0.25 and 0.09 moths per trap per release were caught at the 6 and 15.2 g rates, respectively. This was a 95 and 98 percent reduction compared to controls. Similar results were obtained for the modified flakes, indicating that the manufacturing changes did not affect efficacy. In the plots treated with the micro-flakes, traps caught 0.25 and 0.63 moths per release at the 6 and 15.2 g rates, respectively. No obvious explanation could be found for the increased moth capture at the higher application rate. Trap catch in the plots treated with plastic fibers was 0.38 and 0.26 per trap per release at the 6 and 15.2 g rates, respectively, or 93 and 95 percent reductions compared to controls. In the plots treated with granules, trap catch was 1.35 and 1.76 per trap per release at the 6 and 15.2 g rate, respectively. This represents a reduction compared to controls of 74 and 67 percent. The greater trap catch at the 15.2 g compared to the 6 g rate may have been because the higher rate was applied with-




Figure 41. Gypsy moth trap catch in plots treated with various mating disruption formulations at 6 and 15.2 g AI/acre.

out sticker. Trap catch in plots treated with the 3M MEC formulation were 4.32 and 0.92 at the 6 and 15.2 g rates, respectively. Reductions in trap catch with this formulation compared to the controls were 18 and 83 percent. There were a number of heavy rainfall events in the weeks after the formulations were applied, which may have reduced the efficacy of some of the formulations.

Draft Criteria For New Mating Disruption Formulations

As commercial interest in the development and marketing of new formulations increased, it became necessary to establish a standard set of conditions that must be met by companies to participate in study plot evaluations. Also, criteria had to be established for determining if candidate formulations were suitable for operational use. The following set of conditions and criteria were drafted and provided to companies that expressed interest in developing a gypsy moth mating disruption product. These conditions and criteria were never finalized, and so are still referred to as the “Draft Criteria.” They continue to be used as guidelines for new product development and testing.

Conditions for Participation in Gypsy Moth Mating Disruption Trials

- 1) All data generated from field tests, especially results that pertain to efficacy, can be shared among participants, gypsy moth managers, at technical conferences or other meetings, and in scientific journals.
- 2) Prior to any field testing, formulator must provide release rate data to demonstrate that the product releases pheromone over a minimum period of 8 weeks. Data are to be expressed as percent residual active ingredient through time. Formulator must provide protocols for testing and analyzing release rates under both greenhouse/lab and field conditions.
- 3) All products will be evaluated in field tests using laboratory-reared insects to reduce experimental variability.

Criteria for Determining Suitability for Operational Use

Year 1. Initial field test.

- Evaluation method: suppression of moth capture in traps.
- Replication: minimum of 2 plots.
- Criterion for success: at least 90 percent suppression in moth capture consistently over an 8-week period.

Year 2. In-depth field test.

- Evaluation method: suppression of successful mating in monitor females.
- Replication: minimum of 4 plots.
- Criterion for success: at least 95 percent suppression of mating consistently over an 8-week period. (Note: Successful mating is defined as producing an egg mass with greater than 5 percent fertile eggs).

Year 3. Demonstration blocks.

- Product would be used in operational demonstration tests of 10,000 to 20,000 acres. Product must conform to standard requirements for operational aerial applications.

Trap Capture Versus Mating Success in Northern Wisconsin

Gypsy moth spread rates continued to be higher in Wisconsin compared to the southern regions. To collect additional data on the relationship between trap catch and mating success, and to search for differences in this relationship that could be related to differences in spread rates, an experiment was conducted in northern Wisconsin. This experiment was a repeat of experiments conducted in Virginia and West Virginia in 1994 (Sharov et al. 1995) and southern Wisconsin in 2000 (section 2000—Trap Catch Versus Mating Success in Southern Wisconsin, p. 45; Tcheslavskaja et al. 2002). Based on male moth catches in pheromone traps, six plots were established in the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest and nearby forested sites during August at various distances from the advancing gypsy moth front. At each plot, female mating success was measured from tethered females deployed on trees and male trap catch was measured with two milk carton pheromone traps each located 100 m from the nearest deployed female. Females were retrieved and traps checked about 24 hours after deployment. Average trap catches ranged from 0 to 50 per trap per day. Mating success increased with increasing trap capture. The relationship was similar to that obtained in the other two studies, except that there was more variability and female mating success was somewhat higher at a given level of trap catch than previously. In the three studies, the ratio of mating success to trap catch increased from south to north (Virginia to northern Wisconsin), which coincides with increasing spread rates and colony persistence (Whitmire and Tobin 2006). Further work will be needed to determine if these similar trends are caused by the same factors.

Diffusion of Pheromone in a Forest Canopy

Ongoing research on the movement of insect pheromones within a forest canopy (Thistle et al. 2004) uses a tracer gas (sulfur hexafluoride, SF₆) as a model. To confirm that the tracer gas is a reliable surrogate for gypsy moth pheromone, a test was conducted in a mixed hardwood/conifer forest at the University of Michigan Biological Station, Pellston, Michigan during August. An SF₆ gas generator was co-located with a source of disparlure (Hercon Luretape). An SF₆ detector and a Syntech portable EAG sensor were co-located at a downwind distance of 5 m from the sources (Fig. 42). The SF₆ detector was a modified gas chromatograph (Benner and Lamb 1985) capable of detecting the tracer gas at a minimum concentration of about 30 parts per trillion. The EAG used the intensity of responses from a severed male moth antenna to estimate the concentration of pheromone in the air. Ten 30-minute experiments were conducted in all. There was good agreement between the two sensors in detecting the presence of plumes of SF₆ and pheromone, and in the distribution of normalized gas concentration values. The results of this study suggest that the SF₆ tracer gas is a realistic model for the diffusion of gypsy moth pheromone in a forest canopy (Smith et al. 2004).



Figure 42. Co-located SF₆ detector and portable electroantennogram sensor used to verify that the tracer gas, SF₆, is a realistic model for the movement of dispartlure in a hardwood forest.

Mating Disruption With ExoSex Dispensers

An experimental ground-based gypsy moth mating disruption system provided by ExoSect Limited (Southampton, United Kingdom) was field tested in 2003. Dispensers, which were similar in size and shape to delta traps, contained a waxy powder loaded with 0.1 percent (w/w) (+)-dispartlure. The dispensers were designed to attract males and contaminate them with the powder containing the pheromone. The expected mechanism of mating disruption was auto-confusion of male moths by their contamination with pheromone, rendering them unable to locate females, and by the contaminated males serving as additional pheromone point sources to confuse uncontaminated males. The dispensers were deployed at a density of 10 per ha in two 10-acre plots in the Cumberland and Appomattox-Buckingham State Forests in central Virginia. Other plots from other experiments in the same vicinity that were set up and monitored in exactly the same way served as negative controls (untreated) and positive controls (plots treated with Disrupt II flakes at 6 and 15.2 g AI/acre) (see section 2003—Screening of New Experimental Formulations, p. 54).

Mating success in the plots treated with the ExoSex dispensers was 22.3 percent, which was nearly the same as that in the untreated plots (25.3 percent) (Fig. 43). Mating was reduced to 0.2 percent and 0 in the plots treated with Disrupt II flakes at 6 and 15.2 g AI/acre, respectively. Based on these results, there is no evidence that the ExoSex mating disruption system as deployed in this experiment disrupted gypsy moth mating.




Figure 43. Gypsy moth female mating success in plots treated with ground-applied (ExoSex) and aerially-applied (Disrupt II) mating disruptants.

Summary of 2003 Results

A number of different experimental formulations were tested in study plots. Disrupt II flakes were included in the experiment as a positive control. To establish and communicate guidelines for the testing and evaluation of experimental mating disruption formulations, a set

of draft criteria and conditions were written and distributed. One of the formulations tested was Disrupt II flakes containing proprietary changes in the manufacturing process. There was no apparent loss in efficacy with this modified flake formulation. Another modification of the flakes, a micro-flake consisting of smaller flakes suspended in a liquid slurry and applied using a helicopter was also as effective as the standard flakes, as was a formulation consisting of plastic fibers containing disparlure. A granular formulation applied by helicopter and a sprayable formulation at 6 g AI/acre did not meet the criterion for success (greater than 90 percent reduction in trap catch compared to controls).

To collect additional data on gypsy moth mating success in the northern region, an experiment was conducted in northern Wisconsin to compare mating success with trap catch. As with the experiment conducted in southern Wisconsin, mating success appeared to be higher in Wisconsin at a given trap catch than in a similar experiment conducted in Virginia and West Virginia.

An experimental ground-based mating disruption system was tested. Ten trap-like dispensers were deployed per hectare. The dispensers contained a waxy powder containing (+)-disparlure. The dispensers were designed to attract male moths, that would become contaminated with disparlure upon contacting the powder. These males would then serve as point sources of pheromone to disrupt mating in males that did not enter the dispensers. There was no evidence that mating was disrupted with this system.

In 2003, 3M Canada Company obtained a registration for its commercial product (3M MEC-GM Sprayable Pheromone for Gypsy Moth) from the US EPA, but so far it had only been applied to small acreages for methods development and not used operationally.

2004—EFFECT OF FEMALE MOTH DEPLOYMENT METHOD ON MATING SUCCESS

The deployment and recovery of laboratory-reared female gypsy moths in study plots is a critical part of the biological evaluation of mating disruption treatments. Prior to 2000, females were deployed in modified delta trap mating stations. These were used because they were convenient, easy to install, and resulted in good rates of female recovery. However, as part of the study plot research activities in 2000 (see section 2000—Tethered Females Versus Mating Stations, p. 44), a direct comparison was made of mating success of females deployed in mating stations and females that were tethered with a thread and pinned to tree trunks (Tcheslavskaja et al. 2005b). Mating success of tethered females averaged about twice that of females deployed in delta traps in untreated plots. Tethered females were used in some subsequent study plot work, but before long the process of tethering deployed females was discontinued because it was too time consuming and tedious. For a short time the use of tethered females was replaced by the deployment of females in arenas constructed on the boles of trees. These arenas consisted of duct tape coated with polybutene pest barrier (Tanglefoot Bird Repellent) and stapled to the tree to confine the female and reduce predation by ants. To catch females that fell, a tray constructed out of aluminum flashing was stapled to the bottom of the arena in such a way that the female could climb back up on the trunk if she fell. Rates of mating success using these arenas were never compared to those of tethered females. Later, female deployment was further simplified by placing untethered females directly on tree trunks beneath a barrier made of duct tape coated with polybutene pest barrier (Fig. 44). The



Figure 44. Trunk barrier constructed of duct tape and a polybutene pest barrier to keep monitor female gypsy moths from climbing tree trunks.

barrier prevented the females from ascending the tree, and falling females could climb back up the trunk from the ground. Again, mating success using this method of female deployment relative to that using tethered females was not known.

To obtain information about how these methods of female deployment compare, an experiment was conducted in the Goshen Wildlife Management Area, Goshen, Virginia (Thorpe et al. in press). Five different methods of female deployment were tested:

1. modified delta trap
2. duct tape arena with flashing tray
3. single trunk barrier
4. double trunk barrier (above and below female)
5. tethered female

Rates of recovery and mating success of deployed females were measured. The five different methods were arranged in 50 m radius circles around points at which laboratory-reared males were released. The study was conducted in an untreated area and in a plot that had been treated with flakes at a dosage of 0.06 g AI/acre - high enough to affect mating success but low enough that mating would not be eliminated.

Recovery rates (females and/or egg masses) were not affected by the disparlure treatment. Recovery rates varied from 66 percent with the single band method in the treated area to 98 percent in the delta trap mating station in the treated area (Fig. 45). Mating success was substantially lower using all deployment methods in the treated plot compared to the untreated area. In untreated areas, mating success was lowest in the delta trap mating station (14 percent) and highest with tethered females (48 percent). Mating success using the flashing and single and double band methods was about mid-way between that using delta traps and tethered females. In the treated plot, mating success was lowest with the delta trap mating stations




Figure 45. Gypsy moth mating success when females were deployed using different methods in plots treated with Disrupt II flakes at 0.06 g AI/acre and untreated.

(3 percent) and was approximately equal among the other methods (from 13 - 21 percent). The cost of each method was estimated based on initial time to set up the mating station and recurring costs associated with female preparation (e.g. tethering), time actually deploying females, and time needed to maintain the mating stations. The delta trap method was the least expensive and tethering was the most expensive. The other methods were intermediate in cost. The tethering method and delta trap method of female deployment are not recommended because of their high cost and low rate of mating success, respectively. There was no significant difference in mating success among the other three deployment methods, but total recovery was somewhat higher with the flashing arena method and somewhat lower with the single trunk band method. Among these methods, the single trunk band method had the lowest application cost and the flashing method had the highest, although the cost difference was probably too small to be a significant consideration. Given the small difference in cost, the lack of difference in mating success, and the relatively small difference in recovery rates among these deployment methods, there is insufficient basis for recommending any one over the others. Individual preferences should dictate which method to use. Given the low cost of installation, the single or double trunk barrier methods may be preferable in most situations.

3M MEC-GM Sprayable Pheromone for Gypsy Moth

A sprayable, microencapsulated gypsy moth mating disruption formulation that can be applied through conventional hydraulic aerial application equipment has been under development by 3M Canada Company for several years. In 2003, an EPA registration was granted for 3M MEC-GM Sprayable Pheromone for Gypsy Moth. This formulation was tested in study plots in 2003. Results were poor at the 6 g but better at the 15.2 g AI/acre rate. Another test of the 3M product was conducted in study plots in 2004 and evaluated using both male trap catch and female mating success. The test was conducted in the Cumberland and Appomattox-Buckingham State Forests in central Virginia using the standard study plot protocol. The 3M product was applied at 6 and 15.2 g AI/acre using two CP nozzles directed straight back (no deflection) at 40 psi. Lastick (2 oz/100 gallons) was added to the tank mix as a sticking agent. Also included in the test were treatments with flakes at 6 and 15.2 g AI/acre and an untreated control. Males were reared on artificial diet containing a red dye which was visible in the adults so that released males could be identified. Only data from released males were included in the male trap catch results.

Moth capture in the plots treated with flakes at 6 and 15.2 g/acre was 2.6 and 0.7 percent of controls, respectively (Fig. 46a). With a single exception (6 g/acre treatment on July 21), all values were reduced by more than 90 percent compared to controls. In the plots treated with 3M MEC, average moth capture at 6 and 15.2 g/acre was 38.5 and 9.1 percent of controls, respectively. Female mating success was 6.3 and 21.1 percent of controls at 6 and 15.2 g AI/acre, respectively (Fig. 46b). Reduction in moth capture was less than 90 percent in most plots treated at 6 g/acre, but only on four dates was the reduction in moth capture compared to controls less than 90 percent in the plots treated at 15.2 g/acre. The first of these dates did not occur until about seven weeks after pheromone application, suggesting that the product's release rate may have been lower during the later part of the evaluation period. While the results at 15.2 g AI/acre are encouraging, there was still a need to increase the effective life of the product to a full eight weeks.




Figure 46. Gypsy moth trap catch (a) and female mating success (b) in plots treated with 3M MEC-GM sprayable pheromone and Disrupt II flakes.

Effect of Moth Density on Effectiveness of Mating Disruption Treatments

The standard evaluation protocol that is used in conjunction with study plots to test dose responses and efficacy of aerially-applied experimental formulations provides consistent and reliable results. This evaluation protocol is assumed to simulate low-density gypsy moth populations such as those targeted in STS. However, there is no direct way to relate the level of moth density simulated in these studies to that in the real world (but see section 2005—Season-Long Trap Catch Versus Mating Success, p. 69). As a preliminary step toward relating the results obtained using the standard evaluation protocol to those in STS, an experiment was conducted to determine the sensitivity of the standard protocol to changes in numbers of released moths. The study was conducted in plots (500 x 500) in the Cumberland and Appomattox-Buckingham State Forests in central Virginia. Four plots were treated at 6 g AI/acre, four were treated at 15.2 g AI/acre, and four were left as untreated controls. In half the plots males were released at the standard rate of 50 moths per release point per release. In the other half, the moth release rate was tripled to 150 moths per release point per release.

Moth recapture in untreated plots averaged 1.2 and 3.5 per trap per day at the low and high moth release rate, respectively (Fig. 47a). Moth recapture from plots treated with flakes at 6 g AI/acre was about 2.5 percent of untreated controls regardless of the release density (Fig. 47b). Moth recapture from plots treated at 15.2 g AI/acre was about 0.6 percent of untreated controls regardless of release density. Percent fertilized females (with >5 percent fer-




Figure 47. Gypsy moth trap catch (a) and trap catch as a percentage of controls (b) in plots treated with Disrupt II flakes under low and high (50 and 150 males/release) simulated moth densities.

tile eggs) was 43.1 and 77.3 in the untreated plots at the low and high release rate, respectively. Percent fertilization was reduced by greater than 99 percent compared to controls at both moth densities at both dosages. Over the range of moth release rates used in this experiment (50 - 150 per release point per release) there was a proportionate increase in the numbers of moths captured and percent fertilization, but moth capture and fertilization rates as a percentage of controls remained constant.

Residual Effects of Previous Year's Treatment

In July 1991, Leonhardt et al. (1996) collected flakes from the forest floor in a plot that had been treated in July of 1990 and analyzed them for disparlure content. They were found to contain 1.8 percent of their original content. To determine if it is possible to detect biological effects from this quantity of residual disparlure in the year after treatment, two study plots that had been treated in 2003 with flakes at 15.2 g AI/acre were evaluated in 2004. Male trap catch in these plots was 62 percent of that in the untreated controls and percent fertilization (>5 percent of eggs fertile) was 37 percent of that in the untreated controls (Fig. 48a and b). Clearly, biological effects, while weak, were still present the year after treatment. This is of concern in STS because the success of operational treatments is determined based on trap catch in treatment blocks the year after treatment. This evaluation method relies on the assumption that reductions in trap catch the year after treatment are the result of reductions in moth reproduction. However, based on this study it appears likely that reductions in moth catch may also be due, at least in part, to residual effects from the previous year's treatment.




Figure 48. Gypsy moth trap catch (a) and female mating success (b) in plots treated the previous year with Disrupt II flakes.

Efficacy of Mating Disruption Treatments in Open Landscapes

Currently, mating disruption is rarely used for eradication treatments, because of a lack of data to support this use and because the treatment prevents the use of pheromone traps to monitor the infestation in the treated area in the year of treatment. However, as an environment friendly, species-specific control tactic, there is interest in using mating disruption to eradicate isolated infestations. Based on discussions with program managers in states conducting eradication activities, several questions were raised. The first was a concern that mating disruption might not be effective in open landscapes, such as parks and residential areas. Possible reasons for lack of effectiveness include the excessive deposit of flakes on the ground and the concentration of male searching activity on a small number of trees. To examine these issues, an experiment was conducted at the Goshen Wildlife Management Area, Goshen, Virginia. Two areas were selected that had been clear cut the previous year. Each clear cut contained several isolated, mature trees surrounded by a cleared area. One clear cut, and an adjacent forested area, were treated with flakes at 15.2 g AI/acre. The other clear cut, together with an adjacent forested area, were left untreated. Females were deployed on the boles of the trees beneath a polybutene pest barrier (Tanglefoot Bird Repellent) which was placed at a height of 2 m. Males were released from four points around each tree, each at a distance of 25 m from the tree, at a rate of 15 males per point per release. Females were retrieved after 24 hours and their fertilization status was determined from their eggs.

The average fertilization rate (>5 percent fertile eggs) of females in untreated areas was 33.9 percent in the clear cut and 24.2 percent in the forested area (Fig. 49). In the treated area, the average fertilization rate was 0.5 percent in the forested area (one female was mated) and no females were mated in the clear cut area. It appears that an aerial application of flakes at 15.2 g AI/acre will effectively shut down mating in both forested areas and open landscapes.




Figure 49. Gypsy moth female mating success in wooded and open areas treated with Disrupt II flakes or untreated.

Efficacy of Mating Disruption Treatments When Male and Female Gypsy Moths Emerge Close Together

Another question that was raised relative to the use of mating disruption to eradicate isolated infestations was how effective the tactic would be in a situation where males and females emerge close together in space and time. To address this question, an experiment was conducted in the Cumberland State Forest in central Virginia. Four plots (500 x 500 m) were treated with flakes at dosages of 0, 0.06, 6 and 15.2 g AI/acre. In each plot, 12 sites were established at a minimum distance of 10 m from each other. Each site consisted of a pair of trees separated by a distance of about 1 m. A polybutene pest barrier (Tanglefoot Bird Repellent) was placed on one of the trees at each site at a height of 2 m. Laboratory-reared

females less than 24 hours old were placed on the tree with the pest barrier. A laboratory-reared male that had emerged from its pupal case within the previous 30 minutes was placed in one of three positions:

1. Next to the female (within 5 cm)
2. On the same bole as the female but near the ground
3. On the other tree (about 1 m away)

Females were retrieved 24 hours after they were deployed.

In the untreated plot, the percentage of fertilized females (>5 percent eggs fertile) was above 50 percent regardless of the initial positions of the moths (Fig. 50). In the treated plots, fertilization rates of females initially placed next to males ranged from 67 percent at 0.06 g AI/acre to 26 percent at 15.2 g AI/acre. When males were released on separate trees, fertilization rates dropped to 76 percent in the untreated plot, 26 percent at 0.06 g, 6 percent at 6 g, and no females were fertilized at 15.2 g AI/acre. Fertilization rates of females placed near the ground but on the same tree as males were about mid-way between these two values. These results suggest that, while mating disruption treatments will greatly reduce mating regardless of how close males and females emerge in space and time, they may not adequately reduce mating if females and males emerge close together on the same tree at the same time. The significance of this finding depends on how often males and females emerge together in space and time. Future work will be needed to address this question.




Figure 50. Gypsy moth female mating success in plots treated at pheromone dosages ranging from 0 to 15.2 g AI/acre when males were released at 3 different positions relative to females.

Air Sampling of Disparlure

During conversations with scientists from Shin-Etsu Chemical Co., Tokyo, Japan, they mentioned that they routinely used charcoal filters to sample airborne concentrations of pheromone applied for control of pink bollworm, peach fruit moth, tea tortrix, and other insect pests. To determine if similar air testing for disparlure was feasible, Shin-Etsu provided 12-volt pumps and glass tubes packed with activated charcoal to sample the air in plots treated for gypsy moth mating disruption. The pumps were originally designed for use in aquariums and provided a flow rate of 8 - 10 liters/minute. Sampling was conducted in plots treated with flakes at 6 and 15.2 g AI/acre. A pulley system was erected in each plot so that pumps could be raised into the canopy. Sampling was conducted for 12 continuous hours each week for eight weeks after application. In each plot, one pump was positioned at 2 m from the ground and another in the canopy. The charcoal filters were washed with solvent and

analyzed by USDA, ARS, Beltsville, Maryland using GC-mass spectroscopy. No disparlure could be detected in any of the samples. It is unknown if the charcoal failed to capture all of the disparlure that passed through the sample tubes or if 12 hours was insufficient time to accumulate detectable amounts of disparlure.

Disparlure Toxicity to *Daphnia*

In 2004, another 48-hour static-renewal acute toxicity test using *Daphnia magna* was conducted by Wildlife International. The same lot number samples that were tested in 1999 and 2001 were re-evaluated along with the 2004 version of Disrupt II flakes. Also, the 3M Canada Company product MEC-GM was evaluated both loaded with racemic disparlure and loaded with a vegetable oil (the chemistry of the capsule formulation would not allow water to be used instead of an oil) and vegetable oil (control). Also tested was the technical racemic disparlure provided by Shin-Etsu and ISP. There was zero *Daphnia* mortality with the loaded flakes up to and including 1000 mg/L for all samples. There was mortality with 3M sprayable microcapsules at 27 mg/L and 300 mg/L (80 and 60 percent respectively) after 48 hours. The mortality was probably due to the oily surface layer. Mortality for the ISP and Shin-Etsu technical racemic disparlure at 300 mg/L and 1000 mg/L was 100 percent, again due to the oily surface layer.

Screening tests (96 hour) with bluegill (*Lepomis macrochirus*) and rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) were conducted using the Disrupt II blank flakes (1000 mg/L), standard flakes (300 and 1000 mg/L), modified Disrupt II flakes (see section 2003—Screening of New Experimental Formulations, p. 54) (300 and 1000 mg/L) and the Shin-Etsu and ISP technical racemic disparlure (1000 mg/L). There was zero mortality for each species.

Summary of 2004 Results

An improved formulation of the 3M sprayable gypsy moth mating disruption formulation was tested in the study plots. This formulation had been registered with the US-EPA in 2003 as 3M MEC-GM Sprayable Pheromone for Gypsy Moth. The results were encouraging, although there was still evidence that the product's release rate had dropped by the end of the 8-week evaluation period.

In an attempt to better understand the effect of moth density on the effectiveness of mating disruption treatments, an experiment was conducted in which males were released at a low (50 per release point) and high (150 per point) density in treated study plots. Moth recapture from plots treated at 15.2 g AI/acre was about 0.6 percent, and recapture from plots treated at 6 g AI/acre was about 2.5 percent of that from untreated plots, regardless of the male moth release rate. This suggests that, at the moth densities simulated in this experiment, moth density does not affect treatment efficacy.

Plots treated with Disrupt II flakes at 15.2 g AI/acre in 2003 were monitored in 2004. Trap catch was reduced by the previous year's treatment by 38 percent and mating success was reduced by 63 percent compared to controls. This is of concern to STS because it suggests that the use of pheromone traps to evaluate treatment effectiveness and to detect and delineate populations remaining in treated areas may be adversely affected by the residual effects of previous treatments.

Additional experiments were conducted to determine if mating disruption treatments would be effective in open landscapes with sparse, isolated trees. A clear cut area was treated with Disrupt II flakes, females were placed on a few trees that remained in the cleared areas, and males were released. Mating was nearly eliminated in the treated areas. In a related experiment, it was determined that the initial positions of male and female gypsy moths affected the effectiveness of mating suppression in treated areas.

2005—PERSISTENCE OF EFFECTS OF MATING DISRUPTION TREATMENTS

Multi-year Residual Effects of Mating Disruption Treatments

Monitoring during 2004 of plots treated with Disrupt II at 15.2 g/acre in 2003 (see section 2004—Residual Effects of Previous Year's Treatment, p. 63) indicated that suppression of both trap catch and mating success persisted into the year following treatment. To confirm and expand on those findings, plots treated with flakes in 2003 and 2004 at 15.2 g/acre and in 2004 at 6 g/acre were monitored in 2005. The plots were located in the Cumberland and Appomattox-Buckingham state forests in central Virginia. Standard monitoring protocols were used. Trap catch and mating success resulting from releases of laboratory-reared males in these plots were compared to those in plots treated with flakes at 15.2 and 6 g/acre in 2005 and untreated control plots.

Trap catch and mating success in plots treated the previous year at 15.2 g/acre were reduced by 52.7 and 81.7 percent, respectively, compared to controls (Fig. 51). Trap catch and mating success in plots treated two years previously at 15.2 g/acre were reduced by 18.9 and 34.2 percent, respectively. Trap catch and mating success in plots treated the previous year at 6 g/acre were reduced by 40.2 and 93.1 percent, respectively, compared to controls. These results confirm those from 2004 for plots treated at 15.2 g/acre in 2003, and indicate that there may be continued suppression two years following treatment. These findings also suggest that trap catch and mating is suppressed the year following a treatment at 6 g/acre.

3M Sprayable Pheromone

The 3M Canada Company announced on January 4, 2005 its intention to exit the 3M-branded Sprayable Pheromone business for both agriculture and forestry markets effective immediately. This was a major disappointment as numerous trials were conducted with their product and it appeared to be a viable alternative to Disrupt II for operational programs.

Shin-Etsu Sprayable Formulation

A Shin-Etsu sprayable gypsy moth mating disruption formulation that was tested in study plots in 2002 (section 2002—Shin-Etsu Sprayable Formulation, p. 53) did not provide adequate release rates throughout the season. In 2005, a modified formulation was tested in study plots in the Cumberland and Appomattox-Buckingham state forests in central Virginia using the standard study plot protocol. The product was applied at 6 and 15.2 g AI/acre with an Air Tractor flying at 140 MPH. For the 15.2 g AI/acre rate, 4 T-Jet nozzles with D-6 tips without whirl plates or cores were used at a boom pressure of 39 psi and a flow rate of 6 gal/min to deliver 2.4 gal/min and 10.9 fl. oz per acre. Disrupt II flakes at 6 and 15.2 g/acre were applied to plots at the same time, and untreated plots were monitored as




Figure 51. Gypsy moth trap catch (a) and female mating success (b) in plots treated one and two years previously with Disrupt II flakes.

controls. Only data from released males (distinguished by a red dye fed to larvae) are included in the male trap catch results.

Moth capture in plots treated with flakes at 6 and 15.2 g/acre was 2.5 and 0.1 percent of controls, respectively (Fig. 52). In the plots treated with the Shin-Etsu product, moth capture averaged 8.6 and 4.6 percent of controls, respectively. Mating success in plots treated with flakes at 6 and 15.2 g/acre was 1.1 and 0.7 percent of controls, respectively. In the plots treated with the Shin-Etsu formulation it was 0.3 and 0.4 percent of controls, respectively. At both application rates, trap capture increased gradually over time, indicating that the product may have been releasing too rapidly to provide uniform coverage throughout the full 8-week evaluation period. However, mating was essentially shut down at both application rates and the product’s performance was much improved compared to the formulation tested in 2002.




Figure 52. Gypsy moth trap catch (a) and female mating success (b) in plots treated with Disrupt II flakes and Shin-Etsu sprayable formulation.

A serious concern with the Shin-Etsu product tested in 2005 was that it was difficult to wash it from surfaces and to clean application and mixing equipment. Once it hardened, it was extremely difficult to remove even from stainless steel surfaces. Shin-Etsu agreed to try to modify their product to make it easier to clean up.

Season-Long Trap Catch Versus Mating Success

While previous efforts have quantified the relationship between gypsy moth mating success and daily trap capture (Sharov et al. 1995; see section 2000—Trap Catch Versus Mating Success in Southern Wisconsin, p. 45, and section 2003—Trap Capture Versus Mating Success in Northern Wisconsin, p. 57), these studies were not conducted through the entire gypsy moth flight period, so they did not provide a means to relate mating success to male density through time. Also, it is not possible from these previous studies to relate mating success to season-long trap capture (SLTC), which is important because all gypsy moth population density data from the STS program are expressed in terms of season-long capture of males in pheromone-baited traps. Therefore, a study was conducted in 2005 to measure mating success and daily male trap capture throughout the entire flight period at locations that ranged in population density from very low to high and for which SLTC was measured.

The study was conducted in the Appomattox-Buckingham State Forest near Dillwyn, Virginia (20,000 acres). Ten plots consisting primarily of oaks with a canopy height of approximately 30 m were established at various locations within the state forest. At each plot, a trunk barrier consisting of duct tape with a narrow bead of polybutene pest barrier (Tangle-foot Bird Repellent) was applied to 15 trees arrayed in a 100-m diameter circle. Two standard USDA milk carton pheromone traps were placed opposite each other and about 250 m from the plot center. Laboratory-reared female gypsy moth pupae were shipped to Virginia from the USDA-APHIS Pest Survey, Detection, and Exclusion Laboratory in Massachusetts, and reared to adults. Starting just prior to the beginning of male flight in the area, female moths were placed on the boles of the trees below the trunk bands. Only females less than 24 h old were used. Females and any egg masses they produced were collected 24 hours later, placed in a paper bag, and held for at least 30 days. After 30 days the eggs were checked for embryonation, which indicates fertilization. Females were placed on trees daily (except weekends) until just after flight ended. Traps were checked each day that females were deployed or collected.

Data from two of the plots are shown below. Circle 2 is from a relatively high gypsy moth population (SLTC = 64), and is typical of other locations with SLTC > 60 (Fig. 53a). While no life stages other than males were found at this location, the high SLTC indicates that populations were probably too high to be suitable for the use of mating disruption. Daily trap capture through the flight period is shown by the solid line. Flight was first detected on June 30 and peaked on July 8 with a daily catch of 25, and the last day of flight was July 19. At these high population densities, mating success rapidly rose to 80 percent or greater early in the flight curve and stayed high until the very end of flight. These data suggest that there was a sufficient number of males to achieve high levels of mating success throughout the entire flight period.

Circle 10 is typical of data from lower population density sites. Under these conditions, mating success more closely tracks changes in daily trap catch. Even at the peak of male flight, mating success remained below 70 percent (Fig. 53b). These data suggest that, under these conditions, mating success is limited by the lower numbers of available males.




Figure 53a. Gypsy moth female mating success and male trap catch throughout the flight period at a location with a season-long trap capture (SLTC) of 64.




Figure 53b. Gypsy moth female mating success and male trap catch throughout the flight period at a location with a season-long trap capture (SLTC) of 8.

The following figure (Fig. 54) shows combined data from each of the 10 plots. Male trap catch (X-axis) is expressed as SLTC. Mating success (Y-axis) is expressed as the average of the highest three mating success values recorded for that plot. Fitting a logarithmic curve to the data results in a model that relates SLTC to mating success. Future work is planned to collect more data at lower population densities (below SLTC = 30) and to study the relationship between SLTC and mating success in other geographic areas, especially in the North Central states.

Finally, the above data were useful in providing an answer to a recurring question concerning simulated gypsy moth populations in field study plot tests. Over the past several years, tests have been conducted in field plots in which laboratory-reared gypsy moth males were released in plots treated with various formulations and dosages of mating disruptants. Released males, rather than naturally occurring males, were used so that moth density among plots could be closely controlled. However, there is no way to relate moth density based on trap capture in the study plots to naturally-occurring gypsy moth density, so it has not been possible to estimate the population density that is being simulated in the study plots. Because mating success is measured in exactly the same way in the study plots and in the above experiment with naturally-occurring moth populations, the measurement of mating success provides a quantitative link between simulated and natural population densities. Mating success in the




Figure 54. Gypsy moth female mating success and season-long trap catch (SLTC) of males.

untreated study plots generally lies between 40 and 60 percent (see section 2004—3M MEC-GM Sprayable Pheromone for Gypsy Moth, p. 61, and section 2005—Shin-Etsu Sprayable Formulation, p. 67). Based on the model shown in the above figure, this range of mating success is associated with season-long trap capture values between 5 and 13. This is important information, because the study plot work is intended to apply to population densities that are low enough to be appropriate for mating disruption treatments, and it appears that the releases of males in the study plots simulate appropriate population densities.

Mating Success of Irradiated Females

Future mating disruption work at low gypsy moth population densities may have to be done in areas outside of the gypsy moth quarantine. If laboratory-reared gypsy moths are required for this work, it may be necessary to use sterilized insects. USDA-APHIS has developed a procedure for irradiating female pupae that will produce only sterile adults. In 2005, an experiment was conducted at the Appomattox-Buckingham State Forest in central Virginia to compare the mating success of irradiated and normal females within the context of the standard study plot biological evaluation protocol. Female pupae were irradiated with 40 Krads of gamma radiation, which renders them incapable of producing fertile progeny. In preliminary tests, 74.9 percent of the eggs produced by females irradiated at this dose and mated to normal males became embryonated. Embryonation is important because it is used in most of the studies reported here to distinguish mated from unmated females. Four 100-meter-radius circles of 15 trees each were selected and polybutene pest barrier rings were applied at a height of 2 m around each of the trees. Normal and irradiated females were alternated on each of the trees and males were released at the center of each of the circles at a rate of 50 per release. A release was made each day that females were deployed. Females were retrieved 24 hours after they were deployed and any eggs produced by the females were checked for fertilization. Mating success was 74.0 percent among normal females and 64.6 percent among irradiated females (Fig. 55). Therefore, irradiation has little or no effect on mating success of laboratory-reared females.




Figure 55. Mating success of normal and irradiated gypsy moth females.

Ground Application of Disrupt II Flakes

Tests conducted in 2004 confirmed that aerial applications of Disrupt II flakes to individual, isolated trees prevented mating (see 2004—Efficacy of Mating Disruption Treatments in Open Landscapes, p. 64). A study was conducted in 2005 in the Goshen Wildlife Management Area, Goshen, Virginia, to test the feasibility and effectiveness of applying flakes to individual trees using ground-based equipment. The manufacturer of Disrupt II flakes, Hercon Environmental, provided a modified hydroseeder

for this test (Fig. 56). Four trees that were growing in the open were selected for treatment and four more were left untreated. As a positive control, eight trees were selected that were within a forested area but were close to a road. Four of these were selected for treatment and four were left untreated. The tank of the hydroseeder was filled with 28 gallons of water, 2.5 gallons of Gelva-2333, 1.25 pounds of guar gum, and 1650 g of flakes (=300 g active ingredient). The hydroseeder had a gasoline engine-driven pump that recirculated the mixture to keep the flakes well-suspended. The pump was calibrated to deliver 1.75 liters each time the trigger was pressed. Each tree was sprayed once from each of four positions around the tree to get uniform coverage. This delivered 7 liters of tank mix per tree, or 18.5 g AI/tree. The spray only reached about 20 feet in height, so it was only possible to reach the bottom of the canopy. Most of the spray mixture fell back to the ground. Females were deployed on the boles of the trees beneath a polybutene pest barrier which was placed at a height of 2 m. Males were released from four points around each tree at a distance of 25 m and a rate of 15 males per point per release. Females were retrieved after 24 hours and their fertilization status was determined from their eggs.



Figure 56. Modified hydroseeder used to apply a tank mix containing Disrupt II flakes to individual trees.

The average fertilization rate (>5 percent fertile eggs) of females in untreated areas was 42.2 percent in trees growing in the open and 32.3 percent in the trees in the forested area (Fig. 57). In the treated area, the average fertilization rate was 1.1 percent in the forested area (one female was mated) and no females were mated in the open areas. It appears that ground-based application of flakes to individual trees at an application rate of 18.5 g AI/tree shuts down mating in forested areas or open landscapes, even though the majority of the product fell to the ground beneath the trees.

Because the sticker (Gelva-2333) was diluted, about 100 flakes on leaves of treated trees that were within reach from the ground were marked and checked after 45 days to determine retention. After 45 days, 76 percent of the flakes remained.

Paintball Mating Disruption Formulation

In 2005, a novel method was tested for applying racemic disparlure. A proprietary formulation called “SPLAT” (3 percent AI), (ISCA Technologies, Inc., Riverside, California), was injected into paintballs to be applied using paintball guns (Fig. 58). Nine 1-acre plots (63 x 63 m) were established in the Appomattox-Buckingham State Forest in central Virginia. Because of the small size of the plots, the standard evaluation protocol had to be modified. A central male moth release point was established in the center of each plot. The nearest tree to the center point and three trees in each cardinal direction, spaced approximately 5 m apart, were selected for female placement. A ring of polybutene pest barrier at a height of 2 m was applied to each of these trees. Two standard milk-carton pheromone traps were each placed about 20 m from the center to the west and east. Two paintball guns powered by compressed CO₂ gas were used to apply the formulation to 100 trees in six of the plots to achieve an application rate of 7.2 g AI/acre. To achieve uniform coverage, the shooters worked out from the plot center to each of 25 regularly spaced points and shot at four trees in cardinal directions from each point. The shooters attempted to shoot at large trees at a distance of 5 m and at a height of 2 m. Six of the plots were treated and three were untreated. The formulation was applied on July 27 and was evaluated for three weeks. Males were released at the plot center every day, and the treatment was evaluated either with the two pheromone traps per plot or by deploying females and retrieving them on the following day. On the days that females were deployed the traps were removed and sealed in plastic bags.



Figure 57. Gypsy moth female mating success on individual trees treated with a ground-based application of Disrupt II flakes.



Figure 58. Paintball guns and paintballs loaded with a SPLAT formulation of racemic disparlure for ground-based application for gypsy moth mating disruption.

Trap catch in the treated plots was reduced by 96.4 percent compared to controls and mating success was reduced by 95.7 percent (Fig. 59a and b). Because the treatment was deployed so late in the season, these results represent only the first three weeks after application. To assess the longevity of the product, an additional evaluation was conducted eight weeks after application. The evaluation consisted of male release and recapture in pheromone traps. Trap catch suppression compared to controls was 79.3 percent after eight weeks, suggesting that the application had lost some effectiveness.




Figure 59. Gypsy moth trap catch (a) and female mating success (b) in plots treated with SPLAT gypsy moth mating disruption formulation and delivered through paintball guns.

With two shooters using two guns, it took 15–20 minutes to treat 1 acre with the paintballs. This is quite fast compared to other methods of deploying mating disruption dispensers from the ground. The speed of application and the promising efficacy results make this formulation a candidate for further evaluation as a ground-based mating disruption treatment.

Summary of 2005 Results

A sprayable formulation developed by Shin-Etsu was tested in study plots. Trap capture was reduced by more than 97 percent and mating success was reduced by more than 98 percent at both 6 and 15.2 g AI/acre compared to untreated controls. However, trap capture increased gradually over time, indicating that the release rate was too rapid. Also, it was extremely difficult to clean the product from exposed surfaces.

Plots treated with flakes at 6 g AI/acre the previous year and at 15.2 g AI/acre one and two years previously were monitored for biological effects. Trap catch was reduced by 53 percent in the plots treated one year previously at 15.2 g AI/acre and by 20 percent after two years. Trap catch was reduced by 40 percent in plots treated one year previously at 6 g AI/acre. Mating success was reduced by more than 81 percent in plots treated one and two years previously at both 6 and 15.2 g AI/acre, and by 34 percent in plots treated two years previously at 15.2 g AI/acre.

The relationship between trap catch and mating success was determined in study plots in central Virginia. Data were collected across the entire flight period. At season-long trap catch values greater than 60, mating success approached 100 percent during the entire male flight period. At very low population densities (season-long trap capture less than 8), peak mating success was less than 30 percent.

A ground application of Disrupt II flakes from a modified hydroseeder provided effective mating disruption on individual treated trees. However, it was not possible to apply the formulation higher than about 20 feet, and most of the formulation fell to the ground. A ground-based application of disparlure consisting of paintballs containing pheromone applied to tree trunks with paintball guns also provided effective mating disruption. The paintball gun application system performed well, and it was possible for two persons using two guns to treat an acre in about 15 minutes. This application system shows promise for use in small areas where aerial applications are not possible, and further research is planned.

QUALITY ASSURANCE AND CONTROL OF PHEROMONE PRODUCTS

Because of the increasing use of pheromone trapping and disruption systems in decision-making and treatment, the consistency and reliability of each product are of paramount importance. Currently, no standardized label is used for the packaging of pheromone products for sale. For example, the date of production is important but not always available on the product package. Also, there is no agency that has the responsibility to certify that the label information is within accepted limits of accuracy; for example, for purity of the technical and formulated product.

CURRENT DISPARLURE FORMULATIONS AND USE

DISRUPT II

The current formulation of disparlure flakes, modified Disrupt II (Hercon Environmental Co., Emigsville, Pennsylvania), was granted full registration by the US EPA under the original registration (Reg. No. 8730-55) granted in 1992. It contains a different plasticizer than the earlier formulation. The current label specifies application of 6-40 g AI/acre to forested and residential areas (more than one house occurring per 10 acres).

The standard and modified Disrupt II controlled release formulations of disparlure consist of multilayered plastic flakes or confetti, each 1/32 by 3/32 inch (1 by 3 mm) (Fig. 60). The flakes contain 18.5 percent AI of racemic disparlure. The active ingredient is implanted and protectively sealed in a layer between outer polymeric layers. The inner layer serves as a reservoir of the active ingredient, which migrates continuously through the permeable barrier layer. The flakes themselves contain 18.5 percent AI but they are packaged with diatomaceous earth (3 percent by weight); therefore, the label for the final product is 17.9 percent AI. The flakes are mixed and applied with 4 oz per acre of the sticker-extender Gelva-2333. This mix is applied using an augering system modified by various contractors from the system originally developed by Schweitzer Aircraft. Modifications include larger and more accessible flake hoppers, more reliable motors and controllers to drive the pumps and augers, permanently mounted, larger capacity sticker tanks, and wash nozzles to reduce sticker and flake accumulation on the spinners.



Figure 60. Plastic laminated flake product, Disrupt II.

The flakes are applied at 6 and 15.2 g AI/acre (14.8 and 37.5 g AI/ha) in one application just prior to the estimated start of adult male emergence. On average the flakes release approximately 30-50 percent of their pheromone by day 42 after treatment. At the 30.4 g AI/acre dose, an average of about 0.3 g per acre per day is released over this period of time. The release rate is consistently low during the male moth flight period; therefore, much of the pheromone is released after the flight period and is wasted. The acrylic multipolymer resin emulsion Gelva-2333 is the sticker-extender mixed with the flake formulation. This sticker-extender has two major components: 1) an adhesive agent to adhere the flakes to foliage or other plant surfaces and 2) a surfactant. The specific components are found on the inert ingredient list provided by US EPA and are considered exempt from the requirement of a tolerance when used as an inert ingredient in a pesticide formulation applied to growing crops. This sticker-extender performs well: in general, about 80 percent of the flakes deposited remain adhered after 42 days of exposure.

Disrupt II is packaged in plastic bags, each containing sufficient flakes to treat 100 acres at the 15.2 g AI/acre dose (8.5 kg or 18.7 lb). Cost of the product varies depending on the quantity ordered. In recent years, the cost to formulate the disparlure into the plastic flakes has been \$45 to \$52/kg and the cost of the active ingredient that goes into 1 kg of flakes was about \$55 to \$60. This equates to a cost of \$8.50 to \$9.52 for enough finished product to treat 1 acre at the 15.2 g AI/acre dose. The plastic components of the flakes can persist in the environment for 10-15 years, but usually are not noticed due to their small size, green color, and minimal deposition (average 2 per square foot). The carrying capacity of the modified Hercon pod systems currently in use vary but at minimum can hold 119 kg of Disrupt II, which is enough to treat 1400 acres at the 15.2 g AI/acre dose in one load. When treating at the 6 g AI/acre dose, fuel is the limiting factor for each load rather than the carrying capacity of the pods.

Disrupt II is not labeled for use on food and feed crops. Hercon is currently pursuing an exemption from EPA's requirement for tolerances on food and feed crops for a variation of their modified flake product. This product will be called Disrupt III, and they hope to have it available for operational use in 2007 along with Disrupt II.

OTHER FORMULATIONS

Decoy GM

An application to register the Decoy GM bead formulation of disparlure was submitted by Biosys (Columbia, Maryland) to the US EPA in February 1995. In 1997, Thermo Trilogy Corporation (Columbia, Maryland) acquired Biosys and stated that they were pursuing registration of the bead formulation. Unfortunately, the company did not pursue the registration and the product is no longer available.

3M MEC-GM Sprayable Pheromone for Gypsy Moth

This microencapsulated formulation was granted US EPA registration in 2003. However, in 2005 the 3M Canada Company discontinued their sprayable pheromone products.

Shin-Etsu Sprayable Formulation

For several years, Shin-Etsu Chemical Company, Tokyo, Japan, has provided sprayable formulations for laboratory and field testing. These formulations are applied using conventional hydraulic nozzles. The results have been promising, and the company is continuing efforts to develop a commercial gypsy moth mating disruption product.

SPLAT

In 2005, ISCA Technologies, Riverside, California, provided a gypsy moth mating disruption formulation that was applied using paintball guns with promising results. They are also developing a similar formulation for aerial application. This product was tested in study plots in 2006 with promising results.

OPERATIONAL USE

Although the standard Disrupt II flake product has been used operationally since 1990, many of the minor problems encountered with this product then still exist today. One of the problems is the slow release of the pheromone during the application year—specifically, during the male moth flight period. Much of the pheromone is released after male moth activity and is consequently wasted. This problem requires the application of a high dose (up to 15.2 g AI/acre) of disparlure with its associated high costs. The application equipment performs consistently due to upgrades in the motors for the flake augering system and enlargement of the flake hoppers. The pods still mandate special aircraft requirements: at least a 24-volt electrical system, high wing for the pilot to observe proper functioning, and FAA approval. These requirements severely limit the number of applicators able to bid on operational mating disruption projects. The persistence of the three-layer plastic laminate in the field continues to be an environmental concern. Hercon has evaluated a slow release flake formulation consisting of biodegradable plastics in the laboratory, but results have not been promising.

EFFECTS ON NONTARGET ORGANISMS

The toxicity of insect pheromones to mammals is relatively low, and the US EPA requires less rigorous testing of these products than it requires of insecticides. Therefore the toxicity data on disparlure is limited (Beroza et al. 1975, USDA 2004b). Data regarding the toxicity of disparlure to animals or humans after subchronic or chronic exposures were not found in the available literature. Moreover, the acute toxicity of disparlure for endpoints other than mortality is poorly characterized (USDA 2004b). Cameron (1995) reported an apparent persistence of disparlure in the human body based on attractancy to male gypsy moths for a minimum of 16 years.

In one laboratory exposure study, concentrations of racemic disparlure greater than 100 mg per liter of water resulted in some mortality of the test population of rainbow trout and

bluegill (USDA Fish and Wildlife Service 1972). This should not be interpreted to mean that racemic disparlure is toxic to fish when used for mating disruption of the gypsy moth, only that excessively large doses might be toxic.

Additional studies by Wildlife International Ltd., Easton, MD, conducted in 1998, 2001, and 2004, found toxicity to the aquatic cladoceran *Daphnia* from various sources associated with Disrupt II flakes, including high concentrations of both blank (without disparlure) and active flakes and technical grade racemic disparlure. Tests in 2004 with bluegill and rainbow trout resulted in zero mortality at all flake concentrations tested.

CONCLUSIONS

The mating disruption technique should be used only to manage isolated or area-wide low density (fewer than 30 male moths caught in pheromone traps per season) populations of the European strain of the gypsy moth. The exact biological parameters for its successful use have not been fully identified, although since 1990 there have been many successes in reducing populations (compared with untreated areas) within a range of low level populations. Criteria currently recommended for its use are these: 1) traps should capture no greater than 30 male moths per trap, and the average capture should be less than 15 per trap in the year before treatment, 2) populations should be well delimited (i.e., at least nine traps per square mile), 3) the treated area should be at least 5 miles from a source of large numbers of migrating male moths, and 4) the treated area should be large enough to offset anticipated male moth migration (e.g., at least 2,500 ft on a side). To a large extent, these criteria have been derived empirically from operational experience. Refinement and validation through research is still needed. In operational uses, monitoring for treatment effectiveness is the same as that used with traditional insecticides on eradication projects (e.g., delimiting grids of at least nine traps per acre deployed for at least two years after treatment). However, with mating disruption, 0 captures in the year of treatment does not necessarily equate with successful mating disruption. Rather, the captures in the year after treatment are used to evaluate effectiveness. Furthermore, recent findings that trap capture is suppressed for at least 2 years following Disrupt II applications suggest that further research and possible modifications to treatment evaluation may be necessary.

Initially, costs associated with the manufacture and application of racemic disparlure and Disrupt II were high compared with costs associated with aerial application of traditional insecticides. However, as dosages were reduced, production rates increased because of improvements in application equipment, and through the economy of scale, costs for mating disruption treatments in STS are currently lower than those for other treatments.

The cost of monitoring in methods development areas is quite high. The production and use of females obtained as pupae from laboratory colonies to monitor mating success is labor intensive and requires holding the pupae until adult emergence, placing and collecting one-day-old females at monitoring locations, and determining mating and embryonation of the collected females and/or egg masses. Laboratory experiments and field evaluations indicate that monitor females, both laboratory-strain and wild, are comparable in attractiveness to wild male populations.

SUMMARY

The use of pheromones to manage pest species has proven to be an effective technique in agriculture and forestry. Insect pheromones that act as sex attractants are used to suppress pest populations through mating disruption. This publication is a compilation of historical and current information on the use of mating disruption to manage sparse-density populations of the European strain of the gypsy moth.

MATING BIOLOGY OF THE GYPSY MOTH

The mating disruption technique is more effective as populations decrease in density since at higher population densities males can locate females visually, by chance encounter, as well as by following plumes of pheromone emitted by females. The gypsy moth has one generation per year, and the mating season occurs over a 3-6 week period in mid to late summer, depending on weather conditions and geographical area. Adult flight activity and mating are temperature mediated but most mating normally occurs daily between 1000-1700 hours.

MATING DISRUPTION OF THE GYPSY MOTH

The identification and production of the synthetic gypsy moth sex pheromone, disparlure (Bierl et al. 1970), provided the opportunity to manage gypsy moth populations by mating disruption. Failure of males to locate females in air saturated with disparlure probably results from desensitization of the chemoreceptors in the males' antennae, as well as from disorientation by following false pheromone trails or leaving the pheromone-treated area. The gypsy moth is not an ideal candidate for mating disruption due to its high fecundity. In addition, males are highly polygamous, and natural distribution patterns of adult females are not random but clumped or aggregated. Good characteristics of the European strain of the gypsy moth for mating disruption include flightless females, low mating success of females at sparse densities, limited dispersal of the majority of males beyond a few hundred meters, and one generation per year. Because some recently introduced females of the Asian strain of the gypsy moth are capable of flight, this strain may be less suited to the use of mating disruption, although this has not been investigated experimentally.

DEVELOPMENT OF MATING DISRUPTION, 1971 THROUGH 2005

Since 1971, many attempts have been made to use mating disruption to manage populations of the gypsy moth. Kolodny-Hirsch and Schwalbe (1990) reviewed the results of research and operational trials before 1989. In general, these results were inconsistent in terms of efficacy and formulation performance, and disparlure release profiles were not monitored during the treatment year.

In 1989, an eradication program was conducted on 2,500 acres in Giles County, Virginia, using the Disrupt II plastic flake slow release formulation (Hercon Environmental Inc.). The flakes were applied at a dose of 30.4 g AI/acre of racemic disparlure in one application using a small fixed-wing aircraft. The efficacy results were excellent as no adult male moths were captured within the treated block from 1989 through 1991 (male moths were recovered in an

associated untreated block). In spite of the favorable efficacy results, the application equipment, which intermittently malfunctioned and produced an uneven deposition pattern of flakes across the swath, raised concerns for future use. Also, the flakes released only a small percentage of their disparlure content during male moth flight.

In 1990, in response to the need for focused research and development on gypsy moth mating disruption, a Gypsy Moth Mating Disruption Working Group consisting of members from federal, state, and county governmental agencies, universities, and private companies was formed. The Working Group identified as broad objectives of methods development work the refinement of methods for applying Disrupt II, reductions in application rates, and the development of additional formulations that could be applied through conventional spray systems.

In 1990, a replicated study was conducted in Rockbridge County, Virginia, to evaluate three treatments: 1) two applications of flakes in 1990 only, each at a dose of 30.4 g AI/acre, 2) a single application of flakes in 1990 and again every year from 1991 through 1993 at a dose of 30.4 g AI/acre, and 3) untreated. The efficacy results over all years (1990 through 1994) showed that gypsy moth populations were significantly reduced by either type of flake treatment (Leonhardt et al. 1996). The flake application equipment continued to malfunction and, based on anticipated high costs to replace or redesign the equipment, an effort was made to locate another controlled-release formulation that could be applied through conventional booms and nozzles.

In 1990, AgriSense (formerly biosys, then Thermo Trilogy, and now Certis, Columbia, Maryland) developed a polymeric flowable bead formulation containing disparlure (Decoy GM). Release rate evaluations showed that the bead formulation released disparlure at a faster rate than the plastic laminate flake formulation.

In 1991 through 1994, various trials were conducted using the beads applied in two applications at doses from 6 to 30.4 g AI/acre per application in 1 gal of tank mix per acre per application. Although efficacy results were inconsistent over the various doses, in general results were favorable at doses as low as 6 g AI/acre per application for two applications. A bead formulation containing a greater portion of larger diameter beads was manufactured in an effort to slow the disparlure release rate. Flakes were used operationally in several states. The operability of the application equipment for the flakes was improved by upgrading the motors for turning the augers and enlarging the holding capacity of the flake hoppers.

In 1993, a federal strategy to reduce the rate of expansion of the gypsy moth into new areas, known as the Slow the Spread of the Gypsy Moth (STS) project, was pilot tested. The project was fully implemented in 2000 in 9 states along the leading edge. While mating disruption was initially not the primary treatment tactic in STS, it has become the preferred treatment tactic because it is target specific, effective, and less costly than other available treatment methods. Since 2000, 82 percent of the nearly 2.9 million acres treated in STS used mating disruption.

Starting in 1998, methods development focused on further improvements in the use of mating disruption in STS. Some of the results obtained are as follows. It was determined that

sticker is required for optimum performance of the Disrupt II formulation, but that high levels of efficacy can be obtained when flakes are applied without sticker. Applications without sticker could be required in certain residential areas. Field studies showed that the effects of mating disruption treatments extend at least 250 meters beyond treated areas, and in one instance effects were detected up to 600 meters away. This finding led to a series of experiments that showed that an application of Disrupt II flakes in alternating treated and untreated swaths was effective, but that treated swaths separated by three untreated swaths may not be adequate to disrupt mating. It is possible to detect pheromone in the air in plots treated at a rate of 30.4 g AI/acre using a portable electroantennogram sensor, but neither of the two sensors tested could reliably detect pheromone in plots treated at less than 30.4 g AI/acre. A promising new microcapsule formulation was developed by 3M Canada Company, but the product was withdrawn by the company after receiving EPA registration because of market considerations. A dose response for Disrupt II flakes was determined in the field. While dosages as low as 0.06 g AI/acre suppressed trap catch, significant reductions in efficacy occurred when dosages were reduced below 6 g AI/acre, indicating that it may not be possible to reduce application rates below this level. Aerial applications of Disrupt II to trees within open areas resulted in effective mating disruption. However, if male and female gypsy moths emerge close together in space and time, mating disruption treatments will not completely eliminate mating. Ground application of pheromone using paintballs loaded with an experimental formulation and shot at trees using paintball guns disrupted mating and may be a useful method in situations where aerial application is not feasible. Biological effects from aerial applications of Disrupt II flakes were found to persist for at least two years after the year of application. While this is potentially beneficial in that it provides additional suppression of mating, it is of concern because it interferes with the ability of pheromone traps to evaluate treatment effectiveness and to detect and delimit residual populations in treated areas in years after the year of treatment. Further studies will be required to determine how to deal with this effect.

In addition, studies were conducted on: the relationship between mating success and gypsy moth density both in mid-Atlantic and northern regions; efficacy, release rate, and weatherability of numerous experimental formulations and adjuvants; new delivery systems for flakes and sprayable formulations; non-target effects of disparlure and mating disruption formulations; pheromone dispersion in hardwood forests; and a comparison of methods of deploying female gypsy moths to measure mating success.

CURRENT DISPARLURE FORMULATIONS AND USE

Disrupt II, the plastic flake formulation produced by Hercon, is currently the only formulation registered by US EPA and used in USDA programs. The plastic flakes are applied operationally at two doses: 15.2 g AI/acre and 6.0 g AI/acre. The plastic flakes are applied in a single application using modified Hercon pods mounted on the underside of the agricultural spray aircraft wing. Formulation costs are about \$110 per kg of Disrupt II (\$60 for the active ingredient and \$50 for formulation), which equates to \$9.35 per acre for a 15.2 g AI/acre dose or \$3.74 per acre for the 6.0 g AI/acre dose. A new Hercon flake product, Disrupt III, that is exempt from tolerances on food and feed crops, is currently under EPA review.

The exact biological parameters for the successful use of the mating disruption technique have not been fully identified, although it is thought that the technique should be used only to manage isolated or area-wide (to reduce the possibility of insect movement into the treated area) low density populations of the European strain. The technique is specific to the gypsy moth and has no known impacts on nontarget organisms.

REFERENCES CITED

- Benner, R.; Lamb, B. 1985. A fast response continuous analyzer for halogenated atmospheric tracers. *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology* 2:582-589.
- Beroza, M.; Knipling, E. 1972. Gypsy moth control with the sex attractant pheromone. *Science* 177:19-27.
- Beroza, M.; Hood, S.; Trefrey, D.; Leonard, D.; Knipling, E.; Klassen, W.; Stevens, L. 1974. Large field trial with microencapsulated sex pheromone to prevent mating of the gypsy moth. *Journal Economic Entomology* 67:569-664.
- Beroza, M.; Inscoc, M.; Schwartz, P.; Keplinger, M.; Mastro, C. 1975. Acute toxicity studies with insect attractants. *Toxicology and Applied Pharmacology* 3 1:421-429.
- Bierl, B.; Beroza, M.; Collier, C. 1970. Potent sex attractant of the gypsy moth: its isolation, identification, and synthesis. *Science* 170:87-89.
- Cameron, E. 1995. On the apparent persistence of disparlure in the human body. *Journal of Chemical Ecology* 21:385-386.
- Carde, R.; Minks, A. 1995. Control of moth pests by mating disruption: successes and constraints. *Annual Review of Entomology* 40:559-585.
- Caro, J.; Freeman, H.; Brower, D.; Bierl-Leonhardt, B. 1981. Comparative distribution and persistence of disparlure in woodland air after aerial application of three controlled-release formulations. *Journal of Chemical Ecology* 7:867-880.
- Charlton, R.; Carde, R. 1982. Rate and diel periodicity of pheromone emission from female gypsy moths, (*Lymantria dispar*), determined with a glass absorption collection system. *Journal of Insect Physiology*.
- Charlton, R.; Carde, R. 1990. Orientation of male gypsy moths, *Lymantria dispar* (L.), to pheromone sources: the role of olfactory and visual cues. *Journal of Insect Behavior* 3:443-469.
- Färbart, P.; Koch, U.; Färbert, A.; Staten, R.; Carde, R. 1997. Pheromone concentration measured with electroantennogram in cotton fields treated for mating disruption of *Pectinophora gossypiella* (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae). *Environmental Entomology* 26:1105-1116.
- Giebultowicz, J.; Raina, A.; Uebel, E.; Ridgway, R. 1991. Two-step regulation of sex-pheromone decline in mated gypsy moth females. *Archives of Insect Biochemistry and Physiology* 16:95-105

- Granett, J.; Doane, C. 1975. Reduction of gypsy moth male mating potential in dense populations by mistblower sprays of microencapsulated disparlure. *Journal of Economic Entomology* 68:435-437.
- Knipling, E.F. 1979. The basic principles of insect population suppression and management. Agric. Handbook 512. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture.
- Koch, U.T. 1990. A portable EAG system for measurement of pheromones in the field. In: Proceedings of the 200th National Meeting of the American Chemical Society, Division of Agricultural and Food Chemistry. Washington, D.C. August 26-31, 1990. Abstract 31.
- Kolodny-Hirsch, D.; Schwalbe, C. 1990. Use of disparlure in the management of the gypsy moth. In: Ridgway, R.; Silverstein, R.; Insoe, M. ed. Behavior Modifying Chemicals for Insect Management: Application of Pheromones and Other Attractants. New York: Marcel Dekker Inc; 363-385.
- Leonard, D. 1994. An evaluation of four rates of racemic disparlure to disrupt mating in low density populations of gypsy moth. M.S. thesis. Clemson University; 40 p.
- Leonard, D.; Leonhardt, B.; McLane, W.; Ghent, J.; Parker, S.; Roland, T.; Reardon, R. 1992. Aerial application of racemic disparlure to manage low-level populations of gypsy moth, Giles County, Virginia, 1989. NA-TP-04-92. Radnor, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Area; 16 p.
- Leonhardt, B.; Leonard, D.; Mastro, V.; McLane, W.; Reardon, R. 1995. Use of controlled-release formulations of pheromone for disruption of gypsy moth mating. Proceed. Intern. Symp. Control. Rel. Bioact. Mater. 22(1995). Controlled Release Society, Inc.
- Leonhardt, B.; Mastro, V.; Leonard, D.; McLane, W.; Reardon, R.; Thorpe, L. 1996. Control of low-density gypsy moth (Lepidoptera: Lymantriidae) populations by mating disruption with pheromone. *Journal of Chemical Ecology* 22:1255-1270.
- Leonhardt, B.; Rankin, F.; McLane, W.; Leonard, D.; Mastro, V.; Reardon, R. 1992. Development of a microbead formulation of disparlure for mating disruption of the gypsy moth. Proceedings International Symposium Controlled Release Bioactive Materials 19: 176-177. Controlled Release Society, Inc.
- Leibhold, A.; Elkinton, J.; Wallner, W. 1986. Effect of burlap bands on between-tree movement of late-instar gypsy moth, *Lymantria dispar* (Lepidoptera: Lymantriidae). *Environmental Entomology* 15:373-379.
- Liebhold, A.; Halverson, J.; Elmes, G. 1992. Quantitative analysis of the invasion of gypsy moth in North America. *Journal of Biogeography* 19:513-520.
- Liebhold, A.; Thorpe, K.; Ghent, J.; Lyons, B. 1994. Egg mass sampling for decision-making. USDA, Forest Service, NA-TP-04-94.
- Liebhold, A.; Gottschalk, K.; Mason, D.; Bush, R. 1997. Forest susceptibility to the gypsy moth. *Journal of Forestry* 95:20-24.

- van der Pers, J.; Minks, A. 1998. A portable electroantennogram sensor for routine measurements of pheromone concentrations in greenhouses. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata* 87:209-215.
- Proshold, F. 1995. Remating by gypsy moths (Lepidoptera: Lymantriidae) mated with F1-Sterile Males as a function of sperm within the spermatheca. *Journal of Economic Entomology* 88:644-648.
- Reardon, R. 1991. Appalachian gypsy moth integrated pest management project. *Forest Ecology and Management* 39:107-112.
- Reardon, R.; Leonhard, D.; Mastro, V.; Leonhardt, B.; McLane, W.; Talley, S.; Thorpe, K.; Webb, R. 1998. Using mating disruption to manage gypsy moth: a review. U.S. Forest Service, Forest Health Technology Enterprise Team, Morgantown, WV. FHTET-98-01. 85 p.
- Ridgway, R.; Silverstein, R.; Inscoc, M. 1990. Behavior-modifying chemicals for insect management. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc.
- Sauer, A.; Karg, G.; deKramer, J.; Milli, R. 1992. A portable EAG system for the measurement of pheromone concentrations in the field. *Chemical Senses* 17:543-553.
- Schwalbe, C.; Cameron, E.; Hall, D.; Richardson, J.; Beroza, M.; Stevens, L. 1974. Field tests of microencapsulated disparlure for suppression of mating among wild and laboratory-reared gypsy moths. *Environmental Entomology* 3:589-592.
- Sharov, A.; Liebhold, A.; Ravlin, W. 1995. Prediction of gypsy moth (Lepidoptera: Lymantriidae) mating success from pheromone trap counts. *Environmental Entomology* 24:1239-1244.
- Sharov, A.; Thorpe, K.; Tcheslavskaja, K.; 2002a. Effect of synthetic pheromone on gypsy moth (Lepidoptera: Lymantriidae) trap catch and mating success beyond treated areas. *Environmental Entomology* 31:1119-1127.
- Sharov, A.; Liebhold, A.; Leonard, D.. 2002b. "Slow the Spread," a national program to contain the gypsy moth. *Journal of Forestry* July/Aug., pp. 30-35.
- Sharov, A.; Leonard, D.; Liebhold, A.; Clemens, N. 2002c. Evaluation of preventive treatments in low-density gypsy moth populations using pheromone traps. *Journal of Economic Entomology* 95:1205-1215.
- Smith, T.; Peterson, H.; Thorpe, K.; Tcheslavskaja, K.; Thistle, H.; Strand, T.; Lamb, B. 2004. Diffusion of insect pheromones in a forest canopy: co-located tracer/electroantennogram experiments. ASAE/CSAE Annual International Meeting. Paper No. 044202. Ottawa, Ontario. 11 p.
- Stevens, L.; Beroza, M. 1972. Mating-inhibition field tests using disparlure, the synthetic gypsy moth sex pheromone. *Journal of Economic Entomology* 65:1090-1095.
- Suckling, D.; Karg, G.; Bradley, S.; Howard, C. 1994. Field electroantennogram and behavioral responses of *Epiphyas postvittana* (Lepidoptera: Tortricidae) under low pheromone and inhibitor concentrations. *Journal of Economic Entomology* 87:1477-1487.

- Tcheslavskaja, K.; Brewster, C. C.; Sharov, A. A.. 2002. Mating success of gypsy moth (Lepidoptera: Lymantriidae) females in southern Wisconsin. *The Great Lakes Entomologist* 35: 1-7.
- Tcheslavskaja, K.; Brewster, C.; Thorpe, K.; Sharov, A.; Leonard, D.; Roberts, A. 2005a. Effects of intentional gaps in spray coverage on the efficacy of gypsy moth mating disruption. *Journal of Applied Entomology* 129: 475-480.
- Tcheslavskaja, K. S.; Thorpe, K. W.; Brewster, C. C.; Sharov, A. A.; Leonard, D. S.; Reardon, R. C.; Mastro, V. C.; Sellers, P.; Roberts, E. A. 2005b. Optimization of pheromone dosage for gypsy moth mating disruption. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata* 115: 355-361.
- Thistle, H.; Peterson, H.; Allwine, G.; Lamb, B.; Strand, T.; Holsten, E.; Shea, P. 2004. Surrogate pheromone plumes in three forest trunk spaces: composite statistics and case studies. *Forest Science* 50:610-625.
- Thorpe, K.; Leonhardt, D.; Mastro, W.; McLane, W.; Reardon, R.; Sellers, P.; Webb, R.; Talley, S. 2000. Effectiveness of gypsy moth mating disruption from aerial application of plastic laminate flakes with and without a sticking agent. *Agricultural and Forest Entomology* 2:225-231.
- Thorpe, K.W.; Mastro, V.C.; Leonard, D.S.; Leonhardt, B.A.; McLane, W.; Reardon, R.C.; Talley, S. 1999. Comparative efficacy of two controlled-release gypsy moth mating disruption formulations. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata* 90:267-277.
- Thorpe, K.W.; Hickman, A.D.; Tcheslavskaja, K.S.; Leonard, D. S.; Roberts, E.A. 2006. Comparison of methods for deploying female gypsy moths to evaluate mating disruption treatments. *Agricultural and Forest Entomology* (in press).
- Tobin, P. C.; Sharov, A.; Liebhold, A.; Leonard, D.; Roberts, E.; Learn, M. 2004. Management of the gypsy moth through a decision algorithm under the STS project. *American Entomologist* 50:200-209.
- Trent, A.; Thistle, H. 1999. Aerial application of gypsy moth pheromone flakes and sticker. ASAE Meeting Presentation Paper No. 991115.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2004a. Accomplishments in slowing the spread of the gypsy moth. STS Annual Report, February, 2005, 2 pp.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2004b. Control/eradication agents for the gypsy moth—human health and ecological risk assessment for Disparlure. Syracuse Environmental Research Associates, Inc. Fayetteville, NY.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2006. Gypsy Moth Digest. Gypsy moth slow the spread by year, 2000-2005 (<http://www.na.fs.fed.us/fhp/gm/astsyr1.cfm>). USDA, Forest Service, State and Private Forestry, Morgantown, West Virginia.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service. 1972. Results of four-day static fish toxicity studies of rainbow trout and bluegills. Report submitted to U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Webb, R.; Tatman, K.; Leonhardt, B.; Plimmer, J.; Boyd, V.; Bystrak, P.; Schwalbe, C.; Douglas, L. 1988. Effect of aerial application of racemic disparlure on male trap catch and female mating success of gypsy moth. *Journal of Economic Entomology* 81:268-273.

Whitmire, S.L.; Tobin, P.C. 2006. Persistence of invading gypsy moth populations in the United States. *Oecologia* 147:230-237.

APPENDICES

DISRUPT II LABEL

DISRUPT II MSDS

GELVA 2333 MSDS

HERCON® DISRUPT® II GYPSY MOTH MATING DISRUPTANT

Population Suppressant

HERCON DISRUPT II® Gypsy Moth is a controlled-release pheromone formulation designed to lower incidence of gypsy moth, *Lymantria dispar*, mating by disrupting normal male flight orientation to females. This reduction in mating will help suppress the larval (caterpillar) population that causes damage by feeding on the leaves of hardwoods and evergreens.

ACTIVE INGREDIENTS:

(Z)-7,8-epoxy-2-methyloctadecane...	17.9 %*
OTHER INGREDIENTS	82.1 %
TOTAL	100.0 %

CONTENTS:

MINIMUM NET WEIGHT: KG[lb]†
* 8.5 kg [18.7 lb] of product will treat 50 acres at 30.4 g A.I./acre

KEEP OUT OF REACH OF CHILDREN C A U T I O N

Read Directions and Precautionary Statements Before Use

FIRST AID:

Have the product container or label with you when calling a poison control center or doctor or going for treatment

IF SWALLOWED:

- Call a poison control center or doctor immediately for treatment advice.
- Have person sip a glass of water if able to swallow
- Do not induce vomiting unless told to by a poison control center or doctor.
- Do not give anything to an unconscious person

IF IN EYES:

- Hold eye open and rinse slowly and gently with water for 15-20 minutes. Remove contact lenses, if present, after the first 5 minutes, then continue rinsing.
- Call a poison control center or doctor immediately for treatment advice

IF ON SKIN:

- Take off contaminated clothing.
- Rinse skin immediately with plenty of water for 15-20 minutes.
- Call a poison control center or doctor immediately for treatment advice.

IF INHALED:

- Move person to fresh air.
- If person is not breathing, call 911 or an ambulance, then give artificial respiration, preferably mouth-to-mouth if possible.
- Call a poison control center or doctor immediately for further treatment advice.

Have the product container or label with you when calling a poison control center or doctor or going for treatment. You may also contact the National Pesticide Telecommunications Network at 1-800-868-7378 for emergency medical treatment information. Hours of operation are seven days a week 6:30 am to 4:30 pm PST.

HERCON® DISRUPT II GYPSY MOTH PRECAUTIONARY STATEMENTS

Hazards to Humans and Domestic Animals

CAUTION: Harmful if swallowed or absorbed through skin. Avoid contact with skin, eyes and mouth. Wash hands thoroughly with soap and water after handling and before eating, drinking, chewing gum, using tobacco products or using the toilet. Applicators and other handlers must wear long-sleeved shirt and long pants, waterproof gloves and shoes plus socks.

ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARDS: For terrestrial uses: Do not apply directly to water or to areas where surface water is present nor to intertidal areas below the mean high water mark, except under forest canopy. Do not contaminate water when disposing of equipment washwaters or rinsate.

DIRECTIONS FOR USE

It is a violation of Federal law to use this product in a manner inconsistent with its labeling.

Apply this product up to two weeks before adult gypsy moth emergence. Depending on the gypsy moth population densities apply 30 gm (170 gm (6 oz) of product), 15 gm (85 gm (3 oz) of product) or 6 gm (34 gm (1.2 oz) of product) of active ingredient per application per acre. Apply 15 gm and 6 gm of active ingredient in low density gypsy moth populations. Consult your state or local authorities for determining gypsy moth population levels in your area. To ensure proper rate and method of application, make application by or under the supervision of a qualified a person.

Apply a second application if adult gypsy moth emergence is extended or delayed, otherwise one application lasts the entire season. Use an inert sticker material with DISRUPT II to hold flakes on treated foliage or plant parts. The Hercon applicator is specifically designed to mix the proper amount of DISRUPT II flakes and inert sticker at the time of application. Use in areas such as forest; residential, municipal and shade tree area, recreational area such as campgrounds, golf courses, parks and parkways; ornamental, shade tree plantings; shelter belts and rights of way and other easements.

STORAGE AND DISPOSAL:

Do not contaminate water, food, or feed by storage and disposal

PESTICIDE STORAGE: Store in sealed containers in a cool dry place.

PESTICIDE DISPOSAL: Waste resulting from this product may be discarded in an approved landfill.

CONTAINER DISPOSAL: Do not reuse empty bags. Place empty bags in trash

WARRANTY AND DISCLAIMER STATEMENT

To the fullest extent permitted by law, Hercon Environmental warrants that this material conforms to the chemical description on the label. Manufacturer neither makes, nor authorizes any agent or representative to make any other warranty of fitness or of merchantability, guarantee or representation, expressed or implied concerning this material. Manufacturer's maximum liability for breach of this warranty shall not exceed the purchase price of this product. Buyer and user acknowledge and assume all risks and liabilities resulting from the handling, storage and use of this material not in conformance with the label.

Made in the USA by

HERCON ENVIRONMENTAL

Emigsville, PA 17318-0435 EPA Reg. No. 8730-55 EPA Est. No. 8730-PA-01

Questions? Call 1-866-4-HERCON

®"HERCON" and Disrupt are registered trademarks of Aberdeen Road Company, Emigsville, PA

Rev 10/04

**MATERIAL SAFETY DATA SHEET
HERCON ENVIRONMENTAL**

SECTION I – PRODUCT AND COMPANY INFORMATION

PRODUCT NAME: HERCON® DISRUPT® II Gypsy Moth Mating Disruptant
Target Insect: Gypsy Moth, Lymantria dispar
Pheromone Dispenser for Use as a Mating Disruptant,
Laminated polymeric dispensers EPA Reg. No. 873055

MSDS Number 100306

COMPANY: ABERDEEN ROAD COMPANY d/b/a HERCON ENVIRONMENTAL
P.O. Box 435
Aberdeen Road
Emigsville, PA 17318

For an emergency or more information call 717-764-1192

SECTION III. COMPOSITION AND INFORMATION ON INGREDIENTS

ACTIVE

COMMON NAME: *Racemic Disparlure*
CHEMICAL NAME: *(7R,8S) cis 7,8-epoxy-2-methyloctadecane*
CHEMICAL FAMILY of active ingredient *Insect Pheromone*
C.A.S. NUMBER: 35898-62-5
FORMULA: *C₁₉H₃₈O*
CONSTRUCTION: Laminated PVC controlled release dispenser 1/32" X 3/32" to be aerially applied with an appropriate sticker

SECTION IV. PHYSICAL PROPERTIES

BULK DENSITY: <i>N/A</i>	SPECIFIC GRAVITY/25°C: <i>N/A</i>
MELTING POINT: <i>300°F</i>	BOILING POINT: <i>N/A</i>
FREEZING PT: <i>N/A</i>	pH: <i>N/A</i>
PERCENT VOLATILE by volume: <i>None specified</i>	
ODOR DESCRIPTION: <i>Mild</i>	VAPOR DENSITY (AIR = 1): <i>N/A</i>
VAPOR PRESSURE (20°C, mm HG): <i>Not determined</i>	SOLUBILITY IN WATER: <i>Insoluble</i>

SECTION V. PRODUCT HAZARD INFORMATION

PERCENT ACTIVE IN PRODUCT: 17.9%
OCCUPATIONAL EXPOSURE LIMITS: *Not established*
HEALTH/TOXICITY INFORMATION: *Toxicological properties of the active ingredient have been investigated: Oral LD50 (rat) >34,000 mg/kg. Dermal LD50 (rat) >2,025 mg/kg. Use appropriate procedures to prevent direct contact with skin or eyes and prevent inhalation. No significant toxicity is expected*
EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE: *None reported*

.....Continued

EMERGENCY AND FIRST AID PROCEDURES: *IF SWALLOWED: Have person sip a glass of water if able to swallow, Do not induce vomiting unless told by a poison control center or doctor. IF IN EYES: Hold eye open and rinse slowly and gently with water for 1520 minutes. Remove contact lenses, if present, after 5 minutes then continue rinsing. IF ONSKIN: Remove contaminated clothing Rinse skin immediately with plenty of water for 1520 minutes. IF INHALED: Move person to fresh air. If person is not breathing call 911 or an ambulance then give artificial respiration, preferably mouth to mouth. In all cases call a poison control center or doctor immediately for further treatment advice. Have the product container or label with you when calling a poison control center or doctor or going for treatment.*

SECTION VI. FIRE HAZARD INFORMATION

FLASH POINT: *N/A* FLAMMABLE LIMITS in air: *N/A*
EXTINGUISHING MEDIA: *Dry chemical, foam, water fog or sprayCarbon dioxide, foam*
SPECIAL FIRE FIGHTING PROCEDURES: *If involved in fire, use air-supplied equipment. Do not inhale fumes. Wear full protective equipment and NIOSH approved pressure demand, self contained breathing apparatus*
UNUSUAL FIRE AND EXPLOSION HAZARDS: *When burned the hazardous decomposition products that will result because of incomplete combustion include carbon monoxide, other unidentified products of hydrocarbon degradation, Nø low level cyanides and hydrogen chloride.*

SECTION VII. REACTIVITY INFORMATION

PRODUCT STABILITY: UNSTABLE _____ STABLE _____ X _____
HAZARDOUS POLYMERIZATION: May Occur _____ May Not Occur X _____
CONDITIONS TO AVOID: *Do not store near easily ignited chemicals and materials or open flames. MATERIAL TO AVOID: Strong oxidizing agents*
HAZARDOUS DECOMPOSITION PRODUCTS: *On combustion, the polymeric dispensers may produce CO,CO₂, HCL and CL₂.*

SECTION VIII. SPILL OR LEAK PROCEDURES

STEPS TO BE TAKEN IF MATERIAL IS RELEASED OR SPILLED: *Place unpouched product in tightly sealed containers. Keep out of water sources and sewers.*
WASTE DISPOSAL METHOD: *Incinerate or otherwise manage at RCRA permitted waste management facility. Do not reuse empty containers. Check state and local authorities for other options.*

SECTION IX. PERSONAL PROTECTION INFORMATION

RESPIRATORY PROTECTION: *Usually none required.*
EYE PROTECTION: *Usually none required*
VENTILATION: *Good general ventilation should be sufficient.*
PROTECTIVE GLOVES: *None required but vinyl, latex or rubber gloves recommended for*

.....Continued

continuous handling. OTHER PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT: None under normal usage.

NOTE: *Personal protection information shown above is based upon general information as to normal uses and conditions. Where special or unusual uses or conditions exist, it is suggested that the expert assistance of an industrial hygienist or other qualified professional be sought.*

SECTION X. HANDLING AND STORAGE PRECAUTIONS

GENERAL PRECAUTIONS TO BE TAKEN IN HANDLING AND STORAGE: *Store in sealed containers in a cool, dry place and away from open flames. To maintain product integrity protect from high temperatures. Keep container closed. Launder contaminated clothing before use. Wear protective equipment described above if exposure conditions warrant. Do not contaminate water sources, food or feed.*

SPECIAL PRECAUTIONARY CONDITIONS: *None.*

SECTION XI. TRANSPORTATION DATA

DOT LABEL: *None required, non-hazardous material.*

SECTION XII. DISCLAIMER

WARRANTY AND LIMITATION OF DAMAGES

Hercon Environmental warrants that this product conforms to the chemical description on the label and is reasonably fit for the purposes stated on the label when used in accordance with the Directions for Use under normal conditions of use to the extent allowed by state law. Hercon neither makes, nor authorizes any agent or representative to make any other warranty of fitness or of merchantability, guarantee or representation, expressed or implied concerning this material except as stated above. This warranty does not extend to the use of this product contrary to the label instructions, or under abnormal use conditions, or under conditions not reasonably foreseeable to Hercon Environmental. If this product is defective, Buyer's exclusive remedy shall be the replacement of the product, or if replacement is impracticable as determined by Hercon, refund of the purchase price. To the extent allowable by law, Hercon's maximum liability for breach of this warranty shall not exceed the purchase price of this product. In no case will Hercon be liable for incidental, consequential or special damages resulting from handling, storage, use, misuse or abuse of this product.

MSDS NUMBER 100306 DATE ISSUED: 17 Sept. 1986 (LZ)
BY: Priscilla MacLean DATE REVISED: 30, Jan. 2006,
TITLE: Product Development Manager Replaces 11 Mar. 2005



1. PRODUCT AND COMPANY IDENTIFICATION

Product name: GELVA® MULTIPOLYMER EMULSION 2333

Reference Number: 000000000485

Date: 09/14/2005

Company Information:

United States:

Cytec Surface Specialties Inc.
1950 Lake Park Drive
Smyrna, GA 30080
Emergency telephone: CHEMTREC: 1-800-424-9300
For Product Information call: 1-800-652-6013 or 1-973-357-3193

Canada:

Surface Specialties Canada Inc.
Garner Road, P.O. Box 240
Niagara Falls, Ontario, Canada L2E 6T4
Emergency telephone: 1-905-356-8310
For Product Information call: 1-800-652-6013 or 1-973-357-3193

Mexico/Latin America:

Cytec de Mexico S.A. de C.V.
KM. 40 Carretera Guadalajara-La Barca
Atequiza, Jalisco, Mexico C.P. 45860
Emergency telephone:
In Mexico: 01-(376)-737-0004
Outside Mexico: (52)-(376)-737-0004
For Product Information call:
In Mexico: 01-(555)-531-6771
Outside Mexico: (52)- (555)-531-6771

Brazil:

Especialidades para Superfícies Ltda.
Avenue Jorge Bei Maluf,
2105 Vila Teodoro
CEP 08686-000 Suzano, SP, Brasil
Emergency telephone: (52)-(376)-737-0004
For Product Information call: (55)-11-4745-8569

2. COMPOSITION/INFORMATION ON INGREDIENTS

<u>Components</u>	<u>CAS No.</u>	<u>Average concentration</u>	<u>Concentration range</u>	<u>Units (wt./wt.)</u>
¹ acrylic copolymer			>=48.0 - <=53.0	%
water	7732-18-5		>=42.0 - <=47.0	%
vinyl acetate	108-05-4		<0.05	%

¹ The specific chemical identity (including CAS No.) and/or concentration is being withheld because it is trade secret.

3. HAZARDS IDENTIFICATION

EMERGENCY OVERVIEW

Form: viscous, liquid
Colour: white
Odour: acrid

WARNING STATEMENTS

No significant hazards associated with this material

POTENTIAL HEALTH EFFECTS

Likely routes of exposure: eye and skin contact
inhalation

Eye contact: No more than slightly irritating to eyes.

Skin contact: No more than slightly irritating to skin.
No more than slightly toxic if absorbed.

Inhalation: No more than slightly irritating
No more than slightly toxic if inhaled.

Ingestion: No more than slightly toxic if swallowed.
Significant adverse health effects are not expected to develop if only small amounts (less than a mouthful) are swallowed.

Refer to Section 11 for toxicological information.

4. FIRST AID MEASURES

If in eyes: Immediate first aid is not likely to be required.
This material should be removed with water.

If on skin: Immediate first aid is not likely to be required.
This material can be removed with water.
Wash heavily contaminated clothing before reuse.

If inhaled: Immediate first aid is not likely to be required.
If symptoms occur, remove to fresh air.
Remove material from eyes, skin and clothing.

If swallowed: Immediate first aid is not likely to be required.
A physician or Poison Control Center can be contacted for advice.
Wash heavily contaminated clothing before reuse.

5. FIRE FIGHTING MEASURES

Flash point: Non flammable aqueous solution

Hazardous products of combustion: carbon dioxide; carbon monoxide (CO); smoke; soot

Extinguishing media: Water spray, foam, dry chemical, or carbon dioxide

Unusual fire and explosion hazards: None known

Fire fighting equipment: Firefighters, and others exposed, wear self-contained breathing apparatus.
Equipment should be thoroughly decontaminated after use.

6. ACCIDENTAL RELEASE MEASURES

Personal precautions: Use personal protection recommended in section 8.

Environmental precautions: Keep out of drains and water courses.

Methods for cleaning up: Contain large spills with dikes and transfer the material to appropriate containers for reclamation or disposal. Absorb remaining material or small spills with an inert material and then place in a chemical waste container. Flush spill area with water.

Refer to Section 13 for disposal information and Sections 14 and 15 for reportable quantity information.

7. HANDLING AND STORAGE

Handling

Handle in accordance with good industrial hygiene and safety practices.

These practices include avoiding unnecessary exposure and removal of material from eyes, skin and clothing.

Emptied containers retain vapour and product residue. Observe all recommended safety precautions until container is cleaned, reconditioned or destroyed. The reuse of this material's container for non-industrial purposes is prohibited and any reuse must be in consideration of the data provided in this material safety data sheet.

Storage

Temperature: 10 - 32 °C

General: Freeze sensitive.
After prolonged storage (greater than 6 months) products tends to settle and may require agitation to redisperse.
Stable under normal conditions of handling and storage.

8. EXPOSURE CONTROLS/PERSONAL PROTECTION

Eye protection: Does not cause significant eye irritation or eye toxicity requiring special protection.
Use good industrial practice to avoid eye contact.

Hand protection: Although this product does not present a significant skin concern, minimize skin contamination by following good industrial practice.
Wearing protective gloves is recommended.
Consult the glove/clothing manufacturer to determine the appropriate type

glove/clothing for a given application.

Body protection: Although this product does not present a significant skin concern, minimize skin contamination by following good industrial practice.
Wash contaminated skin thoroughly after handling.

Respiratory protection: This material is not likely to present an airborne exposure concern under normal conditions of use.
Avoid breathing vapour or mist.
Use approved respiratory protection equipment when airborne exposure limits are exceeded.
Consult the respirator manufacturer to determine the appropriate type of equipment for a given application.
Observe respirator use limitations specified by the manufacturer.

Ventilation: Provide natural or mechanical ventilation to control exposure levels below airborne exposure limits.
If practical, use local mechanical exhaust ventilation at sources of air contamination such as processing equipment.

Airborne exposure limits: (ml/m³ = ppm)

**GELVA®
MULTIPOLYMER
EMULSION 2333** No specific occupational exposure limit has been established.

vinyl acetate ACGIH TLV: 10 ml/m³ ; ; 8-hr TWA
ACGIH TLV: 15 ml/m³ ; ; 15-min STEL
A3: The ACGIH has designated this component as an "A3" substance thereby including it among substances that are confirmed animal carcinogens with unknown relevance to humans.
OSHA PEL: 10 ml/m³ ; ; 8-hr TWA
OSHA PEL: 20 ml/m³ ; ; 15-min STEL
Mexican OEL: 10 ml/m³ ; 30 mg/m³ ; ; 8-hr TWA
Mexican OEL: 20 ml/m³ ; 60 mg/m³ ; ; 15-min STEL

Components referred to herein may be regulated by specific Canadian provincial legislation. Please refer to exposure limits legislated for the province in which the substance will be used.

9. PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL PROPERTIES

Specific gravity: 1.01 @ 25 °C

pH: 4.5 - 5.5

Boiling point : 100 °C
Water solubility: completely miscible

Viscosity : 300 - 700 mPa.s @ 25 °C

NOTE: These physical data are typical values based on material tested but may vary from sample to sample. Typical values should not be construed as a guaranteed analysis of any specific lot or as specifications for the product.

10. STABILITY AND REACTIVITY

Conditions to avoid:	Do not expose to extreme temperatures.
Materials to avoid - Hazardous reactions:	None known Hazardous polymerization does not occur.
Hazardous decomposition products:	None known;

11. TOXICOLOGICAL INFORMATION

This product has been tested for toxicity. Results from Cytec sponsored studies or from the available public literature are described below.

Acute animal toxicity data

Oral:	LD50 , rat, > 5,000 mg/kg , Practically nontoxic following oral administration.
Dermal:	LD50 , rabbit, > 5,000 mg/kg , Practically nontoxic after skin application in animal studies.
Eye irritation:	rabbit , Practically non irritating to eyes (rabbit), 24 h
Skin irritation:	rabbit , Practically non irritating to skin (rabbit), 4 h rabbit , Practically non irritating to skin (rabbit), 24 h
Skin sensitization:	Human experience , These materials demonstrated a potential for cumulative irritation but primary irritation and allergic skin reactions were not observed. Data obtained on similar product.
Mutagenicity:	No genetic effects were observed in standard tests using bacterial and animal cells. Data obtained on similar product.

Components

Data from Cytec studies and/or the available scientific literature on the components of this material which have been identified as hazardous chemicals under the criteria of the OSHA Hazard Communication Standard (29 CFR 1910.1200) or the Canadian Hazardous Products Act are discussed below.

vinyl acetate	Irritating to eyes, skin and respiratory tract. Can cause blisters. Can cause injury to the eyes. Slightly toxic following oral administration. Practically nontoxic after skin application in animal studies. Slightly toxic based on animal inhalation exposure studies. No adverse effects noted following repeated oral administration.
---------------	---

Repeated inhalation exposure produced changes to the lungs in animal models.
This material produced tumours in laboratory animals.
Listed as "possibly carcinogenic to humans" (Group 2B) by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC).
No birth defects were noted in rats given the active ingredient orally during pregnancy.
This material impaired fertility of laboratory animals below dose levels toxic to parental animals.
The weight of the evidence indicates that this material is mutagenic in in vitro assays.

12. ECOLOGICAL INFORMATION

This product has not been tested for environmental toxicity or biodegradation, but data obtained on a similar products are summarised below :

Environmental Toxicity:

Invertebrates	48 h, EC50	Water flea (Daphnia magna)	> 1000 mg/l
Fish:	96 h, LC50	Bluegill sunfish (Lepomis macrochirus)	> 1000 mg/l
	96 h, LC50	Rainbow trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)	> 1000 mg/l

13. DISPOSAL CONSIDERATIONS

US EPA RCRA Status: This material when discarded is not a hazardous waste as that term is defined by the Resource, Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), 40 CFR 261.

Disposal considerations: Incineration
Recycle

Miscellaneous advice: Local, state, provincial, and national disposal regulations may be more or less stringent. Consult your attorney or appropriate regulatory officials for information on such disposal.
This product should not be dumped, spilled, rinsed or washed into sewers or public waterways.

14. TRANSPORT INFORMATION

The data provided in this section is for information only. Please apply the appropriate regulations to properly classify your shipment for transportation.

US DOT

Other: NOT REGULATED FOR TRANSPORT.

Canadian TDG

Other: NOT REGULATED FOR TRANSPORT.

15. REGULATORY INFORMATION

Product name: GELVA® MULTIPOLYMER EMULSION 2333
Cytec Material Safety Data Sheet
Reference Number: 00000000485

Page 7 / 8
Date: 09/14/2005
Version 1.3/E

All components are in compliance with the following inventories: U.S. TSCA, Canadian DSL, EU EINECS, Australian AICS, Japanese ENCS, Phillipine PICCS, Chinese

Other chemical inventory information: The polymer contained within this product is exempt from listing in the European Inventory. The monomers used to manufacture this polymer are listed as required, as are all other components of this product.

Canadian WHMIS classification: Not Controlled

SARA Hazard Notification:

Hazard Categories Under Title III Rules (40 CFR 370): Not applicable

Section 302 Extremely Hazardous Substances: vinyl acetate

Section 313 Toxic Chemical(s): vinyl acetate

CERCLA Reportable Quantity:

5,000 lb vinyl acetate

For this/these chemicals, release of more than the Reportable Quantity to the environment in a 24 hour period requires notification to the National Response Center (800-424-8802 or 202-426-2675).

This product has been classified in accordance with the hazard criteria of the Canadian Controlled Products Regulation and the MSDS contains all the information required by the Canadian Controlled Products Regulation.

Refer to Section 11 for OSHA/HPA Hazardous Chemical(s) and Section 13 for RCRA classification.

Safety data sheet also created in accordance with Brazilian law NBR 14725

16. OTHER INFORMATION

Product use: Adhesive, binding agents

Reason for revision: Company name change.

	Health	Fire	Reactivity	Additional Information
Suggested NFPA Rating	1	0	0	
Suggested HMIS Rating:	1	0	0	B

Prepared by the Cytec Surface Specialties Product Stewardship Group. Please contact us @ 1-800-433-2873 if further information is needed. See page header for date of preparation.

® indicates trademark registered in the United States. Outside the United States, mark may be registered, pending or a trademark. Mark is or may be used under license. TM indicates trademark. Mark may be registered or pending. Mark is or may be used under license.

Although the information and recommendations set forth herein (hereinafter "Information") are presented

Product name: GELVA® MULTIPOLYMER EMULSION 2333
Cytec Material Safety Data Sheet
Reference Number: 00000000485

Page 8 / 8
Date: 09/14/2005
Version 1.3/E

in good faith and believed to be correct as of the date hereof, no representations as to the completeness or accuracy thereof is made. Information is supplied upon the condition that the persons receiving same will make their own determination as to its suitability for their purposes prior to use. NO REPRESENTATIONS OR WARRANTIES, EITHER EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, OF MERCHANTABILITY, FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE OR OF ANY OTHER NATURE ARE MADE HEREUNDER WITH RESPECT TO INFORMATION OR THE PRODUCT TO WHICH INFORMATION REFERS.