

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

COPYRIGHT PERMISSION PAGE

EFFECTS OF MIMIC® BIOINSECTICIDE ON THE SPECIES
DIVERSITY OF NON-TARGET FOREST LEPIDOPTERA IN AN
OPERATIONAL SPRUCE BUDWORM (LEPIDOPTERA:
TORTRICIDAE: *Choristoneura fumiferana* Clem.) SUPPRESSION
PROGRAM IN NORTHWESTERN MANITOBA

BY

Diana E. Saunders

A Thesis/Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of The University
of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree
of
Master of Science

Diana E. Saunders © 2003

Permission has been granted to the Library of The University of Manitoba to lend or sell copies of this thesis/practicum, to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and to University Microfilm Inc. to publish an abstract of this thesis/practicum.

This reproduction or copy of this thesis has been made available by authority of the copyright owner solely for the purpose of private study and research, and may only be reproduced and copied as permitted by copyright laws or with express written authorization from the copyright owner.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Richard Westwood for his patience and guidance throughout this study. I would like to thank the members of my thesis committee, Dr. Neil Holliday, Dr. Bill Remphrey, and Keith Knowles for their assistance and support.

I am grateful to Manitoba Conservation for supplying maps and important information about the study area and the spray program and for providing me with staff to help in some of the fieldwork and for providing my staff and me a place to stay during the field seasons. I would also like to extend my thanks to all my field assistants: Monika Thiessen, Debra Wytrykush, Brin Jones, and Jeff Shaddock, Joe Ackerman, and Heather Tomkins.

The funding for this project was funded by Dow Agrochemicals (Rohm and Haas), Manitoba Hydro and Manitoba Conservation.

Abstract

Saunders, D. E., B.Sc., M.Sc., The University of Manitoba, 2003

Effects of Mimic® Bioinsecticide on the Species Diversity of Non-target Lepidoptera in an Operational Spruce Budworm (Lepidoptera: Tortricidae: *Choristoneura fumiferana* Clemens) Suppression Program in Northwestern Manitoba.

Major Professor: A.R. Westwood

A new biochemical insecticide, Mimic® (Dow Agrochemicals), has recently been registered in Canada for the control of lepidopteran defoliators in forest ecosystems. The active ingredient, tebufenozide, mimics the insect molting hormone, 20-hydroxyecdysone, in larvae of some species of Lepidoptera inducing a premature molt, causing death. To date there has been only one published study on the effects of an operational spray program that has addressed the effects of Mimic® on non-target Lepidoptera in hardwood forest, and none in the boreal forest. Butler *et al.* (1997) found significant reductions in richness and abundance of non-target, larval macrolepidoptera of a hardwood forest following Mimic® application for control of gypsy moth, *Lymantria dispar* (L.). In 1999 and 2000, Manitoba Conservation applied Mimic® to areas of the boreal forest in northwestern Manitoba as part of an operational spruce budworm suppression program. In 2000 and 2001, moths and larvae were collected from twelve study sites within the spray area to determine the effect of Mimic® on spruce budworm and non-target Lepidoptera. Three 70 m² plots were within

spray blocks sprayed once with 70g AI in 2.0 L/ha in June of 1999; three 70 m² were within spray blocks sprayed once in June of 2000 and six were in unsprayed areas. Variables measured within the study sites included percent defoliation for 1999 and 2000, spruce budworm larvae per 45-cm branch, spruce budworm adults, number of understory larvae, number of macrolepidoptera moths, and moth species richness, log series alpha diversity, evenness, and Berger-Parker dominance. A total of 178 macrolepidoptera species were collected in Luminoc® light traps over two field seasons, with 36 species making up 75% of the total catch and being considered common to both sprayed and unsprayed sites. Mimic® significantly reduced spruce budworm populations in sprayed plots versus unsprayed plots. Significant spray effects on number of moths and species richness were found at one year post spray for those sites sprayed in 1999. There were no significant spray effects on non-target Lepidoptera species diversity in either year of the study. Even spray plots that appeared to have been sprayed more effectively did not have significantly lower numbers of moths, species richness or diversity than the unsprayed plots. While 36 of the common non-target species appeared unaffected, two species from the Family Arctiidae and one from the Family Geometridae were consistently less abundant in sprayed plots in both sampling seasons 2000 and 2001. These results, along with Butler's (1997) study, indicate that aerial applications of this insecticide may have a negative impact on certain non-target lepidopteran species but not on overall diversity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	x
LIST OF APPENDICES	xiv
CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II - LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 - Boreal Forest Characteristics	4
2.2 - Spruce Budworm	5
2.2.1 - Outbreaks	7
2.3 - Spruce Budworm Management	9
2.4 - Lepidoptera	13
2.4.1 - Non-target Impacts	16
2.5 - Methods of Community Analysis	
2.5.1 - Diversity	16
2.5.2 - Diversity Measures	17
2.6 - Ordination Analysis	19
2.6.1 - Principal Components Analysis	20
2.6.2 - Redundancy Analysis	21
CHAPTER III - MATERIALS AND METHODS	
3.1 - General Study Area Description	22
3.2 - Experimental Design	23
3.3 - Plot Description	24
3.4 - Spray Treatment	25

3.5 - Vegetation Sampling	25
3.6 - Measurement of Environmental Variables	
3.6.1 - Light Intensity	26
3.6.2 - Temperature and Precipitation	26
3.7 - Lepidoptera Sampling	27
3.7.1 - Adult Sampling - Luminoc Light Traps	27
- Adult Sampling - Ward's Light Traps	28
3.7.2 - Spray Efficacy Data - Spruce Budworm Canopy and Defoliation Assessments	30
3.7.3 - Lepidoptera Larva Sampling From Understorey Vegetation	31
3.8 - Data Analysis	
3.8.1 - Vegetation and Light	32
3.8.2 - Moths	32
CHAPTER IV - RESULTS	
4.1 - Vegetation Abundance and Diversity	44
4.1.1 - Herbaceous Vegetation	45
4.1.2 - Shrubs	45
4.1.3 - Trees	46
4.2 - Principal Components Analysis of Vegetation	
4.2.1 - Herbaceous Vegetation	47
4.2.2 - Shrubs	48
4.2.3 - Trees	49
4.3 - Redundancy Analysis - Vegetation Species and Environmental Variables	49
4.4 - Environmental Variables	
4.4.1 - Light Intensity	51
4.4.2 - Temperature and Precipitation	51
4.5 - Spray Efficacy Results	
4.5.1 - Spruce Budworm Larvae and Canopy Defoliation Assessments	51
4.5.2 - Spruce Budworm Adults	53
4.6 - Non-target Adult Moths	
4.6.1 - Number of Moths	
4.6.1.1 - Luminoc Light Traps	53
4.6.1.2 - Ward's Light Traps	55
4.6.2 - Species Richness	
4.6.2.1 - Luminoc Light Traps	56
4.6.2.2 - Ward's Light Traps	56

4.6.3 - Adult Moth Diversity	
4.6.3.1 - Luminoc Light Traps	56
4.6.3.2 - Ward's Light Traps	57
4.7 - Repeated Measures Analysis	57
4.7.1 - Spruce Budworm Adults	57
4.7.2 - Non-target Moths Excluding Spruce Budworm	58
4.8 - Understorey Larvae	
4.8.1 - Number of Understorey Larvae	58
4.8.2 - Percent Reduction of Understorey Larvae	59
4.9 - Individual Adult Moth Species Responses	59
4.10 - Ordination Analysis of Adult Moths from Luminoc Trap Data	
4.10.1 - Principal Components Analysis	
4.10.1.1 - 2000	61
4.10.1.2 - 2001	63
4.10.2 - Redundancy Analysis of Adult Moths With Treatment Variables	
4.10.2.1 - 2000	64
4.10.2.2 - 2001	65
4.10.3 - Adult Moths with Environmental Variables	
4.10.3.1 - 2000	67
4.10.3.2 - 2001	69
4.10.4 - Moths with Vegetation Species as Environmental Variables	
4.10.4.1 - Herbs 2000	70
4.10.4.2 - Herbs 2001	71
4.10.4.3 - Shrubs 2000	72
4.10.4.4 - Shrubs 2001	73
4.10.4.5 - Trees 2000	74
4.10.4.6 - Trees 2001	75
CHAPTER V - DISCUSSION	
5.1 - Limitations	170
5.2 - Plot Similarity	172
5.3 - Spray Effect on Spruce Budworm	174
5.4 - Spray Effect on Non-target Lepidoptera	175
5.3.1 - Adults	175
5.3.2 - Understorey Larvae	179
5.3.3 - Scarce Moth Species	180
5.5 - Future Considerations	181
CONCLUSIONS	183
LITERATURE CITED	185
APPENDICES	199

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Plot locations and spray dates.	42
Table 2.	Collection dates (2000) for each plot using Ward's Light traps.	43
Table 3.	Dominant vegetation species per plot. Species are listed in descending order of dominance for each plot.	77
Table 4.	ANOVA of the effect of plot type on environmental and vegetation variables plus GLM contrasts between unsprayed and SP1999 plots & unsprayed and SP2000 plots.	79
Table 5.	Spruce budworm adults collected from light traps in 2000 & 2001, spruce budworm larvae collected from mid-canopy in 2001, and defoliation assessments for 1999 and 2000.	80
Table 6.	ANOVA of the effect of plot type plus GLM contrasts between unsprayed and SP1999 plots & unsprayed and SP2000 plots on spruce budworm adult and larval collections and defoliation assessments.	81
Table 7.	Assessment of spruce budworm aerial spray program in northwestern Manitoba in 1999 and 2000.	82
Table 8.	Most frequently caught moth species in Luminoc light traps, defined as those species with a sum total equal to or greater than 1% of the total for the year.	83
Table 9.	Dominant moth species in 2000 and 2001 light trap catches for each site.	88
Table 10.	Luminoc light trap moth ANOVA. Spruce budworm excluded.	90
Table 11.	Luminoc light trap moth ANOVA. Spruce budworm included.	91
Table 12.	Most frequently caught moth species in Ward's light traps, defined as the sum total equal to or greater than 1% of the total for each year.	92
Table 13.	Ward's light trap moth data ANOVA. Spruce budworm excluded.	95
Table 14.	Ward's light trap moth data ANOVA. Spruce budworm included.	96
Table 15.	Repeated measures analysis for number of SBW adults collected from Luminocs.	97
Table 16.	Repeated measures analysis for Luminoc trap data excluding spruce budworm:	
16A	Number of Moths	98

16B	Number of Moth Species	99
16C	Log Series Alpha Diversity	100
16D	Evenness	101
16E	Berger-Parker Dominance	102
Table 17.	Understorey larvae ANOVA.	103
Table 18.	Mean totals and % reduction for understorey larvae for all plots.	104
Table 19.	Percent change of the 37 most frequently caught moth species from Luminoc and Ward's trap data, 2000 and 2001.	105
Table 20.	Location and larval period information for the 37 most frequently caught species for Luminoc traps in 2000 and 2001.	107

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.	Schematic representation of experimental design.	37
Figure 2.	Study area in northwestern Manitoba.	38
Figure 3.	Luminoc light trap.	39
Figure 4.	Plot layout.	40
Figure 5.	Ward's bucket light trap.	41
Figure 6.	PCA ordination diagram of the most common tree species in 12 plots with plot scores and species scores. Species data $\log(x + 0.1)$ transformed.	110
Figure 7.	PCA ordination diagram of the most common shrub species in 12 plots with plot scores and species scores. Species data $\log(x + 0.1)$ transformed.	112
Figure 8.	PCA ordination diagram of the most common herb species in 12 plots with plot scores and species scores. Species data $\log(x + 0.1)$ transformed.	114
Figure 9.	RDA ordination diagram (axes 1 and 3) of the most common herbaceous species and environmental data in 12 plots with plot scores, species scores, and continuous environmental variables. Species data $\log(x + 0.1)$ transformed.	116
Figure 10.	PCA ordination diagram of all non-target moth species and <i>C. fumiferana</i> from Luminoc® traps in 12 plots (2000) with plot scores and species scores.	118
Figure 11.	PCA ordination diagram (Axes 1 & 2) of the 36 most frequently caught non-target moth species and <i>C. fumiferana</i> from Luminoc® traps in 12 plots (2000) with plot scores and species scores. <i>Choristoneura fumiferana</i> and <i>Nepytia canosaria</i> are removed from the	120
Figure 12.	PCA ordination diagram (Axes 1 & 3) of the 36 most frequently caught non-target moth species and <i>C. fumiferana</i> from Luminoc® traps in 12 plots (2000) with plot scores and species scores. <i>Choristoneura fumiferana</i> and <i>Nepytia canosaria</i> are removed from the	122
Figure 13.	PCA ordination diagram of the 36 most frequently caught non-target moth species and <i>C. fumiferana</i> from Luminoc® traps in 12 plots (2001) with plot scores and species scores.	124
Figure 14.	PCA ordination diagram (Axes 1 & 2) of the most frequently caught non-target moth species and <i>C. fumiferana</i> from Luminoc® traps in 12 plots (2001) with plot scores and species scores. <i>C. fumiferana</i> and <i>N. canosaria</i> were removed from the ordination and do n	126

- Figure 15. PCA ordination diagram (Axes 1 & 3) of the most frequently caught non-target moth species and *C. fumiferana* from Luminoc® traps in 12 plots (2001) with plot scores and species scores. *C. fumiferana* and *N. canosaria* were removed from the ordination and do not
128
- Figure 16. RDA ordination diagram of the 36 most frequently caught non-target moth species and *C. fumiferana* from Luminoc® traps in 12 plots (2000) and treatment variables with plot scores, species scores, and nominal variables. 130
- Figure 17. RDA ordination diagram of the 36 most frequently caught non-target moth species and *C. fumiferana* from Luminoc® traps in 12 plots (2000) and treatment variables with plot scores, species scores, and nominal variables. *C. fumiferana* and *N. canosaria* were removed
132
- Figure 18. RDA ordination diagram of the 36 most frequently caught non-target moth species and *C. fumiferana* from Luminoc® traps in 12 plots (2001) and treatment variables with plot scores, species scores, and nominal variables. 134
- Figure 19. RDA ordination diagram of the 36 most frequently caught non-target moth species and *C. fumiferana* from Luminoc® traps in 12 plots (2001) and treatment variables with plot scores, species scores, and nominal variables. *C. fumiferana* and *N. canosaria* were removed
136
- Figure 20. RDA ordination diagram of the 36 most frequently caught non-target moth species and *C. fumiferana* from Luminoc® traps in 12 plots (2000) and environmental variables with plot scores, species scores, and continuous environmental variables. 138
- Figure 21. RDA ordination diagram of the 36 most frequently caught non-target moth species and *C. fumiferana* from Luminoc® traps in 12 plots (2000) and environmental variables with plot scores, species scores, and continuous environmental variables. *C. fumiferana* and
140
- Figure 22. RDA ordination diagram of the 36 most frequently caught non-target moth species and *C. fumiferana* from Luminoc® traps in 12 plots (2001) and environmental variables with plot scores, species scores, and continuous environmental variables. 142
- Figure 23. RDA ordination diagram of the 36 most frequently caught non-target moth species and *C. fumiferana* from Luminoc® traps in 12 plots (2001) and environmental variables with plot scores, species scores, and continuous environmental variables. *C. fumiferana* and
144
- Figure 24. RDA ordination diagram of the most frequently caught non-target moth species and *C. fumiferana* from Luminoc® traps in 12 plots (2000) and tree species with plot scores, species scores, and tree species variables. 146

- Figure 25. RDA ordination diagram of the most frequently caught non-target moth species and *C. fumiferana* from Luminoc® traps in 12 plots (2000) and tree species with plot scores, species scores, and tree species variables. *C. fumiferana* and *N. canosaria* were remove 148
- Figure 26. RDA ordination diagram of the most frequently caught non-target moth species and *C. fumiferana* from Luminoc® traps in 12 plots (2001) and tree species with plot scores, species scores, and tree species variables. 150
- Figure 27. RDA ordination diagram of the most frequently caught non-target moth species and *C. fumiferana* from Luminoc® traps in 12 plots (2001) and tree species with plot scores, species scores, and tree species variables. *C. fumiferana* and *N. canosaria* were remove 152
- Figure 28. RDA ordination diagram of the most frequently caught non-target moth species and *C. fumiferana* from Luminoc® traps in 12 plots (2000) and shrub species with plot scores, species scores, and shrub species variables. 154
- Figure 29. RDA ordination diagram of the most frequently caught non-target moth species and *C. fumiferana* from Luminoc® traps in 12 plots (2000) and shrub species with plot scores, species scores, and shrub species variables. *C. fumiferana* and *N. canosaria* were rem 156
- Figure 30. RDA ordination diagram of the most frequently caught non-target moth species and *C. fumiferana* from Luminoc® traps in 12 plots (2001) and shrub species with plot scores, species scores, and shrub species variables. 158
- Figure 31. RDA ordination diagram of the most frequently caught non-target moth species and *C. fumiferana* from Luminoc® traps in 12 plots (2001) and shrub species with plot scores, species scores, and shrub species variables. *C. fumiferana* and *N. canosaria* were rem 160
- Figure 32. RDA ordination diagram of the most frequently caught non-target moth species and *C. fumiferana* from Luminoc® traps in 12 plots (2000) and herbaceous species with plot scores, species scores, and herb species variables. 162
- Figure 33. RDA ordination diagram of the most frequently caught non-target moth species and *C. fumiferana* from Luminoc® traps in 12 plots (2000) and herbaceous species with plot scores, species scores, and herb species variables. *C. fumiferana* and *N. canosaria* were 164

- Figure 34. RDA ordination diagram of the most frequently caught non-target moth species and *C. fumiferana* from Luminoc® traps in 12 plots (2001) and herbaceous species with plot scores, species scores, and herb species variables. 166
- Figure 35. RDA ordination diagram of the most frequently caught non-target moth species and *C. fumiferana* from Luminoc® traps in 12 plots (2001) and herbaceous species with plot scores, species scores, and herb species variables. *C. fumiferana* and *N. canosaria* were 168
- 170

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix I. Species list of herbaceous and shrub vegetation percent cover and tree density.	203
Appendix II. A) Tree abundance and composition, B) Tree height, DBH, age for all species.	206
Appendix III. Complete species list of moths collected by light traps in 2000 and 2001. Species are listed in decreasing order of abundance.	207

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Large scale aerial spraying of insecticides to control defoliating caterpillar pests (e.g. spruce budworm, *Choristoneura fumiferana* (Clemens); jack pine budworm, *Choristoneura pinus* Freeman; and forest tent caterpillar, *Malacosoma disstria* Hübner) in Canada's forests has been used as a management tool to slow the spread of these pests and to prevent tree mortality for over five decades (Armstrong & Ives 1995). In Manitoba, insecticides have been employed to protect commercial timber supplies, preserve parks and natural areas from large-scale tree mortality, and to protect areas used for recreation and cottage subdivisions.

A new biochemical insecticide, Mimic® (Dow Agrochemicals), has recently been registered in Canada for the control of lepidopteran defoliators in forest ecosystems. Mimic® has been tested in Manitoba since the mid 1990s and the first large scale commercial applications began in Manitoba in 1997. Over 100,000 hectares of forest have been experimentally and operationally sprayed with Mimic® in Manitoba since 1994 and the product has also been applied under experimental permits in other provinces during the last several years. Manitoba is the only area in Canada with sufficient Mimic® usage to date to carry out an intensive investigation on the non-target effects of this product when used at a commercial scale. In 1999 and 2000, Manitoba Conservation applied

Mimic® to areas of the boreal forest in northwestern Manitoba as part of an operational spruce budworm suppression program.

The use of Mimic® is part of a trend that began in the late 1970s and early 1980s to move away from broad-spectrum synthetic insecticides, which killed a wide variety of forest insects, to narrow spectrum biologically based products, which are more pest specific and environmentally acceptable (Armstrong & Ives 1995). By the mid 1980s, *Bacillus thuringiensis* Berliner var. *kurstaki* (Btk), a naturally occurring insect bacterium, had replaced synthetic insecticide use to suppress defoliating caterpillars in Canadian forests (Bendall *et al.* 1986; Miller 1990; Miller 1992; Nealis *et al.* 1992; Otvos & Vanderveen 1993; van Frankenhuyzen 1993; Barber *et al.* 1995). By 1996, Btk was the only product registered in Canada for aerial application to suppress defoliating forest pests (Westwood 1997, 1998). Past performance of Btk has been erratic in certain instances across Canada and there have been ongoing efforts to increase its reliability and to search for more efficacious products with a similar narrow spectrum of activity (Westwood 1997, 1998).

The active ingredient in Mimic®, tebufenozide, mimics the insect molting hormone, 20-hydroxyecdysone, in some larval insects and induces a premature molt. It appears to provide higher levels of pest insect control than *Btk*, and thus provides better protection to trees (Retnakaran 1995; Westwood 1997; Westwood 1998). In Canada, Mimic® has been tested mostly against spruce budworm and proved to be very effective (Smagghe & Degheele 1994).

Mimic's® narrow spectrum of activity make it an attractive alternative to other insecticides for forest insect pest suppression. However, limited studies have indicated that susceptible non-target Lepidoptera species might also be adversely affected. The widespread use of tebufenozide in the suppression of spruce budworm and other forest insect defoliators could lead to undesirable ecological effects. In forests, indiscriminate reduction of immature Lepidoptera could have a detrimental effect on trophic pathways and food chains.

Unlike Btk, there have been relatively few attempts to document the effects of tebufenozide on non-target lepidopteran communities under field conditions. Morris *et al.* (1975), Miller (1990, 1992), Sample *et al.* (1993), and Johnson *et al.* (1995) have all reported significant reductions in both species abundance and richness of non-target Lepidoptera following applications of Btk.

Only one published study has addressed effects of Mimic® on non-target Lepidoptera. Butler *et al.* (1997) found significant reductions in richness and abundance of non-target, canopy-dwelling larval macrolepidoptera of a hardwood forest following Mimic® application for control of gypsy moth, *Lymantria dispar* (L.). It is essential that the effect of Mimic® on non-target lepidopteran diversity in the boreal forest be carefully analyzed and understood. No study has been published to date that examines the effects of Mimic® (when applied under operational conditions) on non-target moths in Canada's northern boreal forest. This study tests the null hypothesis that Mimic application does not reduce species diversity of non-target moths in sprayed areas of boreal forest when compared with unsprayed areas.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 - Boreal Forest Characteristics

The boreal forest covers over 2.6×10^6 km² in Canada forming a continuous, primarily coniferous belt from Newfoundland and Labrador to the Rocky Mountains and Alaska (Danks & Footitt 1989). In the boreal forest of northwestern Manitoba, the summers are short and warm and the winters long and cold, with an annual mean temperature of 0 °C; a mean summer temperature (June to August) of 16 °C; and a mean winter temperature (September to May) of -5.5 °C (Environment Canada, 2003). The growing season is short with approximately 157 frost-free days accumulated between June and September. The average annual precipitation is approximately 46 cm, with approximately 21 cm in rain between June and August and approximately 15 cm in snowfall (Environment Canada, 2003).

There is heterogeneity at the local scale of vegetation and this variation recurs consistently throughout the boreal forest (Danks & Footitt 1989) creating a considerably diverse ecosystem (Graham & Jain 1998).

Disturbance is increasingly recognized as the driving ecological force in all forest ecosystems (Pickett & White 1985) leading to and maintaining variation, especially in boreal ecosystems (Shugart *et al.* 1995). Barnes *et al.* (1998, p. 410) interpret a disturbance as "any relatively discrete event in time that disrupts

ecosystems, their composition, structure, and function". Disturbances, such as fire, insect outbreaks and disease, are natural factors in the boreal forest whose effects in disrupting forest stand structure have long been incorporated in species' adaptations and ecosystem dynamics (Sousa 1984).

In the boreal forest a vegetation mosaic leading to plant and animal diversity is primarily the result of wildfires burning over diverse plots (Bonan & Shugart 1989). Wildfires play an important role in shaping the structure and composition of boreal forests creating a mosaic of conditions that allow a mixture of uneven-aged tree species to thrive (Graham & Jain 1998).

In some areas of the boreal forest, fire frequency is low and *C. fumiferana* (spruce budworm) outbreaks are considered the most important disturbance. In the last 70 years in Canada, 48% of the boreal forest was disturbed by fire, 39% by insects (mainly spruce budworm in eastern Canada) and 10% by logging (Bergeron *et al.* 1998). Fires (Payette 1992) and outbreaks of spruce budworm (Bergeron *et al.* 1998) are widespread disturbances in the eastern Canadian boreal forest. These disturbance regimes are not independent, and changes in one regime can affect the others (Bergeron *et al.* 1995).

2.2 - Spruce Budworm

The eastern spruce budworm, *C. fumiferana*, is the most important defoliator of coniferous forest trees in North America (Talerico 1984; Fleming 1990). Probably no species of Lepidoptera has been studied more intensively (Powell 1995). It is native to North America and a principal pest of balsam fir, *Abies balsamea* (Linnaeus) Miller, white spruce, *Picea glauca* (Moench) Voss,

black spruce *Picea mariana* (Mill.) BSP and red spruce, *Picea rubens* Sargent (Mattson *et al.* 1988). The impact of the spruce budworm can be considerable, including growth loss by affecting photosynthesis, top kill, cone and seed mortality, increasing susceptibility of trees to secondary factors and widespread tree mortality (Kulman 1971; MacLean 1980). Any spruce-fir stand in eastern and central North America is susceptible to spruce budworm feeding (Mattson *et al.* 1988). Spruce budworm outbreaks have more effect on structure and function of the spruce-fir forests of eastern Canada than virtually any other factors (Baskerville 1975a; MacLean 1985, 1990).

Choristoneura fumiferana occupies forests of the east and central parts of the continent, associated mostly with the boreal forest, but also with the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence and Acadian forest regions (Rowe 1972). The range of *C. fumiferana* coincides almost completely with the range of its major hosts, balsam fir and red and white spruce (Mattson *et al.* 1988; Sanders 1991).

Spruce budworm larval stages mine old needles, and feed on buds and the current year's needles from early May to late June. Balsam fir trees often die following three or four years of severe defoliation. White spruce, which is more tolerant of budworm feeding, may die after five or six years of severe defoliation (Ives 1974; Manitoba Conservation 2003).

The spruce budworm is univoltine (one generation per year), has six larval instars, and over winters as a diapausing 2nd instar larva (Morris 1963; Mattson *et al.* 1988). Emphasis is put on the feeding behaviour of spruce budworm larvae because the effectiveness of many of the insecticides used in management

protocols depends on the ingestion of the active ingredient (van Frankenhuyzen 1990). The last three of the six larval instars feed openly on the rapidly expanding shoots and are usually the targets for control (Prebble 1975). Eighty to ninety percent of total larval food consumption occurs during the sixth-instar larval stage so depletion of current-year foliage is unlikely to happen prior to the budworm's sixth instar (Retnakaran 1983; Carisey & Bause 1997).

2.2.1 – Outbreaks

Populations of spruce budworm have reached outbreak levels on a more or less regular basis over extensive areas of northeastern and north central North America for at least the past three centuries (Blais 1954, 1965, 1981; Brown 1970; Kettela 1983; Morin *et al.* 1993). Periodic outbreaks of the budworm in eastern Canada are known to have occurred since the early 1700s (Blais 1965; Blais 1968; Blais 1983; Stedinger 1984). The most extensive and destructive outbreaks have occurred in the Maritime Provinces (New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland), Quebec, Ontario, Maine and the Great Lakes states (Harvey 1985; Mattson *et al.* 1988).

Outbreaks have two dimensions: time period between outbreaks and the geographical extent of the outbreak. Generally, when no treatment is applied, outbreaks last from five to fifteen years and non-outbreak periods average about 35 years in eastern Canada (Blais 1983, 1985a; Simmons *et al.* 1984; Solomon 1991).

Outbreaks seem to be controlled by a complex interaction of factors (Morris 1963; Solomon 1991; Sanders 1995). It appears that the natural enemies

EFFECTS OF MIMIC® BIOINSECTICIDE ON THE SPECIES
DIVERSITY OF NON-TARGET FOREST LEPIDOPTERA IN AN
OPERATIONAL SPRUCE BUDWORM (LEPIDOPTERA:
TORTRICIDAE: *Choristoneura fumiferana* Clem.) SUPPRESSION
PROGRAM IN NORTHWESTERN MANITOBA

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty

Of

Graduate Studies

The University of Manitoba

By

Diana E. Saunders

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Of

Master of Science

2003

© Copyright by Diana E. Saunders 2003

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

MASTER'S THESIS/PRACTICUM FINAL REPORT

The undersigned certify that they have read the Master's Thesis/Practicum entitled:
EFFECTS OF MIMIC® BIOINSECTICIDE ON THE SPECIES DIVERSITY OF NON-TARGET
FOREST LEPIDOPTERA IN AN OPERATIONAL SPRUCE BUDWORM (LEPIDOPTERA:
TORTRICIDAE: *Choristoneura fumiferana* Clem.) SUPPRESSION PROGRAM IN
NORTHWESTERN MANITOBA

submitted by
Diana E. Saunders

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science

The Thesis/Practicum Examining Committee certifies that the thesis/practicum (and oral examination if required) is:

APPROVED
(Approved or Not Approved)

Thesis

Advisor:

Richard Westwood
William P. Kempner
N. J. Holliday
K. Knorr

Practicum

Date: 20 VIII 03

of the budworm operate within a complex system along with other factors such as the composition, density and maturity of the forest (MacLean 1980; Mattson *et al.* 1988; Bergeron *et al.* 1995; Su *et al.* 1996; MacLean & MacKinnon 1997; Bergeron & Leduc 1998) and variations in weather (Wellington *et al.* 1950; Greenbank 1956; Ives 1974; Hardy *et al.* 1983; Blais 1985b; Mattson *et al.* 1988). There are variations in the influence of the budworm on the trees and the subsequent reverse action of the food supply upon the budworm population (Blais 1985b; Mattson *et al.* 1991). Outbreaks are also influenced by the long-distance movements of great numbers of adults (Greenbank *et al.* 1980). These interactions are further complicated by the use of insecticides and forest management practices designed to suppress outbreaks (Solomon 1991).

Outbreaks may start in epicenters, or foci, from which they spread by moth migration or even larval dispersal into neighboring budworm-free forest (Hardy *et al.* 1983; Blais 1985b). Others believe the spruce budworm is a cyclical outbreak species where populations go through more or less regular cycles or oscillations (Royama 1984; Wallner 1987; Régnière & Lysyk 1995).

The last countrywide spruce budworm infestation in Canada ended in the late 1980s but pockets have continued at very high intensities in Manitoba and Saskatchewan and to a lesser extent northern Alberta during the 1990s (Knowles, pers.com.). In northwestern Manitoba, the most recent spruce budworm outbreak began in 1995 and has continued to present. In 2002, approximately 111,480 hectares of spruce/fir forests experienced moderate to

severe defoliation by spruce budworm in Manitoba (Manitoba Conservation 2003).

2.3 - Spruce Budworm Management

The spruce budworm is one of the most destructive forest insects in North America and consequently the target of most of the insecticides that are applied to boreal forests in Canada (Cadogan *et al.* 1997). The objective of forest protection spraying in Canada is to prevent or reduce damage to the trees and forest stand (Prebble 1975).

Aerial insecticide applications, particularly the bacterial insecticide Btk and tebufenozide (Mimic®), are registered in Canada for managing spruce budworm. Decisions to implement spruce budworm control activities are usually based upon assessments of stand susceptibility (the probability that a stand will be attacked by the spruce budworm) and vulnerability (the probability of tree mortality resulting from a given level of budworm attack) to spruce budworm and assessments of spruce budworm numbers (Mott 1963; MacLean 1980; Lynch *et al.* 1985). These assessments are used to determine whether a stand should be sprayed in the current or next year and also to determine areas for protection, harvesting or salvage (Ennis & Caldwell 1991).

In general, in commercial forestry, the only options when faced with a budworm outbreak are: 1) to prevent tree mortality by insecticide spraying, 2) to do nothing and allow the timber to die and deteriorate, or 3) to embark upon pre-

salvage (before mortality) or salvage (after mortality) programs in the affected stands (MacLean 1980).

Spruce budworm suppression programs usually target 4th and 5th instar larvae in order to lower levels of defoliation. Spruce budworm larvae are typically at these stages in early June in northwestern Manitoba. Non-target Lepidoptera species are most susceptible to Mimic® if their larval feeding periods are within this timing window of application. Sometimes adverse weather conditions restrict insecticide applications to 6th instar larvae (mid to late June) and defoliation protection is sacrificed for population suppression (Volney & Cerezke 1992).

Since 1980, there has been a dramatic increase in eastern Canada in the use of microbial insecticides based on the bacterium Bt (Albert 1991). There was an increase from 1% of the total area treated with Btk for *C. fumiferana* in 1979 to 52% in 1985 and 63% in 1986 (Morris *et al.* 1986; Hulme 1988; Ennis & Caldwell 1991; Sanders 1995).

Bacillus thuringiensis is a naturally occurring spore-forming bacterium that produces a crystalline toxin during sporulation (Angus 1971; Fast and Dimond 1984). Btk is toxic to larvae of Lepidoptera (Fast & Régnière 1984). While the mode of Btk gives it considerably more specificity than the more broad spectrum insecticides like diflubenzuron (Dimilin®) (Martinat *et al.* 1988, 1993; Sample *et al.* 1995; Butler 1995b), non-target Lepidoptera are also directly susceptible to Btk. Miller (1990) noted that Btk treatments for the gypsy moth in western Oregon reduced species richness and larval abundance for up to two years within a guild of native, non-target Lepidoptera feeding on oak. In 1992, Miller also observed