Final

BioForest

2020

Gypsy Moth Monitoring Program

Town of Pelham

2020 Population Assessments and 2021 Forecasts

Prepared For:

JASON MARR
DIRECTOR, PUBLIC WORKS
20 PELHAM TOWN SQUARE, PO BOX 400
FONTHILL, ON L0S 1E0

Prepared By:

LALLEMAND INC./BIOFOREST
151 SKYWAY AVENUE, TORONTO ON
PHONE: (705) 942-5824 EXT. 218
EMAIL: ACRAIG@BIOFOREST.CA
WEBSITE: WWW.BIOFOREST.CA

Table of Contents

Table of Figures

Introduction

Gypsy Moth Background

Gypsy Moth in North America

Gypsy moth (*Lymantria dispar*) is native to Europe and Asia and was introduced to North America from Europe in 1869. Interested in developing a silkworm industry in North America by crossing European gypsy moths with North American silkworms, Professor L. Trouvelot brought gypsy moths from France to Massachusetts. In 1870, a small number of gypsy moths escaped and, within 20 years, gypsy moth had become a serious regional pest.

Although the United States government has had a quarantine in place since the early 1900s, gypsy moth has been advancing slowly westward from the northeastern United States. In the United States, gypsy moth has spread from western Pennsylvania, through Ohio, Michigan, and Illinois and is now in central Wisconsin. It is estimated that gypsy moth is currently spreading at a rate of 21 km/year (USDA 2003). To address the gypsy moth invasion in the United States, the U.S. Forest Service has implemented the Slow the Spread (STS) project. The STS project is a large integrated pest management program that aims to eradicate or suppress colonies of gypsy moth detected along the expanding front of the population.

In Canada, the first gypsy moth was detected in British Columbia in 1912, but it did not become established. The first gypsy moth infestation in Canada happened in southwestern Quebec in 1924 and the second in New Brunswick in 1936. These eastern detections were the result of the expanding gypsy moth population in the northeastern United States. Intensive egg mass removal programs were used to eradicate both infestations. Since 1955, when gypsy moth was detected again in Quebec, gypsy moth has become established in southern Ontario, Quebec, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia (Natural Resources Canada 2003). In Canada, the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) is responsible for preventing the introduction and spread of invasive pest species, including gypsy moth. Figure 1 (below) shows the areas of Canada that CFIA regulates for gypsy moth.



Figure 1. Areas in Canada currently regulated for gypsy moth by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (Source: CFIA 2021).

Gypsy Moth in Ontario

Gypsy moth is a relatively new pest to Ontario. After its accidental release into Massachusetts in 1870, gypsy moth expanded its range over the next 100 years and was first detected in Ontario in 1969 on Wolfe Island, south of the city of Kingston. In 1981, the first major area of gypsy moth defoliation in the Province was detected near Kaladar in eastern Ontario. By 1985, gypsy moth was a serious problem throughout southeastern Ontario. As of 1996, the distribution of gypsy moth larvae includes the southern third of the Province and the northern boundary runs from North Bay to Sault Ste. Marie.

In Ontario, gypsy moth populations have peaked in 1985, 1991, and 2002, according to the 2019 Forest Health Conditions Report produced by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (OMNRF 2019). The last outbreak in Ontario, in 2008, was much less severe than previous ones.

In 2016, low populations of gypsy moth causing trace-to-light defoliation were reported in small areas in southern Ontario, indicating an upward trend (OMNRF 2016). In 2017, 10,866 hectares of moderate-to-severe defoliation were mapped covering large areas of Hamilton and Niagara Region, with smaller pockets in the Aylmer District near Guelph, Sarnia, and Windsor (Francis 2018). In 2018, the area mapped for moderate-to-severe defoliation increased to 14,937 hectares, with the population increasing and spreading northeast in the Aurora District. The southwestern population had decreased; however, pockets still persist throughout Burlington, Hamilton and Niagara Region, with a few pockets showing up westward along Lake Erie (Francis 2018). Results from 2020 provincial forest health surveys show the largest mapped increase in moderate-to-severe damage areas, from 47,203 hectares in 2019 to 586,385 hectares in 2020 (OMNRF 2020). A map created by the OMNRF which shows area of light to severe defoliation in southern Ontario can be seen in Figure 2. It is worth noting that the OMNRF does not conduct these aerial surveys over urban areas due to flight restrictions, therefore Mississauga is not included in this map.



Figure 2. Gypsy moth defoliation mapped by Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry, 2020 (Source: OMNRF, 2020).

Biology and Life Cycle

Figure 3 presents the life cycle of the gypsy moth. Gypsy moth is in the order Lepidoptera, which consists of moths and butterflies, and has one generation per year with four life stages: egg, larva, pupa, adult. Gypsy moth eggs are laid in late July or early August. Weather, food sources, and factors such as diseases all affect the exact time that eggs are laid. Eggs are usually laid in dark, sheltered areas such as in bark crevices, on the underside of branches, or in leaf litter, although they can be also be found on a wide variety of surfaces such as rocks, buildings, lawn furniture, and automobiles. The eggs are covered with fine brown hairs from the female's abdomen, giving the egg mass the appearance of a small piece of chamois (OMNR, undated). Egg masses can vary in size from being about the size of a dime to being larger than a one-dollar coin and may contain from 100 to 1,000 eggs. Smaller egg masses tend to indicate that a gypsy moth population is in decline, while larger egg masses indicate a stable or growing population.

Fully formed, dormant larvae, or caterpillars, spend the winter inside the eggs. Generally, egg masses are resistant to drying and cold temperatures. However, if temperatures drop below –32ºC for an extended period, egg masses above the snow line may be susceptible to winter kill. Eggs below the snow line are likely able to avoid winter mortality (Leonard 1974). When temperatures are warm enough in late April or early May, buff-coloured larvae chew through the egg mass coverings and emerge. Shortly after emerging, the larvae turn black. If conditions are favourable, larvae, attracted by light, begin moving upward towards foliage. If conditions are not favourable, the larvae will remain clustered on the egg mass until conditions improve.



Figure 3. Gypsy moth life cycle in Ontario.

Of the four life stages of the gypsy moth, the larval stage is the only one that feeds. As a larva develops, it passes through stages called instars, separated by molts during which the larva's skin is shed and replaced with a new one. The male gypsy moth has five larval instars, while the female has six. Depending on weather, the first larval instar lasts five to 10 days, the next three (male) or four (female) instars last about a week, and the fifth (male) and sixth (female) instars last about 10 to 15 days (OMNR, undated). First instar larvae are approximately 4 mm long. Full-grown larvae are hairy and range in length from 35 to 90mm and have pairs of five blue and six red dots along their backs.

First instar larvae are very lightweight and covered with an abundance of fine hairs. While feeding throughout the crown of a tree, the larvae spin silken threads that can be caught by the wind, dispersing the larvae to new host trees. This form of dispersal is known as "ballooning." Some larvae balloon several times before they start feeding (Liebhold et al. 1992). Ballooning generally transports larvae short distances, moving gypsy moth larvae up to 1km. Gypsy moth are generally dispersed greater distances by people moving objects such as firewood, recreational vehicles, Christmas trees, and boats that have larvae, pupae, or egg masses on them. Although people can inadvertently disperse all gypsy moth life stages, they most commonly transport egg masses.

Figure 4. Gypsy moth defoliation (Source: Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry).

First instar larvae begin feeding by cutting small holes in the surface of leaves. As the larvae develop, they feed on the edge of leaves (Figure 4). The first three larval instars remain on the foliage and feed day and night. When populations are very low (i.e. fewer than 250 egg masses/ha), larvae in instars four through six feed at night and at dawn look for shelter where they spend the day protected from the sun and predators. At higher populations (i.e. more than 1,250 egg masses/ha), shelter becomes less important and all larvae feed in the day and night (Brooks and Hall 2005). When the host plant is depleted, larvae crawl to find another suitable host (USDA 1995a).

Gypsy moth larvae are active from approximately early May to mid-July. During that time, one larva is able to consume an average of $1m^2$ of foliage, which is roughly the equivalent of 10 to 15 entire red oak leaves (Nealis and Erb 1993). Males generally eat slightly less than $1m^2$ and females eat slightly more. Larvae in the last instar cause the most defoliation, consuming three quarters of the total amount of foliage that they eat (OMNR, undated). Sixth instar female larvae are the most ravenous feeders and are often twice the size of full-grown male larvae.

After feeding is complete around mid-July, pupation occurs in a cocoon that can be found in many places including trees, rocks, houses, boats, trailers, fences, picnic tables, and firewood. In 13 to 17 days, the moths emerge. Male moths usually emerge one to two days before females (USDA 1995a). Both sexes have wings, but only the male can fly. The female is too heavy bodied to fly, so gypsy moth relies on the larval stage for dispersal. The male moth is dark brown to beige, is medium-sized, flies during the day, and is a very erratic flyer. Dark wavy lines cross the male moth's forewings and its wingspan ranges from 35 to 40mm. The female is mostly white and has a wingspan between 60 to 70mm. Dark wavy lines also cross the female moth's forewings but, because the female is lighter in colour, these lines are more prominent.

Figure 5. Female gypsy moth laying eggs.

To attract males, female moths emit a powerful pheromone, or sex attractant. Males have large feathery antennae for detecting the pheromone and can do so from about 1.5km away. Within about 24 hours of mating, the female lays eggs in a mass of 100 to 1000 on tree trunks, branches, houses, and fences and under rocks and forest floor debris (Figure 7). Since the female cannot fly, eggs are laid close to where pupation occurred. The female dies about one day after egg laying and the male survives about one week, after mating with several different females (Nealis and Erb 1993).

Although in Europe and Asia there is evidence of cyclical outbreaks of gypsy moth, a clear pattern of outbreaks in North America has not yet been established (Liebhold et al 1994). However, gypsy moth populations do appear to exist in one of four phases: innocuous, release, outbreak, decline (Elkinton and Liebhold 1990). The innocuous phase is characterized by very low population levels. The release phase usually takes places over the course of one or two years and can result in population density increases of several orders of magnitude. During the outbreak phase, populations are high enough to cause noticeable defoliation and damage to host trees. After this point, high levels of gypsy moth mortality are observed usually due to starvation or disease and the population crashes. This is considered the decline phase.

Area-wide outbreaks can last up to ten years, but generally population densities in localized areas remain high for two to three years (Cloyd and Nixon 2001).

Natural Controls

Natural factors such as weather, predators, parasites, and pathogens significantly influence gypsy moth population densities.

Weather conditions can favour either low- or high-density populations. Extreme weather conditions characterized by prolonged periods of cold temperatures (colder than –32^{o}C) can kill unprotected eggs, which can help to keep low density populations low or decrease high density populations. In contrast, warm, dry conditions tend to accompany increases in gypsy moth populations (Skaller 1985). Heavy rainfall during egg hatch may result in drowning of larvae; rainy weather during the first instar can delay migration and cause larvae to congregate on the underside of leaves (National Parks Service 2010). The conditions can also increase the duration of this instar.

Low density populations are normally kept in check by natural enemies such as predators and parasites (Brooks and Hall 2005). Predators that feed on gypsy moth larvae include about 40 species of birds such as vireos, chickadees, tanagers, orioles, robins, blue jays, grackles, starlings, blackbirds, and cuckoos (OMNR, undated); other insects; and small mammals such as skunks, white-footed mice, squirrels, and raccoons. Insect parasitoids kill gypsy moth by laying their eggs in gypsy moth eggs, larvae, and pupae.



Figure 6. Gypsy moth larva killed by *Entomophaga maimaiga* (Source: Steven Katovich, USDA Forest Service, Bugwood.org).

At the start of a gypsy moth outbreak, natural enemies have little effect on the gypsy moth population (Brooks and Hall 2005). Populations increase when suitable conditions exist such as favourable weather and abundant foliage. Population decreases tend to happen in cooler, wetter conditions that favour pathogens. Gypsy moth is susceptible to a variety of naturally occurring infectious diseases that are caused by bacteria, fungi, and the nucleopolyhedrosis virus (NPV) (Campbell and Podgwaite 1971). *Entomophaga maimaiga* and NPV, the most significant natural enemies of gypsy moth, are capable of killing large numbers of gypsy moth larvae and represent the largest and most important factors in high density gypsy moth population crashes. *E. maimaiga* is a fungus that is specific to gypsy moth and is prevalent throughout low-to-high density gypsy moth populations. Although it is not completely clear how *E. maimaiga* first became established in North America, it was first recovered from North American gypsy moth in the northeastern United States in 1989. It was recovered from gypsy moth in southern Ontario in 1990. A late larva killed by *E. maimaiga* hangs vertically with its head pointed downward and its body tight to the trunk of the tree (Figure 6). An early larva killed by *E. maimaiga* generally remains on the foliage (Reardon and Hajek 1998). NPV was inadvertently introduced to North America with the gypsy moth or its parasites. Like *E. maimaiga*, NPV is specific to gypsy moth. NPV is often referred to as "wilt" due to the soft, limp appearance of the diseased larvae (Nealis and Erb 1993). A larva killed by NPV hangs on the tree in the shape of an inverted “V” (Figure 7).

Figure 7. Gypsy moth larva killed by nucleopolyhedrosis virus.

No single natural enemy or combination of natural control agents can completely eliminate a gypsy moth population. Natural control agents can keep gypsy moth populations low, however, at times, outbreak conditions occur and the natural enemies are not able to control the growing gypsy moth populations (OMNR, undated).

Hosts and Impacts

Gypsy moth has been found on approximately 500 different tree species (OMNR, undated) and is a major defoliator of forest, ornamental, and orchard trees. Gypsy moth defoliates mainly hardwoods and some conifers. Table 1 lists the most common host species for gypsy moth and categorizes them by 'most preferred', 'preferred', and 'least preferred'.

A gypsy moth infestation can impact an area in a number of ways. In the short term, high populations of larvae cause defoliation that affects the aesthetic and recreational value of an infested area. Generally, leaf loss becomes noticeable when a tree sustains 30 to 40% defoliation. Also, in the short term, egg masses can be a nuisance because they can be laid on such a wide variety of surfaces including tree trunks, branches, rocks, logs, fences, picnic tables, and buildings. In the long term, a gypsy moth infestation can cause twig, branch and, in some cases, whole tree mortality, invasion from secondary pests such as rot, and thin tree canopies.

Several factors affect how a tree responds to gypsy moth defoliation including the amount of foliage removed, the weather, the number of years of repeated defoliation, the timing of defoliation in the growing season, the presence and number of other insects and diseases, and the health and vigor of the tree at the time of defoliation (OMNR, undated). For example, damage from gypsy moth may increase substantially if trees are growing on poor sites or if defoliation occurs during the same period as drought.

Most healthy trees can withstand a single year of moderate to severe defoliation, but two to three years of heavy defoliation (less than or equal to 50%) can result in branch or whole tree mortality. A tree's crown condition plays an important part in its ability to survive gypsy moth defoliation. A tree with less than 25% dead branches in its crown is more likely to survive defoliation than a tree with more than 50% dead branches in its crown (Gottschalk 1993). Trees that are diseased, crowded, or stressed may die after one or two years of defoliation (OMNR, undated).

Table 1. Most preferred, preferred, and least preferred gypsy moth tree hosts (Source: GM-06-105).

Most Preferred	Preferred	Least Preferred
Oak (all species)	Beech	Black ash
Largetooth aspen	Yellow birch	Green ash
Trembling aspen	Cherry (all species)	White ash
White birch	Butternut	Black locust
Grey birch	Chestnut	Mountain maple
Basswood	White elm	Red spruce
Tamarack	Eastern hemlock	White cedar
Alder	Ironwood	Eastern red cedar
Apple	Maple (most species)	Sumac
Hawthorn	White spruce	Red mulberry
Willow	Norway spruce	Tulip-tree
Manitoba maple	Pine (all species)	Balsam fir
Mountain ash	Hickory	Sycamore
Carolina poplar	Black walnut	
Larch	Sassafras	
	Serviceberry	

The impact of an outbreak on an area can be influenced by when the defoliation occurs. Defoliation that happens in mid-season can be more damaging than that which occurs in the spring because in mid-season, trees do not have time to replenish food reserves and new buds do not have time to harden before colder temperatures start (Gottschalk 1993).

Tree location can also play a role in how susceptible a tree is to gypsy moth defoliation. Gypsy moth generally prefers ridge top sites and steep, south or west facing slopes. These sites tend to have the tree species that gypsy moth prefers and the trees are often crooked, are low in vigour, and have deep fissures in their bark, providing good gypsy moth habitat. In the winter, the temperature on these sites rarely drops below –32ºC, the threshold below which gypsy moth egg masses die. Therefore, more eggs survive to hatch in the spring. In the spring, these sites are not likely to be exposed to late spring frosts that would kill young gypsy moth larvae. In the summer, these sites tend to be hot and dry, which helps gypsy moth larvae to survive and thrive (Gottschalk 1993).

Healthy, vigorous trees on lower, north or east facing slopes are likely going to be less susceptible to gypsy moth defoliation. These sites tend to have deep, fertile soils and tend not to be stressed by drought. Trees on these sites are often straight and fast-growing with smooth bark and healthy crowns, making them more resistant to gypsy moth damage (Gottschalk 1993).

The composition of trees in an area can affect the amount of damage that gypsy moth causes. For example, areas with mostly oak, birch, or poplar are more susceptible than areas with predominately sugar maple, ash, spruce, or pine (OMNR, undated).

Management Options: An Integrated Pest Management Approach

While definitions of Integrated Pest Management (IPM) vary, it is essentially a philosophy, concept and methodology for dealing with destructive insects and diseases affecting trees either in an urban environment or in the natural forest (Coulson and Witter 1984). Waters (1974) provides a good definition:

"IPM is the maintenance of destructive agents, including insects, at tolerable levels by the planned use of preventive, suppressive, or regulatory tactics and strategies that are ecologically and economically efficient and socially acceptable."

Components of an IPM strategy include pest surveys and monitoring, and a decision-making process based on surveys and other supportive data (Reardon et al. 1987). In the case of gypsy moth this could include:

- Egg mass densities and quality;
- Larval and pupal counts;
- Male moth captures;
- Defoliation estimates;
- Area affected;
- Stand susceptibility;
- Environmental sensitivity; and
- Parasite and disease incidence.

The decision-making process in an IPM strategy results from an evaluation of available treatment options and an analysis of impacts. Information requirements include knowledge of pest biology and population dynamics, tree impacts and stand dynamics. The final component of the IPM strategy is a benefit-cost analysis. In the urban forest everyone is a potential participant in the implementation process.

The options described in this report reflect the philosophy of an IPM system for gypsy moth control. The overall strategy is to maintain pest populations at tolerable levels in terms of tree impacts and effects on human health and safety. The tactics employed will be influenced by the status of the gypsy moth population at any point in time but, to be effective, strategies and tactics must be communicated and implemented.

The application of an IPM system will not eradicate gypsy moth from the forests and streets of the Town of Pelham. That is not the goal of an IPM system, and it would imply a degree of knowledge about this pest that scientists and pest management practitioners do not have. Outbreaks of this pests will most certainly occur again in the future. The objective of an IPM system is to reduce the frequency and severity of future outbreaks.

Do Nothing

The "Do Nothing" option is the one most often chosen for most pest outbreaks in Canada. A review of major pest outbreaks and control efforts in North America between 1985 and 1997 showed that of the 156,549,000 hectares infested by pests such as gypsy moth, spruce budworm and hemlock looper, only 13,841,000 hectares, or 9%, were actually treated with an aerial application of an insecticide (Hayes et al. 1998). Doing nothing is always an option to be considered and may be the most practical option in specific areas of the current gypsy moth population.

Pest outbreaks come and go. Based on the historical record of gypsy moth in North America and Ontario, it is likely that the current outbreak in the Town of Pelham will collapse naturally over the next several years. As described earlier in this report, predators, parasites and pathogens will bring about a significant decrease in gypsy moth populations to low endemic levels. The pest will exist at these low population levels until conditions allow for another rapid rise to outbreak levels.

Potential consequences of the "Do Nothing" option are described in the section of this report entitled *Potential Impacts of No Intervention.* It should be noted, however, that the nuisance factor resulting from gypsy moth/human contacts and experiences in the outbreak will be variable but frequent in some areas, forcing residents to respond with their own management efforts. This is a concern because in some cases residents will choose to mitigate impacts to their properties by applying pesticides on their own or through a commercial tree care company. The end result of potentially hundreds of property owners taking their own control measures is a significant increase in the overall use of pesticides within the Town of Pelham, and the consequent increased risk of exposure for users, bystanders and the environment. Homeowners with a lack of sufficient training or knowledge of pesticide application may also apply pesticides incorrectly. Thus, in urban and suburban areas, the "Do Nothing" option may actually result in an increase in pesticide use. Other innovative control measures employed by homeowners may not be very effective and some may actually cause more harm than good to trees.

Gypsy Moth Management Options

Maintain or Enhance Tree Health

Trees stressed by other factors such as drought or disease are more vulnerable to defoliation caused by insect pests such as gypsy moth, or to attack by secondary pests such as the two-lined chestnut borer and *Armillaria* root rot. Therefore, efforts should be made to maintain or improve tree vigour and property owners should be encouraged to consider the following (McManus et al. 1979):

- Maintain good soil conditions to encourage the development of the tree's fine feeder roots. Many activities such as construction, cutting and filling, paving, changing grades and tree removal can have harmful effects on soil/moisture relations;
- In wooded areas or in transition zones between lawns and forested areas, keep the forest floor as natural as possible. Oaks thrive under acidic soil conditions, so removal of the organic acid-rich leaf litter can be harmful;
- Maintain the natural layers of leaf litter to reduce drying in the surface soils where most of the tree's feeder roots occur. This will also provide natural habitat for mice and shrews, predators of gypsy moth larvae and pupae;
- Mulching isolated trees growing on lawns will also improve growing conditions. Mulch out to the edge of the canopy drip line to reduce competition from grasses which compete for soil moisture and nutrients;
- Water trees during periods of drought. A light pruning will thin the crown and reduce moisture demands.

Low Population Strategies

During periods when gypsy moth populations are low, homeowners can mitigate future outbreaks by:

- Cleaning yards of objects that may provide shelter for gypsy moth larvae, pupae and egg masses (e.g. dead branches and trees, stumps, and debris such as boxes, tires, containers etc.);
- Diversifying the tree species in an area to reduce the proportion of preferred gypsy moth host species. Select tree species most compatible with the local climate and soil conditions to encourage tree vigour.

Destroying Egg Masses

Finding and destroying egg masses is a management technique that homeowners can use to reduce gypsy moth damage on their properties. Finding egg masses on trees is easiest from fall until early spring when the leaves are off the trees. Egg masses can be found on tree trunks, under branches, on rocks, woodpiles, fences, or almost any other surface. Egg masses can be scraped into a container of soapy water (e.g. one teaspoon of detergent in 1 litre of water) and soaked for one week or scraped into containers of household bleach or ammonia. Egg masses should not be simply scraped onto the ground because this will not prevent them from hatching. It is important to wear gloves when removing and destroying egg masses because many people are sensitive to the hairs that cover egg masses.

Sticky Barrier Bands

Barrier bands intercept early instar larvae crawling up and down trees. Barriers can be created using sticky material applied to bands wrapped around tree trunks. To make barrier bands, wrap duct tape (sticky side towards bark) or tar paper around the trunk of a tree in overlapping bands about 1.5m from the ground. The total width of the band should be at least 12.5cm. Press the band into the bark crevices so that the larvae cannot crawl underneath the band. Tuck the edges of the tape or paper into the bark and apply a vegetable-based sticky material to the band. Do not apply sticky substances directly to the tree trunk. Sticky substances can kill thin-barked trees and will leave permanent dark stains on all trees. Avoid petroleum-based products because they may cause swelling and cankering on thin-barked trees. The small insects will get caught in the sticky material as they crawl on the trees. Replace the sticky bands as they get covered with larvae and dirt. Larvae can be destroyed by dropping them in buckets of soapy water (e.g. one teaspoon of detergent in 1 litre of water) and letting them soak for one week. For gypsy moth, it is important to wear gloves when removing and destroying larvae because many people are sensitive to the larval hairs. Barrier bands can be removed when they are no longer catching larvae or when the larvae have pupated.

Burlap Barrier Bands

Burlap bands wrapped around trees is a control method that takes advantage of the movement of gypsy moth larvae during the day. Fourth, fifth and sixth instar larvae do most of their feeding at night and seek protection from the sun and predators during the day by, in some cases, crawling to the ground for shelter in dead leaves and underbrush. Burlap bands wrapped around trees will intercept larval movement and the larvae will seek shelter in the bands. The larvae can then be removed from the bands and destroyed.

Hiding bands can be made using cloth or burlap. Bands should be 30 to 45cm wide and fastened to trees at chest height. Use twine to loosely tie the middle of the bands to the trees and fold the tops of bands over the bottoms. Bands must be checked, and larvae removed daily because the bands will neither kill the larvae nor keep them from crawling back up the tree. Late afternoon is the best time to remove larvae. Larvae can be destroyed by dropping them into buckets of soapy water (e.g. one teaspoon of detergent in 1 litre of water) and letting them soak for one week. It is important to wear gloves when removing and destroying larvae because many people are sensitive to the larval hairs. Burlap banding is a popular method of control but, if done improperly, can cause more damage to trees than gypsy moth. For example, foil and plastic wrap should never be wrapped around a tree in place of burlap or cloth because they can scar or kill the tree.

Homeowner Sprays

Homeowners can use insecticides for small scale treatment of shrubs and small trees on their properties to protect them from gypsy moth defoliation. Insecticides registered in Canada for control of gypsy moth include *Bacillus* *thuringiensis* (Btk), carbaryl, pyrethrin, phosmet, and permethrin. Homeowners should follow all pesticide label instructions or call a licensed applicator to perform the treatment where necessary.

Ground treatments with TreeAzin® Systemic Insecticide

Ground treatments with TreeAzin® will help to reduce feeding pressure from gypsy moth on individual trees. The product targets the larvae as they feed on the foliage, and as it is applied systemically through the trees' vascular system via micro-injection technology, there is no exposure risk to the public. Treatments must be applied post-bloom and at the time when gypsy moth eggs are starting to hatch.

Ground/Aerial Application of *Bacillus thuringiensis* (Btk)

Bacillus thuringiensis var. *kurstaki* (Btk) is the most common commercial product used to control large-scale gypsy moth infestations and has been extensively used in previous aerial control programs against gypsy moth in both Canada and the United States. This product targets only Lepidoptera larvae feeding at the time, and is non-toxic to birds, animals, humans, honeybees, fish, and most other insects. The spray must be applied while the early instar larvae are actively hatching and feeding on the foliage, usually early to mid-May. Within about two to three hours of consuming the product, the larvae stop feeding and die within a few days (City of Regina 2016). Ground applications tend to be most effective when the spray is able to cover a high percentage of the canopy – effectiveness tends to decrease significantly if spray equipment does not reach the upper canopy.

In terms of environmental safety, Btk is considered to be a very safe option. It is a naturally occurring bacteria found in the soil, not a chemical, and it works by producing proteins that are toxic to larvae. It degrades rapidly in the environment (within 1 to 4 days) due to sunlight and other microorganisms, so the exposure window is limited. It does not travel into the soil beyond 25 cm, therefore there are no concerns with leaching into groundwater (Perez 2015). In fact, pest control products containing Btk have been registered for use in Canada for 40 years and it is the most widely used pest control product in the world and can be used on certified organic farms.

Btk specifically targets immature insects (larvae) in the Lepidoptera family. An extensive literature exists on the consequences of non-target organisms to Btk, including reports of several long-term field studies. The data have been reviewed periodically (e.g. Melin and Cozzi 1990, Otvos and Vanderveen 1993) and the range of non-target species that have been found to be susceptible to direct toxic action of Btk has remained small. Spring feeding Lepidoptera species (leafrollers, fruitworms, cankerworms, and budmoths) may be affected and species richness may be locally and temporarily reduced following a spray event. Significant Lepidoptera species such as monarchs and swallowtails are not affected as they are not in the susceptible life stage when the spray is applied.

According to the World Health Organization, Btk has been sprayed over populated areas in several countries including the USA, Canada, and New Zealand. Some of these applications have been followed by public health surveillance programs and in general no (or very few) harmful effects have been reported among residents of the sprayed communities. A large epidemiological study conducted by the University of British Columbia concluded that "the largescale spray program of Btk in the lower mainland for control of the Asian and European gypsy moth did not cause any measurable increase in serious community unwellness that could be attributed to the spray" (Otvos and Vanderveen 1993).

Potential Impacts of No Intervention

Despite its arrival in North America in 1869, gypsy moth is a relatively new pest in the forests of Canada. It joins a number of other native insect pests, such as the forest tent caterpillar (*Malacosoma distria*) and the spring and fall cankerworms, as a potential defoliator of many different tree species and is, therefore, another potential stress on our forests.

The urban environment, while in many ways similar to forested environments, generally involves several unique features that influence pest problems (Coulson and Witter 1984) and consequently management strategies. For example, in urban environments:

- The diversity of valued host species is generally greater;
- Host trees consist of both native and exotic species;
- There is usually a greater range of age-class of host trees;
- Mature, and often senescent trees are especially valued.

Urban trees are under considerable stress. The urban forest is subject to a wide variety of disturbance factors that generally reduce tree vigour and increase susceptibility to pests. These disturbances include road construction, transmission line clearing, building construction, sidewalks, driveways, poor soil nutrients, compaction, high salinity and pH, and photochemical oxidation. Therefore, predicting the full impacts of a gypsy moth outbreak in the natural forest is different than in the urban setting.

Environmental Impacts

Environmental impacts of a gypsy moth outbreak will be greatly influenced by a number of factors including urban canopy composition, forest age, stand vigour, soils, and climate. Some general observations from previous outbreaks are:

- Generally, areas of mature to overmature forests with a high composition of host tree species will be the most heavily impacted by gypsy moth defoliation;
- Vigourous trees can usually withstand severe defoliation for a few years. Eventually, however, these trees will become more susceptible to attack by secondary pests such as two-lined chestnut borer (*Agrilus bilineatus*), oak decline, *Armillaria* root rot, etc.;
- Heavy defoliation over large areas of urban forest reduces water use by the trees and can result in increased fluctuations in run-off (Benoit and Lachance 1990);
- In heavily defoliated areas, sunlight falls directly onto ground vegetation and soils, raising temperatures. This may drive away predators such as snakes, lizards and frogs and may cause root damage and increase the effects of drought;
- Some thin-barked tree species may be damaged by the sudden increase in sunlight penetration;
- The aesthetic value of treed areas within the city is lessened and their utility as windbreaks and privacy barriers is reduced;
- Several years of heavy defoliation may kill host trees and, therefore, reduce the proportion of susceptible host trees in an area. This is a slow process, but may ultimately reduce the susceptibility of the stand by increasing the proportion of less susceptible tree species;
- Less favoured food species and understory vegetation may benefit indirectly from gypsy moth defoliation through increases in light, moisture and nutrients (Campbell 1979). Conversely, increased light, moisture and nutrient availability in the understory can provide the right conditions to allow for the spread of invasive understory species such as buckthorn (*Rhamnus cathartica*), garlic mustard (*Alliaria petiolata*), dog strangling vine (*Vincetoxicum rossicum*), etc.;
- Gypsy moth infestations can have positive and negative effects on wildlife. Defoliation of the overstory can result in more growth of shrubs, grasses, and herbs, which provides additional habitat for some wildlife species. In some cases, however, defoliation may reduce or compromise habitat for some wildlife species. For example, defoliation may make bird eggs vulnerable to predation due to the reduction in protection from a tree's foliage (Gottschalk 1993);

- Outbreaks can also impact waterways. For example, increases in frass, or droppings, and leaves into streams can reduce the quality of the water. Loss of canopy cover due to gypsy moth defoliation can cause the temperature of streams to increase, which can have harmful effects on organisms in the streams (Gottschalk 1993).

Human Health Impacts

During low population periods there is little human exposure to gypsy moth life stages. However, as populations increase, children and others who spend a lot of time outdoors can be affected in a number of ways (USDA 1995b):

- Allergic reactions in some people to the gypsy moth larval hairs, the hairs that coat egg masses, and wing scales have been reported;
- Rashes or other skin irritations from contact with larvae;
- Eye irritation;
- Respiratory tract irritations;
- Some individuals may be psychologically affected by high numbers of caterpillars or adverse effects of the outbreak on local aesthetics;
- Safety hazards may be created when larvae and their droppings make walkways and roads slippery;
- Dead or dying trees caused by gypsy moth defoliation can pose a hazard as tree crowns deteriorate and dead limbs break and fall to the ground.

Damage caused by gypsy moth in the urban environment can result in an increase in factors that can indirectly harm human health. These include:

- Increased air pollution;
- Local climate extremes;
- Increased noise pollution.

Economic Impacts

Gypsy moth outbreaks can impact local or regional economies. Outdoor activities can be reduced significantly when populations of either pest are high, thus impacting recreation and tourism businesses. Repeated defoliations can affect the aesthetics of an area, reducing the numbers of visitors for periods of several years beyond the duration of the outbreak. Property owners may incur costs for:

- Treating gypsy moth with a pesticide;
- Removing larvae or their droppings;
- Removing egg masses;
- Repainting buildings;
- Pruning or removing declining or dead trees;
- Replacing damaged or dead trees and shrubs;
- Increased liability for damage or injuries sustained from falling trees and branches.

Studies have also shown the contribution of trees to the overall property value of a residence. In an early study, Payne (1971) evaluated the contribution of trees to property values of homes in Massachusetts and found that they contributed an average of 7% and as much as 15% to the value of a residence. More recent valuations can be found in Miller (1996) and Pandit et al. (2013).

Economic impacts to the Town of Pelham could include:

- Increased tree removal and replacement costs;
- Loss of aesthetics in parks and woodlands resulting in reduced usage;

- Increased tree inspection costs;
- Increased tree pruning and maintenance costs;
- Potential liability costs for damage to property and personal injury.

Population Assessment Methodologies

A variety of sampling methods have been developed for assessing gypsy moth populations and forecasting potential damage to host trees. Gypsy moth is a difficult insect to sample accurately because of its association with many host species, the activity of the insect during the larval stage, and the dramatic fluctuations between low endemic and high outbreak populations over a relatively short period of time (Nealis and Erb 1993). Another factor that can complicate gypsy moth population assessments and forecasts is the tendency of early instar larvae to disperse by ballooning over the landscape, often in large numbers. This can result in areas suffering high defoliation rates even though egg mass densities were low, or in some cases, non-existent.

Sampling methods have been developed for each stage of the gypsy moth life cycle.

Larvae: Burlap or sticky bands placed around the main stem of the tree can be used to trap gypsy moth larvae and pupae. Gypsy moth larvae seek shelter under the bands during the later feeding stages and often will pupate under these bands. Larval densities can vary greatly from day to day, and even during the day. Weather, tree species, larval density, and larval development can affect numbers, therefore, this method is not considered a reliable method for population assessment.

Larvae can also be sampled from foliage collected from the tree canopy. The accuracy of this method has not been assessed but can be used to determine the presence or absence of gypsy moth larvae, especially during the early instars.

A third method for assessing gypsy moth larvae populations is the collection of frass in containers placed on the ground (Liebhold and Elkinton 1988a and Liebhold and Elkinton 1988b). This is the most accurate method but is a time-consuming process that requires some expertise and therefore is usually restricted to research and not reliable in an urban environment because of potential sample tampering by pedestrians.

Adults: Female gypsy moth adults do not fly but attract the male moths by releasing a powerful airborne attractant called a pheromone. This pheromone has been synthetically reproduced and is used to lure male moths to a variety of sticky or bucket-like traps. This is an effective method for detecting the presence of low-level gypsy moth populations and is widely used in the United States and Canada (Gage et al. 1990). Because this pheromone is so efficient, gypsy moth pheromone traps are less effective during periods of high populations when they tend to become saturated with moths, making it difficult to develop relationships between trap catches and subsequent populations and forecasted host damage.

Egg Masses: Gypsy moths lay their eggs in masses of up to 1,000 eggs on the stems and branches of trees, as well as on the forest floor and man-made objects in July and August each year. They will remain in the egg mass until hatch begins sometime in April or May the following year. This provides the longest period for assessing gypsy moth populations and is considered the most reliable method. Egg masses are easily counted, especially following leaf fall in the autumn, and old egg masses are generally easily distinguishable from new egg masses, allowing for more accurate counts of the current year population. Egg mass size can also be measured and is a good indicator of outbreak status – large egg masses (greater than 30mm) indicate a healthy, increasing population and small egg masses (less than 20mm) indicate a decreasing population (Nealis and Erb 1993). Moore and Jones (1987) provide a simple equation for estimating the number of eggs per mass based on a measure of egg mass length.

A number of sampling methods have been developed for estimating egg mass densities and forecasting host defoliation in the following year:

1. **Walkthroughs:** Observers count all egg masses visible during a walkthrough of an area. This method can be used as a quick survey tool but is often imprecise and is usually followed-up with a more detailed survey.
2. **Fixed-area plots:** Observers count all egg masses within a standardized area. Results can be extrapolated into numbers per hectare, which allows comparison between years. In the United States, the fixed-area plot (5.4m radius) of 1/40 acres (0.01ha) is the most commonly used. In Ontario, the 10m by 10m Modified Kaladar Plot (MKP) has been used since the gypsy moth was detected in the Kaladar region of eastern Ontario in the early 1980s.

Intervention Thresholds

Intervention thresholds are defined by the management objectives and could include nuisance abatement, foliage protection, and prevention of tree mortality or a combination of these objectives. The relationships between egg mass density and subsequent damage (defoliation) will guide the manager in establishing these thresholds, which in turn will determine when and where treatments are needed. Some helpful guidelines for hardwood forests include:

- Damage is not noticeable from the air until defoliation levels reach about 30%;
- Growth loss in trees begins when defoliation reaches about 40%;
- Re-foliation occurs when about 60% of the trees' foliage is lost. This can cause a reduction in the tree's overall health and survival.

Managers may choose to modify tolerance thresholds to lower levels if these neighbourhoods have been subjected to other stresses that may predispose trees to mortality, or if unusually high value or specimen trees are involved (Liebhold et al. 1994). General stand condition and vigour can be influenced by tree age and human-related disturbances to the environment that negatively affect tree health.

Tree mortality is of course normal in any environment, and typically averages between 1 to 2% per year in natural forests, and 5% or more in the urban environment (Nowak et al. 2004). Insect and disease outbreaks can accelerate tree mortality, thus reducing the benefits to residents and the urban environment. Damage to forests can be increased when insect outbreaks occur during periods of environmental stress. Short- and long-term climate changes can increase stress levels on trees making them more susceptible to pests such as the gypsy moth.

The density at which gypsy moths become a nuisance in residential or recreational areas is not well established. The sight of one or two larvae may be intolerable for some individuals, while others may be comfortable with much higher populations. According to Liebhold et al (1994) an intervention threshold of 600 egg masses per hectare has been widely used in the past for intervention in both general forest and residential areas. While this value may be justified for reducing certain nuisance impacts (such as service calls or resident complaints), it may not be justified for other management objectives (Liebhold et al 1994).

In this discussion of management intervention thresholds, it must be noted and understood that it is impossible for managers to predict defoliation levels without a certain amount of error.

Egg Mass Surveys in Forest vs. Urban Environments

Definitions of urban and suburban environments may vary but Fleischer et al. (1992) defined these areas as having a minimum of one house per ten acres (4.04ha). With the exclusion of some municipal parks, this would apply to most of the areas surveyed within the urban areas of the Town of Pelham. Use of fixed-area plots is the most accurate method for assessing gypsy moth densities and is the most frequently used method in forest environments. Generally, groups or clusters of three to five MKPs were used in Ontario to estimate average egg mass densities and forecast defoliation in specific areas. In urban or suburban environments, however, the 10m by 10m fixed-area plot may not be practicable when egg mass surveys are limited to street trees, and when access to private property and backyards is a constraint.

The urban environment is influenced by man-made objects and the distribution of gypsy moth egg masses is more clumped than in the forest (Fleischer et al. 1992). This probably reflects the distribution of preferred host species and the discontinuous nature of treed areas in urban environments. Sample methods for urban and suburban environments need to reflect this difference in egg mass distribution.

BioForest has developed the **'Modified MKP'**, a version of the original MKP that is more suited to the constraints of the urban and suburban environment. The Modified MKP uses five trees in close proximity to each other, which would be typical of the number of mature trees found in a 0.01ha fixed-area MKP plot. One tree, preferably a mature oak, is selected to be the plot center and the four next closest appropriate host trees are surveyed as one "plot".

Objectives

The objectives of this report are to provide the Town of Pelham with 1) an assessment of 2020 gypsy moth egg mass densities and convert these into forecasts of expected host damage and defoliation for 2021, 2) provide short- and long-term management options applying a philosophy of Integrated Pest Management (IPM), and 3) specific recommendations for management in the affected areas in 2021. All options will be considered and evaluated.

Assessment of Gypsy Moth Populations in Pelham

History of Gypsy Moth Monitoring and Management in Pelham

In 2009, the Town of Pelham partnered with Trees Unlimited and Zimmer Air to implement control measures when gypsy moth populations reached outbreak levels. Those measures were successful in reducing the population to acceptable levels.

In 2017, the Town began receiving concerns from citizens regarding the re-emergence of gypsy moths and in the spring of 2018 the Town conducted an aerial spray in Hillcrest Park (6.47 hectares). Throughout the summer of 2018, staff continued to receive reports and concerns regarding gypsy moth activity throughout the urban boundary. Trees Unlimited was again contracted to conduct egg mass surveys in early 2019, and 17 residential, park and cemetery properties were surveyed. Six of the properties surveyed had severe defoliation forecasts (Canboro Road at Concord Street, Hillcrest Park, Pancake Lane south to Beechnut Court, Oak Lane, Kunda Park, and Fonthill Cemetery). In response, the Town sprayed 161.2 hectares of public and private property within the urban boundary. Post spray surveys conducted in all treated areas indicated a significant reduction in caterpillars and tree defoliation (with some exceptions). In 2019, BioForest crew established a grid based surveying approach, aiming to obtain good coverage and fair representation through the areas of concern for the Town of Pelham. A total of 133 plots and a total of 665 trees were surveyed. In the spring of 2020, the Town sprayed approximately 120 hectares of public and private property within the urban boundaries of Fenwick and Fonthill, including a buffer along Canboro Road between both urban areas. Post spray defoliation surveys conducted indicated a significant reduction in tree defoliation.

2020 Gypsy Moth Egg Mass Surveys

The 2020 gypsy moth egg mass surveys were conducted from February 8th – 26th, 2021. All 2019 plots were resurveyed, and no new plots were added. For a detailed description of plot establishment and distribution, see the 2019 Gypsy Moth Monitoring Program report (BioForest 2020). Plot trees were surveyed by examining the trunk and scanning the entire tree, from base to crown, using binoculars. At least two opposite sides of each tree were surveyed. All egg masses observed on the tree, both old and new, were recorded.

The total number of egg masses on each tree were summed. In a separate count, egg masses that were easily distinguishable as old or new were tallied. As many intact egg masses within reach were measured and recorded as old or new, in order to obtain 2020 egg mass size data.

All gypsy moth egg mass data was entered and managed in a Microsoft Excel database. In addition, a point shapefile of all plots was created in ArcMap. All plot centers were drawn in ArcMap and categorized based on the adjusted number of egg masses present within that plot and the defoliation forecast for 2021. The predicted defoliation values were obtained using a USDA defoliation prediction model (Gansner et al. 1985) based on egg mass counts.

Gypsy moth egg mass age (new vs. old ratio): The proportion of new and old egg masses is an indicator of population vigor. A low proportion of old egg masses (i.e. less than 25% old) indicates a healthy, building population while a high proportion of old egg masses (i.e. more than 50% old) suggests a population in decline (Liebhold et al. 1994). Crews distinguished the age of all egg masses on each tree trunk and summed both old and new egg masses observed for each grid cell.

Figure 8. Large new egg mass measured by BioForest staff.

In 2020, approximately **67%** of egg masses surveyed by BioForest crews were new. This is nearly a 10% increase from 2019 (58%). The percentage of new egg masses, though higher than 2019, still represents a moderate proportion of new egg masses and may indicate that this population has passed its peak and is on the decline.

Gypsy moth egg mass size: The actual size of the egg mass is a vital statistic for assessing gypsy moth populations. Larger egg masses (more than 500 eggs per mass, greater than 30mm) indicate a healthy, increasing population whereas smaller egg masses are characteristic of a decreasing population (less than 20mm in size) (Nealis and Erb 1993). The number of eggs per mass can be estimated by measuring the length of egg masses in the field.

Within each property surveyed, BioForest crews measured as many egg masses as possible to provide more information on the infestation status.

In 2020, **30%** of all new egg masses measured were considered to be “large” (25mm or greater) (Figure 9). Comparing to 2019’s baseline data of **84%**, this is a significant decrease in the percentage of large egg masses. The average size of new egg masses in 2020 was 25.0mm (n=723), significantly smaller than 2019 (33.5mm) (Figure 10), which potentially indicates that this population has passed its peak and is on the decline.



Figure 9. Comparing relative size distribution of new egg masses in Pelham from 2019 and 2020.



Figure 10. The average new egg mass size comparison 2019 to 2020.

Natural controls: BioForest crews observed a small number of caterpillars affected by *E. maimaiga* and NPV during the egg mass surveys. Egg mass predation (attacks) by birds and small mammals was evident at many locations throughout the survey, as well as evidence of parasitism. For example, small pinholes in egg masses indicated the presence of the tiny parasitic wasp, *Ooencyrtus kuvanae*. These predators and parasites will help to reduce gypsy moth populations.

2021 Gypsy Moth Defoliation Forecasts in Pelham

Gypsy moth forecast surveys using egg mass densities to predict defoliation are difficult to conduct in the urban environment. Most of the methodologies developed to date are suitable for continuous forested environments but are not easily adapted to the city where tree species and tree densities can vary considerably and where access is often limited. In 2021, BioForest crews conducted surveys in residential neighbourhoods on public trees, in a selection of parks and along rural roads to assess egg mass densities and egg mass size. A 2021 forecast map was developed based on a calculation of the density of gypsy moth egg masses per hectare, the standard measure for temporal and spatial comparisons of populations and defoliation forecasts in forests.

Gypsy moth defoliation is difficult to predict with a high degree of probability. As noted earlier, populations are subject to a wide variety of biotic and abiotic factors that complicate the forecasting process. Some degree of defoliation is likely to occur in all areas where egg masses have been observed. However, the data collected in the 2020 surveys does indicate clear areas that are likely to be affected in 2021. It should be noted that the forecasts presented in this report are based **only** on observed egg masses occurring on public trees in residential neighbourhoods, within those parks and along those rural roads that were surveyed. Private property was not surveyed, except for a few front yard or private woodlot trees where necessary.

The 2020 survey focused on resurveying all plots from 2019. It is likely that other areas of the Town, including parks, natural areas and large private property that were not included in this survey are also harbouring gypsy moth populations, just not yet reported. Depending on the composition and geographic characteristics of these areas (i.e. species, age class, slopes, etc.), they could potentially be a breeding ground for gypsy moth populations next year and into the future.

Table 2 illustrates the egg mass density thresholds that were used for defoliation forecasts, and the anticipated management impacts associated with each level of defoliation. It is important to remember, however, that these are just estimations and that the actual level of defoliation and damage is dependent on a variety of other factors such as tree condition, previous years' defoliation, presence of other pests, etc.

Table 2. Gypsy moth defoliation predictions based on egg mass densities per hectare and associated management impacts. Thresholds derived from USDA defoliation prediction model developed by Gansner et al. 1985.

Egg Mass Density (Em/Ha)	Defoliation Forecast	Defoliation Forecast Range (%)	Management Impacts
0	Nil	0 to 5	None
1 to 1,250	Light	6 to 25	Up to 20% Defoliation
1,251 to 3,750	Moderate	26 to 65	Nuisance and Aesthetics; Noticeable Defoliation
3,751 to 5,000	Heavy	66 to 90	Wildlife and Recreation; Growth Loss
> 5,001	Severe	91 to 100	Tree Mortality

Results

Figure 11 and 12 provide an overview of the location of all plots surveyed in 2020 and the 2021 defoliation forecasts for each plot surveyed. Figure 13 and 14 show close up maps of Fonthill and Fenwick, the urban areas within Pelham.



Figure 11. All gypsy moth egg mass monitoring plots surveyed in February 2021, Town of Pelham.



Figure 12. All gypsy moth egg mass monitoring plots surveyed in February 2021 and all blocks sprayed in May-June 2020, Town of Pelham.



Figure 13. All gypsy moth egg mass monitoring plots surveyed in February 2021 and all blocks sprayed in May-June 2020, Fonthill, Town of Pelham.



Figure 14. All gypsy moth egg mass monitoring plots surveyed in February 2021 and all blocks sprayed in May-June 2020, Fenwick, Town of Pelham.

The 2021 defoliation forecast results for the entire area surveyed (Figure 12) show high gypsy moth egg mass densities, or moderate to severe defoliation forecasts (represented by yellow, orange, and red dots on the map), occur in 100 plots out of 133, or 75% of plots with the majority of those being severe (76 plots). Light defoliation (represented by the light green dots on the map) is forecasted in 28 out of 133 plots, or 21%, and no defoliation (represented by the dark green dots on the map) is forecasted in 5 plots, or 4%.

The most severe defoliation is anticipated to occur: south of Fenwick (Sumberland Road, Balfour Street, Cream Street, and Foss Road) and throughout Fenwick, with the exception of Sandra Drive, Sunset drive, and Cream Street between Welland Road and Canboro Road; between Fenwick and Fonthill (along Welland Road and Canboro Road, particularly in proximity to Effingham Street and Cream Street, and Pancake Lane); northwest of Fonthill (Effingham Street, Kilman Road, Moore Drive, Centre Street, Haist Street, and Metler Road), and; the northern border and mid-western area of Fonthill (Pancake Lane, Berkwood Place, Canboro Road, Haist Street).

Table 3. Summary of grids and plots surveyed in 2020 for the Town of Pelham Gypsy Moth Egg Mass Surveys. Asterisk (*) denotes plots located in the 2020 spray zones.

Location	Grid	Plot	Plot Centre Address	Total Egg Masses	Adjusted Total Egg Masses	2020 New Egg Masses/Hectare (Em/Ha)	2021 Defoliation Forecast
Fenwick	73	73.3*	1159 Maple Street	1,028	433	43,284	Severe
	63	63.5	1050 Church Street	335	314	31,406	Severe
	64	64.1	663 Welland Road	336	299	29,867	Severe
	63	63.2	1090 Balfour Street	235	220	22,031	Severe
	63	63.4	999 Church Street	231	217	21,656	Severe
	74	74.2*	1284 Cream Street	378	151	15,120	Severe
	74	74.1*	612 Memorial Drive	359	144	14,360	Severe
	73	73.2*	746 Canboro Road	330	139	13,895	Severe
	74	74.4*	688 Canboro Road	212	85	8,480	Severe
	73	73.4*	726 Memorial Drive	157	66	6,611	Severe
	73	73.6	1229 Maple Street	121	51	5,095	Severe
	73	73.5*	1115 Garner Ave	120	51	5,053	Severe
	73	73.1*	90 Sandra Drive	55	23	2,316	Moderate
	74	74.3	1144 Cream Street	35	14	1,400	Moderate
	74	74.5*	1160 Sunset Drive	18	7	720	Light
Average						**14,753**	**Severe**
Fonthill	78	78.5*	38 Pancake Lane	515	235	23,486	Severe
	88	88.2*	Hillcrest Park	688	160	15,993	Severe
	99	99.3	6 Shorthill Place	221	151	15,137	Severe
	78	78.3*	22 Berkwood Place	286	130	13,042	Severe
	88	88.11	173 Canboro Road	545	127	12,669	Severe
	78	78.4*	1183 Haist Street	273	124	12,450	Severe
	99	99.2	23 Shorthill Place	154	105	10,548	Severe
	88	88.1*	15 Blackwood Cresent	439	102	10,205	Severe
	79	79.1*	43 Stella Street	177	74	7,428	Severe
	109	109.2	Across 1708 Pelham Street	75	57	5,657	Severe
	98	98.4*	16 Marlene Steward Drive	140	56	5,600	Severe

Location	Grid	Plot	Plot Centre Address	Total Egg Masses	Adjusted Total Egg Masses	2020 New Egg Masses/Hectare (Em/Ha)	2021 Defoliation Forecast
	78	78.6*	72 Millbridge Cresent	111	51	5,062	Severe
	78	78.2*	18 Rolling Meadows Boulevard	103	47	4,697	Heavy
	99	99.1	5 Leslie Place	68	47	4,658	Heavy
	88	88.7*	10 Oak Lane	200	46	4,649	Heavy
	68	68.3	1081 Deborah Street	63	43	4,302	Heavy
	80	80.2	220 Merritt Road	43	43	4,300	Heavy
	88	88.12	7 Highland Avenue	180	42	4,184	Heavy
	68	68.5	88 Woodside Square	58	40	3,961	Heavy
	98	98.1	18 Peachtree Park	49	33	3,267	Moderate
	68	68.4	1 Arbor Circle	44	30	3,005	Moderate
	78	78.1*	55 Rolling Meadows Boulevard	60	27	2,736	Moderate
	78	78.8	13 Deer Park Cresent	57	26	2,599	Moderate
	100	100.2	11 Scottdale Court	25	25	2,500	Moderate
	69	69.3	27 Tanner Drive	33	23	2,250	Moderate
	79	79.4	11 FallingBrook Drive	46	19	1,930	Moderate
	88	88.6*	8 Brucewood Street	75	17	1,743	Moderate
	88	88.13	127 Daleview Cresent	42	10	976	Light
	99	99.4	Trail behind 10 Elm Avenue	13	9	890	Light
	89	89.1	1 Petronella Parkway	16	8	838	Light
	79	79.5	2 Pancake Lane	17	7	713	Light
	68	68.2	1077 Edward Avenue	10	7	683	Light
	88	88.3*	Hillcrest Park	27	6	628	Light
	68	68.6	Along trail behind Maureen Court	7	5	478	Light
	69	69.1	88 Woodside Square	7	5	477	Light
	79	79.2	57 Stella Street	11	5	462	Light
	88	88.8	42 Strathcona Drive	19	4	442	Light
	88	88.9	28 Concord Street	19	4	442	Light
	99	99.7	33 Park Lane	6	4	411	Light
	69	69.4	Behind 52 Woodside Square	6	4	409	Light
	89	89.2	14 Donahugh	7	4	367	Light
	88	88.4*	Hillcrest Park	13	3	302	Light
	100	100.1	1 Stonegate Place	3	3	300	Light
	99	99.5	Trail behind 1532 Pelham Avenue	4	3	274	Light
	88	88.5*	Hillcrest Park	11	3	256	Light
	79	79.6	90 Merritt Road	5	2	210	Light
	89	89.4	1 emmett Street	4	2	210	Light
	99	99.6	20 Pelham Town Square	2	1	137	Light
	68	68.1	1077 Edward Avenue	2	1	137	Light
	79	79.3	Across 1253 Pelham Street	2	1	84	Light
	89	89.3	1353 Pelham Street	1	1	52	Light
	69	69.2	15 Manson Drive	0	0	0	Nil

Location	Grid	Plot	Plot Centre Address	Total Egg Masses	Adjusted Total Egg Masses	2020 New Egg Masses/Hectare (Em/Ha)	2021 Defoliation Forecast
	78	78.7	Bheind 19 Parkhill Road	0	0	0	Nil
	80	80.1	1304 Rice Road	0	0	0	Nil
Average						**3,671**	**Moderate**
Rural	44	44.1	617 Sumberland Road	1,168	1,168	116,800	Severe
	67	67.2	273 Welland Road	1,767	1,132	113,208	Severe
	117	117.1	1974 Effingham Street	1,287	1,026	102,619	Severe
	125	125.2	461 Kilman Road	1,184	908	90,764	Severe
	107	107.2	Across 307 Moore Drive	918	787	78,686	Severe
	77	77.1	1139 Effingham Street	941	704	70,438	Severe
	75	75.1*	546 Memorial Drive	1,601	691	69,115	Severe
	98	98.2	1636 Haist Street	991	661	66,067	Severe
	87	87.1*	250 Canboro Road	1,151	576	57,550	Severe
	115	115.3	1951 Centre Street	717	574	57,360	Severe
	118	118.2	1936 Haist Street	885	558	55,818	Severe
	118	118.1	Across 155 Metler Road	840	530	52,980	Severe
	75	75.3*	554 Canboro Road	1,210	522	52,236	Severe
	107	107.1	1770 Effingham Street	594	509	50,914	Severe
	43	43.4	595 Balfour Street	459	459	45,900	Severe
	126	126.1	350 Kilman Road	554	443	44,320	Severe
	98	98.3	1615 Haist Street	658	439	43,867	Severe
	77	77.2	1160 Effingham Street	577	432	43,191	Severe
	54	54.1	Across 586 Foss Road	464	425	42,533	Severe
	75	75.5	Across 1116 Centre Road	421	379	37,890	Severe
	77	77.3	230 Pancake Lane	499	374	37,353	Severe
	63	63.3	925 Balfour Street	394	369	36,938	Severe
	115	115.2	1934 Centre Street	454	363	36,320	Severe
	116	116.1	1951 Centre Street	404	323	32,320	Severe
	117	117.2	205 Metler Road	403	321	32,133	Severe
	54	54.2	770 Groen Road	348	319	31,900	Severe
	44	44.2	631 Sumberland Road	294	294	29,400	Severe
	34	34.1	Across 310 Cream Street	293	293	29,300	Severe
	53	53.3	910 Foss Road	281	281	28,100	Severe
	125	125.3	591 Kilman Road	353	271	27,061	Severe
	115	115.1	1951 Centre Street	333	266	26,640	Severe
	97	97.1	245 Hwy 20 West	664	266	26,560	Severe
	67	67.1	1005 Effingham Street	386	247	24,730	Severe
	43	43.5	625 Balfour Street	245	245	24,500	Severe
	107	107.3	315 Moore Drive	253	217	21,686	Severe
	104	104.2	1780 Cream Street	281	213	21,332	Severe
	53	53.1	764 Foss Road	188	188	18,800	Severe
	108	108.1	Across 1861 Haist Street	239	181	18,050	Severe

Location	Grid	Plot	Plot Centre Address	Total Egg Masses	Adjusted Total Egg Masses	2020 New Egg Masses/Hectare (Em/Ha)	2021 Defoliation Forecast
	109	109.1	1747 Pelham Street	234	177	17,650	Severe
	87	87.2	250 Hwy 20 West	441	176	17,640	Severe
	104	104.3	1732 Cream Street	228	173	17,308	Severe
	54	54.3	586 Foss Road	177	162	16,225	Severe
	106	106.1	345 Tice Road	396	158	15,840	Severe
	118	118.3	1925 Hansler Street	242	153	15,263	Severe
	43	43.2	716 Sumbler Road	146	146	14,600	Severe
	43	43.1	775 Sumbler Road	129	129	12,900	Severe
	106	106.2	345 Tice Road	150	128	12,750	Severe
	43	43.3	725 Balfour Street	92	92	9,200	Severe
	104	104.1	1895 Cream Street	121	92	9,186	Severe
	63	63.1	961 Balfour Street	63	59	5,906	Severe
	125	125.4	485 Kilman Road	76	58	5,826	Severe
	86	86.3*	353 Canboro Road	150	57	5,727	Severe
	105	105.1	1797 Centre Street	50	45	4,500	Heavy
	53	53.2	725 Balfour Street	44	44	4,400	Heavy
	33	33.2	Behind 701 Webber Road	36	36	3,600	Moderate
	86	86.1*	451 Canboro Road	85	32	3,245	Moderate
	83	83.1	740 Hwy 20 W	50	25	2,500	Moderate
	33	33.1	Behind 700 Chantler Road	21	21	2,100	Moderate
	75	75.4	1165 Centre Street	15	14	1,350	Moderate
	75	75.2*	491 Canboro Road	28	12	1,209	Light
	125	125.1	2180 Centre Street	11	8	843	Light
	94	94.1	653 Hwy 20 W	12	7	720	Light
	68	68.7	940 Haist Street	0	0	0	Nil
	86	86.2*	451 Canboro Road	0	0	0	Nil
Average						**31,185**	**Severe**

Fonthill

Public and private trees mostly along the mid-western area of Fonthill (Pancake Lane and Haist Street) and the along the northern border (Haist Street) will potentially experience severe levels of defoliation in 2021 (Figure 13). The average new egg mass size in Fonthill in 2020 was 26.8mm (n=97).

Fenwick

Public and private trees throughout the community of Fenwick will potentially experience severe levels of defoliation (Figure 14). There is not a significant amount of forested area throughout Fenwick, but new egg masses were observed on a wide variety of species and appeared on both large diameter and small diameter trees on both public and private property. Given the density of egg masses, combined with the severe defoliation that was forecasted for 2020, trees will possibly experience a decline in 2021 if they are defoliated for another consecutive year. The average new egg mass size for Fenwick in 2020 was 32.3mm (n=40).

Rural Areas

Rural, forested property south of Fenwick, between Fenwick and Fonthill, as well as northwest of Fonthill are also at risk of severe defoliation in 2021. Surveys in these areas were conducted primarily along roadways along the perimeter of these properties, in order to not trespass on private land (unless homeowners were on-site and gave permission), therefore the forecasts are representative of edge populations, which can be higher than more interior forests (Bellinger et al 1989). It is possible that these perimeter plots are an over-representation of the counts throughout the property, however the counts are so extreme (ranging from 0 all the way up to 116,800 egg masses per hectare) that it is very possible that interior counts are still high. The average new egg mass size for the rural areas in 2020 was 24.5mm (n=606).

Weather

Cool, wet conditions tend to favour the build-up of both NPV and *E. maimaiga*, and therefore, this is usually associated with a decrease in gypsy moth populations in the following year. Conversely, hot, dry conditions typically suppress the build-up of both NPV and *E. maimaiga*. Environment Canada weather data from the Welland-Pelham area indicate that in 2020, spring and summer temperatures were above normal in March and June, and below normal in April and May (Figure 15), and precipitation was above normal in March and April and below normal in May and June (Figure 16). In May and June 2020, the total precipitation amount was 66% of the normal total. The lower-than-normal precipitation amounts would not be favourable to NPV and *E. maimaiga*, therefore, it is likely that 2020 larval mortality due to natural pathogens was low. This is likely a contributing factor to the currently high levels of gypsy moth seen throughout the Town, and the province in general. As of December 2020, winter temperatures have also been higher than normal, therefore overwintering larval survivorship is expected to be good. A few days of -30°C temperatures would have a significant effect on those larvae; however, this is very rare in southern Ontario. A late frost (post-larval emergence) could also reduce the populations but it is impossible to predict the likelihood of this occurring.

Extreme larval populations, as seen throughout Pelham, are not sustainable. In combination with the right environmental conditions, such high host presence allows NPV to proliferate and spread more effectively throughout the gypsy moth population. This could potentially lead to a population crash in 2022 if conditions are right. But again, there is no way to predict the likelihood of this happening at this point in time.



Figure 15. Twenty-nine-year historical temperature normals (1981-2010) and 2020 monthly temperature averages for Town of Pelham area.



Figure 16. Twenty-nine-year historical precipitation normals (1981-2010) and 2020 monthly totals for the Town of Pelham area.

Conclusions and Recommendations for 2021

The objectives of this report are to provide the Town of Pelham with 1) an assessment of 2020 gypsy moth egg mass densities and convert these into forecasts of expected host damage and defoliation for 2021, 2) provide short- and long-term management options applying a philosophy of Integrated Pest Management (IPM), and 3) specific recommendations for management in the affected areas in 2021.

Based on the gypsy moth data collected during February 2021, the Town has potential to experience severe levels of defoliation throughout Fenwick, the mid-western and northern areas of Fonthill as well as forested areas south of Fenwick, northwest of Fonthill and in between Fenwick and Fonthill. It is possible the defoliation will extend beyond the areas surveyed, especially north of Kilman Road west of Effingham Street throughout these continuous heavily forested areas of the Natural Heritage Environmental Conservation areas.

At a high-level comparison, 2021 defoliation forecasts appear relatively unchanged from the 2020 forecasts. However, a closer look into the data reveals that more than 50% of plots recorded a decline in egg mass densities between 2019 and 2020 (Table 3).

In the rural area, **38%** of plots (24 out of 64) saw a decrease in egg mass density. Rural plots 53.3, 75.1, 75.3, 67.2, and 87.1 saw the greatest decline in egg mass density, with an average of 60% decline between these plots. Additionally, average egg mass size decreased between 2019 (30.9mm) and 2020 (24.5mm).

In Fenwick, **90%** of plots (14 out of 15) saw a decrease in egg mass density. Plots 73.4 and 73.2 saw the greatest declines within the Fenwick urban boundary, with 2020 egg mass densities approximately 87% lower than what was calculated in 2019. Both plots were located within the 2020 spray zones. Average egg mass size in Fenwick stayed relatively the same between 2019 (32.3mm) and 2020 (32.2mm).

In Fonthill, **57%** of plots (31 of 54) saw a decrease in egg mass density. Plots 78.4, 78.5, and 88.2 saw the greatest decline within the Fonthill urban boundary, with 2020 egg mass densities approximately 70% lower than what was calculated in 2020. These three plots are also located in the 2020 spray zones. Average egg mass sizes in Fonthill had the largest decrease from 2019 (36.5mm) to 2020 (26.8mm), a decline of nearly 10mm.

The overall average egg mass density for the Town of Pelham decreased by a quarter from 2019 (24,103 em/ha) to 2020 (18,161 em/ha), roughly 6,000 egg masses per hectare. This data potentially shows that gypsy moth populations in the area have passed their peak and is on the decline.

A moderate proportion (**67%**) of gypsy moth egg masses observed in February 2021 were new, which was slightly larger then 2019 (58%), but remain below levels for what is considered a healthy population (75%). Of these new egg masses, a small proportion (**30%**) were considered to be large, a significant drop from 2019 (84%). This provides further evidence that populations are potentially passing their peak and are on the decline.

Approximately 120 hectares were sprayed in the spring of 2020, mainly focusing on municipal properties within the urban boundaries of Fenwick and Fonthill, including along Canboro Road between both urban areas. Of the plots located within the spray zones **100%** (31 out of 31) saw a decline in egg mass density. As part of the spray program, trees within and outside of the spray blocks were evaluated for defoliation approximately one month, post-spray. Of the 100 trees that were evaluated for defoliation within the spray blocks, a significant majority of branches (84.3%) and trees (94%) had less than 5% defoliation. None of the trees had more than 25% defoliation, and only 1% of branches evaluated had more than 25% defoliation. For comparison purposes, seven sites that were not sprayed (but were forecasted to experience severe defoliation by the 2019 egg mass surveys) were also evaluated for defoliation. The majority of branches (57%) and trees (51.4) exceeded 50% defoliation.

The results of the defoliation surveys confirm that the 2020 aerial spray program was successful at protecting trees from severe defoliation within the spray blocks, and some residual effects from the spray have resulted in lower egg mass densities within the spray blocks. Since gypsy moth is such an established pest in the southern Ontario landscape, it is not possible to eradicate it from the area, nor is this the goal of Integrated Pest Management (IPM). However, the 2020 aerial spray program does appear to have suppressed populations within the spray blocks with some degree of efficacy. The main objective of gypsy moth management is to protect overall tree/forest health by mitigating the negative effects of multiple consecutive years of defoliation, and ultimately help trees to survive throughout the outbreak. The 2020 spray program was effective at achieving this objective within the spray zones, however, given the population levels seen in Pelham in combination with the abundant host availability, it is unsurprising that many plots throughout the Town have severe defoliation forecasts again for 2021. Many factors – including the age of the outbreak in the Niagara Region, declines seen in egg mass densities and egg mass sizes between 2019 and 2020, and evidence of egg parasitism – suggest that Pelham's gypsy moth population may have passed it peak and may be on the decline. However, it has not yet collapsed completely, and the 2020 survey data indicates that areas throughout the Town will potentially experience severe levels of defoliation in 2021.

Recommendations

The Town has three management options for 2021 which are outlined below: 1) "Do Nothing", where the Town does not intervene and allows the gypsy moth population to run its natural course, 2) targeted treatment of areas within urban boundaries of Fonthill and Fenwick, with the option of adding the forested areas directly adjacent to the urban boundaries, or 3) large-scale treatment including areas within urban boundaries of Fonthill and Fenwick as well as rural regions of the Town.

Option 1: The Town takes no action on public trees and executes a strong communication and engagement program throughout the communities of Fenwick and Fonthill, as well as rural landowners. Landowners should be educated on what their treatment options are (ground treatments with Btk or TreeAzin®, manual egg mass removal, or burlap banding) as well as the pros and cons associated with each option, focusing on cost and efficacy. Communication should be executed through a variety of avenues in order to reach as many people as possible. A combination of public open houses, direct mailings/letter drop-off/door hanger, website and social media (Twitter, Facebook, Instagram) will reach a wide audience. Open houses should be hosted on multiple evenings in early spring (March/April), and distributed materials should include a gypsy moth fact sheet and options summary, burlap band and twine, as well as information on what the Town is doing. This option requires much less time and fewer resources than the subsequent options, however with a population as severe as this it is very unlikely that management on private property alone would control the current outbreak. As a result, varying levels of defoliation will still occur and there is the risk that the gypsy moth population will persist for another year, thus prolonging the cost of management. Additionally, since this is likely the second or third year of high population levels, some decline in tree health may start to be observed such as branch dieback or reduced vigor, and tree mortality in some cases. Finally, given the political context of the gypsy moth issue over the past few years, this option may not be acceptable.

The consequences associated with inaction may result in overall tree health decline and further expenses required due to hazard tree removal, service requests, pruning, etc. as a result of a persisting and severe gypsy moth population and all of the impacts described under the section "Potential Impacts of No Intervention". The upside of this approach is the reduced immediate cost to the Town in 2020.

Option 2: The Town implements a targeted aerial spray program within the urban boundaries of Fonthill and Fenwick, supported by a strong public outreach and communications program as described in Option 1, targeted towards private landowners with moderate-to-severe defoliation forecast plots located on their property. An aerial spray program including both public and private property would be the most effective method of controlling the gypsy moth population and reducing the risk to tree health in Fonthill and Fenwick. The downside of such a program includes significant staff time and upfront costs associated with organization, communication and implementation. The upside would be the immediate and dramatic reduction in gypsy moth populations, reduced number of resident complaints, and preservation of tree health. This approach may be cost-prohibitive if Pelham is the sole municipality undertaking an aerial spray program. However, there may be the opportunity to work with other southern Ontario municipalities who are also interested in a spray program to achieve some cost-effectiveness through cooperation. Private landowners located outside of the spray blocks, especially those with moderate-to-severe forecast plots on their property, should be communicated with in a similar manner as described below in Option 1. They should be encouraged to take action on their property using one of the management options available to the public.

High value trees (i.e. significant and/or mature trees) that have high 2020 egg mass counts, but do not get included in the spray blocks, should be considered as candidates for alternative control methods such as ground treatments with Btk or TreeAzin®, manual egg mass removal, or burlap banding. These measures will help to mitigate the effects of gypsy moth defoliation on these individual trees.

This option could limit the spray to public property, however, due to the landscape nature of this pest it is possible that the sprayed public areas could be re-infested by populations in neighbouring untreated private areas. This option could also include the treatment of forested areas directly adjacent to the urban boundaries in order to provide more comprehensive and effective landscape control and avoid re-infestation from properties just on the other side of the geographical urban/rural boundary.

Option 3: The Town implements a large-scale, extensive aerial spray program within the urban boundaries of Fonthill and Fenwick, as well as throughout rural areas of Pelham that have high defoliation forecasts. The downside of such a program include all those mentioned in Option 2, though the cost increases due to the inclusion of rural areas.

Regardless of the option selected, timely and comprehensive communication with the public about the Town's plan and the expected role of private landowners is key to a successful program. If left untreated, the current gypsy moth outbreak has the potential to impact a significant component of Pelham's urban forest. Therefore, given the results from the 2020 egg mass surveys in combination with the historical gypsy moth activity in the area, the Town should strongly consider implementing a gypsy moth-focused tree protection program in 2021, with the goal of reducing unacceptable levels of defoliation and mitigating the overall impact to the health and sustainability of Pelham's urban forest.

References

Bellinger, R., F. Ravlin, M. Mcmanus. 1989. Forest edge effects and their influence on gypsy moth (Lepidoptera: Lymantriidae) egg mass distribution. Environmental Entomology 18(5): 840-843.

Benoit, P. and D. Lachance. 1990. Gypsy moth in Canada: Behavior and control. For. Can. Quebec Region. Inf. Rep. DPC-X-32.

BioForest. 2020. 2019 Gypsy Moth Monitoring Program: Town of Pelham 2019 Population Assessment and 2020 Defoliation Forecasts. 38 pp.

Brooks, C. and D. Hall. 2005. Gypsy Moth Silvicultural Guidelines for Wisconsin. Wisconsin DNR PUB-FR-123 97. 14 pp.

Campbell, R.W. 1966. Gypsy moth egg mass density and subsequent defoliation. USDA Forest Service, Research Note NE-44.

Campbell, R.W. 1979. Gypsy moth: Forest influence. USDA Forest Service, Bulletin No 423.

Campbell, R.W. and J.D. Podgwaite. 1971. The disease complex of the gypsy moth. Journal of Invertebrate Pathology. 18:101-107.

Capitol Health Region. 1999. Human health surveillance during the aerial spraying for control of North American gypsy moth on southern Vancouver Island, BC, 1999. A Report to the Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks, Province of British Columbia. By Capital Health Region, Victoria, BC.

Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA). 2005. http://www.inspection.gc.ca/english/sci/surv/2005maps/ldcanqz2005e.shtml

City of Regina. 2016. City's Cankerworm Control Program. City of Regina. Available online at: http://www.regina.ca/residents/tree-yard/control-pests/cankerworm-control-program/.

Cloyd, R.A. and P.L. Nixon. 2001. Gypsy Moth: Entomology Fact Sheet NHE-153. Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

Coulson, R.N. and J.A. Witter. 1984. Forest entomology ecology and management. John Wiley and Sons.

Eirich, R. 2008. Establishing action thresholds for control of cankerworms in Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada. Arboriculture & Urban Forestry 34(2):66-73.

Evans 2005. Forest Health Update November 18, 2005. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Natural Resources Canada, Canadian Forest Service. 5 pp.

Fleischer, S., J. Carter, R. Reardon and F.W. Ravlin. 1992. Sequential sampling plans for estimating gypsy moth egg mass density. USDA Forest Service AIPM Technical Information Transfer. NA-TP-07-92.

Gansner, D.A., O.W. Herrick, and M. Ticehurst. 1985. A method for predicting gypsy moth defoliation from egg mass counts. Northern Journal of Applied Forestry 2:78-79.

Gage, S.H., T.M. Wirth and G. A. Simmons. 1990. Predicting regional gypsy moth (Lymantriidae) population trends in an expanding population using pheromone trap catch and spatial analysis. Environmental Entomology 19: 370-377.

Ghent, J.H. and C.L. Morris. 1978. Sticky trap survey to predict fall cankerworm defoliation. USDA Forest Service. Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

Gottschalk, K.W. 1993. Silvicultural guidelines for forest stands threatened by the gypsy moth. USDA Forest Service NE For. Exp. Sta. Gen Tech. NE-171. 50 pp.

Hayes, A., J. Meating and C. Howard. 1998. North American insect control history: Major forest pests. Report prepared by BioForest Technologies Inc. for Abbott Laboratories.

Health Canada.1997. Effective Control of Gypsy Moth. Pest Management Regulatory Agency Pest Note. 2 pp.

Health Canada. 2000. Fact Sheet on the Bacillus thuringiensis subspecies kurstaki. Health Canada.

La France, K.R. and A.R. Westwood. 2006. An assessment of tree banding techniques to capture cankerworm defoliators of elm and ash trees in Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada. Arboriculture & Urban Forestry 32(1):10-17.

Leonard, D.E. 1974. Recent developments in ecology and control of the gypsy moth. Annual Review of Entomology 19:197-229.

Liebhold, A.M. and J. S. Elkinton. 1988a. Estimating the density of larvay gypsy moth, Lymantria dispar (Lepidoptera: Lymantriidae), using frass drop and frass production measurements: sources of variation and sample size. Environmental Entomology 17: 385-390.

Liebhold, A.M. and J.S. Elkinton. 1988b. Techniques for estimating the density of late-instar gypsy moth, Lymantria dispar (Lepidoptera: Lymantriidae), populations using frass drop and frass production measurements. Environmental Entomology 17: 381-384.

Liebhold, A.M., J.A. Halverson, and G.A. Elmes. 1992. Gypsy moth invasion of North America: A quantitative analysis. Journal of Biogeography 19: 513-520.

Liebhold, A., K. Thorpe, J. Ghent and D.B Lyons. 1994. Gypsy Moth Egg Mass Sampling for Decision-Making: A User's Guide. USDA Forest Service NE Area S. Reg. NA-TP-04-94.

McManus, M.L., D.R. Huston and W.E. Wallner. 1979. The homeowner and the gypsy moth: Guidelines for control. USDA Gypsy Moth Handbook. U.S. Govt. Printing Office. Stock No. 001-000-03950-4.

Melin B.E. and Cozzi E.M. 1990. Safety to nontarget invertebrates of Lepidopteran strains of *Bacillus thuringiensis* and their (ß)-exotoxins. In: Laird M, Lacey LA, & Davidson EW ed. Safety of microbial insecticides. Boca Raton, Florida, CRC Press, pp 149–167.

Miller, R.W. 1996. Urban forestry: planning and managing urban greenspaces. Prentice Hall New Jersey.

Moore, K.E.B. and C.G. Jones. 1987. Field estimation of fecundity of gypsy moth (Lepidoptera: Lymantriidae). Environmental Entomology 16: 165-167.

National Parks Service. 2010. Gypsy Moth: Integrated Pest Management Manual. United States Department of the Interior. Available online at: https://www.nature.nps.gov/biology/ipm/manual/gypsymth.cfm.

Nealis, V.G. and S. Erb. 1993. A sourcebook for management of the gypsy moth. For. Can. Ont. Reg., Great Lakes Forestry Centre.

Nester, E.W., L.S. Thomashow, M. Metz and M. Gordon. 2002. 100 Years of Bacillus thuringiensis: A critical scientific assessment. A Report for the American Academy of Microbiology

Noble, M.A., P.D. Riben and G. Cook. 1992. Microbiological and Epidemiological Surveillance Programme to Monitor the Health Effects of Foray 48B Btk Spray. Prepared for: Ministry of Forests, Province of British Columbia. Prepared by: UBC, Department of Pathology and Health Care and Epidemiology, and University Hospital, Vancouver, B.C.

Noukoun, C., G. Bryant, S.D. Frank. 2014. The effect of sticky bands on cankerworm abundance and defoliation in urban trees. Arboriculture & Urban Forestry 40(3):135-142.

Nowak, D.J., M. Kuroda and D.E. Crane. 2004. Tree mortality rates and tree population projections in Baltimore, Maryland, USA. www.urbanforestrysouth.org

Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (OMNR), undated. Gypsy moth in Ontario: Facts about protecting property against gypsy moth infestation. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources Gypsy Moth Management Committee.

OMNR 2001. A manual for aerial spraying in Ontario's Crown forests. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources.

Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (OMNRF). 2018. Forest Health Conditions of Ontario, 2018. Available online at: https://files.ontario.ca/forest_health_conditions_ontario_2018_access.pdf.

OMNRF. 2019. Forest Health Conditions of Ontario, 2019. Presented by Dan Rowlinson on October 23, 2019.

Otvos I.S. and Vanderveen S. 1993. Environmental report and current status of *Bacillus thuringiensis* var. *kurstaki* use for control of forest and agricultural insect pests. Victoria, British Columbia, Ministry of Forests, Forestry Canada, pp 1–81.

Pandit, R., Polyakov, M., Tapsuwan, S., and T. Moran. 2013. The effect of street trees on property value in Perth, Western Australia. Landscape and Urban Planning 110: 134-142.

Payne, B.R. 1971. The contribution of trees to residential property values in Amherst, Massachusetts. USDA Forest Service, Hamden, Conn.

Perez, J., Bond, C., Buhl, K., Stone, D. 2015. Bacillus thuringiensis (Bt) General Fact Sheet; National Pesticide Information Center, Oregon State University Extension Services. http://npic.orst.edu/factsheets/btgen.html.

Reardon, R.C. and A.E. Hajek. 1998. The Gypsy Moth Fungus Entomophaga maimaiga in North America. FHTET-97-11. USDA Forest Service, Forest Health Technology Enterprise Team, Morgantown, WV. 22 pp.

Reardon, R., M. McManus, D. Kolodny-Hirsch, R. Tichenor, M. Raupp, C. Schwalbe, R. Webb and P. Meckley. 1987. Development and implementation of a gypsy moth integrated pest management program. Journal of Arboriculture 13: 209-216.

Skaller, P.M. 1985. Patterns in the distribution of gypsy moth (Lymantria dispar) (Lepidoptera: Lymantriidae) egg masses over an 11-year population cycle. Environmental Entomology 14:106-117.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1998. Registration eligibility decision, Bacillus thuringiensis. United States Environmental Protection Agency. March 1998. Washington, D.C.

USDA Forest Service. 1995a. Gypsy moth management in the United States: A cooperative approach. Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry, Radnor, PA. [pagination not continuous].

USDA Forest Service. 1995b. Gypsy Moth Management in the United States: Draft Environmental Impact Statement Summary. Radnor PA.

USDA 2003. www.fs.fed.us/ne/morgantown/4557/gmoth/spread/

Walter, J.A., F.T. Finch, and D.M. Johnson. 2016. Re-evaluating fall cankerworm management thresholds for urban and suburban forests. Agricultural and Forest Entomology 18:145-150.

Waters, W.E. 1974. Systems approach to managing pine bark beetles. In Payne, T.L., R.N. Coulson, R.C. Thatcher (Eds.), Southern Pine Beetle Symposium. Proceedings of Symposium, Texas Agriculture Experiment Station, College Station.

Williams, D.W., R.W. Fuester, W.W. Metterhouse, R.J. Balaam, R.H. Bullock and J. Chianese. 1991. Oak defoliation and population density relationships for the gypsy moth (Lepidoptera: Lymantriidae). Journal of Economic Entomology 84: 1508-1514.

Appendix – A

Table 4. Comparison of egg mass density from 2019 to 2020. Asterix (*) indicates plots located in 2020 spray zones

Location	Grid	Plot	Plot Centre Address	Total Egg Masses	Adjusted Total Egg Masses	2020 Egg Masses/Hectare (Em/Ha)	2021 Defoliation Forecast	2019 Egg Masses/Hectare (Em/Ha)	Difference from 2019-2020
Fenwick	73	73.3*	1159 Maple Street	1,028	433	43,284	Severe	93,450	-50,166
	63	63.5	1050 Church Street	335	314	31,406	Severe	58,154	-26,748
	64	64.1	663 Welland Road	336	299	29,867	Severe	39,914	-10,048
	63	63.2	1090 Balfour Street	235	220	22,031	Severe	24,674	-2,643
	63	63.4	999 Church Street	231	217	21,656	Severe	23,843	-2,187
	74	74.2*	1284 Cream Street	378	151	15,120	Severe	38,838	-23,718
	74	74.1*	612 Memorial Drive	359	144	14,360	Severe	62,292	-47,932
	73	73.2*	746 Canboro Road	330	139	13,895	Severe	78,525	-64,630
	74	74.4*	688 Canboro Road	212	85	8,480	Severe	32,111	-23,631
	73	73.4*	726 Memorial Drive	157	66	6,611	Severe	74,175	-67,564
	73	73.6	1229 Maple Street	121	51	5,095	Severe	1,875	+3,220
	73	73.5*	1115 Garner Ave	120	51	5,053	Severe	47,775	-42,722
	73	73.1*	90 Sandra Drive	55	23	2,316	Moderate	52,350	-50,034
	74	74.3	1144 Cream Street	35	14	1,400	Moderate	1,696	-296
	74	74.5*	1160 Sunset Drive	18	7	720	Light	12,634	-11,914
Average						**14,753**	**Severe**	**42,820**	**-28,067**
Fonthill	78	78.5*	38 Pancake Lane	515	235	23,486	Severe	78,992	-55,506
	88	88.2*	Hillcrest Park	688	160	15,993	Severe	46,832	-30,838
	99	99.3	6 Shorthill Place	221	151	15,137	Severe	10,739	+4,398
	78	78.3*	22 Berkwood Place	286	130	13,042	Severe	35,332	-22,289
	88	88.11	173 Canboro Road	545	127	12,669	Severe	35,461	-22,792
	78	78.4*	1183 Haist Street	273	124	12,450	Severe	42,871	-30,422
	99	99.2	23 Shorthill Place	154	105	10,548	Severe	6,774	+3,774
	88	88.1*	15 Blackwood Cresent	439	102	10,205	Severe	26,786	-16,581
	79	79.1*	43 Stella Street	177	74	7,428	Severe	11,530	-4,103
	109	109.2	Across 1708 Pelham Street	75	57	5,657	Severe	2,750	+2,907
	98	98.4*	16 Marlene Steward Drive	140	56	5,600	Severe	25,200	-19,600
	78	78.6*	72 Millbridge Cresent	111	51	5,062	Severe	15,167	-10,105
	78	78.2*	18 Rolling Meadows Boulevard	103	47	4,697	Heavy	19,112	-14,415
	99	99.1	5 Leslie Place	68	47	4,658	Heavy	1,817	+2,840
	88	88.7*	10 Oak Lane	200	46	4,649	Heavy	10,438	-5,789
	68	68.3	1081 Deborah Street	63	43	4,302	Heavy	3,335	+967
	80	80.2	220 Merritt Road	43	43	4,300	Heavy	300	+4,000
	88	88.12	7 Highland Avenue	180	42	4,184	Heavy	11,475	-7,290
	68	68.5	88 Woodside Square	58	40	3,961	Heavy	2,274	+1,687
	98	98.1	18 Peachtree Park	49	33	3,267	Moderate	6,300	-3,033
	68	68.4	1 Arbor Circle	44	30	3,005	Moderate	2,198	+806

Location	Grid	Plot	Plot Centre Address	Total Egg Masses	Adjusted Total Egg Masses	2020 Egg Masses/Hectare (Em/Ha)	2021 Defoliation Forecast	2019 Egg Masses/Hectare (Em/Ha)	Difference from 2019-2020
	78	78.1*	55 Rolling Meadows Boulevard	60	27	2,736	Moderate	24,197	-21,461
	78	78.8	13 Deer Park Cresent	57	26	2,599	Moderate	3,945	-1346
	100	100.2	11 Scottdale Court	25	25	2,500	Moderate	267	+2,233
	69	69.3	27 Tanner Drive	33	23	2,250	Moderate	4,860	-2,610
	79	79.4	11 FallingBrook Drive	46	19	1,930	Moderate	1,526	+404
	88	88.6*	8 Brucewood Street	75	17	1,743	Moderate	4,286	-2,542
	88	88.13	127 Daleview Cresent	42	10	976	Light	1,141	-164
	99	99.4	Trail behind 10 Elm Avenue	13	9	890	Light	0	+890
	89	89.1	1 Petronella Parkway	16	8	838	Light	509	-329
	79	79.5	2 Pancake Lane	17	7	713	Light	113	+600
	68	68.2	1077 Edward Avenue	10	7	683	Light	985	-303
	88	88.3*	Hillcrest Park	27	6	628	Light	1,175	-547
	68	68.6	Along trail behind Maureen Court	7	5	478	Light	76	+402
	69	69.1	88 Woodside Square	7	5	477	Light	0	+477
	79	79.2	57 Stella Street	11	5	462	Light	0	+462
	88	88.8	42 Strathcona Drive	19	4	442	Light	622	-180
	88	88.9	28 Concord Street	19	4	442	Light	1,244	-803
	99	99.7	33 Park Lane	6	4	411	Light	0	+411
	69	69.4	Behind 52 Woodside Square	6	4	409	Light	810	-401
	89	89.2	14 Donahugh	7	4	367	Light	318	+48
	88	88.4*	Hillcrest Park	13	3	302	Light	2,869	-2,566
	100	100.1	1 Stonegate Place	3	3	300	Light	67	+233
	99	99.5	Trail behind 1532 Pelham Avenue	4	3	274	Light	0	+274
	88	88.5*	Hillcrest Park	11	3	256	Light	449	-194
	79	79.6	90 Merritt Road	5	2	210	Light	0	+210
	89	89.4	1 emmett Street	4	2	210	Light	191	+19
	99	99.6	20 Pelham Town Square	2	1	137	Light	83	+54
	68	68.1	1077 Edward Avenue	2	1	137	Light	227	-91
	79	79.3	Across 1253 Pelham Street	2	1	84	Light	0	+84
	89	89.3	1353 Pelham Street	1	1	52	Light	318	-266
	69	69.2	15 Manson Drive	0	0	0	Nil	0	0
	78	78.7	Bheind 19 Parkhill Road	0	0	0	Nil	526	-526
	80	80.1	1304 Rice Road	0	0	0	Nil	0	0
Average						**3,671**	**Moderate**	**8,268**	**-4,597**
Rural	44	44.1	617 Sumberland Road	1,168	1,168	116,800	Severe	83,000	+33,800
	67	67.2	273 Welland Road	1,767	1,132	113,208	Severe	184,342	-71,134
	117	117.1	1974 Effingham Street	1,287	1,026	102,619	Severe	52,465	+50,153
	125	125.2	461 Kilman Road	1,184	908	90,764	Severe	33,577	+57,187
	107	107.2	Across 307 Moore Drive	918	787	78,686	Severe	65,726	+12,960
	77	77.1	1139 Effingham Street	941	704	70,438	Severe	85,237	-14,798
	75	75.1*	546 Memorial Drive	1,601	691	69,115	Severe	213,120	-144,005

Location	Grid	Plot	Plot Centre Address	Total Egg Masses	Adjusted Total Egg Masses	2020 Egg Masses/Hectare (Em/Ha)	2021 Defoliation Forecast	2019 Egg Masses/Hectare (Em/Ha)	Difference from 2019-2020
	98	98.2	1636 Haist Street	991	661	66,067	Severe	25,855	+40,212
	87	87.1*	250 Canboro Road	1,151	576	57,550	Severe	124,912	-67,362
	115	115.3	1951 Centre Street	717	574	57,360	Severe	28,920	+28,440
	118	118.2	1936 Haist Street	885	558	55,818	Severe	61,742	-5,924
	118	118.1	Across 155 Metler Road	840	530	52,980	Severe	82,129	-29,149
	75	75.3*	554 Canboro Road	1,210	522	52,236	Severe	136,320	-84,084
	107	107.1	1770 Effingham Street	594	509	50,914	Severe	9,078	+41,837
	43	43.4	595 Balfour Street	459	459	45,900	Severe	54,900	-9,000
	126	126.1	350 Kilman Road	554	443	44,320	Severe	30,100	+14,220
	98	98.3	1615 Haist Street	658	439	43,867	Severe	40,745	+3,121
	77	77.2	1160 Effingham Street	577	432	43,191	Severe	16,770	+26,421
	54	54.1	Across 586 Foss Road	464	425	42,533	Severe	9,600	+32,933
	75	75.5	Across 1116 Centre Road	421	379	37,890	Severe	8,080	+29,810
	77	77.3	230 Pancake Lane	499	374	37,353	Severe	20,713	+16,639
	63	63.3	925 Balfour Street	394	369	36,938	Severe	34,062	+2,876
	115	115.2	1934 Centre Street	454	363	36,320	Severe	40,380	-4,060
	116	116.1	1951 Centre Street	404	323	32,320	Severe	15,150	+17,170
	117	117.2	205 Metler Road	403	321	32,133	Severe	19,826	+12,307
	54	54.2	770 Groen Road	348	319	31,900	Severe	11,500	+20,400
	44	44.2	631 Sumberland Road	294	294	29,400	Severe	22,900	+6,500
	34	34.1	Across 310 Cream Street	293	293	29,300	Severe	1,600	+27,700
	53	53.3	910 Foss Road	281	281	28,100	Severe	117,100	-89,000
	125	125.3	591 Kilman Road	353	271	27,061	Severe	3,664	+23,397
	115	115.1	1951 Centre Street	333	266	26,640	Severe	31,500	-4,860
	97	97.1	245 Hwy 20 West	664	266	26,560	Severe	33,702	-7,142
	67	67.1	1005 Effingham Street	386	247	24,730	Severe	22,263	+2,467
	43	43.5	625 Balfour Street	245	245	24,500	Severe	60,525	-36,025
	107	107.3	315 Moore Drive	253	217	21,686	Severe	9,852	+11,834
	104	104.2	1780 Cream Street	281	213	21,332	Severe	12,347	+8,984
	53	53.1	764 Foss Road	188	188	18,800	Severe	15,100	+3,700
	108	108.1	Across 1861 Haist Street	239	181	18,050	Severe	7,850	+10,200
	109	109.1	1747 Pelham Street	234	177	17,650	Severe	5,463	+12,187
	87	87.2	250 Hwy 20 West	441	176	17,640	Severe	59,126	-41,486
	104	104.3	1732 Cream Street	228	173	17,308	Severe	3,726	+13,582
	54	54.3	586 Foss Road	177	162	16,225	Severe	3,900	+12,325
	106	106.1	345 Tice Road	396	158	15,840	Severe	27,072	-11,232
	118	118.3	1925 Hansler Street	242	153	15,263	Severe	14,774	+489
	43	43.2	716 Sumbler Road	146	146	14,600	Severe	45,525	-30,925
	43	43.1	775 Sumbler Road	129	129	12,900	Severe	9,675	+3,225
	106	106.2	345 Tice Road	150	128	12,750	Severe	2,017	+10,733
	43	43.3	725 Balfour Street	92	92	9,200	Severe	38,025	-28,825

Location	Grid	Plot	Plot Centre Address	Total Egg Masses	Adjusted Total Egg Masses	2020 Egg Masses/Hectare (Em/Ha)	2021 Defoliation Forecast	2019 Egg Masses/Hectare (Em/Ha)	Difference from 2019-2020
	104	104.1	1895 Cream Street	121	92	9,186	Severe	2,211	+6,975
	63	63.1	961 Balfour Street	63	59	5,906	Severe	31,486	-25,580
	125	125.4	485 Kilman Road	76	58	5,826	Severe	1,438	+4,388
	86	86.3*	353 Canboro Road	150	57	5,727	Severe	17,963	-12,236
	105	105.1	1797 Centre Street	50	45	4,500	Heavy	1,500	+3,000
	53	53.2	725 Balfour Street	44	44	4,400	Heavy	1,000	+3,400
	33	33.2	Behind 701 Webber Road	36	36	3,600	Moderate	700	+2,900
	86	86.1*	451 Canboro Road	85	32	3,245	Moderate	11,398	-8,153
	83	83.1	740 Hwy 20 W	50	25	2,500	Moderate	4,107	-1,607
	33	33.1	Behind 700 Chantler Road	21	21	2,100	Moderate	0	+2,100
	75	75.4	1165 Centre Street	15	14	1,350	Moderate	240	+1,110
	75	75.2*	491 Canboro Road	28	12	1,209	Light	5,440	-4,231
	125	125.1	2180 Centre Street	11	8	843	Light	325	+519
	94	94.1	653 Hwy 20 W	12	7	720	Light	2,314	-1,594
	68	68.7	940 Haist Street	0	0	0	Nil	0	0
	86	86.2*	451 Canboro Road	0	0	0	Nil	835	-835
Average						**31,185**	**Severe**	**33,077**	**-1,892**