

CANADIAN WILDLIFE SERVICE WESTERN REGIONAL LIBRARY

EFFECTS OF FOREST SPRAYING OF SUMITHION ON BIRDS AND AMPHIBIANS IN NEW BRUNSWICK

P.A. Pearce and S.M. Teeple Canadian Wildlife Service Fredericton, N.B., and Ottawa, Ont.

For Interdepartmental Committee on Forest Spraying Operations November 1969

Abstract

Pre- and post-spray bird counts were made in a forest area operationally sprayed twice with Sumithion at 2 oz in 0.15 U.S.G./acre. Census data revealed no marked decrease in the numbers of birds after spraying. Three intoxicated birds were found, two of which died in captivity a few hours later. No carcasses were found nor any other evidence that birds had been adversely affected by the spray. Postspray searching in an additional six **areas** treated in the same manner failed to indicate that birds had been poisoned. There was no observable effect on frogs and toads in a pond sprayed once with Sumithion at 2 oz in 0.15 U.S.G./acre. The Canadian Wildlife Service was able to monitor operational spraying of Sumithion in only one of the blocks treated during the 1969 spruce budworm control program in New Brunswick. The following brief reported is concerned with observations of the effects on forest birds and amphibians.

By virtue of its accessibility and proximity to field headquarters, Block #167, about 4 miles northeast of Doaktown, was selected for monitoring. A 2-mile transect was marked in the centre of the block along a road oriented roughly at right angles to the planned flight path of spray aircraft. Bird counts were made before and after spraying in the manner described in previous submissions to this Committee. Control counts were made in an area south of Muzroll Brook about 7 miles southeast of Doaktown. Sprayed areas were searched for evidence of bird intoxication. The bird counts are summarized in Tables 1 and 2 and the population indices derived from them are presented in Table 3.

m

Block #167 was sprayed on the evening of June 1 with 2 oz Sumithion in 0.15 U.S.G. formulation/acre. Subsequent re-drawing of spray block boundaries resulted in the transect falling in 2 blocks (666 and 667). Block #666, containing the western 1/3 of the transect, was re-sprayed on the morning of June 9 with 2 oz Sumithion in 0.15 U.S.G./acre. Block #667, containing the eastern 2/3 of the transect, was re-sprayed in the same manner during the evening of June 10. Total dosage was thus 4 oz active ingredient in 0.30 U.S.G./acre. Table 1. Bird count results, Operational Area Sumithion 167 (666 & 667)

Yellow-bellied sapsucker Least flycatcher Eastern wood pewee	5	6		45.7		9		10		11	12
Olive-sided flycatcher Blue jay Boreal chickadee Red-breasted nuthatch Winter wren Robin Swainson's thrush Veery Ruby-crowned kinglet	0 0 2 1 5 2 3 0 4 1 2 3 1 1 3 3 2 4 8 5 2 5 8 1 20	0 3 0 0 2 2 4 10 3 1 1 1 8 2 10 1 2 2 6 22 7 3 12 8 10 16	730032351323263933499563963 19623	First spray application (entire transect) - evening of June	96221416174905151027223138221	11 5 3 1 3 3 2 4 3 4 6 8 2 5 1 8 1 1 2 7 24 4 9 3 5 2 16	Second spray application (western one-third of transect) - morning of June 9	10 3 3 1 3 2 4 8 7 6 8 1 5 0 6 0	Second spray application (eastern two-thirds of transect) - evening of June 10	7812243756133610	873132141549021162215263776421

* Those recorded consistently, after initial arrival on operational area, at least up to time of first spray application.

2

		Num	ber of	birds	recor	ded	
Species*	June 1	June 2	June 3	June 6	June 9	June 11	June 14
Yellow-bellied sapsucker	7	13	11	6	13	11	8
Least flycatcher	15	9	12	10	8	9	15
Eastern wood pewee	0	1	0	3	5	7	7
Olive-sided flycatcher	0	3	0	3	2	4	3
Black-capped chickadee	4	4	1	4	1	1	0
Red-breasted nuthatch	5	6	1 2	2	5	2	3 0 1 0
Brown creeper	4	7	5	3	2	0	0
Winter wren	7	9	9	5	6	4	7
Hylocichla spp.	12	7	9	12	8	11	15
Ruby-crowned kinglet	6	2	4	3	2	2	0
Vireo spp.	1	3	2	4	4	4	3
Tennessee warbler	22	14	24	17	18	24	3 33
Parula warbler	3	3	5	5	4	3	7
Magnolia warbler	10	4	14	9	8	9	7
Cape May warbler	0	1	3	2	8 3 2	1	7 5 3 1 3 7
Black-throated blue warbler	2	2	3	2	2	2	3
Myrtle warbler	5	3	2	3 1	2	1	1
Black-throated green warbler	5	6	8	1	l	4	3
Blackburnian warbler	5	4	8	6	3	4 5 6	7
Bay-breasted warbler	13	10	13	8	7	6	3
Ovenbird	7	11	13	15	13	15	14
Yellowthroat	7	2	2	2	l	3	0
Canada warbler	2	3 2	4	5	3	l	8 9 1
American redstart	8		8	10	6	6	9
Rose-breasted grosbeak	2	1	4	7	8	6	
Slate-colored junco	3	4	3	4	l	1	3
White-throated sparrow	29	34	24	24	26	24	17

Table 2. Bird count results, Control Area

* Only those recorded consistently, after initial arrival on control area.

=

ine

	24	May 27	28	- 110 - 11 1	5	9	June 10	11	12
Birds/minute Songs/minute Total species	3.1 16 29	3.2 15 29	3. 14 34	6	3.2 15 32	3.8 17 34	3 3.2 16 33	3.4 17 38	3.5 16 33
Control Area									
	1		2	3	June 6		9	11	14
Birds/minute Songs/minute Total species	2. 10 34		1.6 7 35	1.8 10 36	1.9 10 39		1.6 9 39	1.6 12 38	1.7 12 34

Table 3. Population indices

* Entire transect sprayed on evening of June 1. Western one-third of transect sprayed on morning of June 9. Eastern two-thirds of transect sprayed on evening of June 10.

Five man-hours of searching on the morning of June 2 failed to reveal any evidence of bird poisoning. On the evening of June 10, 2 intoxicated chipping sparrows were captured by hand in the zone sprayed for the second time on the morning of the preceding day. Both birds died during the night. A third chipping sparrow, flying weakly and falling forward on the ground, narrowly avoided capture. No marked decrease in the numbers of any bird species was detected after spraying. Population indices remained quite constant during the period, May 24 to June 12, in which bird counts were made. As time and availability of observers permitted, post-spray searching was carried out in parts of 6 other spray blocks. The timing of and amount of effort devoted to these activities are summarized in Table 4. The searched portions of Block #217 and Block #222 were sprayed 3 times at 2 oz/acre. The searched areas of the other 4 blocks were sprayed twice at 2 oz/acre. No carcasses were found and no evidence of bird poisoning detected in any of the blocks. Birds of 4 species continued to incubate eggs in 5 nests in Block #658 after spraying.

Spray block	Spray history of part searched	Timing of search	ix i sa	Resul	lts
217	May 29 a.m. June 5 p.m.	June 17 p.m. 3 man-hours	Birds	apparent	ly unaffected
	June 17 a.m.				
222	May 30 a.m. June 6 a.m.	June 17 p.m. 5 man-hours	Ш й	11	1
	June 17 a.m.	100 Jan 19			
643	Second spray- June 20 p.m.	June 21 p.m. 5 man-hours	11	21	18
	oune 20 p.m.	June 22 a.m.			
		2 man-hours			
651	Second spray- June 17 p.m.	June 18 p.m. 5 man-hours	tt		n
1 50	est busice and	Sector and a fair	ŧ		н
653	Second spray- June 17 a.m.	June 17 p.m. 2 man-hours			Sala and Salar
658	Second spray-	June 20 p.m.	11	п	11
a.	June 19 a.m.	4 man-hours			

Table 4. Summary of post-spray searches

5

ing

"Census" data and post-spray searches indicated that operational spraying of Sumithion in New Brunswick in 1969 presented no serious hazard to the forest avifauna, although in localized areas a few birds were able to pick up lethal amounts of the insecticide. These conclusions agree with those drawn after monitoring the same treatment in New Brunswick and Newfoundland in 1968.

In an effort to determine if Sumithion, applied under operational conditions, has any gross effects on amphibian populations, a pond on the floodplain on the south side of the Southwest Miramichi River, about 3.5 miles east of Doaktown, was censused for frogs and toads during the period May 31 to June 11, 1969. The pond lay in Block No. 167, sprayed on the evening of June 1 with 2 oz. Sumithion in 0.15 U.S.G./acre. Subsequent redrawing of block boundaries placed the pond in Block No. 666, sprayed on the morning of June 9 with 2 oz. Sumithion in 0.15 U.S.G./acre.

Spray detection cards laid along the pond indicated good spray coverage on the second application (June 9). No spray cards were used on the first application (June 1), but from ground observation it appeared that the spray aircraft had their booms off when they passed over the pond. Therefore, total dosage of Sumithion applied to the pond was probably 2 oz. in 0.15 U.S.G./acre, on the morning of June 9.

A census consisted of walking slowly once around the bond during the evening and counting all frogs and toads seen in the water and on the shore. Results are given in Table 5.

6

May Jun

wh

in

fr

May 3122:30 19 628June 122:30 15 1 10 11 223:0055 1 1 8 1 20:3055-65 2 2 1 5 $19:30$ $65-70$ 15 0 15 8 evening $65-70$ 22 0 22 sprayed during morning of June 9 9 evening $60-65$ 20 0 10 $20:00$ 70 32 0 32 11 $20:30$ $60-65$ 30 0 30	Date	Time(ADT)	Temp(°F)	Number Frog s	of individua Toads	als recorded Total
June 1 22:30 45 4 10 14 2 23:00 55 4 4 8 4 20:30 55-65 2 2 4 5 19:30 65-70 15 0 15 8 evening 65-70 22 0 22 sprayed during morning of June 9 9 evening 60-65 20 0 20	May 31	22:30	L9	6	2	8
5 19:30 65-70 15 0 15 8 evening 65-70 22 0 22 sprayed during morning of June 9 9 evening 60-65 20 0 20			45	4	10	14
5 19:30 65-70 15 0 15 8 evening 65-70 22 0 22 sprayed during morning of June 9 9 evening 60-65 20 0 20	2	-	55	4	4	8
5 19:30 65-70 15 0 15 8 evening 65-70 22 0 22 sprayed during morning of June 9 9 evening 60-65 20 0 20	հ	-	55-65	2	2	4
8 evening 65-70 22 0 22 sprayed during morning of June 9 9 evening 60-65 20 0 20	5	19:30	65-70	15	0	15
sprayed during morning of June 9 9 evening 60-65 20 0 20	8	-			0	-
9 evening 60-65 20 0 20		0	-	orning of J	une 9	
	9				0	20
11 20:30 60 - 65 30 0 30	10			32	0	
	11				0	30

Table 5. Counts of frogs and toads in a Sumithion-sprayed pond

* Primarily Rana clamitans

** Bufo americanus

No amphibian mortality was observed at any time, and the census data, while variable, give no grounds for supposing Sumithion applied operationally, in the morning, at the rate of 2 oz. in 0.15 U.S.G./acre has any effect on frogs and toads.

' ıge

5

\$

:k