

Environnement Environment Canada

Forestry Service

Canada

Service des Forêts

MATACIL APPLIED TO SPRUCE TREES AS SIMULATED AERIAL SPRAY - SHAWVILLE - 1976

by

W. W. Hopewell

File Report 76

May, 1977

Chemical Control Research Institute Department of Fisheries and Environment 25 Pickering Place, Ottawa, Ontario KLA OW3

NOT FOR PUBLICATION CONFIDENTIAL ----

This report may not be cited or published in whole or in part without the written consent of The Director, Chemical Control Research Institute, Canadian Forestry Service, Environment Canada, 25 Pickering Place, Ottawa, Ontario KIA OW3, Canada.

MATACIL APPLIED TO SPRUCE TREES AS SIMULATED AERIAL SPRAY - SHAWVILLE - 1976

bv

W. W. Hopewell

Dr. Sundaram required seven small white spruce trees plus a clear area of typical forest soil cover to be treated with Matacil applied as simulated aerial spray deposit. The formulation was applied by use of the technique and device developed by the author for the purpose of producing simulated aerial spray deposits.

MATACIL

The commercial concentrate contained 1.4 lbs/U.S. gal. \equiv 16.7% wt/ vol. For use, the concentrate was diluted 10X with a mixture of fuel oil No. 2:Arotex 3470:3:1 by volume, to give a formulation containing 1.67% wt/vol. Matacil. Automate Red dye was added for assessment purposes.

APPLICATION

During application the test trees were within a portable shelter, open at the top and enclosing an area 2.13×2.13 metres; the height was 2.44 m.

Two applications were made, the first on 6 July, 1976 and the second on 14 July, 1976. Four samples of deposit were taken for each application (5 in the case of bare ground tests) for later assessment for l/ha and number of drops/cm². In each treatment 1.5 ml of formulation was emitted over the 4.55 m² for a nominal volume application rate of 3.3 l/ha and 55 g AI/ha.

Results of deposit assessments are given in Table I.

Table I

Matacil Deposit on Treated White Spruce Trees - Shawville, 1976

Tree		First Application			Second Application		
No.	Quadrant	l/ha	q AI/ha	Drops/cm ²		g AI/ha	Drops/cm ²
1	N E S W Avg.	6.3 9.1 6.7 <u>7.1</u> 7.3	106 153 113 119 122	50 30 56 55 50	7.0 2.1 7.0 <u>3.2</u> 4.82	$ 118 \\ 35 \\ 118 \\ 54 \\ \overline{80} $	88 13 72 <u>11</u> 46
2	N E S W Avg.	$2.96.51.58.0\overline{4.72}$	49 109 25 <u>134</u> 79	24 63 10 <u>63</u> 40	4.2 2.5 2.3 <u>4.6</u> 3.4	71 42 39 77 57	43 34 31 <u>43</u> 38
3	N E S W Avg.	$1.44.11.32.2\overline{2.25}$	24 69 22 <u>37</u> 38	16 25 20 <u>21</u> 21	2.22.910.34.5 4.98	37 49 173 <u>76</u> 83	17 32 86 <u>45</u> 45
4	N E S W Avg.	2.62.811.53.5 5.1	44 47 193 <u>59</u> 85	50 37 103 <u>8</u> 50	$4.7 \\ 1.8 \\ 2.9 \\ 4.9 \\ \overline{3.58}$	79 30 49 82 60	109 12 28 <u>61</u> 82
5	N E S W Avg.	2.7 5.0 2.0 <u>3.6</u> <u>3.32</u>	45 84 34 60 55	47 33 40 <u>49</u> 42	4.53.81.3 $4.2\overline{3.45}$	76 64 22 70 58	65 40 17 <u>39</u> 40
6	N E S W Avg.	2.8 1.9 7.5 2.3 3.62	47 32 126 <u>39</u> 60	43 15 55 <u>28</u> 35	$6.2 \\ 1.9 \\ 4.4 \\ 6.7 \\ 4.8 $	104 32 74 <u>113</u> 80	85 9 51 <u>69</u> 54

s;

Tree		First Application			Second Application		
No.	Quadrant		g AI/ha	Drop/am ²	l/ha	g AI/ha	Drops/cm ²
7	N E S W Avg.	5.0 3.8 2.5 <u>3.8</u> 3.78	84 64 42 <u>64</u> 63	59 59 26 <u>51</u> 49	5.1 4.2 2.3 8.8	86 71 39	46 31 30 <u>62</u> 42
8	N E S W	7.0 3.0 3.5 3.4 4.22	118 50 59 <u>57</u> 70	75 48 30 <u>65</u> 54	$3.0 \\ 8.1 \\ 3.8 \\ 7.7 \\ \overline{5.65}$	64	38 76 51 <u>87</u> 63
Soil Ce	N E S W entre	2.4 4.3 1.7 3.5 3.9	40 72 29 59 66	33 43 23 40 40	3.2 3.3 2.8 1.9 3.9	47 32 66	38 25 35 18 37
		3.16 4.72	53	36	3.0		31 1995

Table 1 (Continued)