

**Finding of No Significant Impact**  
**Gypsy Moth Cooperative Eradication Program**  
**in**  
**Anoka, Hennepin, and Washington Counties, Minnesota**  
**Environmental Assessment**  
**April 2011**

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), and the U.S. Forest Service (FS) in cooperation with the Minnesota Department of Agriculture propose to eradicate the North American gypsy moth infestations located in Anoka, Hennepin, and Washington Counties, Minnesota. APHIS and FS have prepared an environmental assessment (EA) which analyzes potential environmental consequences of eradicating gypsy moth in Anoka, Hennepin, and Washington Counties. This EA is tiered to the “Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Gypsy Moth Management in the United States: A Cooperative Approach.” This EA is available at [http://www.aphis.usda.gov/plant\\_health/ea/gm.shtml](http://www.aphis.usda.gov/plant_health/ea/gm.shtml) or from—

U.S. Department of Agriculture  
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service  
Plant Protection and Quarantine  
Program Support  
4700 River Road, Unit 134  
Riverdale, MD 20737

or U.S. Department of Agriculture  
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service  
900 American Blvd. East, Suite 204  
Bloomington, MN 55420

The EA analyzed two alternatives consisting of (1) APHIS and USDA–FS would not aid in the treatment of gypsy moth in any of these three areas under consideration, and (2) treatment of gypsy moth in Anoka, Hennepin, and Washington Counties using two aerial applications of *Bacillus thuringiensis kurstaki* (Btk) applied with approximately a 10- to 14-day interval between applications. This will be followed by trapping when the gypsy moths are adults to ensure that the eradication was successful (proposed action). Funding for the Anoka and Hennepin County sites will be provided by APHIS, and funding for the Washington County site will be provided by FS.

APHIS provides assistance to States to eradicate isolated infestations of gypsy moth on 640 acres or less, while FS provides assistance when areas exceed 640 acres. Only Anoka and Hennepin Counties have areas that are 640 acres or less. FS will prepare a separate decision document for the remaining treatment area for Washington County.

The EA evaluated ecological and human impacts under each alternative. The proposed action was preferred because of its ability to achieve the eradication objective in a way that minimizes potential environmental consequences and provides the most opportunity for successful eradication.

Based on the proposed application of Btk, the rate of application, and persistence of Btk in the environment, nontarget exposure is expected to be low. Pesticide label requirements will further

reduce risk to sensitive nontarget organisms. Impacts to human health are not anticipated. The use of traps will not be likely to result in impacts to human health or the environment. The traps contain disparlure, a gypsy moth pheromone. Laboratory studies and field experience has demonstrated a lack of toxicity for disparlure and similar compounds.

A notification of the EA was posted in a local newspaper with a 30-day public comment period ending on Wednesday, May 18, 2011. No comments were received on the EA.

APHIS evaluated the program's potential effects to threatened and endangered species and their critical habitat. APHIS determined there would be no effect to listed species as there are no federally listed species in Anoka County. Also, there would be no effect to the one listed species in Hennepin County (Higgins eye pearly mussel (*Lampsilis higginsii*) because impacts to aquatic species are not expected due to low toxicity, and the treatment sites are more than 3 miles from the Mississippi River where the Higgins eye pearly mussel is known to occur, thus eliminating exposure to the mussels or its glochidial host fish.

APHIS has determined that there is not a potential for disproportionately high or adverse human health or environmental effects on any minority or low-income populations consistent with the Executive Order (EO) 12898 "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations." APHIS has also determined that there would not be any disproportionately high or adverse environmental health and safety risks to children consistent with the EO 13045 "Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks."

The implementation of the preferred alternative will not significantly impact the quality of the human environment. I have considered and based my finding of no significant impact on the analysis of the program's characteristics and its anticipated environmental consequences, as analyzed in the EA. I have determined that there would be no significant impact to the human environment from the implementation of the preferred alternative and, therefore, no environmental impact statement needs to be prepared.

*Kevin Connors*

Kevin Connors  
Plant Protection and Quarantine  
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

*5/23/11*

Date