NALED FM 119 12/22/31 alea (1,2mminrono=2,2-michlerosthy) e WAR CHIEES 1 1150 40 TOPIC 51.3540 FOR MENTION BY # FOR PLATING NOT 1054(1F18) CONTENT CAT OF FICHE/ ASTER 10 00074888 Chevron Chemical Commany (1960) Elexicity of Olbrom to Fish and wildlifel. (Corpilation; upouplished study received Sep 27, 1965 under unknown abnin, no.; COL:125232-L) SUBST. CLASS = 5. OTHER SUBJECT PESCHIPTORS DIRECT RVA TIME # (19) STANT+UNTE - UND DATE REVIEWFU BY: Kyle DAmbehen . TITLE: Wildlife Biologist O. S: HED LEEB LUCITEL: cn2-1121/557-11-1 DATE: 24/5/FL SIGNATURE: 184 M APPROVED BY! TITLE: U# 5: LOC/TEL: SIGNATURE: DATES

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

DATA EVALUATION RECORD

- 1. Chemical: Naled
- 2. Formulation: Dibrom (Formulation ?)
- 3. Citation: Chevron Chemical Company, 1960. Toxicity of dibrom to fish and Wildlife (Compilation, unpublished study received Sept. 27, 1965 under unknown admin. no.: CDL: 125232-L) I.D.#00074882
- 4. Reviewed by: Kyle Barbehenn, Wildlife Biologist
 Ecological Effects Branch
 Hazard Evaluation Division (TS-769)
- 5. Date Reviewed: September 23, 1982
- 6. Test Type: Simulated aquatic and terrestrial field tests.
- 7. Reported results: Under the conditions of the tests, Dibrom was not toxic to Gambusia, tropical fish, parakets and wildlife.
- 8. Reviewer's Conclusion: The results of these studies are scientifically sound but they are inadequte to fulfill any guideline data requirements.

Methods/Materials

mind . I

Test Procedures: Field studies were conducted in three areas (Florida) treated

with 0.1 lb/A dibrom by air. Use of oil-sensitive cands indicated that 40% of the spray material reached the ground. Fish were exposed in cartons and birds in cages; 30 minutes

after exposure they were brought to a certain loction for further observation for up to 48 hours post-treatment.

Incidental observations were made of natural population of

fish and wildlife.

Statistical Analysis: None

Discussion/Results: No adverse effects of the dibrom treatments were observed.

Reviewer's Evaluation:

Procedures: The test organisms employed here would not be acceptable under

current testing standards.

Statistical Analysis: N/A

Discussion/Results: Some useful informtion was obtained from the experiments

but the results cannot be used to extrapolate to natural populations of concern. There is no basic toxicity data on the birds and fish and Gambusia population utilized may have had previous exposure to pesticides. Field observations

were generally inadequate.

Conclusions:

Validation category: Supplemental

Category rationale: Results of limited usefulness in evaluating risk to

natural populutions

Category repairability: N/A