

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 1 2 1987

MEMORANDUM

OFFICE OF
PESTICID AND TOXIC SUBSTANCES

SUBJECT: Sodium Monofluoroacetate (Compound 1080),

[TOX Chem. No. 770]

FROM:

Ray Landolt

Review Section #1
Toxicology Branch

Hazard Evaluation Division (TS-769C)

THRU:

R. Bruce Jaeger, Section Head

Review Section #1 Toxicology Branch

Hazard Evaluation Division

(TS-769C)

TO:

William Miller, PM 16

Insecticide/Rodenticide Branch Registration Division (TS-767)

Registrant: USDA, Animal Damage Control, letter of May 1, 1987

Registration No.: 56228-22

Action Requested: Response to N

Response to Notice of Data Requirements
Pursuant to 3(c)(2)B of FIFRA, Livestock

Protection Collar

Recommendation:

1. The primary eye and dermal irritation studies found deficient in the July 14, 1986 Laboratory Audit at the Denver Wildlife Research Center, were conducted with a 1.0% formulation.

If the data derived from study 3, Estimated Doses of Sodium Fluoroacetate Delivered to Coyotes by Toxic Collars, results in a change in the use concentration in the collar, then these two irritation studies should be conducted on the final concentration of 1080 to be used in the collar.

2. The primary eye and dermal irritation studies should be conducted with the use concentration of 1080 less the coloring agent included as a maker.

- 3. It is noted that these two irritation studies may be conducted under contract to a commercial laboratory, however, in the attachment Study I and II identifies the Denver Wildlife Research Center as the laboratory to perform the studies. Consideration should be given to deficiency seven of the Lab Audit "The studies were not properly authenticated to indicate that the irritation responses were scored by an experienced/qualified examiner".
- 4. We have no objection to the change in the coloring agent used as a marker. However, the placement of rhodamine B dye on "List 1 of Pesticide Inerts" was for food uses of the dye. The use of rhodamine B dye in the Livestock Protection Collar as a marker would not be considered a food use.