EE BRANCH REVIEW

DAT	E: IN 1	1/19/84 OUT JAN 1 4 1985	
		201-401, 201-401	
PETITION OR EXP. PER	MIT NO	5F3171, SF 3172	
DATE OF SUBMISSION _		11/6/84	
DATE RECEIVED BY HED) ————————————————————————————————————	11/13/84	
RD REQUESTED COMPLET	ION DATE _	1/22/85	
EEB ESTIMATED COMPLE			
RD ACTION CODE/TYPE	OF REVIEW	330/Amendment	
		N, R, S <u>Insecticide</u>	
		A. Heyward (17)	
PRODUCT NAME(S)		Pydrin 2.4 EC	
COMPANY NAME		Shell Oil Company	
SUBMISSION PURPOSE	Proposed registration of carrots and spinach		
SHAUGHNESSEY NO.	C	CHEMICAL, & FORMULATION	% A.I.
			
Orania de la compania			
COMPANY NAME SUBMISSION PURPOSE	Pro	Shell Oil Company oposed registration of carrots and spinach	% A.I.

100.0 <u>Pesticide Use:</u> Shell 0il Company is proposing that Pydrin insecticide 2.4 EC be registered for carrot and spinach crops.

100.1 Application Rates/Methods/Directions

		DOSA		NO. ACRES		T T
CROP	INSECT	LB/AI	FL OZ/	TREATED	FURTHER USE	DAYS TO
		ACRE	ACRE	WITH GAL	INSTRUCTIONS	HARVEST
Spinach	Cabbage Looper, Beet Armyworm	0.1-0.2	5 1/3- 10 2/3	24-12	Apply as needed for control, but do not exceed 1.4 lb ai/acre per season.	3
Carrots	Aster Leafhopper Cutworms	0.1-0.2	5 1/3- 10 2/3	24–12	Apply as needed for control, but do not exceed 2.0 lb ai/acre per season.	. 7

101.0 Physical and Chemical Properties

101.1 Chemical Name: Cyano (3-phanoxyphenyl)methyl-4-chloro-alpha-(1-methylethyl) benzeneacetate

101.2 Structural Formulation

101.5 Molecular Weight: 419.9

101.7 Solubility:

Solvent	g/l at 20°C
Hexane	77
Xylene	>450
Acetone	>450
Chloroform	>450
Hexylene Glycol	>450
Water	<20 ppb

101.8 Hydrolysis

рĤ		
1.1	100 hours	(4.2 days)
7.2	570 hours	(24 days)
9.1	70 hours	(2.9 days)

103.0 Toxicological Properties

Refer to Chemical Profile

104.0 Hazard Assessment

Pydrin 2.4 EC is currently registered on cotton, field corn, peanuts, soybeans, apples, peaches, pecans, filburts, cabbage, cauliflower, cucumbers, melons, pumpkins, beans, potatoes and sweet corn. The registrant is now proposing a Pydrin registration for carrots and spinach, two crops that account for about 100,000 acres.

Pydrin is a second generation pyrethroid that is relatively persistent and extremely toxic to aquatic organisms. Under anaerobic conditions, pydrin degradation proceeds at a slow rate with a half-life of about 6 months. Although, hydrolysis results after 24 days at pH 7.2, pydrin is stongly sorbed from aqueous solutions onto soil (soil water partition coefficient was found to be greater than 15,000 and desorption is slowly reversible).

Pydrin appears to be practically non-toxic to birds (mallard LD $_{50}$ = 9932 ppm; Bobwhite quail LC $_{50}$ = 10,000 ppm). However, pydrin is highly toxic to fish (Bluegill LC $_{50}$ = .42 - 0.64 ppb), aquatic invertebrates (Daphnia EC $_{50}$ = 1.6 ppb). Dr. Richard Garnas, at the Gulf Breeze station, stated that the invertebrate studies that were conducted, showed no chronic end point (all dose levels were acutely toxic). It was also noted that residues were toxic in the sediment. Since, pydrin has an affinity to bind with the organic rather than the inorganic constituents of the sediment, Dr. Garnas concludes that there could be a threat to detritus and filter feeding aquatic organisms.

Field studies (Faatz 5/83, 9/80) show that Pydrin residues via runoff can be detected in an aquatic system at levels that equal or exceed aquatic LC_{50} values. The studies, also, note that these residues are detectable one year after initial application. This potential for exposure and high toxicity, suggests that pydrin use is a hazard to adjacent aquatic systems.

105.0 Adequacy of Toxicity Data

EEB needs an adequate aquatic field test. Previously submitted field test (Turner 2/14/79) was unacceptable.

106.0 Endangered Species

This proposed use should not affect Endangered Species.

107.0 Conclusions:

EEB has completed its evaluation of the proposed registration of Pydrin 2.4 EC for use on carrots and spinach. Although, these low acreage crops do not appear to present an incremental increase in risk, the registered uses of pydrin meet RPAR criteria 162.11(3)(c) and present data are not adequate for EEB to complete a hazard assessment. An adequate aquatic field study is still a requirement that has not been satisfied. xxxde 1/14/85

Fishery Biologist

EEB/HED

Noman Owk 1-14-85 Norm Cook Section Head EEB/HED

I toymord W. Mother Ray Matheny Acting Branch Chief

EEB/HED