

5/2/80

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Budd
5-2-80

DATE:

SUBJECT: Update on the Current Status of the Toxicology Branch Review of Permethrin.

Caswell #652BB

FROM: Edwin R. Budd
Toxicology Branch/HED (TS-769)TO: Mike Conlon
Associate Deputy Assistant Administrator
for Pesticide Programs (TS-766)THRU: Acting Chief
Toxicology Branch/HED (TS-769)

THRU: Director, Hazard Evaluation Division (TS-769)

Per your request of May 1, 1980, this memo is an update on the current status of the Toxicology Branch review of the "Mouse II" oncogenicity study on permethrin recently received from FMC Corporation.

Study Identification:

A Two-Year Oral Toxicity/Oncogenicity Study of FMC 33297 in Mice (Mouse II); Bio/dynamics, Inc.; October 9, 1979. Submitted by FMC Corporation to EPA on April 8, 1980; EPA Accession No. 242174 and No. 242175.

The final and complete report on the above study was received by Toxicology Branch on April 11, 1980. A cursory evaluation of the study results has indicated that female mice fed diets containing 2500 and 5000 ppm of permethrin (mid and high dosage levels) developed bronchioalveolar adenomas of the lung and hepatomas of the liver. The increased incidence of these neoplasms in these dosage groups was statistically significant.

This preliminary analysis of the study results is presently being confirmed by a thorough in-depth scrutiny of the entire study results. It is anticipated that the final Toxicology Branch review of this study will be completed by ~~April~~ ^{May} 15, 1980.

Although preliminary interpretation of the data from this study suggests that permethrin may have oncogenic potential, it should be emphasized that there are, in addition to this study, four other oncogenicity studies on permethrin in EPA files. The final determination of the oncogenic potential of permethrin should be based, of course, on a careful consideration of the entirety of the available oncogenicity data on this chemical.

This leaves the reader guessing. What do these studies say? How long have we had them?

5/6