9-26-84

Data Evaluation Record

1. **Chemical:** H # 15,172
2-Thiophenecarboxylic acid, 3[[[[(4-methoxy-6-methyl-1,3,5-triazin-2-yl)amino]carbonyl]-amino] sulfonyl]-, methyl ester

2. **Formulation:** 97.1% (Technical)

3. **Citation:** Joan Beavers, 1984, A Dietary LC_{50} Study in the Mallard with H # 15,172, Wildlife International Ltd., Project No. 112-144, Submitted by E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Co. Inc., Newark, Delaware, January 13, 1984, Acc No. 072845, 072846.

4. **Study Type:** Dietary LC_{50} on mallard ducks

5. **Reviewed by:** Ken Clark
Agronomist
EED/HED
Date: 9-26-84
Review time: 3 hrs.
Signature: K Clark

6. **Approved by:** ____________________

7. **Reported Results:** LC_{50} greater than 5620 ppm

8. **Reviewers Conclusion:** This study is scientifically sound and meets the guideline requirements with a LC_{50} of greater than 5620 ppm for mallard ducks. This product is "practically non-toxic" to mallard ducks.

9. **Materials/Methods** (Excerpted from submission)

Test Procedure

Apparently healthy 10-day-old mallards were assigned to the treatment groups by random draw without regard to sex. Ten birds were utilized per group, with five treatment and five control groups. Each group of ten birds was placed in a battery brooder identical to that used for rearing. The experimental material was dispersed in corn oil and incorporated into Wildlife International Ltd.'s game bird starter ration utilizing a Hobart Mixer (Model #AS200T). Nominal dietary concentrations used in this study were 562, 1000, 1780, 3160 and 5620 ppm.

The birds were exposed to the appropriate dietary concentrations for five days, and then maintained on basal diet for an aditional three-day observation period. The control birds received the basal diet with 2% (w/w) corn oil for the five-day exposure period, and basal diet only for the three-day observation period.

Body weights were recorded by pen at initiation of the study, on Day 5, and at the termination of the study on Day 8. Feed consumption during the five-day exposure period and during the three-day observation period was recorded for each pen. Feed consumption was measured accurately, but is presented as an estimate due to the unavoidable wastage by the birds.

10. Statistical Analysis

Because no deaths were recorded there was no need for statistical analysis.

11. Discussion/Results

See next page for attached mortality chart.
(Excerpted from submission)

TABLE 1

CUMULATIVE MORTALITIES OF CONTROL MALLARDS

Concentration ppm	Number Dead/Number Exposed								
	Day of Death								
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
0	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10
0	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10
0	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10
0	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10
0	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10

TABLE 2

CUMULATIVE MORTALITIES OF MALLARDS

EXPOSED TO H # 15,172 FOR FIVE DAYS

Concentration ppm	Number Dead/Number Exposed								
	Day of Death								
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
562	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10
1000	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10
1780	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10
3160	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10
5620	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10	0/10

The LC50 value was determined by inspection to be greater than 5620 ppm, the highest concentration tested.

Reviewers Evaluation

A. Test Procedures

The test procedures meet the pesticide assessment guidelines.

B. Statistical Analysis

Because no mortality was shown, no analysis was performed.

C. Discussion/Results

This test is scientifically sound and meets the guideline requirements. This product is "practically non-toxic" to mallard ducks with with a LC_{50} greater than 5620 ppm.

D. Conclusion

1. Category: "Core"
2. Rationale: See Discussion/Results
3. Repairability: N/A