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MEMORANDUM

TO:    George LaRocca, PM 15
        Registration Division, TS-767c

THRU:  Dave Coppage, Head Sec. 3
        Ecological Effects Branch
        Hazard Evaluation Division, TS-769c

THRU:  Clayton Bushong, Chief
        Ecological Effects Branch
        Hazard Evaluation Division, TS-769c

SUBJECT: EEB Review of Endosulfan (Reg No. 8340-13)
        Data submitted in response to Registration
        Standard data requests. Accession No. 252043.

EEB received and reviewed three (3) data submissions under
Reg. No. 8340-13. These data were submitted in response to the
Agency's Registration Standard for Endosulfan. We make the following
conclusions regarding acceptability of the studies:

scientifically sound. The guidelines requirement
is satisfied. Technical endosulfan is "highly
toxic" to Bobwhite quail; LD50 = 42 (25-56) mg/kg,
single oral dose."

Roberts, N.L. and C.N. Phillips. 1983 "Acute toxicity to mallard duck. The study is scientifi-
cally sound. The guidelines requirement is satisfied.
Technical endosulfan is "highly toxic" to mallard duck;
LD50 = 28 (22-36) mg/kg, single oral dose."

Fischer, R. 1983. "Acute toxicity to Rainbow Trout. The study is scientifically
sound. The guidelines requirement is satisfied, but the
author's conclusions are not accepted. The 96-Hr. LC50
for Rainbow Trout is recalculated by EEB to 0.83 (0.54-
1.18) ug/L. Technical endosulfan is "very highly toxic"
to Rainbow Trout."
Regarding the registrant's request for an extension of the deadlines for submitting the avian reproduction studies, since the deadline of Nov, 1983 is well past, there is little point in EEB commenting on this request.

The avian reproduction study protocols submitted appear adequate to perform a guidelines study.

John J. Bascietto  
Wildlife Biologist, Sec. 3  
Ecological Effects Branch  
Hazard Evaluation Division, TS-769c