US ERA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

MRID No. 448065-03

## DATA EVALUATION RECORD AQUATIC PLANT EC<sub>50</sub> TEST GUIDELINE 123-2 (TIER II)

1. **CHEMICAL**: Captan

PC Code No.: 081301

2. TEST MATERIAL: Captan technical

**Purity: 99.8%** 

3. CITATION:

Authors: K.R. Drottar and H.O. Krueger

Title: Captan: A 7-Day Toxicity Test with Duckweed (Lemna gibba G3)

Study Completion Date: April 14, 1999

<u>Laboratory</u>: Wildlife International Ltd., Easton, MD

Sponsor: Captan Stewardship Task Force - Tomen Agro, Inc., San Francisco, CA, and

Makhteshim-Agan of North America, Inc., New York, NY

Laboratory Report ID:493A-103

DP Barcode:

D255807

MRID No.:

448065-03

4. **REVIEWED BY:** Mark Mossler, M.S., Environmental Scientist,

Golder Associates Inc.

Signature:

Date:

**APPROVED BY:** Pim Kosalwat, Ph.D., Senior Scientist,

Golder Associates Inc.

Signature:

Date:

5. APPROVED BY: Brian Montague, Fisheries Biologist

Signature:

Date:Oct. 29, 1999

6. STUDY PARAMETER: Definitive Test Duration:

**Definitive Test Duration:** 7 days

**Type of Concentrations:** 

Initial measured

7. <u>CONCLUSIONS</u>: This study is scientifically sound and fulfills the guideline requirements for an acute aquatic plant study. 4 to 18% cell density reduction was observed at dose levels above 0.4 ppm, but was not dose consistent. Classification is **Core**.

**Results Synopsis:** 

EC<sub>50</sub>: >12.7 ppm ai

95% C.I.: N/A

NOEC: 0.4 ppm ai

Probit Slope: N/A

8. ADEQUACY OF THE STUDY:

A. Classification: Core

B. Rationale: N/A

. Radonale: N/A

C. Repairability: N/A

2082656

## 9. **GUIDELINE DEVIATIONS**:

- 1. The test length (7 days) was less than recommended (14 days).
- **10. <u>SUBMISSION PURPOSE</u>**: Submitted to support captan use in areas where exposure to aquatic habitats is expected.

## 11. MATERIALS AND METHODS:

## A. Test Organisms

Guideline Criteria	Reported Information
<u>Species</u> Lemna gibba	Lemna gibba
Number of Plants/Fronds 5 plants, 3 fronds per plant.	5 plants per replicate with 3 fronds each
Nutrients Standard formula, e.g. 20X-AAP	M-Hoagland's medium without sucrose or EDTA

## B. Test System

Guideline Criteria	Reported Information					
Solvent	DMF (0.1 mL/L)					
Temperature 25°C	23.6 - 24.6°C					
<u>Light Intensity</u> 5.0 Klux (±15%)	4.3 - 4.9 Klux					
Photoperiod Continuous	Continuous					
pH Approximately 5.0	4.8 - 5.6					
<u>Test System</u> Static or renewal	Static					

## C. Test Design

Guideline Criteria	Reported Information		
Dose range 2X or 3X progression	2X		
Doses	0.63, 1.3, 2.5, 5.0, and 10 mg active ingredient (ai)/L		

Guideline Criteria	Reported Information				
at least 5					
Controls negative and/or solvent	Negative and solvent control				
Replicates per dose 3 or more	3 replicates				
<u>Duration of test</u> 14 days	7 days				
Daily observations were made?	Observations made on Days 3, 5, and 7.				
Method of Observations	Frond counts				
Maximum Labeled Rate	Not reported				

# 12. <u>REPORTED RESULTS</u>:

Guideline Criteria	Reported Information			
Initial and terminal day frond count?	Yes			
Control frond count at termination ≥2X initial count?	Yes			
Initial chemical concentrations measured? (Optional)	Yes, values were 70-127% of nominal, procedural recovery was 108%, and the LOQ was 0.251 ppm ai			
Raw data included?	Yes			

<u>Dose Response - Frond Count</u>

Initial Measured Concentration (mg ai/L)	Mean Frond Number	% Inhibition <sup>a</sup>	Day 7 pH values
Control	173		5,6
Solvent Control	166		5.6
0.4	166	0	5.6
1.1	136	18	5.6
2.7	151	9	5.6
5.9	139	16	5.6
12.7	160	4	5.5

### <sup>a</sup>compared to the solvent control

Other Significant Results: Fronds in the highest replicate were noted as having smaller fronds and affected roots.

#### Statistical Results

Statistical Method: Visual interpretation was used to estimate the EC<sub>50</sub> value and Bonferroni's test was used to determine the NOEC with respect to the pooled control data. Results were based on initial measured concentrations.

EC<sub>50</sub>: >12.7 ppm ai Probit Slope: N/A 95% C.I.: N/A NOEC: 2.7 ppm ai

### 13. <u>VERIFICATION OF STATISTICAL RESULTS</u>:

<u>Statistical Method</u>: The EC<sub>50</sub> could not be calculated. Williams' test was used for mean comparisons versus the solvent control.

EC<sub>50</sub>: >12.7 ppm ai Probit Slope: N/A 95% C.I.: N/A NOEC: 0.4 ppm ai

14. **REVIEWER'S COMMENTS:** The reported water solubility of captan technical was 5.1 ppm. Additionally, no maximum label rate was reported. However, water concentration of 12,000 ppb would not be expected with presently labeled use rates. With the consideration that 12.7 ppm ai is above the maximum water solubility without a solvent, this study is scientifically sound and fulfills the guideline requirements for an aquatic plant toxicity study. Based on initial measured concentrations, the 7-day EC<sub>50</sub> for *Lemna gibba* exposed to captan was >12.7 ppm ai. The NOEC was determined to be 0.4 ppm ai. This study is classified as **Core**.

### Lemna frond number

File: lem Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS TEST (Isotonic regression model) TABLE 1 OF 2

GRO	UP IDENTIFICATION	ORIGINAL N ME		FORMED EAN	ISOTONIZED MEAN
1	Sol. Con. 3	165.667	165.667	165.667	
2	0.4 ppm ai 3	165.667	165.667	165.667	
3	1.1 ppm ai 3	135.667	135.667	146.333	
4	2.7 ppm ai 3	150.667	150.667	146.333	
.5	5.9 ppm ai 3	139.000	139.000	146.333	
6	12.7 ppm ai 3	160.000	160.000	146.333	1

### Lemna frond number

File: lem Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS TEST (Isotonic regression model) TABLE 2 OF 2

	ISO	<b>FONIZED</b>	CALC	. SIC	TA	BLE DEC	GREES C	)F
	IDENTIFICATION	ON ME	EAN	WILLI	AMS	P=.05 WILI	LIAMS	FREEDOM
_								
	Sol. Con.	165.667						
	0.4 ppm ai	165.667	0.000		1.78	k=1, v=12		
	1.1 ppm ai	146.333	2.257	*	1.87	k=2, v=1	2	
	2.7 ppm ai	146.333	2.257	*	1.90	k=3, v=12	2	
	5.9 ppm ai	146.333	2.257	*	1.92	k=4, v=1	2	
	12.7 ppm ai	146.333	2.257			•		

s = 10.491

Note: df used for table values are approximate when v > 20.