

1



LEGAL
Wilmington, Delaware 19898

Contains No CBI

002 OCT 27 PM 2:47

OTS CSIC

21

A

No CBI

**Certified Mail
Return Receipt Requested**

October 15, 1992

Document Processing Center (TS-790)
Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics
Environmental Protection Agency
401 M Street., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460
Attn: Section 8(e) Coordinator (CAP Agreement)

8892 00 10340
8EHQ-92-12102
INIT

Dear Coordinator:

8ECAP-0025

On behalf of the Regulatee and pursuant to Unit II B.1.b. and Unit II C of the 6/28/91 CAP Agreement, E.I. Du Pont de Nemours and Co. hereby submits (*in triplicate*) the attached studies. Submission of this information is voluntary and is occasioned by unilateral changes in EPA's standard as to what EPA now considers as reportable information. Regulatee's submission of information is made solely in response to the new EPA §8(e) reporting standards and is not an admission: (1) of TSCA violation or liability; (2) that Regulatee's activities with the study compounds reasonably support a conclusion of substantial health or environmental risk or (3) that the studies themselves reasonably support a conclusion of substantial health or environmental risk.

The "Reporting Guide" creates new TSCA 8(e) reporting criteria which were not previously announced by EPA in its 1978 Statement of Interpretation and Enforcement Policy, 43 Fed Reg 11110 (March 16, 1978). The "Reporting Guide states criteria which expands upon and conflicts with the 1978 Statement of Interpretation. Absent amendment of the Statement of Interpretation, the informal issuance of the "Reporting Guide" raises significant due processes issues and clouds the appropriate reporting standard by which regulated persons can assure TSCA Section 8(e) compliance.

For Regulatee,

Mark H. Christman
Counsel
Legal D-7158
1007 Market Street
Wilmington, DE 19898
(302) 774-6443

RECEIVED
8-15-94

ATTACHMENT 1

Submission of information is made under the 6/28/91 CAP Agreement, Unit II. This submission is made voluntarily and is occasioned by recent changes in EPA's TSCA §8(e) reporting standard; such changes made, for the first time in 1991 and 1992 without prior notice and in violation of Regulatee's constitutional due process rights. Regulatee's submission of information under this changed standard is not a waiver of its due process rights; an admission of TSCA violation or liability, or an admission that Regulatee's activities with the study compounds reasonably support a conclusion of substantial risk to health or to the environment. Regulatee has historically relied in good faith upon the 1978 Statement of Interpretation and Enforcement Policy criteria for determining whether study information is reportable under TSCA §8(e), 43 Fed Reg 11110 (March 16, 1978). EPA has not, to date, amended this Statement of Interpretation.

After CAP registration, EPA provided the Regulatee the June 1, 1991 "TSCA Section 8(e) Reporting Guide". This "Guide" has been further amended by EPA, EPA letter, April 10, 1992. EPA has not indicated that the "Reporting Guide" or the April 1992 amendment supersedes the 1978 Statement of Interpretation. The "Reporting Guide" and April 1992 amendment substantively lowers the Statement of Interpretation's TSCA §8(e) reporting standard². This is particularly troublesome as the "Reporting Guide" states criteria, applied retroactively, which expands upon and conflicts with the Statement of Interpretation.³ Absent amendment of the Statement of Interpretation, the informal issuance of the "Reporting Guide" and the April 1992 amendment clouds the appropriate standard by which regulated persons must assess information for purposes of TSCA §8(e).

²In sharp contrast to the Agency's 1977 and 1978 actions to soliciting public comment on the proposed and final §8(e) Policy, EPA has unilaterally pronounced §8(e) substantive reporting criteria in the 1991 Section 8(e) Guide without public notice and comment. See 42 Fed Reg 45362 (9/9/77), "Notification of Substantial Risk under Section 8(e): Proposed Guidance".

³A comparison of the 1978 Statement of Interpretation and the 1992 "Reporting Guide" is appended.

Throughout the CAP, EPA has mischaracterized the 1991 guidance as reflecting "longstanding" EPA policy concerning the standards by which toxicity information should be reviewed for purposes of §8(e) compliance. Regulatee recognizes that experience with the 1978 Statement of Interpretation may cause a review of its criteria. Regulatee supports and has no objection to the Agency's amending reporting criteria *provided that* such amendment is not applied to the regulated community in an unfair way. However, with the unilateral announcement of the CAP under the auspices of an OCM enforcement proceeding, EPA has wrought a terrific unfairness since much of the criteria EPA has espoused in the June 1991 Reporting Guide and in the Agency's April 2, 1992 amendment is new criteria which does not exist in the 1978 Statement of Interpretation and Enforcement Policy.

The following examples of new criteria contained in the "Reporting Guide" that is not contained in the Statement of Interpretation follow:

- o even though EPA expressly disclaims each "status report" as being preliminary evaluations that should not be regarded as final EPA policy or intent⁴, the "Reporting Guide" gives the "status reports" great weight as "sound and adequate basis" from which to determine mandatory reporting obligations. ("Guide" at page 20).
- o the "Reporting Guide" contains a matrix that establishes new numerical reporting "cutoff" concentrations for acute lethality information ("Guide" at p. 31). Neither this matrix nor the cutoff values therein are contained in the Statement of Interpretation. The regulated community was not made aware of these cutoff values prior to issuance of the "Reporting Guide" in June, 1991.
- o the "Reporting Guide" states new specific definitional criteria with which the Agency, for the first time, defines as 'distinguishable neurotoxicological effects'; such criteria/guidance not expressed in the 1978 Statement of Interpretation.⁵;

o the "Reporting Guide" provides new review/ reporting criteria for irritation and sensitization studies; such criteria not previously found in the 1978 Statement of Interpretation/Enforcement Policy.

o the "Reporting Guide" publicizes certain EPA Q/A criteria issued to the Monsanto Co. in 1989 which are not in the Statement of Interpretation; have never been published in the Federal Register or distributed by the EPA to the Regulatee. Such Q/A establishes new reporting criteria not previously found in the 1978 Statement of Interpretation/Enforcement Policy .

⁴The 'status reports' address the significance, if any, of particular information reported to the Agency, rather than stating EPA's interpretation of §8(e) reporting criteria. In the infrequent instances in which the status reports contain discussion of reportability, the analysis is invariably quite limited, without substantial supporting scientific or legal rationale.

⁵ See, e.g., 10/2/91 letter from Du Pont to EPA regarding the definition of 'serious and prolonged effects' as this term may relate to transient anesthetic effects observed at lethal levels; 10/1/91 letter from the American Petroleum Institute to EPA regarding clarification of the Reporting Guide criteria.

In discharging its responsibilities, an administrative agency must give the regulated community fair and adequate warning to as what constitutes noncompliance for which penalties may be assessed.

Among the myriad applications of the due process clause is the fundamental principle that statutes and regulations which purport to govern conduct must give an adequate warning of what they command or forbid.... Even a regulation which governs purely economic or commercial activities, if its violation can engender penalties, must be so framed as to provide a constitutionally adequate warning to those whose activities are governed.

Diebold, Inc. v. Marshall, 585 F.2d 1327, 1335-36 (D.C. Cir. 1978). See also, Rollins Environmental Services (NJ) Inc. v. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 937 F. 2d 649 (D.C. Cir. 1991).

While neither the are rules, This principle has been applied to hold that agency 'clarification', such as the Statement of Interpretation, the "Reporting Guide" nor the April 1992 amendments will not applied retroactively.

...a federal court will not retroactively apply an unforeseeable interpretation of an administrative regulation to the detriment of a regulated party on the theory that the post hoc interpretation asserted by the Agency is generally consistent with the policies underlying the Agency's regulatory program, when the semantic meaning of the regulations, as previously drafted and construed by the appropriate agency, does not support the interpretation which that agency urges upon the court.

Standard Oil Co. v. Federal Energy Administration, 453 F. Supp. 203, 240 (N.D. Ohio 1978), aff'd sub nom. Standard Oil Co. v. Department of Energy, 596 F.2d 1029 (Em. App. 1978):

The 1978 Statement of Interpretation does not provide adequate notice of, and indeed conflicts with, the Agency's current position at §8(e) requires reporting of all 'positive' toxicological findings without regard to an assessment of their relevance to human health. In accordance with the statute, EPA's 1978 Statement of Interpretation requires the regulated community to use scientific judgment to evaluate the significance of toxicological findings and to determining whether they reasonably support a conclusion of a substantial risk. Part V of the Statement of Interpretation urges persons to consider "the fact or probability" of an effect's occurrence. Similarly, the 1978 Statement of Interpretation stresses that an animal study is reportable only when "it contains reliable evidence ascribing the effect to the chemical." 43 Fed Reg. at 11112. Moreover, EPA's Statement of Interpretation defines the substantiality of risk as a function of both the seriousness of the effect and the probability of its occurrence. 43 Fed Reg 11110 (1978). Earlier Agency interpretation also emphasized the "substantial" nature of a §8(e) determination. See 42 Fed Reg 45362, 45363

(1977). [Section 8(e) findings require "extraordinary exposure to a chemical substance...which critically imperil human health or the environment"].

The recently issued "Reporting Guide" and April 1992 Amendment guidance requires reporting beyond and inconsistent with that required by the Statement of Interpretation. Given the statute and the Statement of Interpretation's explicit focus on substantial human or environmental risk, whether a substance poses a "substantial risk" of injury requires the application of scientific judgment to the available data on a case-by-case basis.

If an overall weight-of-evidence analysis indicates that this classification is unwarranted, reporting should be unnecessary under §8(e) because the available data will not "reasonably support the conclusion" that the chemical presents a substantial risk of serious adverse consequences to human health.

Neither the legislative history of §8(e) nor the plain meaning of the statute support EPA's recent lowering of the reporting threshold that TSCA §8(e) was intended to be a sweeping information gathering mechanism. In introducing the new version of the toxic substances legislation, Representative Eckhart included for the record discussion of the specific changes from the version of H. R. 10318 reported by the Consumer Protection and Finance Subcommittee in December 1975. One of these changes was to modify the standard for reporting under §8(e). The standard in the House version was changed from "causes or contributes to an unreasonable risk" to "causes or significantly contributes to a substantial risk". This particular change was one of several made in TSCA §8 to avoid placing an undue burden on the regulated community. The final changes to focus the scope of Section 8(e) were made in the version reported by the Conference Committee.

The word "substantial" means "considerable in importance, value, degree, amount or extent". Therefore, as generally understood, a "substantial risk" is one which will affect a considerable number of people or portion of the environment, will cause serious injury and is based on reasonably sound scientific analysis or data. Support for the interpretation can be found in a similar provision in the Consumer Product Safety Act. Section 15 of the CPSA defines a "substantial product hazard" to be:

"a product defect which because of the pattern of defect, the number of defective products distributed in commerce, the severity of the risk, or otherwise, creates a substantial risk of injury to the public."

Similarly, EPA has interpreted the word 'substantial' as a quantitative measurement. Thus, a 'substantial risk' is a risk that can be quantified, See, 56 Fed Reg 32292, 32297 (7/15/91). Finally, since information pertinent to the exposure of humans or the environment to chemical substances or mixtures may be obtained by EPA through Sections 8(a) and 8(d) regardless of the degree of potential risk, §8(e) has specialized function. Consequently, information subject to §8(e) reporting should be of a type which would lead a reasonable man to conclude that some type action was required immediately to prevent injury to health or the environment.

Attachment

Comparison:

Reporting triggers found in the 1978 "Statement of Interpretation/ Enforcement Policy", 43 Fed Reg 11110 (3/16/78) and the June 1991 *Section 8(e) Guide*.

<u>TEST TYPE</u>	<u>1978 POLICY CRITERIA EXIST?</u>	<u>New 1991 GUIDE CRITERIA EXIST?</u>
ACUTE LETHALITY		
Oral	N}	Y}
Dermal	N}	Y}
Inhalation (Vapors)	} ⁶	} ⁷
aerosol	N}	Y}
dusts/ particles	N}	Y}
SKIN IRRITATION	N	Y ⁸
SKIN SENSITIZATION (ANIMALS)	N	Y ⁹
EYE IRRITATION	N	Y ¹⁰
SUBCHRONIC (ORAL/DERMAL/INHALATION)	N	Y ¹¹
REPRODUCTION STUDY	N	Y ¹²
DEVELOPMENTAL TOX	Y ¹³	Y ¹⁴

⁶43 Fed Reg at 11114, comment 14:

"This policy statements directs the reporting of specific effects when unknown to the Administrator. Many routine tests are based on a knowledge of toxicity associated with a chemical. Unknown effects occurring during such a range test may have to be reported if they are those of concern to the Agency and if the information meets the criteria set forth in Parts V and VII."

⁷Guide at pp.22, 29-31.

⁸Guide at pp-34-36.

⁹Guide at pp-34-36.

¹⁰Guide at pp-34-36.

¹¹Guide at pp-22; 36-37.

¹²Guide at pp-22

¹³43 Fed Reg at 11112

"Birth Defects" listed.

¹⁴Guide at pp-22

NEUROTOXICITY	N	Y ¹⁵
CARCINOGENICITY	Y ¹⁶	Y ¹⁷
MUTAGENICITY		
<i>In Vitro</i>	Y ¹⁸	Y ¹⁹
<i>In Vivo</i>	Y}	Y}
ENVIRONMENTAL		
Bioaccumulation	Y}	N
Bioconcentration	Y ²⁰	N
Oct/water Part. Coeff.	Y}	N
Acute Fish	N	N
Acute Daphnia	N	N
Subchronic Fish	N	N
Subchronic Daphnia	N	N
Chronic Fish	N	N
AVIAN		
Acute	N	N
Reproductive	N	N
Reproductive	N	N

¹⁵Guide at pp-23; 33-34.

¹⁶43 Fed Reg at 11112
"Cancer" listed

¹⁷Guide at pp-21.

¹⁸43 Fed Reg at 11112; 11115 at Comment 15

"Mutagenicity" listed/ *in vivo* vs *invitro* discussed; discussion of "Ames test".

¹⁹Guide at pp-23.

²⁰43 Fed Reg at 11112; 11115 at Comment 16.

CAS# 13098-39-0

Chem: Hexafluoroacetone Sesquihydrate

Title: Primary irritation skin test

Date: 12/19/63

Summary of Effects: strong skin irritants

Copies to: C. W. Maynard, Jr. (6)

P. G. Heytler (6)

M.A.S. (36)

E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company
Haskell Laboratory for Toxicology and Industrial Medicine

Wm. H. & Cordie

John Cardell

HASKELL LABORATORY REPORT NO. 54-63 MS BOS. 627 & 707

Haskell No.: 3448

Material Tested: Hexafluoroacetone Sesquihydrate

Submitted by: C. W. Maynard, Jr., Organic Chemicals Department
Research and Development Division

PRIMARY IRRITATION SKIN TEST

Procedure: One drop of the undiluted material or of aqueous solutions was applied to the intact shaved skin of albino male guinea pigs. Observations were made 24 hours later.

<u>Per Cent Solution</u>	<u>Number of Animals</u>	<u>Degree of Irritation</u>
100	2	Strong erythema with edema
50	10	Strong erythema
25	10	Mild erythema
5	10	None
1	10	None

EYE IRRITATION TEST

Procedure: Doses of 0.05 ml of the undiluted sample or 5% solutions, either aqueous or in 0.8% NaCl buffered with 10% $MgCO_3$, were instilled into a conjunctival sac of each of 6 male albino rabbits, respectively. Two eyes were dosed with each of the three preparations; one eye of each pair was washed with tap water 20 seconds after contact for a 1-minute interval and the other eye was not washed. Eyes exposed to the undiluted sample were examined at 1-4, 7, and 29 days, while those exposed to the 5% solutions were examined 1-3 days only.

Material	Dose	Exposure	Ocular Effect		
			Cornea	Iris	Conjunctiva
100%, pH = 1 (pyridron)		Washed	Severe injury 1-7 days; extensive damage with small totally opaque area present at 7 days. At 29 days small scar with localized vascularization.	Moderate or severe inflammation through 7 days; edema at 3 days. Normal at 29 days.	Swelling; redness, with minute hemorrhages; fibrinous discharge, all through 7 days. Normal at 29 days.
		Not washed	Severe injury 1-7 days; damage to entire surface with large completely opaque area present at 7 days. At 29 days circumcorneal growth of white tissue with vascularization-covering the peripheral 2/3 of the cornea. Pannus.	Severe inflammation with edema through 3 days; observations 4-7 days limited by corneal clouding. Not visible at 29 days due to growth of white tissue over cornea.	Swelling; redness or extensive blanching; fibrinous discharge, all through 7 days. Mild irritation with fibrinous discharge at 29 days.
5% aqueous pH = 3.6 (Beckmann)		Washed	None	None	Minimal redness at 1 hour.
		Not washed	None	None	Mild localized redness 1 hour-2 days; minimal discharge at 1 hour.
5% in saline, buffered to pH = 7.4 (Beckmann)		Washed	None	None	Minimal redness at 1 hour.
		Not washed	None	None	Minimal redness at 1 hour.

Summary: The undiluted benzfluoracetone sesquihydrate as well as a 50% solution are strong skin irritants. Concentrations below 50% produced mild or no irritation.

The undiluted sample was instantly painful and produced severe extensive injury in both a washed and an unwashed rabbit eye through 7 days. The eye receiving prompt washing subsequently showed considerable improvement; at 29 days after exposure this eye was normal except for a small corneal injury with local vascularization. However, at 29 days an eye similarly exposed but not washed showed extensive opacity, scar tissue, pannus, and chronic conjunctivitis.

Five per cent solutions, either aqueous or in buffered physiological saline, produced only minimal transitory conjunctival irritation in both washed and unwashed eyes.

Conclusion: The severe irreversible eye injury and severe skin irritation caused by the undiluted material indicate that concentrated hexafluoroacetone sesquihydrate must be handled with the care accorded strong mineral acids.

Report by: Ruth E. Reinke
Ruth E. Reinke

Approved by: D. B. Hood
D. B. Hood
Chief, Toxicology Section

J. Wesley Clayton, Jr.
J. Wesley Clayton, Jr.
Assistant Director

RER/mfs
Date: December 19, 1963



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

Mark H. Christman
Counsel
E. I. Du Pont De Nemours and Company
Legal D-7010-1
1007 M. Street
Wilmington, Delaware 19898

OFFICE OF
PREVENTION, PESTICIDES AND
TOXIC SUBSTANCES

MAR 06 1995

EPA acknowledges the receipt of information submitted by your organization under Section 8(e) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). For your reference, copies of the first page(s) of your submission(s) are enclosed and display the TSCA §8(e) Document Control Number (e.g., 8EHQ-00-0000) assigned by EPA to your submission(s). Please cite the assigned 8(e) number when submitting follow-up or supplemental information and refer to the reverse side of this page for "EPA Information Requests".

All TSCA 8(e) submissions are placed in the public files unless confidentiality is claimed according to the procedures outlined in Part X of EPA's TSCA §8(e) policy statement (43 FR 11110, March 16, 1978). Confidential submissions received pursuant to the TSCA §8(e) Compliance Audit Program (CAP) should already contain information supporting confidentiality claims. This information is required and should be submitted if not done so previously. To substantiate claims, submit responses to the questions in the enclosure "Support Information for Confidentiality Claims". This same enclosure is used to support confidentiality claims for non-CAP submissions.

Please address any further correspondence with the Agency related to this TSCA 8(e) submission to:

Document Processing Center (7407)
Attn: TSCA Section 8(e) Coordinator
Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C. 20460-0001

EPA looks forward to continued cooperation with your organization in its ongoing efforts to evaluate and manage potential risks posed by chemicals to health and the environment.

Sincerely,

Terry R. O'Bryan
Terry R. O'Bryan
Risk Analysis Branch

Enclosure

12102A



Recycled/Recyclable
Printed with Soy/Canola Ink on paper that
contains at least 50% recycled fiber

CECATS DATA: 12102 SEQ. A
 Submission # 1092-10910

TYPE: INDSUPP FLWP

SUBMITTER NAME: E. I. DuPont de Nemours and Company

INFORMATION REQUESTED: FLWP DATE:
 0501 NO INFO REQUESTED
 0502 INFO REQUESTED (TECH)
 0503 INFO REQUESTED (VOL ACTIONS)
 0504 INFO REQUESTED (REPORTING RATIONAL E)
 DISPOSITION:
 0639 REFER TO CHEMICAL SCREENING
 1678 SCAP NOTICE

VOLUNTARY ACTIONS:
 0401 NO ACTION REPORTED
 0402 STUDIES PLANNED/IN PROGRESS
 0403 NOTIFICATION OF WORK IN PROGRESS
 0404 LABEL/MSDS CHANGES
 0405 PROCESS/STANDLING CHANGES
 0406 APP/USE DISCONTINUED
 0407 PRODUCTION DISCONTINUED
 0408 CONFIDENTIAL

SUB DATE: 10/15/92 OTS DATE: 10/27/92 CSRAD DATE: 08/15/94
 CAS#: 13098-39-0

CHEMICAL NAME: 2-propanone, 1,1,1,3,3,3-hexafluoro-, 2-
 Sesaquihydrate
HexaFluoroacetone Sesaquihydrate

INFORMATION TYPE:	P F C	INFORMATION TYPE:	P F C	INFORMATION TYPE:	P F C
0201 ONCO (HUMAN)	01 02 04	0216 EPI/CLIN	01 02 04	0241 IMMUNO (ANIMAL)	01 02 04
0202 ONCO (ANIMAL)	01 02 04	0217 HUMAN EXPOS (PROD CONTAM)	01 02 04	0242 IMMUNO (HUMAN)	01 02 04
0203 CELL TRANS (IN VITRO)	01 02 04	0218 HUMAN EXPOS (ACCIDENTAL)	01 02 04	0243 CHEM/PHYS PROP	01 02 04
0204 MUTA (IN VITRO)	01 02 04	0219 HUMAN EXPOS (MONITORING)	01 02 04	0244 CLASTO (IN VITRO)	01 02 04
0205 MUTA (IN VIVO)	01 02 04	0220 ECO/AQUA TOX	01 02 04	0245 CLASTO (ANIMAL)	01 02 04
0206 REPRO/TERATO (HUMAN)	01 02 04	0221 ENV. OCCUR/REL/FATE	01 02 04	0246 CLASTO (HUMAN)	01 02 04
0207 REPRO/TERATO (ANIMAL)	01 02 04	0222 EMER INCI OF ENV CONTAM	01 02 04	0247 DNA DAM/REPAIR	01 02 04
0208 NEURO (HUMAN)	01 02 04	0223 RESPONSE REQUEST DELAY	01 02 04	0248 PROD/USE/PROC	01 02 04
0209 NEURO (ANIMAL)	01 02 04	0224 PROD/COMP/CHEM ID	01 02 04	0251 MSDS	01 02 04
0210 ACUTE TOX. (HUMAN)	01 02 04	0225 REPORTING RATIONALE	01 02 04	OTHER	01 02 04
0211 CHR. TOX. (HUMAN)	01 02 04	CONFIDENTIAL			
0212 ACUTE TOX. (ANIMAL)	01 02 04	ALLERG (HUMAN)	01 02 04		
0213 SUB ACUTE TOX (ANIMAL)	01 02 04	ALLERG (ANIMAL)	01 02 04		
0214 SUB CHRONIC TOX (ANIMAL)	01 02 04	METAB/PHARMACO (ANIMAL)	01 02 04		
0215 CHRONIC TOX (ANIMAL)	01 02 04	METAB/PHARMACO (HUMAN)	01 02 04		

TRIAJE DATA: NON-CBI INVENTORY YES
ONGOING REVIEW YES (DROP/REFER)
 CAS SR: NO NO (CONTINUE)
 REFER:

DETERMINE

COMMENTS:

SPECIES: GP RB
 TOXICOLOGICAL CONCERN: LOW
 MED HIGH

USE: PRODUCTION:

CECATS DATA: Submission # BEHQ 1092-12102 SEQ. # A

TYPE: INT SUPP FLWP
 SUBMITTER NAME: E. I. Dupont de Nemours and Company

INFORMATION REQUESTED: FLWP DATE: _____
 0501 NO INFO REQUESTED
 0502 INFO REQUESTED (TECH)
 0503 INFO REQUESTED (VOL ACTIONS)
 0504 INFO REQUESTED (REPORTING RATIONALE)
 DISPOSITION:
 0639 REFER TO CHEMICAL SCREENING
 0678 CAP NOTICE

VOLUNTARY ACTIONS:
 0401 NO ACTION REPORTED
 0402 STUDIES PLANNED/IN PROGRESS
 0403 NOTIFICATION OF WORKING RESOURCES
 0404 LABELING/MSDS CHANGES
 0405 PROCESSING/CHANGING
 0406 APP USE DISCONTINUED
 0407 PRODUCTION DISCONTINUED
 0408 CONFIDENTIAL

SUB. DATE: 10/15/92 OTS DATE: 10/27/92 CSRAD DATE: 02/15/95

CHEMICAL NAME: FC 238
Methone, 5-tetra-fluorodibromo -
Chlor, tri-fluoromethoxydibromo -
 CAS# 74-83-9
Unknown
Unknown
→ FC-236
→ FC-237

INFORMATION TYPE:	P F C	INFORMATION TYPE:	P F C	INFORMATION TYPE:	P F C
0201 ONCO (HUMAN)	01 02 04	0216 ERYCLIN	01 02 04	0241 IMMUNO (ANIMAL)	01 02 04
0202 ONCO (ANIMAL)	01 02 04	0217 HUMAN EXPOS (PROD CONTAM)	01 02 04	0242 IMMUNO (HUMAN)	01 02 04
0203 CELL TRANS (IN VITRO)	01 02 04	0218 HUMAN EXPOS (ACCIDENTAL)	01 02 04	0243 CHEM/PHYS PROP	01 02 04
0204 MUTA (IN VITRO)	01 02 04	0219 HUMAN EXPOS (MONITORING)	01 02 04	0244 CLASTO (IN VITRO)	01 02 04
0205 MUTA (IN VIVO)	01 02 04	0220 ECOAQUA TOX	01 02 04	0245 CLASTO (ANIMAL)	01 02 04
0206 REPRO/TERATO (HUMAN)	01 02 04	0221 ENV. OCCUREL/FATE	01 02 04	0246 CLASTO (HUMAN)	01 02 04
0207 REPRO/TERATO (ANIMAL)	01 02 04	0222 EMER INCI OF ENV CONTAM	01 02 04	0247 DNA DAM/REPAIR	01 02 04
0208 NEURO (HUMAN)	01 02 04	0223 RESPONSE REOUEST DELAY	01 02 04	0248 PROD/USE/PROC	01 02 04
0209 NEURO (ANIMAL)	01 02 04	0224 PRODCOMP/CHEM ID	01 02 04	0251 MSDS	01 02 04
0210 ACUTE TOX. (HUMAN)	01 02 04	0225 REPORTING RATIONALE	01 02 04	0299 OTHER	01 02 04
0211 CHR. TOX. (HUMAN)	01 02 04	0226 CONFIDENTIAL	01 02 04		
0212 ACUTE TOX. (ANIMAL)	01 02 04	0227 ALLERG (HUMAN)	01 02 04		
0213 SUB ACUTE TOX (ANIMAL)	01 02 04	0228 ALLERG (ANIMAL)	01 02 04		
0214 SUB CHRONIC TOX (ANIMAL)	01 02 04	0229 METAB/PHARMACO (ANIMAL)	01 02 04		
0215 CHRONIC TOX (ANIMAL)	01 02 04	0240 METAB/PHARMACO (HUMAN)	01 02 04		

TRIAAGE DATA: NON-CBI INVENTORY
 YES
 NO

ONGOING REVIEW: YES (DROP/REFER) NO (CONTINUE)

SPECIES: RAT

TOXICOLOGICAL CONCERN: LOW

USE: _____

PRODUCTION: _____

CAS SR NO

IN T R A N S I T

REFTR

MED
HIGH

-CPSS- 1004951453

0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

> <ID NUMBER>

8(e)-12102A

> <TOX CONCERN>

M

> <COMMENT>

EYE IRRITATION IN MALE RABBITS IS HIGH CONCERN. GROUPS OF TWO ANIMALS (1 WASHED, 1 UNWASHED) WERE DOSED WITH UNDILUTED TEST MATERIAL (PH=1), A 5% AQUEOUS (PH=3.6), AND A 5% IN SALINE (PH=7.4). THE EYES EXPOSED TO UNDILUTED TEST MATERIAL EXHIBITED SEVERE CORNEAL INJURY (CORNEAL OPACITY, VASCULARIZATION, AND PANNUS); MODERATE TO SEVERE INFLAMMATION OF THE IRIS WITH EDEMA; AND CONJUNCTIVAL IRRITATION (REDNESS OR EXTENSIVE BLANCHING, SWELLING WITH MINUTE HEMORRHAGES, AND FIBRINOUS DISCHARGE). AT THE OTHER TWO DOSE LEVELS, EXHIBITED MINIMAL REDNESS OF THE CONJUNCTIVAE IN ALL WITH MINIMAL DISCHARGE IN 1. PRIMARY DERMAL IRRITATION IN GUINEA PIGS IS MEDIUM CONCERN. A 100% SOLUTION OF TEST MATERIAL ADMINISTERED TO INTACT SKIN RESULTED IN STRONG ERYTHEMA WITH EDEMA IN 2 ANIMALS. 10 ANIMALS EXHIBITED STRONG ERYTHEMA WHEN EXPOSED TO A 50% SOLUTION AND A 25% SOLUTION RESULTED IN MILD ERYTHEMA IN 10 ANIMALS. NO REACTION WAS NOTED WHEN EITHER 5% OR 1% SOLUTION WAS ADMINISTERED TO GROUPS OF 10 ANIMALS.

\$\$\$\$