ECOLOGICAL RISK ASSESSMENT OF WILDLAND FIRE-FIGHTING CHEMICALS: CLASS A FOAMS

Prepared for:

Fire and Aviation Management &
National Technology and Development Program
U.S. Forest Service
Missoula, MT

By:

Headquarters:
51 West 4th Avenue
Denver, CO 80223

June 2023

Table of Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations

EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ft	feet
GLEAMS	Groundwater Loading Effects of Agricultural Management Systems
gpc	gallons per 100 square feet
kg	kilogram
L	liter
L/RMP	land / resource management plan
LC_{50}	median lethal concentration
LD_{50}	median lethal dose
mg	milligram
mg/kg	milligrams per kilogram
mg/L	milligrams per liter
NOEC	no-observed-effect concentration
ppm	parts per million
QPL	Qualified Products List
spp.	multiple species
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture

ECOLOGICAL RISK ASSESSMENT OF WILDLAND FIRE-FIGHTING CHEMICALS: CLASS A FOAMS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Forest Service uses a variety of chemicals to aid in the suppression of fire in wildlands, including long-term fire retardants, Class A foams, and water enhancers. The potential ecological impacts of the products were first assessed in a programmatic risk assessment prepared in 1994. The risk assessment has been periodically updated to include new products and assessment approaches. This report provides a structure for maintaining the product-specific risk assessments for efficient reference, access, and organization of the most current information for each product.

This risk assessment analyzes the ecological risks due to chemical toxicity from using Class A foams in wildland fire-fighting. A companion report evaluates the risks to human health from Class A foam use. Separate risk assessments address human health and ecological risks from long-term retardants and water enhancers.

This risk assessment evaluates the toxicological effects associated with chemical exposure, that is, the direct effects of chemical toxicity, using methodologies established by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). A risk assessment is different from and is only one component of a comprehensive impact assessment of an action's possible effects on wildlife and the environment, including aircraft noise, cumulative impacts, habitat effects, and other direct or indirect effects.

This report is organized into five major sections and three attachments. Section 1.0 provides an introduction, background information, and an overview of the analysis approach. Section 2.0 presents the problem formulation, including problem definition, assessment endpoints, and conceptual model. Section 3.0 describes the data and models for analysis, characterizes exposure, and characterizes effects. Section 4.0 presents the risk characterization methodology. Section 5.0 lists the references cited throughout this report. Attachments A, B, and C present a summary of the current risk conclusions, the Qualified Products List (QPL) of Class A foam formulations evaluated in this risk assessment, and product-specific risk estimates, respectively.

1.1 Background: Fire-Fighting Chemicals

The information in the following paragraphs was derived from the Forest Service's Wildland Fire Chemicals Systems information web site (https://www.fs.usda.gov/rm/fire/wfcs):

- *Long-term fire retardants*, commonly referred to as retardants, are applied from aerial or ground equipment. The red liquids dropped from aircraft, often viewed in media coverage of wildland fire-fighting activities, are retardants. These products, many of which are primarily the same salts found in agricultural fertilizers, are supplied as either wet or dry concentrates.

They are mixed with water in a prescribed ratio and applied to a target area just ahead of a fire (during wildland firefighting) or prior to a fire (during prescribed fire operations). While the water contained in the mixed product aids in firefighting, its primary purpose is to aid in accurately delivering the product to the fire. They continue to be effective after the water in the mixture has evaporated, as the retardant residue slows the spread and reduces the intensity of fire.

- *Class A Foam fire suppressants*, commonly referred to as foams, are supplied as wet concentrates similar to liquid dishwashing products that are mixed with water and then aerated to produce foam. They are applied from aerial or ground equipment directly to the fire area to slow or stop combustion. Foam bubbles and their components (water and the concentrated product in it) interact with fuel surfaces in several ways. The fuels may absorb the moisture as it drains out of the foam mixture, which makes them less susceptible to combustion, and may be protected from wind, heat, and flame by foam coating the fuel's surface. Depending on the desired outcome, a wide range of foam characteristics can be prepared from the same concentrate by changing the mix ratio and adjusting the foam generation and application method used. Higher amounts of concentrate and aeration in the foam solution produce drier, slow draining foam for vertical surface protection. Moderate amounts produce wetting, fast draining foam for vegetation (horizontal surface) application. Low amounts can be used to make "wet water" that has enhanced penetration for mop up.

- *Water enhancers,* commonly referred to as gels, are supplied as wet or dry concentrates that contain thickeners and other ingredients that, when mixed with water, improve aerial application, minimize drift, and aid in adherence to fuels. Water enhancers may be applied from ground or aerial application equipment. These products may be used in structure protection within the wildland interface or on wildland fuels. The effectiveness of water enhancers depends on the water content of the gels and, once they dry out, they are no longer effective.

Foams and water enhancers all increase the inherent ability of water to suppress fire, while retardants leave a dried residue after the water evaporates that helps to protect the fuel from burning.

Fire-fighting chemicals may be dropped from fixed-wing airplanes ("airtankers") or helicopters, or applied by ground crews from fire engines or using portable equipment; the application methods approved for each product are listed on the current QPL, which can be found online at https://www.fs.usda.gov/rm/fire/wfcs.

1.2 Overview of Analysis

The purpose of this assessment is to estimate the potential ecological impacts as a result of the use of foams in wildland fire-fighting. This ecological risk assessment looks only at the biological risks of the wildland fire-fighting chemicals, should they be used. It does not evaluate alternatives to their use, nor does it discuss factors affecting management decisions on whether chemicals should be used in a particular situation.

This ecological risk assessment follows the steps of problem formulation, analysis, and risk characterization, as described in EPA's *Guidelines for Ecological Risk Assessment* (EPA 1998). This risk assessment also identifies uncertainties that are associated with the conclusions of the risk characterization. The discussion that follows briefly describes these elements. A detailed description of ecological risk assessment methodology is contained in the EPA guidelines.

1.2.1 Problem Formulation

In problem formulation, the purpose of the assessment is provided, the problem is defined, and a plan for analyzing and characterizing risk is determined. The potential stressors (in this case, wildland fire-fighting chemicals), the ecological effects expected or observed, the receptors, and ecosystem(s) potentially affected are identified and characterized. Using this information, the three products of problem formulation are developed: (1) assessment endpoints that adequately reflect management goals and the ecosystem they represent, (2) conceptual models that describe key relationships between a stressor and assessment endpoint, and (3) an analysis plan that includes the design of the assessment, data needs, measures that will be used to evaluate risk hypotheses, and methods for conducting the analysis phase of the assessment.

1.2.2 Analysis

Analysis is a process that examines the two primary components of risk—exposure and effects—and the relationships between each other and ecosystem characteristics. The assessment endpoints and conceptual models developed during problem formulation provide the focus and structure for the analysis. Exposure characterization describes potential or actual contact or co-occurrence of stressors with receptors, to produce a summary exposure profile that identifies the receptor, describes the exposure pathway, and describes the intensity and extent of contact or co-occurrence. Ecological effects characterization consists of evaluating ecological effects (including ecotoxicity) data for the stressor of interest, as related to the assessment endpoints and the conceptual models, and preparing a stressor-response profile.

1.2.3 Risk Characterization

Risk characterization (1) uses the results of the analysis phase to develop an estimate of the risks to ecological entities, (2) describes the significance and likelihood of any predicted adverse effects, and (3) identifies uncertainties, assumptions, and qualifiers in the risk assessment.

2.0 PROBLEM FORMULATION

This section presents the results of the problem formulation, in which the purpose of the ecological risk assessment is provided, the problem is defined, and a plan for analyzing and characterizing risk is determined. As stated in Chapter 1, the purpose of this assessment is to estimate the potential ecological impacts as a result of the use of wildland fire chemicals such as foams.

2.1 Problem Definition: Integration of Available Information

In this first step of problem formulation, the risk assessment identifies and characterizes the stressors, the ecological effects expected or observed, the receptors, and ecosystem potentially affected.

2.1.1 Stressors

In this ecological risk assessment, the potential stressors are the foams that may be used to fight fires. The foams addressed in this risk assessment are those approved for use by the U.S. Forest Service, as listed on the current QPL.

Each foam product used in wildland fire-fighting is a mixture of individual chemicals. The product is supplied as a liquid concentrate that is then diluted with water to produce the mixture that is applied during fire-fighting operations. The risk assessment process for a product had a two-part approach: (1) toxicity data on the whole product were considered, to account for any effects due to the product being a mixture (synergism or antagonism); and (2) each ingredient in the product formulations was screened, and risk from any ingredient with toxicity exceeding a screening threshold (see Section 2.4.1) was separately quantified.

The application rate for foams varies by situation; the type of fuel (vegetation) is a major factor in this determination. The application rates assumed in this risk assessment for foams applied to various fuel types are included in Table 2-1 in Section 2.1.4. The application rates vary from 1 to 6 gallons of mixed (diluted) product per 100 square feet (gallons per 100 square feet, or “gpc”).

2.1.2 Ecological Effects

The ecological effects that may be caused by foams are those associated with (1) direct toxicity to terrestrial wildlife and aquatic species that encounter the chemical, (2) phytotoxicity, and (3) effects on vegetation diversity. Permanent or persistent exposures through terrestrial environmental pathways are not expected, since the application “footprint” of these chemicals is quite limited in terms of foraging areas and species habitat for any individual animal, and the ingredients generally degrade in the environment. Although bioaccumulation was evaluated in simple predator-prey scenarios, the potential for long-term biomagnification in the terrestrial food web was not evaluated for this same reason.

Fire is an integral component to and may have beneficial impacts on ecosystems. Adverse effects to an ecosystem could occur in terms of a decrease in fire-based beneficial effects. However,

these effects are not directly related to risks from the chemicals specifically but are tied to fire management and suppression decision-making regarding all methods of fire suppression. An analysis of these risks and benefits is outside the scope of this risk assessment, which focuses only on potential ecological risks from the foams; however, a subset of related risk management considerations is briefly discussed in Section 4.2.

2.1.3 Receptors

The potential receptors in this ecological risk assessment were selected to represent a range of species present in wildlands. These receptors include mammals, birds, amphibians, fish, and aquatic invertebrates for which quantitative risk estimates can be made, based on the program description data in this chapter and the environmental fate and transport predictions described in Section 3.1. Based on the results of this analysis, an assessment was conducted of risks to special status species—such as endangered, threatened, or other designated special status species, collectively referred to as "sensitive species" in this risk assessment—for whom the acceptable exposure threshold would be lower, to identify whether there could be risks to individual animals, as contrasted with protecting animal populations overall for non-sensitive species.

2.1.4 Ecosystems Potentially Affected

Foams could be applied wherever a wildfire occurs, and no one ecosystem can represent the variety of site conditions that are found in all areas where wildland fire is possible. Therefore, this risk assessment identified representative ecoregions to be analyzed (see Table 2-1), based on the classifications described by Bailey (1995) and considering areas of the U.S. where fire-fighting chemicals are more likely to be applied.

The timing of peak fire season within an ecoregion is one factor in the probability that the predicted risks to wildlife species would occur. If chemical application coincides with the presence of vulnerable life stages of a species, adverse impacts may be more likely. The peak fire season for each ecoregion is noted in Table 2-1.

Table 2-1. Representative Ecoregions

Description	Ecoregion [a]	Geographic Location	Foam Coverage Level (gpc, or gallons per 100 square feet) [b]	Peak Fire Season [c]
Annual and perennial western grasses	331: Great Plains-Palouse dry steppe	Rocky Mountain Piedmont, upper Missouri Basin Broken Lands, Palouse grassland of Washington and Idaho	1	Apr - Oct
Conifer with grass	M313: Arizona-New Mexico mountains–semidesert–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	Arizona, New Mexico	2	May - Jul
	M331: Southern Rocky Mountain steppe–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	Middle and southern Rocky Mountains	2	Jun - Sep
Shortneedle closed conifer	M332: Middle Rocky Mountain steppe–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	Blue Mountains, Salmon River Mountains, basins and ranges of southwestern Montana	2	Jun - Sep
	242: Pacific lowland mixed forest	Puget-Willamette lowland	2	Jul - Oct
Summer hardwood	234: Lower Mississippi riverine forest	Lower Mississippi River floodplain	2	Aug - May
Longneedle conifer	M212: Adirondack-New England mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	Adirondack-New England highlands	2	Mar - Jun Oct - Nov
Fall hardwood	231: Southeastern mixed forest	Southeastern U.S.	2	Oct - Jun
Sagebrush with grass	342: Intermountain semi-desert	Columbia-Snake River plateaus, Wyoming basin	3	Jun - Oct
Intermediate brush (green)	315: Southwest plateau and plains dry steppe and shrub	Texas, eastern New Mexico	3	Oct - Jul
Shortneedle conifer (heavy dead litter)	212: Laurentian mixed forest	North-central lake-swamp-morainic plains, New England lowlands	4	May, Aug, Nov
	M242: Cascade mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	Pacific northwest	4	Jul - Oct
Southern rough	232: Outer coastal plain mixed forest	Atlantic and gulf coastal plains, Florida	6	Sep - Jul
Alaska black spruce	131: Yukon intermontane plateaus taiga	Interior Alaska	6	Jun - Sep
California mixed chaparral	M262: California coastal range open woodland–shrub–coniferous forest–meadow	Southern California coastal range	>6	Aug - Oct

[a] Numbers and categories correspond to those described by Bailey (1995).
[b] Mixed (diluted) product.
[c] Source: NFPA 2011.

2.2 Assessment Endpoints

Assessment endpoints are selected based on three criteria: ecological relevance, susceptibility to stressors, and relevance to management goals (EPA 1998). For species that are endangered, threatened, or sensitive, the assessment endpoint selected is individual survival, growth, and reproduction. For non-sensitive species present in an area that was treated with fire-fighting chemicals, the assessment endpoint selected is the survival of populations.

Scenarios describing the potential impacts of fire-fighting chemical use on the assessment endpoints are developed in the conceptual model described in the next section. Table 2-2 summarizes the potential ecological effects and associated assessment endpoints for this risk assessment of fire-fighting chemicals.

Table 2-2. Assessment Endpoints

Ecological Effect	Assessment Endpoint
Direct toxicity to terrestrial wildlife and aquatic species	For species that are endangered, threatened, or sensitive, the assessment endpoint selected is survival, growth, and reproduction of each individual. For non-sensitive species, the assessment endpoint selected is the survival of a majority of individuals to sustain a local population.
Phytotoxicity	Individual plant growth for endangered, threatened, or sensitive species; survival of populations for non-sensitive species.
Effects on vegetation diversity	Changes in vegetation species/succession in an area

2.3 Conceptual Model

A conceptual model consists of (1) a risk hypothesis that describes relationships between the stressor, exposure, and assessment endpoint response; and (2) a diagram illustrating these relationships. For use of foams on wildlands in the U.S., the risk hypothesis is as follows:

Risk Hypothesis
Some ingredients in the foam products have demonstrated toxicity to terrestrial and aquatic wildlife and plant species, at varying levels, based on laboratory and field tests. The associated hypothesis is that use of foams for wildland fire-fighting will cause chemical toxicity resulting from individual ingredients, or from the products as a mixture of ingredients. Environmental exposure to the chemical(s) is postulated to result in adverse effects to an individual's survival, growth, and reproduction for sensitive species, or to the survival of populations of non-sensitive species. Specifically, it is hypothesized that direct contact or soil-, water-, or diet-mediated exposure may occur at levels predicted to be associated with adverse individual or population-level effects.

To test this hypothesis, a conceptual model was developed to illustrate the relationships between stressors, exposure routes, and receptors. The conceptual model is presented in Figure 2-1

Figure 2-1. Conceptual Model



*The "application to stream" scenario includes accidents as well as invoking an exception to the "Interagency Policy for Aerial and Ground Delivery of Wildland Fire Chemicals near Waterways and Other Avoidance Areas" as stated in Chapter 12 of the *Interagency Standards for Fire and Fire Aviation Operations* ("Red Book") (USFS/DOI 2021).

2.4 Analysis Plan

Based on the conceptual model, scenarios were identified to evaluate risks to terrestrial and aquatic wildlife species from the identified assessment endpoints.

2.4.1 Direct Toxicity

Direct toxicity to wildlife species was characterized using the following steps:

1. Representative terrestrial and aquatic species and their characteristics were identified.

2. Each foam formulation was screened for ingredients with high toxicity to wildlife, as determined by a mammalian oral median lethal dose (LD_{50}) <500 milligrams of chemical per kilogram of body weight (mg/kg), or an acute aquatic species median lethal concentration (LC_{50}) <10 milligrams of chemical per liter of water (mg/L). These screening thresholds were based on inclusion of chemicals defined by EPA, in terms of their acute toxicity, as

moderately, highly, or very highly toxic (EPA 2012a). EPA's toxicity categories are listed in Table 2-3.

Table 2-3. EPA Toxicity Categories

Receptor	Parameter and Units	Toxicity Category				
		Very highly toxic	Highly toxic	Moderately toxic	Slightly toxic	Practically nontoxic
Birds and wild mammals	acute oral LD_{50} (mg/kg)	<10	10 - 50	51 - 500	501 – 2,000	>2,000
Aquatic organisms	acute LC_{50} (mg/L)	< 0.1	0.1 - 1	>1 - 10	>10 - 100	>100

3. Effects characterization: for chemicals with high toxicity (as determined in the screening step above), profiles were prepared summarizing toxicity, chemical and physical and properties, and environmental fate and transport.

4. Exposure characterization: environmental fate and exposure models were implemented to estimate exposures in terms of dose (mg/kg) for terrestrial species or concentration (mg/L) for aquatic species.

5. The doses and concentrations identified in the exposure characterization were compared to the toxic properties identified in the effects characterization, using the guidelines developed by EPA for interpreting risk estimates to wildlife and aquatic species.

2.4.2 Phytotoxicity

Impacts on terrestrial plants from ingredients in the foam formulations were unable to be evaluated because no data were available for the effects characterization.

2.4.3 Vegetation Diversity

Positive and negative effects of chemicals on plant species' growth were unable to be evaluated because no data were available for the effects characterization.

3.0 ANALYSIS

Exposures from both planned and accidental releases are considered in this risk assessment. Releases may include on-target drops to terrestrial areas, drops across water bodies, and accidental spills during aerial or ground transport to a stream. A drop across a stream may be accidental, or an intended release as a result of invoking an exception under the "Interagency Policy for Aerial and Ground Delivery of Wildland Fire Chemicals Near Waterways and Other Avoidance Areas," a policy intended to protect aquatic species and certain terrestrial species.[1]

3.1 Data and Models for Analysis

The risk assessment used a combination of laboratory data, field data, and modeling outputs.

Quantitative dose-response information for a range of animal species has been generated for chemicals in laboratory studies conducted by researchers and manufacturers. Sources include peer-reviewed scientific literature, manufacturers' safety data sheets and information summaries, and government reports. These studies were reviewed to generate the LD_{50}s and LC_{50}s that are used in the ecological risk assessment.

Predicting the estimated environmental concentrations of the foams in this analysis relied primarily on mathematical modeling for the following reasons:

- Little to no validated data are available from monitoring studies of foam application, and the nationwide utility of data developed on environmental fate at individual sites would be limited, due to the significant influence of site-specific parameters (such as soil type, climate, slope, and other variables) on the potential for off-site transport; and
- Sophisticated models have been validated in field tests, and are appropriate for application to this problem, which seeks to identify a representative range of exposure estimates for each ecoregion.

The EPA and other regulatory agencies recognize the value of modeling for predicting impacts.

Predicting environmental concentrations after the use of foams is complicated by the wide range of chemical, environmental, and operational variables. A limited number of scenarios based on

[1] The aerial delivery policy is to:

- Avoid aerial application of all wildland fire chemicals within 300 feet of waterways.
- Additional mapped avoidance areas may be designated by individual agency.
- Whenever practical, as determined by the fire incident commander, use water or other less toxic wildland fire chemical suppressants for direct attack or less toxic approved fire retardants in areas occupied by threatened, endangered, proposed, candidate or sensitive species or their designated critical habitats.

The ground delivery policy is to avoid application of all wildland fire chemicals into waterways.

On Forest Service lands, exceptions can be made only for the protection of life or safety (public and firefighter). Other agencies are allowed additional exceptions if alternative line construction tactics are not available, life or property is threatened, or potential damage to natural resources outweighs possible loss of aquatic life. The guideline is a joint policy of the U.S. Forest Service and the Department of the Interior.

anticipated operations and circumstances simplify the task. A conservative bias was incorporated when assumptions were required. This is useful in overcoming the limitations and uncertainties that accompany modeling. If a model predicts that the less favorable circumstances produce acceptable results, then one can predict with greater confidence that the normal or more favorable circumstances will also produce acceptable results.

The computer-based Groundwater Loading Effects of Agricultural Management Systems (GLEAMS) model, described in detail in the following subsection, was used to estimate runoff of foams from treated areas into streams, possibly exposing aquatic species as well as terrestrial species (through drinking water). Point source loading was assumed for edge-of-field runoff into streams and for accidental spills into streams. Residue levels on foliage and other wildlife diet items were estimated using the results of field studies (see Section 3.2.1).

3.1.1 Modeling of Runoff Using GLEAMS

The GLEAMS model, developed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Agricultural Research Service (Leonard et al. 1987, 1988), is a computerized mathematical model to evaluate the movement and degradation of chemicals in soil within the plant root zone under various crop management systems. Version 3.0 of GLEAMS, used for this analysis, includes improved handling of forested areas (Knisel and Davis 2000). The model has been tested and validated using a variety of data (see, for example, Leonard et al. 1987, Crawford et al. 1990). The following paragraphs briefly discuss the structure and function of the model.

3.1.1.1 Components

GLEAMS has four main components: hydrology, erosion, nutrients, and pesticides. The hydrology component of GLEAMS subdivides the soil within the rooting zone into as many as 12 computational layers. Soils data describing porosity, water retention characteristics, and organic matter content for the site-specific soil layers (horizons) are collected for model initialization. During a simulation, GLEAMS computes a continuous accounting of the water balance for each layer, including percolation, evaporation, and transpiration. Evaporation of chemicals from the soil surface is not represented, but evaporation of water can cause chemicals to move upward through the soil.

The erosion component of GLEAMS accounts for the basic soil particle size categories (sand, silt, and clay), and for small and large aggregates of soil particles. The program also accounts for the unequal distribution of organic matter between soil fractions and uses this information and surface-area relationships to calculate an enrichment ratio that describes the greater concentration of chemicals in eroding soil compared with the concentration in surface soil.

The nutrient component of GLEAMS was not used in modeling the behavior and effects of the foams, as these products generally do not contain nitrogen or phosphorus compounds at concentrations that would stimulate vegetative growth.

The pesticide component of GLEAMS can represent chemical deposition directly on the soil, the interception of chemicals by foliage, and subsequent washoff. Although the foams are not

pesticides, GLEAMS appropriately represents the ingredients, since they are deliberately applied at known rates to defined areas. When degradation is considered, degradation rates are allowed to differ between plant surfaces and soil, and between soil horizons and degradation calculations are performed on a daily time interval. Redistribution of chemicals because of hydrologic processes is also calculated on a daily time step. Chemical distribution between dissolved and sorbed states is described as a simple linear relationship, directly proportional to the organic carbon partition coefficient[2] and soil organic matter content. Extraction of chemicals from the soil surface into runoff accounts for sorption (assumed to be relatively rapid) and uses a related parameter describing the depth of the interaction of surface runoff and surface soil. Chemical percolation is calculated through each of the soil layers, and the amount that passes through the last soil layer is accumulated as the potential loading to the vadose zone[3] or groundwater. Input data required by the GLEAMS model consist of several separate files representing rainfall data, temperature data, hydrology parameters, erosion parameters, nutrient parameters, and chemical parameters.

3.1.1.2 Parameter Files

The rainfall data file contains the daily rainfall for the period of simulation. The temperature data file contains the daily or monthly mean temperature for the simulation period. The model determines rain and snow from the temperature data file.

Daily precipitation amounts and temperatures were input into the GLEAMS model. These values were simulated by a weather generator model, CLIGEN (USDA 2003). CLIGEN was initially developed by the USDA Agricultural Research Service, and has since undergone significant changes, including recoding to conform to the Water Erosion Prediction Project Fortran-77 Coding Convention. CLIGEN is a stochastic weather generator that produces daily time series estimates of precipitation, temperature, dewpoint, wind, and solar radiation for a single geographic point, based on average monthly measurements for the period of climatic record. The estimates for each parameter are generated independently of the others. CLIGEN version 5.104 was used in this effort. In addition to daily precipitation amounts and temperatures, wind velocity, dew point, and solar radiation were also obtained from the CLIGEN model.

The hydrology parameter file contains information on the size, shape, and topography of the area to which chemicals were applied, hydraulic conductivity, soil water storage, and leaf area indices. This file also contains the runoff curve number, which describes the tendency for water to run off the surface of the soil. Representative values for these parameters were identified from published soil surveys for each ecoregion.

The erosion parameter file contains information needed to calculate erosion, sediment yield, and sediment particle composition on a storm-by-storm basis. The input data can represent a number

[2] The organic carbon partition coefficient indicates the extent to which a chemical partitions itself between the solid and solution phases of a water-saturated or unsaturated soil, or runoff water and sediment. It is the ratio of the amount of chemical adsorbed to soil per unit weight of organic carbon in the soil or sediment, to the concentration of the chemical in solution at equilibrium. Typical units are (micrograms adsorbed per gram organic carbon) per (microgram per milliliter solution). Values could range from 1 to 10 million.

[3] The partially saturated region between the ground surface and the water table.

of optional configurations of fields, channels, and impoundments, but the scenarios for this analysis represented a single field for application of foams in each ecoregion.

Parameter files were prepared for all ingredients, describing their water solubility, organic carbon partition coefficients, the tendency for the chemical to wash off plant surfaces, and the expected application rate and schedule. For modeling purposes, it was assumed that there were no residues of the chemical on the site at the beginning of the simulation, and that no degradation occurred during the evaluation period.

3.1.1.3 Model Setup

The objective of this simulation was to estimate chemical sorption to soil and loss in runoff following application of foams. Since an earlier risk assessment (USFS 1995) identified no likelihood that retardants or Class A foams would leach below the rooting zone, the groundwater pathway was not evaluated in this assessment. The environmental input parameters were selected to represent the conditions in each ecoregion as realistically as possible.

Table 3-1 lists the specific soil characteristics used in the model simulations. These parameters are described to the modeled rooting depth of 24 to 60 inches (based on regional soil data), which can be interpreted as the depth from which water is actively taken up by the vegetation.

For each ecoregion, application of foams was modeled using the application rates referenced in Table 2-1. Additional assumptions and inputs to the simulations included the following:

- Daily rainfall data were generated for a three-year period using CLIGEN. Simulations were run for a three-year period following application of the foam to allow for variability of runoff concentrations from year to year and to be able to make statistical estimates of the frequency of occurrence of a given level of runoff. No environmental degradation of the chemicals was assumed, to insert a conservative bias into the modeling results. In addition, to provide an additional measure of conservatism, a five-year, 24-hour storm event was inserted on the day following the chemical application, providing an upper bound estimate for potential concentrations in surface water runoff.
- Temperature data were input as monthly average minimum and maximum, as simulated by CLIGEN.
- The vegetative cover factor (C) for erosion calculations was estimated to be 0.004, representing good cover primarily with grasses.

A complete set of GLEAMS input and output tables was created for each combination of chemical and ecoregion.

Table 3-1. Soil Characteristics within the Rooting Zone

Ecoregion	Soil Type	Runoff Curve Number	Hydraulic Slope (feet/feet)	Rooting Depth (inches)	Saturated Conductivity (inches/hour)*	Saturated Conductivity Below Root Zone (inches/hour)	Organic Matter (%)*	Erodibility Factor
Great Plains-Palouse dry steppe	sandy clay loam	60	0.050	60	0.15 / 0.15 / 0.15	0.15	2.26 / 1.57 / 1.20	0.200
Arizona-New Mexico mountains–semidesert–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	clay loam	60	0.150	60	0.50 / 0.15 / 0.15	0.15	1.68 / 1.35 / 1.14	0.350
Southern Rocky Mountain steppe–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	sandy loam	60	0.120	60	1.5 / 1.5 / 1.5	0.15	3.49 / 2.17 / 1.27	0.200
Middle Rocky Mountain steppe–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	loam	60	0.150	60	0.75 / 0.50 / 0.35	0.15	6.49 / 4.39 / 1.15	0.350
Pacific lowland mixed forest	silty loam	60	0.200	60	1.3 / 1.3 / 1.3	0.15	10.0 / 4.2 / 0.8	0.258
Lower Mississippi riverine forest	silt	60	0.150	60	0.2 / 0.2 / 0.2	0.15	4.15 / 0.84 / 0.32	0.350

Table 3-1. Soil Characteristics within the Rooting Zone (continued)

Ecoregion	Soil Type	Runoff Curve Number	Hydraulic Slope (feet/feet)	Rooting Depth (inches)	Saturated Conductivity (inches/hour)*	Saturated Conductivity Below Root Zone (inches/hour)	Organic Matter (%)*	Erodibility Factor
Adirondack-New England mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	sandy loam	60	0.150	60	0.50 / 0.40 / 0.25	0.15	6.10 / 0.95 / 0.18	0.350
Southeastern mixed forest	sandy clay loam	60	0.150	60	4.0 / 0.8 / 2.0	0.15	1.0 / 1.0 / 1.0	0.326
Intermountain semi-desert	fine sandy loam	48	0.100	60	6.0 / 6.0 / 6.0	0.40	1.02 / 0.25 / 0.25	0.236
Southwest plateau and plains dry steppe and shrub	silty clay	60	0.100	60	0.5 / 0.3 / 0.3	0.15	2.91 / 2.12 / 1.80	0.250
Laurentian mixed forest	sandy loam	60	0.200	60	6.0 / 6.0 / 6.0	0.40	6.0 / 4.1 / 4.1	0.191
Cascade mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	clay loam	60	0.120	60	1.3 / 1.2 / 0.4	0.15	3.68 / 3.46 / 1.40	0.296
Outer coastal plain mixed forest	loamy fine sand	60	0.030	60	6.0 / 6.0 / 6.0	0.30	4.7 / 4.7 / 4.7	0.100
Yukon intermontane plateaus taiga	silty loam	73	0.050	24	6.00 / 1.28 / 0.01	0.01	10.0 / 3.7 / 3.0	0.355
California coastal range open woodland–shrub–coniferous forest–meadow	sandy loam	60	0.250	36	1.84 / 0.88 / 0.03	0.03	5.06 / 3.43 / 1.96	0.182

* Multiple entries indicate the values used in the three different soil layers (horizons) that were modeled, in order of surface layer to deepest layer modeled.

GLEAMS output provides edge-of-field chemical concentrations in runoff. To estimate surface water concentrations that may result from runoff events, calculations were applied assuming the application occurred in two different areas: a small (6,400-acre) drainage basin with a 12-cubic-feet-per-second stream flowing through it, and a larger (147,200-acre) drainage basin with a 350-cubic-feet-per-second stream flowing through it. The stream sizes were selected to span the range likely to be present in areas where fire-fighting chemicals are applied. The sizes of the respective drainage basins were estimated by reviewing the sizes of drainage basins typically associated with these stream sizes in watersheds across the U.S. (USGS 2012).

3.1.1.4 Accuracy and Limitations of GLEAMS Modeling Predictions

For a detailed discussion of the validation of GLEAMS, its sensitivity to errors in input parameters, and its expected accuracy, the reader should refer to the model documentation referenced at the beginning of this section. The GLEAMS computer model can provide a large amount of information without having to conduct expensive field studies and the subsequent chemical analysis. However, the model is sensitive to input parameters. Since the ecoregion conditions modeled were intended to be representative of conditions within a large and variable geographic area, the model results will not specifically predict environmental transport at any precise location, but provide an indication of the general chemical behavior that may be expected under typical conditions. The variation of the parameters used from those that exist at a specific location causes the majority of uncertainty in the model's output.

In the fate modeling, environmental degradation of the chemicals—in soil or in surface water—was not credited for reducing concentrations of any chemicals over time, since the length of time elapsing between application and exposure could vary greatly and could possibly be very short. In general, any modeling estimates of chemical fate developed without a degradation factor will result in a conservative estimate.

3.1.2 Accidents

Average stream concentrations of chemicals were estimated one hour after a point-source accidental spill of a foam during transport to fire-fighting operations, to both large and small streams. The volume spilled was assumed as follows:

- a 5-gallon container of wet (liquid) foam concentrate
- 50 gallons of mixed-for-use foam

Foam application directly across a stream was also evaluated for both small and large streams at application rates of 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 gpc.

3.2 Characterization of Exposure

3.2.1 Direct Toxicity

3.2.1.1 Terrestrial Species

The terrestrial species exposure scenarios postulate that a variety of terrestrial wildlife species may encounter residues of foams when they re-enter areas after fire-fighting activities have subsided. The scenarios further postulate that these terrestrial species may be exposed to any applied chemicals through ingestion of contaminated food and water.

The list of representative terrestrial species is as follows:

Mammals
Deer (*Odocoileus* spp.) (large herbivore)
Coyote (*Canis latrans*) (carnivore)
Deer mouse (*Peromyscus maniculatus*) (omnivore, prey species)
Rabbit (*Sylvilagus* spp.) (small herbivore)

Birds
American kestrel (*Falco sparverius*) (raptor)
Red-winged blackbird (*Agelaius phoeniceus*) (songbird)
Bobwhite quail (*Colinus virginianus*) (ground nester)

These particular wildlife species were selected because they represent a range of taxonomic classes, body sizes, foraging habitat, and diets for which parameters are generally available. For each species, characteristics were identified that were used in estimating doses of ingredients in the foams. These characteristics include body weight, dietary intake, composition of diet, and home range/foraging area. There were insufficient data available on the toxicity of the foam products and their ingredients to reptiles and terrestrial stages of amphibians to include representatives of these classes in the analysis.

In a screening-level risk assessment such as this one, emphasis on the dietary route of exposure is appropriate (EPA 2004). For terrestrial wildlife, exposures were assumed to occur through ingestion of forbs, berries, insects, or seeds in a treated area, and, if relevant, ingestion of prey with residues or body burden. In addition, terrestrial species' drinking water was assumed to come from a small stream receiving runoff, as estimated in the analysis described in Section 3.1.1, using the highest small stream concentration predicted for each application rate.

Residues on food items were estimated using the results of field studies by Hoerger and Kenaga (1972), as updated by Fletcher et al. (1994, as cited in Pfleeger et al. 1996). Table 3-2 lists the residue levels predicted.

Table 3-2. Residue Levels

Item	Residue (ppm per pound/acre) [a]
Grass	175 [b]
Leaves	135
Forage	135
Small insects	135 [c]
Fruits	15
Pod containing seeds	12
Large insects	12 [b]

[a] ppm = parts per million
[b] Mean of short range grass and long grass.
[c] EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs groups small insects with broadleaf/forage plants and large insects with fruits, pods, and seeds (EPA 1999).

Predators that feed on other animals were assumed to receive the total body burden that each of the prey species received. Wildlife that feed on aquatic species were assumed to receive residue levels based on the chemical concentrations in water in a small stream and chemical-specific bioconcentration factors (the concentration of a chemical in aquatic organisms divided by the concentration in the surrounding water). In both cases, the appropriate prey body burden (appropriate to the prey's exposure as either another terrestrial species or an aquatic species) was incorporated into the "*RES*" term in the equation described in the next paragraph.

The doses for terrestrial wildlife from the food items comprising each species' diet were summed, as follows:

$$DOSE = \left[FRAC \times DIET \times CON \times TA \times RATE \times \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} RES_i \times INT_i \right) \right] \div BW$$

where:

DOSE = dose to wildlife species (mg/kg)
FRAC = fraction of diet assumed to be contaminated, a function of foraging range affected (0.05 to 0.25, depending on size of range) and the fraction of consumed food consisting of contaminated items (0.25, based on professional judgment per heterogeneous coverage within treated area and possible avoidance behavior)
DIET = mass of total daily dietary intake (kg)
TA = fraction of treated area in an acre (0.32, based on average swath width of 67.5 feet)
RATE = application rate of ingredient (pound/acre)
RES_i = chemical residues on food item *i* (milligrams residues per kilogram food item, as related to application rate in pound/acre)

INT_i = fraction of daily diet consisting of food item *i*
BW = body weight (kg)

To predict the total ingestion dose to terrestrial species, these food item doses were added to the estimated doses from the animal drinking all of its water from a small stream that received runoff. The species-specific parameters used in this analysis are summarized in Table 3-3.

3.2.1.2 Aquatic Species

The aquatic species exposure scenarios postulate that fish, aquatic invertebrates, and tadpoles in small and large streams may be exposed to ingredients in foam products through contaminated runoff coming off of areas to which the chemicals had been applied, or as a result of an accidental spill or drop into a stream.

For each chemical, risks were estimated for aquatic species for which ecotoxicity data are available. Representative aquatic species are as follows:

Aquatic Species
Rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) (coldwater fish)
Water flea (*Daphnia* spp.) (aquatic invertebrate)
Tadpoles of frog or toad species, depending on data available (aquatic stages of amphibians)

The concentrations of the chemicals in streams were estimated using the environmental fate and transport modeling methodologies described in Section 3.1.

Table 3-3. Exposure Assessment Parameters for Terrestrial Species

Parameter	Species						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
Body weight (kg)	66.5	13	0.021	2.5	0.11	0.052	0.18
Total diet (kg/day)	1.45635	0.68	0.00399	0.1	0.3	0.00849261	0.0144
Fraction of diet							
Grass	0.05	0	0.026	0.7	0	0.05	0.26
Leaves/forage/ small insects	0.95	0.03	0.379	0.3	0.035	0.7	0.249
Fruits	0	0	0.154	0	0	0	0.113
Pods/seeds/ legumes/large insects	0	0.01	0.446	0	0.326	0.25	0.378
Mammals	0	0.785	0	0	0.317	0	0
Birds	0	0.175	0	0	0.322	0	0
Foraging range (acres)	196	7437.71	0.17297	44.478	370.65	1	8.8956
Foraging range affected	0.1	0.05	0.25	0.1	0.05	0.1	0.1
Drinking water (L/kg-day)	0.104	0.0766	0.19	0	0.15	0.157	0.115

3.2.2 Phytotoxicity and Vegetation Diversity

No information was identified that addressed the potential toxicity to plants of the foam products or effects of fire suppression using foams on the diversity of the vegetative community.

3.3 Characterization of Ecological Effects: Ecological Response Analysis and Development of Stressor-Response Profiles

3.3.1 Toxicity of Individual Ingredients

The ingredients in the foam products were individually reviewed to identify their direct toxicity to terrestrial and aquatic wildlife species. The following screening process was applied to focus the analysis on chemicals with greater potential for effects to wildlife (see Section 2.4.1):

- Ingredients were evaluated if the acute oral LD_{50} for terrestrial species was less than 500 mg/kg.
- Ingredients were evaluated if the acute LC_{50} for aquatic species was less than 10 mg/L.

In all cases, the toxicity data indicating the greatest sensitivity to the chemical were used, regardless of life stage. Detailed profiles for each chemical are on file with the Forest Service's Wildland Fire Chemicals System program. A toxicity endpoint was sought for each of the representative species evaluated in this risk assessment; however, an LD_{50} for other species was used if no data were available for the species evaluated. For example, if no LD_{50} was found for Chemical X from a study using a coyote, an LD_{50} determined for another mammalian species, such as a rat, was used to derive the risk estimates for the coyote from Chemical X. If no data were available at all for a class (for example, no data for any bird species), a mammalian value was substituted, which increased uncertainty but allowed the analysis of risk to that species to proceed.

3.3.2 Laboratory Studies Using Formulated Products

In addition to the laboratory study data for targeted ingredients, the results of laboratory and field studies using formulated products were reviewed. Acute oral and dermal toxicity studies using laboratory mammals (rats) and acute lethality studies using rainbow trout are conducted for each product on the QPL. For some products, studies are also available for additional mammalian and fish, bird, aquatic invertebrate, and amphibian species.

Risks based on both formulated product and ingredient data are assessed as appropriate for each exposure scenario. For assessing risks to aquatic species from runoff, only risks from ingredients are assessed because each chemical behaves differently in the environment; that is, stream concentrations from the chemical in runoff are mediated by each ingredient's properties during environmental transport or solution / suspension in surface water. The risk assessment includes the summation of risks from the ingredient mixtures (that is, products), assuming additivity in accordance with EPA guidance; see approach to assessing risks from mixtures in Section 4.1.1.

4.0 RISK CHARACTERIZATION

Risk characterization is the last step in the ecological risk assessment process. The exposure profile is compared to the stressor-response profile, to estimate the likelihood of adverse effects.

4.1 Methodology for Estimating Risks

By comparing the exposure profile data (estimated dose or water concentration) to the stressor-response profile data (LD_{50}s, LC_{50}s), an estimate of the possibility of adverse effects can be made. The potential risks were characterized following the quotient methodology used by EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs (EPA 2012b). The quotient is the ratio of the exposure level to the hazard level. For acute exposures, the levels of concern at which a quotient is concluded to reflect risk to wildlife species are as follows (EPA 2012b):

- Non-sensitive terrestrial species: 0.5, where dose equals one-half the LD_{50}
- Sensitive terrestrial species (endangered, threatened, other special status): 0.1, where dose equals one-tenth the LD_{50}
- Non-sensitive aquatic species: 0.5, where water concentration equals one-half the LC_{50}
- Sensitive aquatic species (endangered, threatened, other special status): 0.05, where water concentration equals one-twentieth the LC_{50}

Because the foam products are mixtures of ingredients, terrestrial or aquatic wildlife could be exposed to more than one of the individual ingredients at a time. In accordance with current EPA guidance on assessing the risks from chemical mixtures (EPA 1986), an additive approach (in the absence of any data indicating synergistic or antagonistic interactions) was used in these cases, in which the risk quotients of all "screened-in" (see Section 3.3.1) ingredients in a single product were summed, providing an additive risk quotient indicating the risk from the product as a whole. The additive quotient is interpreted in the same manner as a quotient for a single ingredient; that is, risk is presumed to exist if the additive quotient exceeds the thresholds listed above. For example, if two ingredients in Product A had terrestrial risk quotients of 0.005 and 0.001, the additive quotient from summing them would equal 0.006. This additive quotient would be evaluated using the criteria listed above for terrestrial species, determining that it does not exceed 0.5 or 0.1, indicating no additive risk from the ingredients in that product to either non-sensitive or sensitive terrestrial species, respectively.

For terrestrial species, in addition to this additive ingredient assessment, risks based on the formulated products' toxicity data were also estimated.

A similar risk estimate for the formulated product as a whole was not developed for aquatic species, because each individual chemical in a product has specific environmental transport characteristics. These properties determine its predicted runoff behavior and estimated stream concentrations, precluding any aggregated environmental fate modeling approach that would be required to estimate whole-product water concentrations from runoff.

Where risks are identified, they can be interpreted to mean that the identified exposure level (1) could be associated with loss of at least half of a local population of non-sensitive species, or (2) puts individual animals of sensitive species at risk of mortality. The levels of concern identified above are used by EPA as a policy tool to interpret the risk quotient and to analyze potential risk to terrestrial and aquatic organisms (EPA 2012b). For determining the presence of chronic risks, EPA lists the level of concern as the point at which the estimated environmental concentration is less than the "no-observed-effect concentration" (NOEC) from a laboratory or field study. Since NOECs were not consistently available for the foams, and further, since most exposures are expected to be short-term, intermittent, or one-time events, a chronic analysis for all the ingredients in all the products was not conducted as part of this risk assessment. However, possible sublethal effects (including those from longer-term exposures) from the ingredients in approved products is an area of ongoing inquiry within the Forest Service.

Please refer to Attachment A for a summary of the risk conclusions and to Attachment C for product-specific risk estimates.

4.2 Risk Management Considerations

The type, severity, and likelihood of potential risks from use of chemical products to fight wildland fires are discussed in the previous sections of this chapter. The *probability* of their use to suppress a specific wildland fire depends on (1) whether the fire will be suppressed, and, if it will be suppressed, (2) whether chemical products are appropriate to the situation.

4.2.1 Suppression Decision-Making

The *Interagency Standards for Fire and Aviation Operations* categorize wildland fires into two distinct types) (USFS/DOI 2021):

- Wildfires – unplanned ignitions or prescribed fires that are declared wildfires
- Prescribed fires – planned ignitions

As stated in the interagency standards:

> A wildland fire may be concurrently managed for one or more objectives and objectives can change as the fire spreads across the landscape. Objectives are affected by changes in fuels, weather, topography; varying social understanding and tolerance; and involvement of other governmental jurisdictions having different missions and objectives. Management response to a wildland fire on federal land is based on objectives established in the applicable Land / Resource Management Plan (L/RMP) and/or the Fire Management Plan.

For determining the response to a wildland fire, the interagency standards cite the following statements from the *2001 Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy*:

> Fire, as a critical natural process, will be integrated into land and resource management plans and activities on a landscape scale, and across agency boundaries. Response to wildland fires is based on ecological, social, and legal consequences of the fire. The

circumstances under which a fire occurs, and the likely consequences on firefighter and public safety and welfare, natural and cultural resources, and values to be protected, dictate the appropriate response to the fire.

4.2.2 Use of Chemical Products in Fire Suppression Actions

Use of chemical products to fight a wildland fire is determined on a case-by-case basis, by the responsible official for that particular incident. Environmental considerations are included in the decision-making process: environmental guidelines for use of suppression chemicals are integrated into Chapter 12 of *Interagency Standards for Fire and Fire Aviation Operations*, also known as the "Red Book" (USFS/DOI 2021).

4.3 Uncertainties

Analysis of the uncertainty in an ecological risk assessment is an integral part of analyses conducted under EPA's guidelines (EPA 1998). The results presented in this risk assessment depend on a number of factors, including the availability of pertinent scientific information, standard risk assessment practices, exposure assumptions, and toxicity assumptions. Uncertainties are introduced into a risk assessment because a range of values could be used for each assumption. In general, most assumptions were selected to be representative of typical conditions, while a certain few assumptions (such as no environmental degradation to less toxic chemicals) were selected to avoid underestimating risks. Uncertainty is introduced into the ecological risk assessment process in both the problem formulation and analysis stages.

Uncertainties in problem formulation are manifested in the quality of conceptual models (EPA 1998). During problem formulation, the original development of the conceptual model could neglect risks that do exist but are not recognized, or could overemphasize risks that are relatively minor. The lack of available data with which to consistently evaluate sublethal effects for all ingredients/products is one example. In contrast, the conceptual model's characterization of environmental transport pathways and potential routes of fire-fighting chemical exposure to wildlife and aquatic species are reasonably unambiguous, as depicted in Figure 2-1.

In the analysis phase, several sources of uncertainty arise, including selection of receptors; exposure of receptors; data variability regarding the toxicity of the products, their ingredients, and the toxicity of the resulting mixture; and the assumptions made in defining the ecoregion characteristics. The sources of uncertainty and their effect on the risk conclusions are summarized below:

- In terms of the utility of the risk assessment conclusions for nationwide decision-making, the selection of the representative species that were evaluated introduces significant uncertainty into the conclusions. The species that were evaluated were carefully selected with this issue in mind, to provide a basic level of risk information for a wide range of wildlife, including mammals and bird species with a range of dietary/foraging characteristics and body sizes, fish, aquatic invertebrates, and amphibian tadpoles. Risks to other animals such as reptiles and terrestrial stages of amphibians were not assessed, since there were little to no toxicity data available for many of the ingredients in the fire-fighting chemical products for them. The resulting set of risk conclusions provides a general perspective on

potential risks to wildlife, with the uncertainty in actual risk to a species growing with decreasing similarity to the species that were evaluated as representative species in the analysis.

- The actual exposure of any particular animal to the chemicals could, and likely will, vary from the exposures assumed in this assessment:

  - For terrestrial species, dietary and drinking water doses could vary from (a) none, if an animal's ingestion in an unevenly contaminated area resulted in chance or deliberate avoidance of food and water sources containing residues; to (b) 100%, which would result in estimated doses and risks as much as 80 times higher for animals with wide or limited foraging ranges, respectively. (Current dose estimates reflect assumptions about the fraction of an animal's diet that was assumed to be contaminated; see Section 3.2.1.1.)

  - This uncertainty is further complicated by actual variation in residue levels in or on contaminated food items and water. The levels were estimated based on well-validated models, but necessarily assumed uniform application rate of the chemicals over the drop area, which is not consistent with actual use, but will average out over larger areas. The impact of this issue on the total uncertainty is likely minimal. Additional sources of ingestion exposure that were not considered in this assessment could also occur, including incidental soil ingestion (such as from preening / grooming behavior) and ingestion of contaminated sediment entrained in aquatic prey species.

  - For aquatic species, the length of exposure to a chemical concentration in water will significantly affect the toxicity associated with that exposure. Generally, if the time period of exposure is longer, the concentration that can be tolerated is lower, and vice versa. In this analysis, the most conservative short-term LC_{50} was selected for each chemical, regardless of actual duration of the toxicity test. Thus, the LC_{50}s that were used are based on exposure durations that range from 1 hour to more than 10 days. To estimate risks, these LC_{50}s were compared to water concentrations of generally short duration. The risks were based on the initial, instantaneous water concentrations in streams, which would quickly decrease as a result of longitudinal dispersion and possible sediment sorption and degradation. In addition, no scenarios for the potential for aquatic organisms to avoid exposure were introduced into the calculation of risk. This could lead to a generally minimal to moderate overestimate in the predicted risk.

- When more than one toxicity data source was identified, the most conservative value (the value associated with the greatest toxicity) was selected for use in the risk assessment. This could overestimate the predicted risk.

- The interactions of the various ingredients in a product could enhance or decrease the toxicity of any one ingredient. In accordance with EPA guidance, additive toxicity was assumed in the absence of the data to the contrary. For terrestrial species, the estimated risk from additive toxicity of the ingredient combinations in the products was compared to the risks based on toxicity data reported in tests on the product mixtures; this comparison was

made for terrestrial species. Reasonably consistent results indicated that the additivity assumption has resulted in minimal uncertainty in the risk conclusions.

- Terrestrial or aquatic wildlife could be exposed to multiple products if aircraft come from different bases, which may occur during high fire activity. This circumstance was not assessed in this risk assessment due to the great variability in combinations of products; however, it would be assumed that any toxicity would be additive.

- Fire-fighting chemicals can be used anywhere that a wildland fire occurs. The physical, chemical, and biological attributes of the natural system in which the chemicals are deposited will have a great impact on the environmental transport and fate of chemicals in that system, including the concentration of chemicals in water, soil, or as residues on terrestrial species diet items. Fifteen representative ecoregions were modeled in the analysis; actual areas into which fire-fighting chemicals are deposited will differ in some or all of these details. This introduces a significant level of uncertainty into the risk conclusions, which may be associated with either an underestimate or an overestimate of risk at a real-world location.

- For all scenarios, the analysis assumed no degradation of the chemicals to less toxic forms. This assumption was made since no minimum timeframe could be assured between chemical use and ecological exposure. This assumption of no degradation, for purposes of the analysis, may be associated with overestimates of risk to terrestrial and aquatic species.

Table 4-1 summarizes these key sources of uncertainty and their potential significance for the risk conclusions presented in this assessment.

Table 4-1. Summary of Key Uncertainties

Source of Uncertainty	Direction [a,b]	Magnitude [b,c]	Comment
Risk exists but is not assessed.	+/−	2	The availability of toxicity data limits the ability to evaluate issues (such as sublethal effects) for all ingredients/products.
Other significant environmental and/or exposure pathways exist but were not assessed.	+/−	0	Pathways of exposure are relatively unambiguous.
Use of representative species as receptors.	+/−	2	Data availability and model simplification required this approach.
Terrestrial species food item contamination frequency.	+/−	2	Could vary from 0 to 10 times the modeled amount.
Chemical residues in/on terrestrial species food and water.	+/−	1	Models used are well-validated, but actual chemical coverage is not uniform.
Duration of aquatic species' exposure compared to duration of toxicity testing.	+	2	In most cases, exposure duration would be far less than the test duration.

Source of Uncertainty	Direction [a,b]	Magnitude [b,c]	Comment
Initial water concentrations were used instead of a time-weighted average or other downward adjustment (such as decrease due to sorption, dispersion).	+	2	Initial concentrations were used since exposure could occur at any time after application.
Most conservative toxicity value used for each chemical.	+	1	This avoided underestimating toxicity.
Additive toxicity was assumed for ingredient mixtures.	+/−	0	Risks from ingredient-specific vs. whole-product toxicity data were consistent.
Use of representative ecoregions.	+/−	3	Attributes of natural systems where chemicals are used will likely differ in one or more respects from those that were modeled.
Environmental degradation to less toxic forms of ingredients was not included in the model.	+	2	Exposure could occur at any time after application.

[a] Direction of effect on risk calculations: "+" may result in risks that are overly conservative; "−" may result in risks that are underestimated.
[b] Direction and magnitude values based on professional judgment.
[c] Magnitude of effect on risk calculations: 0 = negligible, 1 = small, 2 = medium, 3 = large.

5.0 REFERENCES

Bailey 1995: Bailey, R.G. 1995. Description of the ecoregions of the United States. Miscellaneous publication number 1391. Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Crawford et al. 1990: Crawford, L.A., J.F. Dowd, P.B. Bush, Y.C. Berisford, and J.W. Taylor. 1990. Using GLEAMS to estimate insecticide movement from an Appalachian mountain seed orchard. National Research Conference: Pesticides in the Next Decade–The Challenges Ahead. Virginia Water Resources Research Center. Blacksburg, VA.

EPA 1986: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1986. Guidelines for the Health Risk Assessment of Chemical Mixtures. EPA/630/R-98/002. Federal Register 51(185):34014-34025.

EPA 1998: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1998. Guidelines for ecological risk assessment. Risk Assessment Forum. Washington, DC.

EPA 1999: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1999. Reregistration eligibility decision (RED): Chlorothalonil. EPA 738-R-99-004. Office of Prevention, Pesticides, and Toxic Substances. Washington, DC.

EPA 2004: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2004. Overview of the Ecological Risk Assessment Process in the Office of Pesticide Programs: Endangered and Threatened Species Effects Determinations. Office of Pesticide Programs. Washington, DC.

EPA 2012a: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2012. Technical overview of ecological risk assessment analysis phase: Ecological effects characterization. Office of Pesticide Programs. Washington, DC. https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-science-and-assessing-pesticide-risks/technical-overview-ecological-risk-assessment-0

EPA 2012b: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2012. Technical Overview of Ecological Risk Assessment: Risk Characterization. Office of Pesticide Programs. Washington, DC. https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-science-and-assessing-pesticide-risks/technical-overview-ecological-risk-assessment-risk

Fletcher et al. 1994: Fletcher, J., J. Nellesson, and T. Pfleeger. 1994. Literature review and evaluation of the EPA food chain (Kenaga) nomogram, an instrument for estimating pesticide residues on plants. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry 13:1383-1391. (as cited in Pfleeger et al. 1996)

Hoerger and Kenaga 1972: Hoerger, F., and E.E. Kenaga. 1972. Pesticide residues on plants: Correlation of representative data as a basis for estimation of their magnitude in the environment. In *Environmental Quality and Safety: V1–Global Aspects of Toxicology and Technology as Applied to the Environment.* F. Coulston, ed. Academic Press. New York, NY.

Knisel and Davis 2000: Knisel, W.G., and F.M. Davis. 2000. GLEAMS: Groundwater Loading Effects of Agricultural Management Systems. Version 3.0 User Manual, Publication No. SEWRL-WGK/FMD-050199, revised 8/15/00. USDA Agricultural Research Service. Southeast Watershed Research Laboratory. Tifton, GA.

Labat 2006: Labat Environmental, Inc. 2006. Literature review: Nonylphenol ethoxylates. Prepared for National Interagency Fire Center.

Leonard et al. 1987: Leonard, R.A., W.G. Knisel, and D.A. Still. 1987. GLEAMS: Groundwater loading effects of agricultural management systems. Transactions of the ASAE 30(5):1403-1418.

Leonard et al. 1988: Leonard, R.A., W.G. Knisel, F.M. Davis, and A.W. Johnson. 1988. Modeling pesticide metabolite transport with GLEAMS. Proceedings: Planning Now For Irrigation and Drainage. IR Div/ASCE. Lincoln, NE.

NFPA 2011: National Fire Protection Association. 2011. Peak Fire Seasons Interactive Module. Quincy, MA.

Pfleeger, T.G., A. Fong, R. Hayes, H. Ratsch, and C. Wickliff. 1996. Field evaluation of the EPA (Kenaga) nomogram, a method for estimating wildlife exposure to pesticide residues on plants. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry 15(4):535-543.

USDA 2003: U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2003. Cligen weather generator, expanded and improved by USDA Agricultural Research Service and U.S. Forest Service. http://www.ars.usda.gov/Research/docs.htm?docid=18094

USFS 1995: U.S. Forest Service. 1995. Chemicals used in wildland fire suppression: A risk assessment. Prepared by Labat-Anderson Incorporated for US Forest Service, Fire and Aviation Management.

USFS/DOI 2021: U.S. Forest Service and U.S. Department of the Interior. 2021. *Interagency Standards for Fire and Fire Aviation Operations* ("Red Book"). https://www.nifc.gov/standards/guides/red-book

USGS 2012: U.S. Geological Survey. 2012. Water resources of the United States. Water Resources. http://water.usgs.gov/

Attachment A: Ecological Risk Assessment Summary

CLASS A FOAMS
June 2023

The U.S. Forest Service uses a variety of fire-fighting chemicals to aid in the suppression of fire in wildlands. These products can be categorized as long-term retardants, Class A foams, and water enhancers. A chemical toxicity risk assessment of the foams examined their potential impacts on terrestrial wildlife and aquatic species. Exposures from both planned and accidental releases were considered, including on-target drops to terrestrial areas, accidental or unavoidable drops across water bodies, and accidental spills to a stream during aerial or ground transport.

This risk assessment evaluated the toxicological effects associated with chemical exposure, that is, the direct effects of chemical toxicity, using methodologies established by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. A risk assessment is different from and is only one component of a comprehensive impact assessment of all of an action's possible effects on wildlife and the environment, including aircraft noise, cumulative impacts, habitat effects, and other direct or indirect effects. Consultation under Section 7 of the *Endangered Species Act* and environmental assessments or environmental impact statements pursuant to the *National Environmental Policy Act* consider chemical toxicity, as well as other potential effects, to make management decisions.

Each foam product used in wildland fire-fighting is a mixture of individual chemicals. The product is supplied as a liquid concentrate, which is then diluted with water to produce the mixture that is applied during fire-fighting operations. The risk assessment process for a product had a two-part approach: (1) toxicity data for the whole product were considered, to account for any effects due to the product being a mixture (synergism or antagonism); and (2) each ingredient in the product formulations was screened, and risk from any ingredient with toxicity exceeding a screening threshold was separately quantified.

The results of the risk assessment depend on a number of factors, including the availability of relevant scientific information, standard risk assessment practices, exposure assumptions, and toxicity dose-response assumptions. Whenever possible, the risk assessment integrated chemical- and species-specific scientific information on the response of aquatic and terrestrial organisms as well as the vegetative community. The approaches used to address these factors introduce minor to significant amounts of uncertainty into the risk assessment's conclusions; the risk assessment identified the types of uncertainty affecting the analysis and estimated the degree to which they may affect the conclusions reached. Overall, when assumptions were required, a conservative approach was taken, to provide risk results that are protective of the environment.

The estimated risks to wildlife are summarized below for the foams listed on the December 5, 2021, Qualified Products List at https://www.fs.usda.gov/rm/fire/wfcs, including conditionally or interim qualified products. Any time the QPL is updated, the current applicability of this risk

summary will change. The risk assessment will be updated as federal agency resources and priorities allow.

A.1 Summary of Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Wildlife from Class A Foams

The terrestrial species ecological risk assessment estimated risks from specific ingredients, the additive risk posed by all ingredients screened in to the analysis, and risks based on the toxicity of the formulation as a whole. As described in Section 3.2.1.1, the animals evaluated represent the following classes of wildlife:

- Deer: large herbivore
- Coyote: carnivore
- Deer mouse: omnivore, prey species
- Rabbit: small herbivore
- American kestrel: raptor
- Red-winged blackbird: songbird
- Bobwhite quail: ground nester

No foam products were predicted to pose a direct toxicity risk to terrestrial wildlife based on the toxicity data for the formulated product.

None of the foam product ingredients that were screened in for individual analysis were associated with a direct toxicity risk to terrestrial wildlife.

A.2 Summary of Estimated Risks to Aquatic Wildlife from Class A Foams

A.2.1 Risks from Runoff

Table A-1 lists the ingredients' risks identified from runoff after foam use. The runoff exposure scenario is intended to predict risks to aquatic species when no spills or oversprays of streams occur. No whole-product analysis was attempted for the runoff scenario, since each ingredient's environmental behavior (for example, adsorption to soil and solubility in runoff water) would be influenced, if not wholly determined, by that chemical's specific chemical and physical properties, and not by the product's characteristics.

Degradation was not taken into account, which would reduce chemical concentrations in the environment, since no "expected" length of time can be identified between application and precipitation. Therefore, the selected approach errs on the conservative side to avoid underestimating potential levels of exposure if the actual interim period was brief, which would allow only minimal (if any) degradation to occur.

To simplify this summary, the risks are grouped by ecoregions for which the applied rate is assumed to be the same for the purposes of this risk assessment, as follows:

- 1 gpc: annual and perennial western grasses
- 2 gpc: conifer with grass, shortneedle closed conifer, summer hardwood, longneedle conifer, fall hardwood

- 3 gpc: sagebrush with grass, intermediate brush (green)
- 4 gpc: shortneedle conifer (heavy dead litter – north-central/New England), shortneedle conifer (heavy dead litter – Pacific northwest)
- 6 gpc: southern rough, Alaska black spruce, California mixed chaparral

Table A-1. Estimated Risks to Aquatic Wildlife Species from Runoff into Stream after Application of Mixed (Diluted) Foam

Ingredient	Product	Applied Rate (gpc) [a] / stream size	Representative Species	Risk?	
				Sensitive Species	Non-Sensitive Species
Ingredient #1 [b]	Phos-Chek WD881	2, 3, 6 small stream	Rainbow trout *Daphnia magna*	X	
	Ansul Silv-Ex Plus Class A / Chemguard Direct Attack	2, 3, 6 small stream	Rainbow trout	X	
Ingredient #2 [b]	1% Bushmaster "A" Class Foam	2, 3 small stream	*Daphnia magna*	X	
Ingredient #3 [b]	First Response	2, 4 small stream	*Daphnia magna*	X	
		3, 6 small stream		X	X
	Phos-Chek WD881A	2, 3, 4, 6 small stream	*Daphnia magna*	X	X
		6 large stream		X	
Ingredient #4 [b]	Phos-Chek WD881	2, 3, 4, 6 small stream	Rainbow trout *Daphnia magna*	X	
	First Response Phos-Chek WD881A	2, 3, 6 small stream	Rainbow trout *Daphnia magna*	X	
Additive risk [c]	Phos-Chek WD881	3, 6 small stream	Rainbow trout *Daphnia magna*		X
	First Response	2 small stream	*Daphnia magna*		X
		6 large stream		X	
	1% Bushmaster "A" Class Foam	6 small stream	*Daphnia magna*	X	

[a] gpc = gallons per 100 square feet.
[b] The specific chemical ingredient is proprietary information.
[c] For some products, there may be no risk to this animal at this rate from any individual ingredients, but an additive risk from all ingredients.

A.2.2 Risks from Application Across a Stream

Table A-2 summarizes the estimated risks of direct toxicity to aquatic wildlife from the foam products in the case of a foam application across a stream.

Table A-2. Estimated Risks to Aquatic Species from Accidental Stream Application of Mixed (Diluted) Foam

Ingredient	Product	Applied Rate (gpc) [a] / stream size	Representative Species	Risk?	
				Sensitive Species	Non-Sensitive Species
Ingredient #1 [b]	Phos-Chek WD881	4 small stream	*Daphnia magna*	X	
		6 small stream	Rainbow trout *Daphnia magna*	X	
Ingredient #3 [b]	First Response	3, 4, 6 small stream	*Daphnia magna*	X	
	Phos-Chek WD881A	2, 3, 4, 6 small stream	*Daphnia magna*	X	
Ingredient #5 [b]	FireFoam 103B	1 small & large stream	Rainbow trout	X	
		2, 3, 4, 6 small stream	Rainbow trout	X	X
		2, 3, 4, 6 small stream	*Daphnia magna*	X	
		2, 3, 4, 6 large stream	Rainbow trout	X	
	Phos-Chek WD881	1, 2, 3, 4, 6 small stream	Rainbow trout	X	
	Phos-Chek WD881C	1 small stream	Rainbow trout	X	
		2, 3, 4, 6 small stream	Rainbow trout	X	X
		3, 4, 6 small stream	*Daphnia magna*	X	
		2, 3, 4, 6 large stream	Rainbow trout	X	
	Buckeye Platinum Class A Foam	2 small stream	Rainbow trout	X	
		3 small & large stream	Rainbow trout	X	
		4, 6 small stream	Rainbow trout	X	X
		4, 6 large stream	Rainbow trout	X	
		6 small stream	*Daphnia magna*	X	
	First Response	6 small stream	Rainbow trout	X	
	Ansul Silv-Ex Plus / Chemguard Direct Attack	2, 3, 4, 6 small stream	Rainbow trout	X	
	1% Bushmaster “A” Class Foam	2, 3, 4 small stream	Rainbow trout	X	
		6 small stream	Rainbow trout *Daphnia magna*	X	

Ingredient	Product	Applied Rate (gpc) [a] / stream size	Representative Species	Risk?	
				Sensitive Species	Non-Sensitive Species
Ingredient #5 [b] (continued)	Phos-Chek WD881A	1, 2, 3 small stream	Rainbow trout	X	
		4, 6 small stream	Rainbow trout	X	X
		6 small stream	*Daphnia magna*	X	
		3, 4, 6 large stream	Rainbow trout	X	
Ingredient #6 [b]	1% Bushmaster "A" Class Foam	6 small stream	Rainbow trout	X	
Ingredient #7 [b]	Fomtec Enviro Class A / FireIce Polar EcoFoam	2, 3, 4 small stream	Rainbow trout	X	
		6 small stream	Rainbow trout *Daphnia magna*	X	
	Bio-Ex EcoPol-F	6 small stream	Rainbow trout	X	
Additive risk only [c]	Phos-Chek WD881	6 large stream	Rainbow trout	X	
	First Response	2 small stream	*Daphnia magna*	X	
Product risk	National Foam KnockDown	6 small stream	Rainbow trout	X	
	Angus Hi-Combat A				
	1% Bushmaster "A" Class Foam				
	Bio-Ex EcoPol-F				
	Phos-Chek WD881C	4, 6 small stream	Rainbow trout	X	
	Buckeye Platinum Class A Foam				
	Solberg Fire-Brake 3150A				
	First Response				
	Phos-Chek WD881A				
	FireFoam 103B	3, 4, 6 small stream	Rainbow trout	X	
	Phos-Chek WD881				

[a] gpc = gallons per 100 square feet.
[b] The specific chemical ingredient is proprietary information.
[c] For some products, there may be no risk to this animal at this rate from any individual ingredients, but an additive risk from all ingredients.

Table A-3 provides the aquatic species risk summary organized by product.

Table A-3. Estimated Risks to Aquatic Wildlife Species

Foam	Scenario / Rate Associated with Risk [a]			
	Runoff		Accidental Application to Stream	
	Sensitive Species	Non-sensitive Species	Sensitive Species	Non-sensitive Species
FireFoam 103B	—	—	1-6 gpc	2-6 gpc
Phos-Chek WD881	2-6 gpc	3, 6 gpc	1-6 gpc	—
Pyrocap B-136	—	—	—	—

Phos-Chek WD881C	—	—	1-6 gpc	2-6 gpc
National Foam KnockDown	—	—	6 gpc	—
FlameOut	—	—	—	—
Angus Hi-Combat A	—	—	6 gpc	—
Buckeye Platinum Class A Foam	—	—	2-6 gpc	4, 6 gpc
Solberg Fire-Brake 3150A	—	—	4, 6 gpc	—
First Response, also sold as Fire-Brake PLUS	2-6 gpc	2, 3, 6 gpc	2-6 gpc	—
Ansul Silv-Ex Plus Class A, also sold as Chemguard Direct Attack	2, 3, 6 gpc	—	2-6 gpc	—
1% Bushmaster “A” Class Foam	2, 3, 6 gpc	—	2-6 gpc	—
Phos-Chek WD881A	2-6 gpc	2-6 gpc	1-6 gpc	4, 6 gpc
Fomtec Enviro Class A, also sold as FireIce Polar EcoFoam	—	—	2-6 gpc	—
Bio-Ex Ecopol-F, also sold as BIO FOR N+	—	—	6 gpc	—
[a] gpc = gallons per 100 square feet.				

A.2.3 Risks from Accidental Spills

With two exceptions, all concentrated and mixed foams were associated with risk to one or more aquatic species if spilled into a small or large stream at the volumes assumed in risk assessment. Pyrocap B-136 and FlameOut were associated with this risk only for a spill of concentrate to a stream.

Attachment B: Qualified Products List

US Forest Service **Washington Office** **Fire & Aviation Management**

December 5, 2021

Class A Foam for Wildland Fire Management

Qualified by US Forest Service in Accordance with Forest Service Specification 5100-307b

These products are evaluated, qualified, and approved for use only at the specified mix ratio range with the indicated application equipment.

Consult individual agencies for specific policies relating to wildland fire foam use.

Definition: Foams contain foaming and wetting agents that affect how the product clings to surfaces and penetrates fuels. They depend on the water they contain for their effectiveness.

Chemical	Mix Ratio	Qualified Applications [1]				
		Fixed-Wing		Helicopter		Ground Applied
		Water Scooper	SEATS [2]	Fixed-Tank	Bucket	
FireFoam 103B	0.1–1.0%	●	●	-	●	●
Phos-Chek WD881	0.1–1.0%	●	●	●	●	●
Pyrocap B-136	0.1–1.0%	-	●	-	●	●
Phos-Chek WD881C	0.1–1.0%	●	●	●	●	●
National Foam KnockDown	0.1–1.0%	●	●	-	●	●
FlameOut [3]	0.1–1.0%	-	-	-	●	●
Angus Hi-Combat A	0.1–1.0%	●	●	-	●	●
Buckeye Platinum Class A Foam [3]	0.1–1.0%	●	●	-	●	●
Solberg Fire-Brake 3150A [3]	0.1–1.0%	●	●	-	●	●
First Response	0.1–1.0%	●	●	●	●	●
Also sold as Fire-Brake PLUS						
Ansul Silv-Ex Plus Class A	0.1–1.0%	●	●	●	●	●
Also sold as Chemguard DirectAttack						
1% Bushmaster "A" Class Foam	0.1–1.0%	●	●	-	●	●
Phos-Chek WD881A	0.1–1.0%	●	●	●	●	●
Fomtec Enviro Class A	0.1-1.0%	●	●	-	●	●
Also sold as Firelce Polar EcoFoam						
Bio-Ex Ecopol-F	0.1-1.0%	●	●	●	●	●
Also sold as BIO FOR N+						

1 – Qualification Notes
- ● Fully Qualified – Product complies with all requirements of a formal specification.
- o Conditional Approval – Product complies with all requirements in the specification for laboratory evaluation; a field evaluation is required for full qualification.
- - Not qualified for this application.

2 – Within Canada, the wildland fire management agencies apply foam from land-based fixed-wing airtankers (single or multi engine). The presence of a dot in this column indicates approval in Canada for application from aircraft of either type.

3 – Revision to FS 5100-307b includes new requirements that these products no longer meet. Current inventories can continue to be used, but no new purchases are authorized by this list. All products shall be used by the end of the 2022 fire season,

Attachment C: Ecological Risk Assessments for Class A Foams on Qualified Products List

June 2023

Product
FireFoam 103B
Phos-Chek WD881
Pyrocap B-136
Phos-Chek WD881C
National Foam KnockDown
FlameOut
Angus Hi-Combat A
Buckeye Platinum Class A Foam
Solberg Fire-Brake 3150A
First Response, also sold as Fire-Brake PLUS
Ansul Silv-Ex Plus Class A, also sold as Chemguard Direct Attack
1% Bushmaster "A" Class Foam
Phos-Chek WD881A
Fomtec Enviro Class A, also sold as FireIce Polar EcoFoam
Bio-Ex EcoPol-F, also sold as BIO FOR N+

Scientific notation: Some of the risk tables in this section use scientific notation, since many of the values are very small. For example, the notation 3.63E-001 represents 3.63 x 10^{-1}, or 0.363. Similarly, 4.65E-009 represents 4.65 x 10^{-9}, or 0.00000000465.

Shaded cells in these tables indicate the exposures that are predicted to present a risk to sensitive species.

Shaded and boldfaced entries indicate a risk to both non-sensitive and sensitive species.

NA = not applicable.
ND = no data.

FireFoam 103B

Product Data

Concentrate form:		Liquid	
Mix ratio:		0.01	gallons concentrate/gallon mix
Formulation Oral LD_{50}:	>	5,050	mg/kg
Formulation LC_{50} (mg/L):		12.0	(Rainbow trout, 96 hours)
		ND	(aquatic invertebrate)
		ND	(amphibian tadpole)
Mixture application rate:		up to 0.06	gal/ft^2

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species: Product

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	5.53E-04	4.35E-05	5.55E-03	1.20E-03	2.71E-03	3.20E-03	1.26E-03
2	1.11E-03	8.70E-05	1.11E-02	2.41E-03	5.42E-03	6.40E-03	2.52E-03
3	1.66E-03	1.30E-04	1.67E-02	3.61E-03	8.12E-03	9.60E-03	3.78E-03
4	2.21E-03	1.74E-04	2.22E-02	4.81E-03	1.08E-02	1.28E-02	5.04E-03
6	3.32E-03	2.61E-04	3.33E-02	7.22E-03	1.62E-02	1.92E-02	7.56E-03

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species:
Additive Risk Based on Ingredients Screened into Analysis

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	2.32E-06	1.83E-07	2.33E-05	1.92E-06	1.14E-05	1.34E-05	5.29E-06
2	4.65E-06	3.65E-07	4.66E-05	3.85E-06	2.27E-05	2.69E-05	1.06E-05
3	6.97E-06	5.48E-07	6.99E-05	5.77E-06	3.41E-05	4.03E-05	1.59E-05
4	9.29E-06	7.30E-07	9.32E-05	7.69E-06	4.55E-05	5.37E-05	2.11E-05
6	1.39E-05	1.10E-06	1.40E-04	1.15E-05	6.82E-05	8.06E-05	3.17E-05

Risks to Aquatic Species from Runoff		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on additive toxicity of ingredients)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Ecoregion	GPC	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
331: Great Plains-Palouse dry steppe	1	1.08E-05	7.68E-07	0.00E+00	4.53E-07	3.23E-08	0.00E+00
M313: Arizona-New Mexico mountains–semidesert–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	1.34E-05	9.57E-07	0.00E+00	4.77E-07	3.40E-08	0.00E+00
M331: Southern Rocky Mountain steppe–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	1.37E-05	9.82E-07	0.00E+00	5.69E-07	4.07E-08	0.00E+00
M332: Middle Rocky Mountain steppe–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	2.76E-04	1.97E-05	0.00E+00	1.18E-05	8.39E-07	0.00E+00
242: Pacific lowland mixed forest	2	3.28E-05	2.34E-06	0.00E+00	1.42E-06	1.02E-07	0.00E+00
234: Lower Mississippi riverine forest	2	4.38E-06	3.13E-07	0.00E+00	1.71E-07	1.22E-08	0.00E+00
M212: Adirondack-New England mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	4.89E-06	3.49E-07	0.00E+00	1.75E-07	1.25E-08	0.00E+00
231: Southeastern mixed forest	2	5.97E-06	4.26E-07	0.00E+00	2.59E-07	1.85E-08	0.00E+00
342: Intermountain semi-desert	3	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
315: Southwest plateau and plains dry steppe and shrub	3	1.10E-03	7.85E-05	0.00E+00	4.75E-05	3.40E-06	0.00E+00
212: Laurentian mixed forest	4	8.18E-06	5.84E-07	0.00E+00	2.94E-07	2.10E-08	0.00E+00
M242: Cascade mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	4	4.23E-07	3.02E-08	0.00E+00	1.48E-08	1.06E-09	0.00E+00
232: Outer coastal plain mixed forest	6	2.69E-08	1.92E-09	0.00E+00	9.31E-10	6.65E-11	0.00E+00
131: Yukon intermontane plateaus taiga	6	1.84E-02	1.31E-03	0.00E+00	6.58E-04	4.70E-05	0.00E+00
M262: California coastal range open woodland–shrub–coniferous forest–meadow	6	2.12E-07	1.52E-08	0.00E+00	8.76E-09	6.26E-10	0.00E+00

Risks to Aquatic Species from Accidents		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on toxicity of formulation)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Scenario		Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
Spill into stream: 5 gal concentrate		**1.32E+00**	ND	ND	4.53E-02	ND	ND
Spill into stream: 50 gal mixed for use		1.32E-01	ND	ND	4.53E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	1 GPC	2.14E-02	ND	ND	3.06E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	2 GPC	4.28E-02	ND	ND	6.12E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	3 GPC	6.42E-02	ND	ND	9.17E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	4 GPC	8.56E-02	ND	ND	1.22E-02	ND	ND
Spray across stream	6 GPC	1.28E-01	ND	ND	1.83E-02	ND	ND

Phos-Chek WD881

Product Data

Concentrate form:	Liquid	
Mix ratio:	0.01	gallons concentrate/gallon mix
Formulation Oral LD_{50}:	4,378	mg/kg
Formulation LC_{50} (mg/L):	10.8	(Rainbow trout, 96 hours)
	ND	(aquatic invertebrate)
	ND	(amphibian tadpole)
Mixture application rate:	up to 0.06	gal/ft^2

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species: Product

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	6.40E-04	5.03E-05	6.42E-03	1.39E-03	3.13E-03	3.70E-03	1.46E-03
2	1.28E-03	1.01E-04	1.28E-02	2.78E-03	6.26E-03	7.40E-03	2.91E-03
3	1.92E-03	1.51E-04	1.93E-02	4.17E-03	9.39E-03	1.11E-02	4.37E-03
4	2.56E-03	2.01E-04	2.57E-02	5.56E-03	1.25E-02	1.48E-02	5.82E-03
6	3.84E-03	3.02E-04	3.85E-02	8.34E-03	1.88E-02	2.22E-02	8.73E-03

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species:
Additive Risk Based on Ingredients Screened into Analysis

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
2	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
3	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
4	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
6	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00

Risks to Aquatic Species from Runoff		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on additive toxicity of ingredients)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Ecoregion	GPC	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
331: Great Plains-Palouse dry steppe	1	7.13E-03	7.78E-03	0.00E+00	3.00E-04	3.28E-04	0.00E+00
M313: Arizona-New Mexico mountains–semidesert–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	9.50E-02	1.05E-01	0.00E+00	3.38E-03	3.74E-03	0.00E+00
M331: Southern Rocky Mountain steppe–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	1.22E-02	1.31E-02	0.00E+00	5.04E-04	5.43E-04	0.00E+00
M332: Middle Rocky Mountain steppe–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	6.95E-03	7.36E-03	0.00E+00	2.96E-04	3.13E-04	0.00E+00
242: Pacific lowland mixed forest	2	2.16E-01	2.35E-01	0.00E+00	7.50E-03	8.14E-03	0.00E+00
234: Lower Mississippi riverine forest	2	2.23E-01	2.41E-01	0.00E+00	7.73E-03	8.36E-03	0.00E+00
M212: Adirondack-New England mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	3.73E-02	3.98E-02	0.00E+00	1.34E-03	1.43E-03	0.00E+00
231: Southeastern mixed forest	2	3.82E-01	4.47E-01	0.00E+00	1.32E-02	1.55E-02	0.00E+00
342: Intermountain semi-desert	3	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
315: Southwest plateau and plains dry steppe and shrub	3	**6.49E-01**	**7.07E-01**	0.00E+00	2.24E-02	2.44E-02	0.00E+00
212: Laurentian mixed forest	4	7.12E-02	7.61E-02	0.00E+00	2.56E-03	2.73E-03	0.00E+00
M242: Cascade mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	4	1.10E-01	1.17E-01	0.00E+00	3.85E-03	4.09E-03	0.00E+00
232: Outer coastal plain mixed forest	6	**6.56E-01**	**7.09E-01**	0.00E+00	2.27E-02	2.45E-02	0.00E+00
131: Yukon intermontane plateaus taiga	6	8.19E-02	8.42E-02	0.00E+00	2.93E-03	3.02E-03	0.00E+00
M262: California coastal range open woodland–shrub–coniferous forest–meadow	6	2.80E-02	3.01E-02	0.00E+00	1.16E-03	1.24E-03	0.00E+00

Risks to Aquatic Species from Accidents		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on toxicity of formulation)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Scenario		Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
Spill into stream: 5 gal concentrate		**1.47E+00**	ND	ND	5.04E-02	ND	ND
Spill into stream: 50 gal mixed for use		1.47E-01	ND	ND	5.04E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	1 GPC	2.38E-02	ND	ND	3.40E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	2 GPC	4.77E-02	ND	ND	6.81E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	3 GPC	7.15E-02	ND	ND	1.02E-02	ND	ND
Spray across stream	4 GPC	9.53E-02	ND	ND	1.36E-02	ND	ND
Spray across stream	6 GPC	1.43E-01	ND	ND	2.04E-02	ND	ND

Pyrocap B-136

Product Data

Concentrate form:		Liquid	
Mix ratio:		0.01	gallons concentrate/gallon mix
Formulation Oral LD_{50}:	>	5,050	mg/kg
Formulation LC_{50} (mg/L):		156	(Rainbow trout, 96 hours)
		ND	(aquatic invertebrate)
		ND	(amphibian tadpole)
Mixture application rate:		up to 0.06	gal/ft^2

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species: Product

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	5.62E-04	4.41E-05	5.63E-03	1.22E-03	2.75E-03	3.25E-03	1.28E-03
2	1.12E-03	8.83E-05	1.13E-02	2.44E-03	5.50E-03	6.50E-03	2.56E-03
3	1.68E-03	1.32E-04	1.69E-02	3.66E-03	8.24E-03	9.74E-03	3.83E-03
4	2.25E-03	1.77E-04	2.25E-02	4.88E-03	1.10E-02	1.30E-02	5.11E-03
6	3.37E-03	2.65E-04	3.38E-02	7.32E-03	1.65E-02	1.95E-02	7.67E-03

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species:
Additive Risk Based on Ingredients Screened into Analysis

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	1.64E-03	3.19E-06	4.07E-04	8.82E-05	1.99E-04	2.35E-04	9.24E-05
2	3.28E-03	6.38E-06	8.15E-04	1.76E-04	3.97E-04	4.70E-04	1.85E-04
3	4.91E-03	9.57E-06	1.22E-03	2.65E-04	5.96E-04	7.04E-04	2.77E-04
4	6.55E-03	1.28E-05	1.63E-03	3.53E-04	7.95E-04	9.39E-04	3.70E-04
6	9.83E-03	1.91E-05	2.44E-03	5.29E-04	1.19E-03	1.41E-03	5.54E-04

Risks to Aquatic Species from Runoff		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on additive toxicity of ingredients)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Ecoregion	GPC	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
331: Great Plains-Palouse dry steppe	1	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
M313: Arizona-New Mexico mountains–semidesert–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
M331: Southern Rocky Mountain steppe–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
M332: Middle Rocky Mountain steppe–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
242: Pacific lowland mixed forest	2	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
234: Lower Mississippi riverine forest	2	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
M212: Adirondack-New England mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
231: Southeastern mixed forest	2	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
342: Intermountain semi-desert	3	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
315: Southwest plateau and plains dry steppe and shrub	3	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
212: Laurentian mixed forest	4	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
M242: Cascade mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	4	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
232: Outer coastal plain mixed forest	6	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
131: Yukon intermontane plateaus taiga	6	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
M262: California coastal range open woodland–shrub–coniferous forest–meadow	6	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00

Risks to Aquatic Species from Accidents		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on toxicity of formulation)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Scenario		Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
Spill into stream: 5 gal concentrate		1.03E-01	ND	ND	3.54E-03	ND	ND
Spill into stream: 50 gal mixed for use		1.03E-02	ND	ND	3.54E-04	ND	ND
Spray across stream	1 GPC	1.67E-03	ND	ND	2.39E-04	ND	ND
Spray across stream	2 GPC	3.34E-03	ND	ND	4.77E-04	ND	ND
Spray across stream	3 GPC	5.01E-03	ND	ND	7.16E-04	ND	ND
Spray across stream	4 GPC	6.68E-03	ND	ND	9.55E-04	ND	ND
Spray across stream	6 GPC	1.00E-02	ND	ND	1.43E-03	ND	ND

Phos-Chek WD881C

Product Data

Concentrate form:		Liquid	
Mix ratio:		0.01	gallons concentrate/gallon mix
Formulation Oral LD_{50}:	>	5,050	mg/kg
Formulation LC_{50} (mg/L):		17.0	(Rainbow trout, 96 hours)
		ND	(aquatic invertebrate)
		ND	(amphibian tadpole)
Mixture application rate:		up to 0.06	gal/ft^2

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species: Product

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	5.51E-04	4.33E-05	5.53E-03	1.20E-03	2.70E-03	3.19E-03	1.25E-03
2	1.10E-03	8.67E-05	1.11E-02	2.40E-03	5.40E-03	6.38E-03	2.51E-03
3	1.65E-03	1.30E-04	1.66E-02	3.59E-03	8.09E-03	9.57E-03	3.76E-03
4	2.21E-03	1.73E-04	2.21E-02	4.79E-03	1.08E-02	1.28E-02	5.02E-03
6	3.31E-03	2.60E-04	3.32E-02	7.19E-03	1.62E-02	1.91E-02	7.53E-03

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species:
Additive Risk Based on Ingredients Screened into Analysis

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
2	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
3	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
4	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
6	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00

Risks to Aquatic Species from Runoff		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on additive toxicity of ingredients)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Ecoregion	GPC	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
331: Great Plains-Palouse dry steppe	1	9.63E-06	6.88E-07	0.00E+00	4.06E-07	2.90E-08	0.00E+00
M313: Arizona-New Mexico mountains–semidesert–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	1.20E-05	8.57E-07	0.00E+00	4.27E-07	3.05E-08	0.00E+00
M331: Southern Rocky Mountain steppe–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	1.23E-05	8.79E-07	0.00E+00	5.09E-07	3.64E-08	0.00E+00
M332: Middle Rocky Mountain steppe–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	2.47E-04	1.77E-05	0.00E+00	1.05E-05	7.52E-07	0.00E+00
242: Pacific lowland mixed forest	2	2.89E-05	2.07E-06	0.00E+00	1.26E-06	8.97E-08	0.00E+00
234: Lower Mississippi riverine forest	2	3.91E-06	2.79E-07	0.00E+00	1.53E-07	1.09E-08	0.00E+00
M212: Adirondack-New England mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	4.39E-06	3.13E-07	0.00E+00	1.57E-07	1.12E-08	0.00E+00
231: Southeastern mixed forest	2	4.90E-06	3.50E-07	0.00E+00	2.12E-07	1.52E-08	0.00E+00
342: Intermountain semi-desert	3	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
315: Southwest plateau and plains dry steppe and shrub	3	9.84E-04	7.03E-05	0.00E+00	4.25E-05	3.04E-06	0.00E+00
212: Laurentian mixed forest	4	7.31E-06	5.22E-07	0.00E+00	2.63E-07	1.88E-08	0.00E+00
M242: Cascade mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	4	3.76E-07	2.69E-08	0.00E+00	1.32E-08	9.40E-10	0.00E+00
232: Outer coastal plain mixed forest	6	1.71E-08	1.22E-09	0.00E+00	5.91E-10	4.22E-11	0.00E+00
131: Yukon intermontane plateaus taiga	6	1.64E-02	1.17E-03	0.00E+00	5.89E-04	4.21E-05	0.00E+00
M262: California coastal range open woodland–shrub–coniferous forest–meadow	6	2.02E-07	1.45E-08	0.00E+00	8.35E-09	5.96E-10	0.00E+00

Risks to Aquatic Species from Accidents		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on toxicity of formulation)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Scenario		**Rainbow Trout**	**Daphnia magna**	**Tadpole**	**Rainbow Trout**	**Daphnia magna**	**Tadpole**
Spill into stream: 5 gal concentrate		**9.29E-01**	ND	ND	3.19E-02	ND	ND
Spill into stream: 50 gal mixed for use		9.29E-02	ND	ND	3.19E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	1 GPC	1.51E-02	ND	ND	2.15E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	2 GPC	3.01E-02	ND	ND	4.30E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	3 GPC	4.52E-02	ND	ND	6.45E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	4 GPC	6.02E-02	ND	ND	8.60E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	6 GPC	9.03E-02	ND	ND	1.29E-02	ND	ND

National Foam KnockDown

Product Data

Concentrate form:		Liquid	
Mix ratio:		0.01	gallons concentrate/gallon mix
Formulation Oral LD_{50}:	>	5,000	mg/kg
Formulation LC_{50} (mg/L):		28	(Rainbow trout, 96 hours)
		ND	(aquatic invertebrate)
		ND	(amphibian tadpole)
Mixture application rate:		up to 0.06	gal/ft^2

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species: Product

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	5.73E-04	4.50E-05	5.75E-03	1.24E-03	2.80E-03	3.31E-03	1.30E-03
2	1.15E-03	9.00E-05	1.15E-02	2.49E-03	5.60E-03	6.62E-03	2.61E-03
3	1.72E-03	1.35E-04	1.72E-02	3.73E-03	8.41E-03	9.94E-03	3.91E-03
4	2.29E-03	1.80E-04	2.30E-02	4.98E-03	1.12E-02	1.32E-02	5.21E-03
6	3.44E-03	2.70E-04	3.45E-02	7.47E-03	1.68E-02	1.99E-02	7.82E-03

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species:
Additive Risk Based on Ingredients Screened into Analysis

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	9.36E-07	7.36E-08	9.39E-06	5.93E-07	4.58E-06	5.41E-06	2.13E-06
2	1.87E-06	1.47E-07	1.88E-05	1.19E-06	9.16E-06	1.08E-05	4.26E-06
3	2.81E-06	2.21E-07	2.82E-05	1.78E-06	1.37E-05	1.62E-05	6.39E-06
4	3.74E-06	2.94E-07	3.76E-05	2.37E-06	1.83E-05	2.17E-05	8.52E-06
6	5.62E-06	4.41E-07	5.64E-05	3.56E-06	2.75E-05	3.25E-05	1.28E-05

Risks to Aquatic Species from Runoff		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on additive toxicity of ingredients)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Ecoregion	GPC	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
331: Great Plains-Palouse dry steppe	1	1.54E-07	7.68E-08	0.00E+00	6.49E-09	3.23E-09	0.00E+00
M313: Arizona-New Mexico mountains–semidesert–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	5.25E-07	2.08E-07	0.00E+00	1.87E-08	7.41E-09	0.00E+00
M331: Southern Rocky Mountain steppe–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	5.42E-07	3.33E-07	0.00E+00	2.25E-08	1.38E-08	0.00E+00
M332: Middle Rocky Mountain steppe–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	7.38E-07	7.73E-07	0.00E+00	3.14E-08	3.29E-08	0.00E+00
242: Pacific lowland mixed forest	2	1.82E-06	7.22E-07	0.00E+00	6.29E-08	2.50E-08	0.00E+00
234: Lower Mississippi riverine forest	2	3.15E-06	1.50E-06	0.00E+00	1.09E-07	5.19E-08	0.00E+00
M212: Adirondack-New England mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	2.17E-06	1.70E-06	0.00E+00	7.76E-08	6.09E-08	0.00E+00
231: Southeastern mixed forest	2	5.48E-09	1.39E-09	0.00E+00	1.89E-10	5.11E-11	0.00E+00
342: Intermountain semi-desert	3	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
315: Southwest plateau and plains dry steppe and shrub	3	8.39E-06	3.70E-06	0.00E+00	2.89E-07	1.28E-07	0.00E+00
212: Laurentian mixed forest	4	4.05E-06	3.12E-06	0.00E+00	1.46E-07	1.12E-07	0.00E+00
M242: Cascade mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	4	5.20E-06	3.53E-06	0.00E+00	1.82E-07	1.24E-07	0.00E+00
232: Outer coastal plain mixed forest	6	7.50E-06	3.34E-06	0.00E+00	2.59E-07	1.15E-07	0.00E+00
131: Yukon intermontane plateaus taiga	6	9.61E-06	1.06E-05	0.00E+00	3.44E-07	3.80E-07	0.00E+00
M262: California coastal range open woodland–shrub–coniferous forest–meadow	6	1.02E-06	6.22E-07	0.00E+00	4.19E-08	2.57E-08	0.00E+00

Risks to Aquatic Species from Accidents		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on toxicity of formulation)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Scenario		Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
Spill into stream: 5 gal concentrate		**5.80E-01**	ND	ND	1.99E-02	ND	ND
Spill into stream: 50 gal mixed for use		5.80E-02	ND	ND	1.99E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	1 GPC	9.40E-03	ND	ND	1.34E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	2 GPC	1.88E-02	ND	ND	2.69E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	3 GPC	2.82E-02	ND	ND	4.03E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	4 GPC	3.76E-02	ND	ND	5.37E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	6 GPC	5.64E-02	ND	ND	8.06E-03	ND	ND

FlameOut

Product Data

Concentrate form:		Liquid	
Mix ratio:		0.01	gallons concentrate/gallon mix
Formulation Oral LD_{50}:	>	5,050	mg/kg
Formulation LC_{50} (mg/L):		92.0	(Rainbow trout, 96 hours)
		159	(*Daphnia pulex*, 48 hours)
		ND	(amphibian tadpole)
Mixture application rate:		up to 0.06	gal/ft^2

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species: Product

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	5.51E-04	4.33E-05	5.53E-03	1.20E-03	2.69E-03	3.19E-03	1.25E-03
2	1.10E-03	8.66E-05	1.11E-02	2.39E-03	5.39E-03	6.37E-03	2.51E-03
3	1.65E-03	1.30E-04	1.66E-02	3.59E-03	8.08E-03	9.56E-03	3.76E-03
4	2.20E-03	1.73E-04	2.21E-02	4.79E-03	1.08E-02	1.27E-02	5.01E-03
6	3.30E-03	2.60E-04	3.32E-02	7.18E-03	1.62E-02	1.91E-02	7.52E-03

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species:
Additive Risk Based on Ingredients Screened into Analysis

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
2	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
3	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
4	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
6	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00

Risks to Aquatic Species from Runoff		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on additive toxicity of ingredients)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Ecoregion	GPC	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
331: Great Plains-Palouse dry steppe	1	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
M313: Arizona-New Mexico mountains–semidesert–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
M331: Southern Rocky Mountain steppe–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
M332: Middle Rocky Mountain steppe–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
242: Pacific lowland mixed forest	2	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
234: Lower Mississippi riverine forest	2	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
M212: Adirondack-New England mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
231: Southeastern mixed forest	2	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
342: Intermountain semi-desert	3	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
315: Southwest plateau and plains dry steppe and shrub	3	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
212: Laurentian mixed forest	4	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
M242: Cascade mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	4	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
232: Outer coastal plain mixed forest	6	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
131: Yukon intermontane plateaus taiga	6	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
M262: California coastal range open woodland–shrub–coniferous forest–meadow	6	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00

Risks to Aquatic Species from Accidents		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on toxicity of formulation)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Scenario		Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
Spill into stream: 5 gal concentrate		1.72E-01	9.92E-02	ND	5.88E-03	3.40E-03	ND
Spill into stream: 50 gal mixed for use		1.72E-02	9.92E-03	ND	5.88E-04	3.40E-04	ND
Spray across stream	1 GPC	2.78E-03	1.61E-03	ND	3.97E-04	2.30E-04	ND
Spray across stream	2 GPC	5.56E-03	3.22E-03	ND	7.94E-04	4.59E-04	ND
Spray across stream	3 GPC	8.34E-03	4.82E-03	ND	1.19E-03	6.89E-04	ND
Spray across stream	4 GPC	1.11E-02	6.43E-03	ND	1.59E-03	9.19E-04	ND
Spray across stream	6 GPC	1.67E-02	9.65E-03	ND	2.38E-03	1.38E-03	ND

Angus Hi-Combat A

Product Data

Concentrate form:		Liquid	
Mix ratio:		0.01	gallons concentrate/gallon mix
Formulation Oral LD_{50}:	>	5,050	mg/kg
Formulation LC_{50} (mg/L):		23	(Rainbow trout, 96 hours)
		ND	(aquatic invertebrate)
		ND	(amphibian tadpole)
Mixture application rate:		up to 0.06	gal/ft^2

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species: Product

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	5.67E-04	4.46E-05	5.69E-03	1.23E-03	2.77E-03	3.28E-03	1.29E-03
2	1.13E-03	8.91E-05	1.14E-02	2.46E-03	5.55E-03	6.56E-03	2.58E-03
3	1.70E-03	1.34E-04	1.71E-02	3.70E-03	8.32E-03	9.84E-03	3.87E-03
4	2.27E-03	1.78E-04	2.28E-02	4.93E-03	1.11E-02	1.31E-02	5.16E-03
6	3.40E-03	2.67E-04	3.41E-02	7.39E-03	1.66E-02	1.97E-02	7.74E-03

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species:
Additive Risk Based on Ingredients Screened into Analysis

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	6.56E-07	5.16E-08	6.59E-06	1.27E-06	3.21E-06	3.80E-06	1.49E-06
2	1.31E-06	1.03E-07	1.32E-05	2.53E-06	6.42E-06	7.59E-06	2.99E-06
3	1.97E-06	1.55E-07	1.98E-05	3.80E-06	9.64E-06	1.14E-05	4.48E-06
4	2.63E-06	2.06E-07	2.63E-05	5.07E-06	1.28E-05	1.52E-05	5.98E-06
6	3.94E-06	3.11E-07	3.95E-05	7.60E-06	1.93E-05	2.28E-05	8.96E-06

Risks to Aquatic Species from Runoff		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on additive toxicity of ingredients)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Ecoregion	GPC	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
331: Great Plains-Palouse dry steppe	1	1.08E-06	7.63E-07	0.00E+00	4.55E-08	3.21E-08	0.00E+00
M313: Arizona-New Mexico mountains–semidesert–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	3.67E-06	1.73E-06	0.00E+00	1.31E-07	6.16E-08	0.00E+00
M331: Southern Rocky Mountain steppe–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	3.80E-06	2.66E-06	0.00E+00	1.57E-07	1.10E-07	0.00E+00
M332: Middle Rocky Mountain steppe–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	5.16E-06	1.28E-05	0.00E+00	2.20E-07	5.45E-07	0.00E+00
242: Pacific lowland mixed forest	2	1.27E-05	5.71E-06	0.00E+00	4.40E-07	2.04E-07	0.00E+00
234: Lower Mississippi riverine forest	2	2.21E-05	1.06E-05	0.00E+00	7.63E-07	3.67E-07	0.00E+00
M212: Adirondack-New England mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	1.52E-05	1.21E-05	0.00E+00	5.43E-07	4.32E-07	0.00E+00
231: Southeastern mixed forest	2	3.84E-08	9.95E-08	0.00E+00	1.33E-09	4.25E-09	0.00E+00
342: Intermountain semi-desert	3	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
315: Southwest plateau and plains dry steppe and shrub	3	5.87E-05	2.64E-05	0.00E+00	2.03E-06	9.12E-07	0.00E+00
212: Laurentian mixed forest	4	2.84E-05	2.21E-05	0.00E+00	1.02E-06	7.94E-07	0.00E+00
M242: Cascade mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	4	3.64E-05	2.48E-05	0.00E+00	1.27E-06	8.66E-07	0.00E+00
232: Outer coastal plain mixed forest	6	5.25E-05	2.34E-05	0.00E+00	1.82E-06	8.08E-07	0.00E+00
131: Yukon intermontane plateaus taiga	6	6.72E-05	5.85E-04	0.00E+00	2.41E-06	2.10E-05	0.00E+00
M262: California coastal range open woodland–shrub–coniferous forest–meadow	6	7.11E-06	4.36E-06	0.00E+00	2.93E-07	1.80E-07	0.00E+00

Risks to Aquatic Species from Accidents		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on toxicity of formulation)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Scenario		Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
Spill into stream: 5 gal concentrate		**7.06E-01**	ND	ND	2.42E-02	ND	ND
Spill into stream: 50 gal mixed for use		7.06E-02	ND	ND	2.42E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	1 GPC	1.14E-02	ND	ND	1.63E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	2 GPC	2.29E-02	ND	ND	3.27E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	3 GPC	3.43E-02	ND	ND	4.90E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	4 GPC	4.58E-02	ND	ND	6.54E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	6 GPC	6.86E-02	ND	ND	9.81E-03	ND	ND

Buckeye Platinum Class A Foam

Product Data

Concentrate form:		Liquid	
Mix ratio:		0.01	gallons concentrate/gallon mix
Formulation Oral LD_{50}:	>	5,050	mg/kg
Formulation LC_{50} (mg/L):		19.9	(Rainbow trout, 96 hours)
		ND	(aquatic invertebrate)
		ND	(amphibian tadpole)
Mixture application rate:		up to 0.06	gal/ft^2

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species: Product

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	5.51E-04	4.33E-05	5.53E-03	1.20E-03	2.69E-03	3.19E-03	1.25E-03
2	1.10E-03	8.66E-05	1.11E-02	2.39E-03	5.39E-03	6.37E-03	2.51E-03
3	1.65E-03	1.30E-04	1.66E-02	3.59E-03	8.08E-03	9.56E-03	3.76E-03
4	2.20E-03	1.73E-04	2.21E-02	4.79E-03	1.08E-02	1.27E-02	5.01E-03
6	3.30E-03	2.60E-04	3.32E-02	7.18E-03	1.62E-02	1.91E-02	7.52E-03

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species:
Additive Risk Based on Ingredients Screened into Analysis

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
2	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
3	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
4	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
6	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00

Risks to Aquatic Species from Runoff		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on additive toxicity of ingredients)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Ecoregion	GPC	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
331: Great Plains-Palouse dry steppe	1	4.31E-06	3.09E-07	0.00E+00	1.81E-07	1.30E-08	0.00E+00
M313: Arizona-New Mexico mountains–semidesert–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	5.34E-06	3.83E-07	0.00E+00	1.90E-07	1.36E-08	0.00E+00
M331: Southern Rocky Mountain steppe–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	5.73E-06	4.13E-07	0.00E+00	2.37E-07	1.71E-08	0.00E+00
M332: Middle Rocky Mountain steppe–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	1.19E-04	8.59E-06	0.00E+00	5.06E-06	3.66E-07	0.00E+00
242: Pacific lowland mixed forest	2	1.30E-05	9.30E-07	0.00E+00	5.62E-07	4.03E-08	0.00E+00
234: Lower Mississippi riverine forest	2	1.75E-06	1.25E-07	0.00E+00	6.76E-08	4.85E-09	0.00E+00
M212: Adirondack-New England mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	2.58E-06	1.89E-07	0.00E+00	9.23E-08	6.76E-09	0.00E+00
231: Southeastern mixed forest	2	2.12E-06	1.52E-07	0.00E+00	9.18E-08	6.58E-09	0.00E+00
342: Intermountain semi-desert	3	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
315: Southwest plateau and plains dry steppe and shrub	3	4.16E-04	2.97E-05	0.00E+00	1.80E-05	1.29E-06	0.00E+00
212: Laurentian mixed forest	4	4.28E-06	3.13E-07	0.00E+00	1.54E-07	1.13E-08	0.00E+00
M242: Cascade mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	4	5.05E-07	3.84E-08	0.00E+00	1.77E-08	1.34E-09	0.00E+00
232: Outer coastal plain mixed forest	6	1.03E-08	7.67E-10	0.00E+00	3.57E-10	2.65E-11	0.00E+00
131: Yukon intermontane plateaus taiga	6	7.96E-03	5.75E-04	0.00E+00	2.85E-04	2.06E-05	0.00E+00
M262: California coastal range open woodland–shrub–coniferous forest–meadow	6	1.26E-07	9.27E-09	0.00E+00	5.21E-09	3.82E-10	0.00E+00

Risks to Aquatic Species from Accidents		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on toxicity of formulation)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Scenario		Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
Spill into stream: 5 gal concentrate		**7.93E-01**	ND	ND	2.72E-02	ND	ND
Spill into stream: 50 gal mixed for use		7.93E-02	ND	ND	2.72E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	1 GPC	1.28E-02	ND	ND	1.84E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	2 GPC	2.57E-02	ND	ND	3.67E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	3 GPC	3.85E-02	ND	ND	5.51E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	4 GPC	5.14E-02	ND	ND	7.34E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	6 GPC	7.71E-02	ND	ND	1.10E-02	ND	ND

Solberg Fire-Brake 3150A

Product Data

Concentrate form:		Liquid	
Mix ratio:		0.01	gallons concentrate/gallon mix
Formulation Oral LD_{50}:	>	5,000	mg/kg
Formulation LC_{50} (mg/L):		16.8	(Rainbow trout, 96 hours)
		ND	(aquatic invertebrate)
		ND	(amphibian tadpole)
Mixture application rate:		up to 0.06	gal/ft^2

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species: Product

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	5.40E-04	4.24E-05	5.42E-03	1.17E-03	2.64E-03	3.12E-03	1.23E-03
2	1.08E-03	8.49E-05	1.08E-02	2.35E-03	5.28E-03	6.25E-03	2.46E-03
3	1.62E-03	1.27E-04	1.63E-02	3.52E-03	7.93E-03	9.37E-03	3.69E-03
4	2.16E-03	1.70E-04	2.17E-02	4.69E-03	1.06E-02	1.25E-02	4.92E-03
6	3.24E-03	2.55E-04	3.25E-02	7.04E-03	1.59E-02	1.87E-02	7.37E-03

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species:
Additive Risk Based on Ingredients Screened into Analysis

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	3.36E-07	2.64E-08	3.37E-06	7.29E-07	1.64E-06	1.94E-06	7.64E-07
2	6.71E-07	5.28E-08	6.73E-06	1.46E-06	3.28E-06	3.88E-06	1.53E-06
3	1.01E-06	7.91E-08	1.01E-05	2.19E-06	4.93E-06	5.82E-06	2.29E-06
4	1.34E-06	1.06E-07	1.35E-05	2.92E-06	6.57E-06	7.76E-06	3.06E-06
6	2.01E-06	1.59E-07	2.02E-05	4.38E-06	9.85E-06	1.16E-05	4.58E-06

Risks to Aquatic Species from Runoff		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on additive toxicity of ingredients)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Ecoregion	GPC	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
331: Great Plains-Palouse dry steppe	1	1.30E-04	3.86E-05	0.00E+00	5.47E-06	1.62E-06	0.00E+00
M313: Arizona-New Mexico mountains–semidesert–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	4.23E-04	1.26E-04	0.00E+00	1.51E-05	4.47E-06	0.00E+00
M331: Southern Rocky Mountain steppe–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	4.76E-04	1.41E-04	0.00E+00	1.97E-05	5.86E-06	0.00E+00
M332: Middle Rocky Mountain steppe–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	7.19E-04	2.14E-04	0.00E+00	3.06E-05	9.11E-06	0.00E+00
242: Pacific lowland mixed forest	2	1.48E-03	4.40E-04	0.00E+00	5.14E-05	1.52E-05	0.00E+00
234: Lower Mississippi riverine forest	2	2.66E-03	7.89E-04	0.00E+00	9.20E-05	2.73E-05	0.00E+00
M212: Adirondack-New England mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	2.02E-03	5.99E-04	0.00E+00	7.22E-05	2.14E-05	0.00E+00
231: Southeastern mixed forest	2	3.74E-06	1.11E-06	0.00E+00	1.29E-07	3.85E-08	0.00E+00
342: Intermountain semi-desert	3	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
315: Southwest plateau and plains dry steppe and shrub	3	7.00E-03	2.08E-03	0.00E+00	2.42E-04	7.17E-05	0.00E+00
212: Laurentian mixed forest	4	3.76E-03	1.12E-03	0.00E+00	1.35E-04	4.01E-05	0.00E+00
M242: Cascade mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	4	4.51E-03	1.34E-03	0.00E+00	1.58E-04	4.69E-05	0.00E+00
232: Outer coastal plain mixed forest	6	6.28E-03	1.86E-03	0.00E+00	2.17E-04	6.45E-05	0.00E+00
131: Yukon intermontane plateaus taiga	6	8.80E-03	2.66E-03	0.00E+00	3.15E-04	9.52E-05	0.00E+00
M262: California coastal range open woodland–shrub–coniferous forest–meadow	6	9.00E-04	2.67E-04	0.00E+00	3.71E-05	1.10E-05	0.00E+00

Risks to Aquatic Species from Accidents		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on toxicity of formulation)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Scenario		Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
Spill into stream: 5 gal concentrate		**9.21E-01**	ND	ND	3.16E-02	ND	ND
Spill into stream: 50 gal mixed for use		9.21E-02	ND	ND	3.16E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	1 GPC	1.49E-02	ND	ND	2.13E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	2 GPC	2.98E-02	ND	ND	4.26E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	3 GPC	4.48E-02	ND	ND	6.39E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	4 GPC	5.97E-02	ND	ND	8.52E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	6 GPC	8.95E-02	ND	ND	1.28E-02	ND	ND

First Response (also sold as Fire-Brake PLUS)

Product Data

Concentrate form:		Liquid	
Mix ratio:		0.01	gallons concentrate/gallon mix
Formulation Oral LD_{50}:	>	5,050	mg/kg
Formulation LC_{50} (mg/L):		16.8	(Rainbow trout, 96 hours)
		ND	(aquatic invertebrate)
		ND	(amphibian tadpole)
Mixture application rate:		up to 0.06	gal/ft^2

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species: Product

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	5.52E-04	4.34E-05	5.54E-03	1.20E-03	2.70E-03	3.19E-03	1.26E-03
2	1.10E-03	8.68E-05	1.11E-02	2.40E-03	5.41E-03	6.39E-03	2.51E-03
3	1.66E-03	1.30E-04	1.66E-02	3.60E-03	8.11E-03	9.58E-03	3.77E-03
4	2.21E-03	1.74E-04	2.22E-02	4.80E-03	1.08E-02	1.28E-02	5.03E-03
6	3.31E-03	2.60E-04	3.33E-02	7.20E-03	1.62E-02	1.92E-02	7.54E-03

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species: Additive Risk Based on Ingredients Screened into Analysis

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
2	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
3	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
4	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
6	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00

Risks to Aquatic Species from Runoff		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on additive toxicity of ingredients)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Ecoregion	GPC	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
331: Great Plains-Palouse dry steppe	1	2.36E-03	1.42E-02	0.00E+00	9.95E-05	5.97E-04	0.00E+00
M313: Arizona-New Mexico mountains–semidesert–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	2.92E-02	1.43E-01	0.00E+00	1.04E-03	5.10E-03	0.00E+00
M331: Southern Rocky Mountain steppe–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	4.27E-03	3.01E-02	0.00E+00	1.77E-04	1.25E-03	0.00E+00
M332: Middle Rocky Mountain steppe–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	2.58E-03	2.28E-02	0.00E+00	1.10E-04	9.69E-04	0.00E+00
242: Pacific lowland mixed forest	2	7.37E-02	4.48E-01	0.00E+00	2.55E-03	1.55E-02	0.00E+00
234: Lower Mississippi riverine forest	2	7.74E-02	**5.02E-01**	0.00E+00	2.68E-03	1.74E-02	0.00E+00
M212: Adirondack-New England mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	1.37E-02	1.12E-01	0.00E+00	4.90E-04	4.03E-03	0.00E+00
231: Southeastern mixed forest	2	8.21E-02	2.85E-01	0.00E+00	2.84E-03	9.86E-03	0.00E+00
342: Intermountain semi-desert	3	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
315: Southwest plateau and plains dry steppe and shrub	3	2.18E-01	**1.30E+00**	0.00E+00	7.52E-03	4.49E-02	0.00E+00
212: Laurentian mixed forest	4	2.61E-02	2.13E-01	0.00E+00	9.38E-04	7.65E-03	0.00E+00
M242: Cascade mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	4	4.12E-02	3.67E-01	0.00E+00	1.44E-03	1.28E-02	0.00E+00
232: Outer coastal plain mixed forest	6	2.29E-01	**1.51E+00**	0.00E+00	7.93E-03	5.22E-02	0.00E+00
131: Yukon intermontane plateaus taiga	6	3.06E-02	2.94E-01	0.00E+00	1.10E-03	1.05E-02	0.00E+00
M262: California coastal range open woodland–shrub–coniferous forest–meadow	6	1.01E-02	7.56E-02	0.00E+00	4.15E-04	3.11E-03	0.00E+00

Risks to Aquatic Species from Accidents		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on toxicity of formulation)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Scenario		Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
Spill into stream: 5 gal concentrate		**9.42E-01**	ND	ND	3.23E-02	ND	ND
Spill into stream: 50 gal mixed for use		9.42E-02	ND	ND	3.23E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	1 GPC	1.53E-02	ND	ND	2.18E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	2 GPC	3.05E-02	ND	ND	4.36E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	3 GPC	4.58E-02	ND	ND	6.54E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	4 GPC	6.10E-02	ND	ND	8.72E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	6 GPC	9.16E-02	ND	ND	1.31E-02	ND	ND

Ansul Silv-Ex Plus Class A (also sold as Chemguard Direct Attack)

Product Data

Concentrate form:		Liquid	
Mix ratio:		0.01	gallons concentrate/gallon mix
Formulation Oral LD_{50}:	>	5,050	mg/kg
Formulation LC_{50} (mg/L):		46	(Rainbow trout, 96 hours)
		ND	(aquatic invertebrate)
		ND	(amphibian tadpole)
Mixture application rate:		up to 0.06	gal/ft^2

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species: Product

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	5.40E-04	4.24E-05	5.42E-03	1.17E-03	2.64E-03	3.12E-03	1.23E-03
2	1.08E-03	8.49E-05	1.08E-02	2.35E-03	5.28E-03	6.25E-03	2.46E-03
3	1.62E-03	1.27E-04	1.63E-02	3.52E-03	7.93E-03	9.37E-03	3.69E-03
4	2.16E-03	1.70E-04	2.17E-02	4.69E-03	1.06E-02	1.25E-02	4.92E-03
6	3.24E-03	2.55E-04	3.25E-02	7.04E-03	1.59E-02	1.87E-02	7.37E-03

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species: Additive Risk Based on Ingredients Screened into Analysis

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
2	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
3	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
4	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
6	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00

Risks to Aquatic Species from Runoff		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on additive toxicity of ingredients)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Ecoregion	GPC	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
331: Great Plains-Palouse dry steppe	1	7.06E-04	9.31E-04	0.00E+00	2.97E-05	3.92E-05	0.00E+00
M313: Arizona-New Mexico mountains–semidesert–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	1.07E-02	1.41E-02	0.00E+00	3.81E-04	5.02E-04	0.00E+00
M331: Southern Rocky Mountain steppe–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	1.07E-03	1.41E-03	0.00E+00	4.43E-05	5.85E-05	0.00E+00
M332: Middle Rocky Mountain steppe–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	5.56E-04	6.97E-04	0.00E+00	2.37E-05	2.97E-05	0.00E+00
242: Pacific lowland mixed forest	2	2.03E-02	2.68E-02	0.00E+00	7.03E-04	9.29E-04	0.00E+00
234: Lower Mississippi riverine forest	2	2.02E-02	2.66E-02	0.00E+00	6.98E-04	9.22E-04	0.00E+00
M212: Adirondack-New England mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	2.95E-03	3.90E-03	0.00E+00	1.06E-04	1.40E-04	0.00E+00
231: Southeastern mixed forest	2	6.34E-02	8.37E-02	0.00E+00	2.19E-03	2.89E-03	0.00E+00
342: Intermountain semi-desert	3	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
315: Southwest plateau and plains dry steppe and shrub	3	6.28E-02	8.27E-02	0.00E+00	2.17E-03	2.85E-03	0.00E+00
212: Laurentian mixed forest	4	5.66E-03	7.47E-03	0.00E+00	2.03E-04	2.68E-04	0.00E+00
M242: Cascade mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	4	8.24E-03	1.09E-02	0.00E+00	2.88E-04	3.81E-04	0.00E+00
232: Outer coastal plain mixed forest	6	5.84E-02	7.70E-02	0.00E+00	2.02E-03	2.66E-03	0.00E+00
131: Yukon intermontane plateaus taiga	6	7.64E-03	7.66E-03	0.00E+00	2.74E-04	2.75E-04	0.00E+00
M262: California coastal range open woodland–shrub–coniferous forest–meadow	6	2.33E-03	3.08E-03	0.00E+00	9.62E-05	1.27E-04	0.00E+00

Risks to Aquatic Species from Accidents		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on toxicity of formulation)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Scenario		Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
Spill into stream: 5 gal concentrate		3.36E-01	ND	ND	1.15E-02	ND	ND
Spill into stream: 50 gal mixed for use		3.36E-02	ND	ND	1.15E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	1 GPC	5.45E-03	ND	ND	7.78E-04	ND	ND
Spray across stream	2 GPC	1.09E-02	ND	ND	1.56E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	3 GPC	1.63E-02	ND	ND	2.34E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	4 GPC	2.18E-02	ND	ND	3.11E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	6 GPC	3.27E-02	ND	ND	4.67E-03	ND	ND

1% Bushmaster "A" Class Foam

Product Data

Concentrate form:		Liquid	
Mix ratio:		0.01	gallons concentrate/gallon mix
Formulation Oral LD_{50}:	>	5,050	mg/kg
Formulation LC_{50} (mg/L):		16.8	(Rainbow trout, 96 hours)
		ND	(aquatic invertebrate)
		ND	(amphibian tadpole)
Mixture application rate:		up to 0.06	gal/ft^2

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species: Product

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	5.48E-04	4.31E-05	5.50E-03	1.19E-03	2.68E-03	3.17E-03	1.25E-03
2	1.10E-03	8.61E-05	1.10E-02	2.38E-03	5.36E-03	6.34E-03	2.49E-03
3	1.64E-03	1.29E-04	1.65E-02	3.57E-03	8.05E-03	9.51E-03	3.74E-03
4	2.19E-03	1.72E-04	2.20E-02	4.76E-03	1.07E-02	1.27E-02	4.99E-03
6	3.29E-03	2.58E-04	3.30E-02	7.15E-03	1.61E-02	1.90E-02	7.48E-03

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species:
Additive Risk Based on Ingredients Screened into Analysis

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	4.96E-07	3.90E-08	4.98E-06	3.05E-07	2.43E-06	2.87E-06	1.13E-06
2	9.92E-07	7.80E-08	9.96E-06	6.10E-07	4.86E-06	5.74E-06	2.26E-06
3	1.49E-06	1.17E-07	1.49E-05	9.15E-07	7.28E-06	8.61E-06	3.39E-06
4	1.98E-06	1.56E-07	1.99E-05	1.22E-06	9.71E-06	1.15E-05	4.52E-06
6	2.98E-06	2.34E-07	2.99E-05	1.83E-06	1.46E-05	1.72E-05	6.78E-06

Risks to Aquatic Species from Runoff		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on additive toxicity of ingredients)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Ecoregion	GPC	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
331: Great Plains-Palouse dry steppe	1	2.05E-04	6.58E-04	2.63E-10	8.64E-06	2.77E-05	1.11E-11
M313: Arizona-New Mexico mountains–semidesert–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	1.01E-03	9.47E-03	2.95E-10	3.58E-05	3.37E-04	1.05E-11
M331: Southern Rocky Mountain steppe–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	6.90E-04	1.10E-03	6.17E-10	2.86E-05	4.56E-05	2.55E-11
M332: Middle Rocky Mountain steppe–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	1.01E-03	7.58E-04	1.69E-08	4.31E-05	3.23E-05	7.19E-10
242: Pacific lowland mixed forest	2	2.82E-03	1.79E-02	7.92E-10	9.76E-05	6.20E-04	3.43E-11
234: Lower Mississippi riverine forest	2	4.41E-03	1.82E-02	1.15E-10	1.53E-04	6.30E-04	3.97E-12
M212: Adirondack-New England mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	2.86E-03	3.30E-03	9.30E-10	1.02E-04	1.18E-04	3.33E-11
231: Southeastern mixed forest	2	2.67E-03	5.77E-02	6.75E-11	9.23E-05	1.99E-03	2.92E-12
342: Intermountain semi-desert	3	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
315: Southwest plateau and plains dry steppe and shrub	3	1.21E-02	5.64E-02	1.01E-09	4.17E-04	1.95E-03	3.48E-11
212: Laurentian mixed forest	4	5.33E-03	6.28E-03	1.54E-09	1.91E-04	2.26E-04	5.52E-11
M242: Cascade mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	4	6.46E-03	8.73E-03	5.12E-10	2.26E-04	3.05E-04	1.79E-11
232: Outer coastal plain mixed forest	6	1.08E-02	5.20E-02	6.09E-12	3.74E-04	1.80E-03	2.11E-13
131: Yukon intermontane plateaus taiga	6	1.32E-02	1.01E-02	1.18E-06	4.74E-04	3.62E-04	4.23E-08
M262: California coastal range open woodland–shrub–coniferous forest–meadow	6	1.31E-03	2.33E-03	4.81E-11	5.42E-05	9.62E-05	1.98E-12

Risks to Aquatic Species from Accidents		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on toxicity of formulation)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Scenario		Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
Spill into stream: 5 gal concentrate		**9.35E-01**	ND	ND	3.20E-02	ND	ND
Spill into stream: 50 gal mixed for use		9.35E-02	ND	ND	3.20E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	1 GPC	1.51E-02	ND	ND	2.16E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	2 GPC	3.03E-02	ND	ND	4.33E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	3 GPC	4.54E-02	ND	ND	6.49E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	4 GPC	6.06E-02	ND	ND	8.65E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	6 GPC	9.09E-02	ND	ND	1.30E-02	ND	ND

Phos-Chek WD881A

Product Data

Concentrate form:	Liquid	
Mix ratio:	0.01	gallons concentrate/gallon mix
Formulation Oral LD_{50}:	>5,050	mg/kg
Formulation LC_{50} (mg/L):	16.8	(Rainbow trout, 96 hours)
	ND	(aquatic invertebrate)
	ND	(amphibian tadpole)
Mixture application rate:	up to 0.06	gal/ft^2

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species: Product

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	5.53E-04	4.35E-05	5.55E-03	1.20E-03	2.71E-03	3.20E-03	1.26E-03
2	1.11E-03	8.69E-05	1.11E-02	2.40E-03	5.41E-03	6.40E-03	2.52E-03
3	1.66E-03	1.30E-04	1.66E-02	3.60E-03	8.12E-03	9.59E-03	3.77E-03
4	2.21E-03	1.74E-04	2.22E-02	4.81E-03	1.08E-02	1.28E-02	5.03E-03
6	3.32E-03	2.61E-04	3.33E-02	7.21E-03	1.62E-02	1.92E-02	7.55E-03

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species:
Additive Risk Based on Ingredients Screened into Analysis

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
2	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
3	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
4	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
6	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00

Risks to Aquatic Species from Runoff		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on additive toxicity of ingredients)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Ecoregion	GPC	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
331: Great Plains-Palouse dry steppe	1	2.27E-03	2.35E-02	0.00E+00	9.55E-05	9.89E-04	0.00E+00
M313: Arizona-New Mexico mountains–semidesert–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	2.80E-02	2.33E-01	0.00E+00	9.96E-04	8.30E-03	0.00E+00
M331: Southern Rocky Mountain steppe–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	4.10E-03	5.06E-02	0.00E+00	1.70E-04	2.09E-03	0.00E+00
M332: Middle Rocky Mountain steppe–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	2.57E-03	3.88E-02	0.00E+00	1.10E-04	1.65E-03	0.00E+00
242: Pacific lowland mixed forest	2	7.07E-02	**7.43E-01**	0.00E+00	2.45E-03	2.57E-02	0.00E+00
234: Lower Mississippi riverine forest	2	7.42E-02	**8.38E-01**	0.00E+00	2.57E-03	2.90E-02	0.00E+00
M212: Adirondack-New England mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	1.31E-02	1.90E-01	0.00E+00	4.71E-04	6.82E-03	0.00E+00
231: Southeastern mixed forest	2	7.85E-02	4.45E-01	0.00E+00	2.71E-03	1.54E-02	0.00E+00
342: Intermountain semi-desert	3	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
315: Southwest plateau and plains dry steppe and shrub	3	2.09E-01	**2.16E+00**	0.00E+00	7.22E-03	7.44E-02	0.00E+00
212: Laurentian mixed forest	4	2.51E-02	3.61E-01	0.00E+00	9.00E-04	1.30E-02	0.00E+00
M242: Cascade mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	4	3.96E-02	**6.25E-01**	0.00E+00	1.38E-03	2.19E-02	0.00E+00
232: Outer coastal plain mixed forest	6	2.20E-01	**2.52E+00**	0.00E+00	7.60E-03	8.71E-02	0.00E+00
131: Yukon intermontane plateaus taiga	6	3.58E-02	**5.02E-01**	0.00E+00	1.28E-03	1.80E-02	0.00E+00
M262: California coastal range open woodland–shrub–coniferous forest–meadow	6	9.66E-03	1.27E-01	0.00E+00	3.98E-04	5.25E-03	0.00E+00

Risks to Aquatic Species from Accidents		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on toxicity of formulation)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Scenario		Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
Spill into stream: 5 gal concentrate		**9.43E-01**	ND	ND	3.23E-02	ND	ND
Spill into stream: 50 gal mixed for use		9.43E-02	ND	ND	3.23E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	1 GPC	1.53E-02	ND	ND	2.18E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	2 GPC	3.06E-02	ND	ND	4.36E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	3 GPC	4.58E-02	ND	ND	6.55E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	4 GPC	6.11E-02	ND	ND	8.73E-03	ND	ND
Spray across stream	6 GPC	9.17E-02	ND	ND	1.31E-02	ND	ND

Fomtec Enviro Class A (also sold as FireIce Polar EcoFoam)

Product Data

Concentrate form:		Liquid	
Mix ratio:		0.01	gallons concentrate/gallon mix
Formulation Oral LD_{50}:	>	5,050	mg/kg
Formulation LC_{50} (mg/L):		77.5	(Rainbow trout, 96 hours)
		100	(*Daphnia magna*, 48 hours)
		ND	(amphibian tadpole)
Mixture application rate:		up to 0.06	gal/ft^2

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species: Product

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	5.56E-04	4.37E-05	5.58E-03	1.21E-03	2.72E-03	3.22E-03	1.27E-03
2	1.11E-03	8.74E-05	1.12E-02	2.42E-03	5.44E-03	6.43E-03	2.53E-03
3	1.67E-03	1.31E-04	1.67E-02	3.63E-03	8.16E-03	9.65E-03	3.80E-03
4	2.22E-03	1.75E-04	2.23E-02	4.83E-03	1.09E-02	1.29E-02	5.06E-03
6	3.34E-03	2.62E-04	3.35E-02	7.25E-03	1.63E-02	1.93E-02	7.59E-03

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species: Additive Risk Based on Ingredients Screened into Analysis

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
2	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
3	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
4	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
6	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00

Risks to Aquatic Species from Runoff		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on additive toxicity of ingredients)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Ecoregion	GPC	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
331: Great Plains-Palouse dry steppe	1	2.00E-06	1.05E-06	0.00E+00	8.41E-08	4.42E-08	0.00E+00
M313: Arizona-New Mexico mountains–semidesert–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	2.37E-06	1.19E-06	0.00E+00	8.44E-08	4.22E-08	0.00E+00
M331: Southern Rocky Mountain steppe–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	3.92E-06	3.50E-06	0.00E+00	1.62E-07	1.45E-07	0.00E+00
M332: Middle Rocky Mountain steppe–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	8.92E-05	7.88E-05	0.00E+00	3.80E-06	3.35E-06	0.00E+00
242: Pacific lowland mixed forest	2	5.14E-06	1.23E-06	0.00E+00	2.22E-07	5.30E-08	0.00E+00
234: Lower Mississippi riverine forest	2	1.36E-06	1.52E-06	0.00E+00	5.03E-08	5.33E-08	0.00E+00
M212: Adirondack-New England mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	8.28E-06	1.52E-05	0.00E+00	2.97E-07	5.46E-07	0.00E+00
231: Southeastern mixed forest	2	7.19E-07	2.08E-07	0.00E+00	3.11E-08	9.01E-09	0.00E+00
342: Intermountain semi-desert	3	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
315: Southwest plateau and plains dry steppe and shrub	3	6.99E-06	6.98E-06	0.00E+00	2.41E-07	2.41E-07	0.00E+00
212: Laurentian mixed forest	4	1.39E-05	2.55E-05	0.00E+00	4.98E-07	9.18E-07	0.00E+00
M242: Cascade mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	4	1.48E-05	3.18E-05	0.00E+00	5.17E-07	1.11E-06	0.00E+00
232: Outer coastal plain mixed forest	6	2.04E-07	4.33E-07	0.00E+00	7.06E-09	1.50E-08	0.00E+00
131: Yukon intermontane plateaus taiga	6	5.71E-03	4.41E-03	0.00E+00	2.05E-04	1.58E-04	0.00E+00
M262: California coastal range open woodland–shrub–coniferous forest–meadow	6	6.19E-07	1.22E-06	0.00E+00	2.55E-08	5.04E-08	0.00E+00

Risks to Aquatic Species from Accidents		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on toxicity of formulation)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Scenario		Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
Spill into stream: 5 gal concentrate		2.06E-01	1.59E-01	ND	7.05E-03	5.46E-03	ND
Spill into stream: 50 gal mixed for use		2.06E-02	1.59E-02	ND	7.05E-04	5.46E-04	ND
Spray across stream	1 GPC	3.33E-03	2.58E-03	ND	4.76E-04	3.69E-04	ND
Spray across stream	2 GPC	6.66E-03	5.16E-03	ND	9.52E-04	7.38E-04	ND
Spray across stream	3 GPC	9.99E-03	7.74E-03	ND	1.43E-03	1.11E-03	ND
Spray across stream	4 GPC	1.33E-02	1.03E-02	ND	1.90E-03	1.48E-03	ND
Spray across stream	6 GPC	2.00E-02	1.55E-02	ND	2.86E-03	2.21E-03	ND

Bio-Ex EcoPol-F

Product Data

Concentrate form:		Liquid	
Mix ratio:		0.01	gallons concentrate/gallon mix
Formulation Oral LD_{50}:	>	5,000	mg/kg
Formulation LC_{50} (mg/L):		333.9	(Rainbow trout, 96 hours)
		ND	(aquatic invertebrate)
		ND	(amphibian tadpole)
Mixture application rate:		up to 0.06	gal/ft^2

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species: Product

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	5.51E-04	4.33E-05	5.53E-03	1.20E-03	2.70E-03	3.19E-03	1.25E-03
2	1.10E-03	8.66E-05	1.11E-02	2.39E-03	5.39E-03	6.37E-03	2.51E-03
3	1.65E-03	1.30E-04	1.66E-02	3.59E-03	8.09E-03	9.56E-03	3.76E-03
4	2.20E-03	1.73E-04	2.21E-02	4.79E-03	1.08E-02	1.27E-02	5.01E-03
6	3.30E-03	2.60E-04	3.32E-02	7.18E-03	1.62E-02	1.91E-02	7.52E-03

Estimated Risks to Terrestrial Species:
Additive Risk Based on Ingredients Screened into Analysis

GPC	Risk Quotient						
	Deer	Coyote	Deer Mouse	Rabbit	Am Kestrel	RW Blackbird	BW Quail
1	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
2	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
3	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
4	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00
6	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00	0.00E-00

Risks to Aquatic Species from Runoff		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on additive toxicity of ingredients)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Ecoregion	GPC	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
331: Great Plains-Palouse dry steppe	1	1.50E-06	2.64E-06	0.00E+00	6.33E-08	1.11E-07	0.00E+00
M313: Arizona-New Mexico mountains–semidesert–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	1.67E-06	2.87E-06	0.00E+00	5.94E-08	1.02E-07	0.00E+00
M331: Southern Rocky Mountain steppe–open woodland–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	5.67E-06	1.14E-05	0.00E+00	2.35E-07	4.71E-07	0.00E+00
M332: Middle Rocky Mountain steppe–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	1.27E-04	2.56E-04	0.00E+00	5.43E-06	1.09E-05	0.00E+00
242: Pacific lowland mixed forest	2	1.13E-06	4.72E-07	0.00E+00	4.81E-08	1.84E-08	0.00E+00
234: Lower Mississippi riverine forest	2	2.48E-06	5.26E-06	0.00E+00	8.57E-08	1.82E-07	0.00E+00
M212: Adirondack-New England mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	2	2.68E-05	5.79E-05	0.00E+00	9.60E-07	2.08E-06	0.00E+00
231: Southeastern mixed forest	2	2.33E-07	2.35E-07	0.00E+00	1.01E-08	1.02E-08	0.00E+00
342: Intermountain semi-desert	3	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00
315: Southwest plateau and plains dry steppe and shrub	3	1.15E-05	2.35E-05	0.00E+00	3.97E-07	8.12E-07	0.00E+00
212: Laurentian mixed forest	4	4.50E-05	9.72E-05	0.00E+00	1.61E-06	3.49E-06	0.00E+00
M242: Cascade mixed forest–coniferous forest–alpine meadow	4	5.65E-05	1.23E-04	0.00E+00	1.98E-06	4.31E-06	0.00E+00
232: Outer coastal plain mixed forest	6	7.68E-07	1.67E-06	0.00E+00	2.66E-08	5.79E-08	0.00E+00
131: Yukon intermontane plateaus taiga	6	6.97E-03	1.37E-02	0.00E+00	2.50E-04	4.89E-04	0.00E+00
M262: California coastal range open woodland–shrub–coniferous forest–meadow	6	2.16E-06	4.69E-06	0.00E+00	8.91E-08	1.93E-07	0.00E+00

Risks to Aquatic Species from Accidents		Estimated Risk Quotient (based on toxicity of formulation)					
		Small Stream			Large Stream		
Scenario		Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole	Rainbow Trout	Daphnia magna	Tadpole
Spill into stream: 5 gal concentrate		4.68E-02	ND	ND	1.60E-03	ND	ND
Spill into stream: 50 gal mixed for use		4.68E-03	ND	ND	1.60E-04	ND	ND
Spray across stream	1 GPC	7.58E-04	ND	ND	1.08E-04	ND	ND
Spray across stream	2 GPC	1.52E-03	ND	ND	2.17E-04	ND	ND
Spray across stream	3 GPC	2.27E-03	ND	ND	3.25E-04	ND	ND
Spray across stream	4 GPC	3.03E-03	ND	ND	4.33E-04	ND	ND
Spray across stream	6 GPC	4.55E-03	ND	ND	6.50E-04	ND	ND