

# Canadian Water Quality Guidelines for the Protection of Aquatic Life

# **DICAMBA**

icamba ( $C_6H_6Cl_2O_3$ ) is a herbicide with a CAS name and number of 3,6-dichloro-2-methoxybenzoic acid and 1918-00-9, respectively Trade names include Banvel, Dyvel, and Dycleer. Dicamba was introduced in 1967 by Velsicol Chemical Corporation for use as a herbicide and has been registered in Canada since 1963 (S. Keating, 1992, Agriculture Canada, Ottawa, pers. com.).

Dicamba is characterized by a low vapour pressure (4.5 mPa at 25°C), high water solubility (6.5 g·L $^{-1}$  at 25°C), and stability to oxidation and hydrolysis under typical environmental conditions (Ashton 1982; Tomlin 1994). Dicamba has a low affinity for most soil types, having a low soil—water partition coefficient ( $K_{\rm d}=0{-}0.11~{\rm mL\cdot g^{-1}}$ ). The pKa of dicamba is 1.87, and it forms salts that are appreciably soluble in water (e.g., sodium, potassium, and dimethylammonium salts) (Tomlin 1994).

Dicamba is a selective systemic herbicide that acts as an auxin-like growth regulator used to control more than 50 varieties of annual and perennial broadleaf weeds in lawns (Tomlin 1994; Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada 1997).

Direct contamination of surface water may occur due to nontarget drift from aerial or ground boom spraying operations. Indirect contamination can occur because of runoff from treated areas or leaching into groundwater and subsequent recharging of surface waters. Extreme contamination may result from pesticide spills, deliberate dumping of tank residues, or from equipment-washing operations (CCME 1993).

Contamination of Canadian freshwater sources has been detected in the western provinces, Ontario, and Quebec, where dicamba is primarily used. Detected values range from 0.05 to 517  $\mu g \cdot L^{-1}$  (Frank et al. 1987; Waite et al. 1995).

Microbial degradation appears to be the most important process governing the removal of dicamba if released to water. Photolysis, hydrolysis, volatilization, adsorption to sediment, and bioconcentration are not expected to be significant removal processes (CCME 1993). The half-life of dicamba was found to be <7 d, and the substance was completely dissipated in 40 d (Scifres et al. 1973).

Based on its high solubility in water, low  $K_d$  value, and low log octanol—water partition coefficient (log  $K_{\rm ow}=0.477$ ) (Rao and Davidson 1980; Hansch 1985), it is not likely that significant amounts of dicamba would adsorb onto aquatic sediments. It is also not likely that dicamba would accumulate to a significant extent in the tissues of aquatic organisms. Some accumulation of dicamba in freshwater algae (BCF ~10) was reported in a 32-d microcosm study where concentrations of dicamba in water averaged 0.166 mg·L<sup>-1</sup>, but levels in organisms higher in the food chain where negligible (Yu et al. 1975).

Dicamba is also relatively stable to degradation by hydrolysis in water. Chau and Thompson (1978) observed no detectable degradation of dicamba in either distilled water or in natural lake water over 40- and 50-d periods, respectively. Similarly, Scifres et al. (1973) reported minimal losses (5%) of dicamba over 133 d.

# **Water Quality Guideline Derivation**

The interim Canadian water quality guideline for dicamba for the protection of freshwater life was developed based on the CCCME protocol (CCME 1991).

#### Freshwater Life

Data exist for eight species of freshwater fish representing five families, six of which are native to Canada. Among these species, acutely (24–96-h) toxic concentrations ( $LC_{50}s$ ) of dicamba ranged from 28 to 516 mg·L<sup>-1</sup> (Bohmont 1967; Johnson 1978; Johnson and Finley 1980). These data indicate that dicamba is relatively nontoxic to freshwater fish.

Table 1. Water quality guidelines for dicamba for the protection of aquatic life (CCME 1993).

| Aquatic life | Guideline value (µg·L <sup>-1</sup> ) |  |  |  |  |
|--------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Freshwater   | 10*                                   |  |  |  |  |
| Marine       | ${ m NRG}^{\dagger}$                  |  |  |  |  |

<sup>\*</sup>Interim guideline.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>T</sup>No recommended guideline.

Data on the acute toxicity of dicamba were available for nine species of freshwater invertebrates, representing five families native to North America. The amphipod *Gammarus lacustris* was the most sensitive species tested, with a 96-h LC<sub>50</sub> of 3.9 mg·L<sup>-1</sup> (Sanders 1969). The water flea *Daphnia pulex* was also relatively sensitive to dicamba (48-h LC<sub>50</sub> = 11 mg·L<sup>-1</sup>) (Sanders and Cope 1966; Hulbert 1975). It was not possible to rate the sensitivities of the other invertebrate species tested as LC<sub>50</sub> values were all greater than the highest test concentration administered. These data suggest that freshwater invertebrates are comparatively more sensitive to the toxic effects of dicamba than fish. This substance, however, should be considered only slightly toxic to aquatic invertebrate species, as it was for fish.

Data are available from a single study on the effects of dicamba on 14 species of green algae (Chlorophyceae). These data suggest that freshwater algae exhibit a wide range of sensitivities to this substance. Reported EC<sub>50</sub>s for green algae ranged from 100 to >10 000  $\mu g \cdot L^{-1}$  (Cullimore 1975). The interim water quality guideline for dicamba for the protection of freshwater life is 10  $\mu g \cdot L^{-1}$  (CCME 1993). It was derived by multiplying the LOEL of 100  $\mu g \cdot L^{-1}$  for the green alga *Hormidium barlowi* (Cullimore 1975) by a safety factor of 0.1 (CCME 1991).

| Toxicity information             |                              | Species           | Toxicity endpoint        |          | Concentration (µg·L <sup>-1</sup> ) |          |          |     |   |  |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|----------|----------|-----|---|--|
| Acute                            | Vertebrates                  | O. mykiss         | 96-h LC <sub>50</sub>    | <u> </u> |                                     |          |          |     |   |  |
|                                  |                              | G. affinis        | 24-h LC <sub>50</sub>    | :        |                                     |          |          |     |   |  |
|                                  |                              | G. affinis        | 48-h LC <sub>50</sub>    | l:       |                                     |          |          |     |   |  |
|                                  |                              | G. affinis        | 96-h LC <sub>50</sub>    |          |                                     |          |          |     | 0 |  |
|                                  | Invertebrates                | G. lacustris      | 24-h LC <sub>50</sub>    | <u> </u> |                                     |          |          |     |   |  |
|                                  |                              | G. lacustris      | 48-h LC <sub>50</sub>    | :        |                                     |          |          |     |   |  |
|                                  |                              | G. lacustris      | 96-h LC <sub>50</sub>    | :        |                                     |          |          |     |   |  |
| Chronic                          | Plants                       | C. subellipsoidea | 5-30-d EC <sub>50</sub>  | i:       |                                     |          |          |     |   |  |
|                                  |                              | C. subellipsoidea | 5-30-d EC <sub>100</sub> | l:       |                                     |          |          |     |   |  |
|                                  |                              | H. barlowi        | 5-30-d EC <sub>50</sub>  | l:       | •                                   |          |          |     |   |  |
|                                  |                              | H. barlowi        | 5-30-d EC <sub>100</sub> |          |                                     |          |          |     |   |  |
| Canadian Water Quality Guideline |                              | Ŀ                 |                          |          |                                     |          |          |     |   |  |
| 10 μg·L <sup>-1</sup>            |                              |                   | <u> </u>                 |          |                                     |          |          |     |   |  |
|                                  |                              |                   | $10^{1}$                 | $10^{2}$ | $10^{3}$                            | $10^{4}$ | $10^{5}$ | 106 |   |  |
| □ S6                             | ■ secondary ● critical value |                   |                          |          | Canadian Guideline                  |          |          |     |   |  |

Figure 1. Select freshwater toxicity data for dicamba.

#### References

Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada. 1997. Regulatory Information on Pesticide Products (RIPP) Database (CCINFODISK). Issue 97-3. Produced by Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada and distributed by the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety. CD-ROM.

Ashton, F. 1982. Persistence and biodegradation of herbicides. In: Biodegradation of pesticides. F. Matsumura and C.R. Krishna Murti, eds. Plenum Press, New York. Bohmont, B.L. 1967. Toxicity of herbicides to livestock, fish, honeybees, and wildlife. In: Proceedings: 20th West. Weed Control Conf. 21:25–27.

CCME (Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment). 1991. Appendix IX—A protocol for the derivation of water quality guidelines for the protection of aquatic life (April 1991). In: Canadian water quality guidelines, Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers. 1987. Prepared by the Task Force on Water Quality Guidelines. [Updated and reprinted with minor revisions and editorial changes in Canadian environmental quality guidelines, Chapter 4, Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, 1999, Winnipeg.]

. 1993. Appendix XII—Canadian water quality guidelines: Updates (March 1993), bromoxynil, dicamba, and diclofop-methyl. In: Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers. 1987. Canadian water quality guidelines. Prepared by the Task Force on Water Quality Guidelines.

Chau, A.S.Y., and K. Thompson. 1978. Investigations of the integrity of seven herbicide acids in water samples. J. Assoc. Off. Anal. Chem. 61:1481–1485.

Cullimore, D.R. 1975. The *in vitro* sensitivity of some species of Chlorophyceae to a selected range of herbicides. Weed Res. 15:401–406

Frank, R., B.S. Clegg, B.D. Ripley, and H.E. Braun. 1987.Investigations of pesticide contaminations in rural wells, 1979–1984.Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 16:9–22.

Hansch, C. 1985. Medchem Project. Issue 26. Pomona College, Claremont, CA.

Hulbert, S.H. 1975. Secondary effects of pesticides on aquatic ecosystems. Residue Rev. 57:81–148.

Johnson, C.R. 1978. Herbicide toxicities in the mosquito fish, Gambusia affinis. Proc. R. Soc. Queensl. 89:25–27.

Johnson, W.W., and M.T. Finley. 1980. Handbook of acute toxicity of chemicals to fish and aquatic invertebrates. U.S. Fish Wildl. Serv. Resour. Publ. 137. U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, DC.

Rao, P.S.C., and J.M. Davidson. 1980. Estimation of pesticide retention and transformation parameters required in non-point source pollution models. In: Environmental impacts of non-point source pollution, M.R. Overcash and J.M. Davidson, eds. Ann Arbor Science Publishers, Inc., Ann Arbor, MI.

Sanders, H.O. 1969. Toxicity of pesticides to the crustacean *Gammarus lacustris*. U.S. Fish Wildl. Serv. Tech. Pap. 25. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Columbia, MO.

Sanders, H.O., and O.B. Cope. 1966. Toxicities of several pesticides to two species of cladocerans. Trans. Am. Fish Soc. 95:165–169.

Scifres, C.J., T.J. Allen, C.L. Leinweber, and K.H. Pearson. 1973. Dissipation and phytotoxicity of dicamba residues in water. J. Environ. Qual. 2:306–309.

Tomlin, C. (ed.). 1994. The pesticide manual: A world compendium. 10th ed. (Incorporating the Agrochemicals handbook.) British Crop Protection Council and Royal Society of Chemistry, Thornton Heath, LTK

Waite, D.T., R. Grover, N. D. Westcott, D.G. Irvine, L.A. Kerr, and H. Sommerstad. 1995. Atmospheric deposition of pesticides in a small southern Saskatchewan watershed. Environ. Toxicol. Chem. 7(14):1171–1175.

Yu, C.C., D.J. Hansen, and G.M. Booth. 1975. Fate of dicamba in a model ecosystem. Illinois Natural History Survey and Illinois Agricultural Experiment Station, Urbana, IL.

# Canadian Water Quality Guidelines for the Protection of Aquatic Life

**DICAMBA** 

### Reference listing:

Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment. 1999. Canadian water quality guidelines for the protection of aquatic life: Dicamba. In: Canadian environmental quality guidelines, 1999, Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, Winnipeg.

For further scientific information, contact:

Environment Canada Guidelines and Standards Division 351 St. Joseph Blvd. Hull, QC K1A 0H3

Phone: (819) 953-1550
Facsimile: (819) 953-0461
E-mail: ceqg-rcqe@ec.gc.ca
Internet: http://www.ec.gc.ca

© Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment 1999 Excerpt from Publication No. 1299; ISBN 1-896997-34-1 For additional copies, contact:

CCME Documents c/o Manitoba Statutory Publications 200 Vaughan St.

Winnipeg, MB R3C 1T5 Phone: (204) 945-4664 Facsimile: (204) 945-7172

E-mail: spccme@chc.gov.mb.ca

Aussi disponible en français.