10	CAS No.: 88-06-2	Substance: 2,4,6-Trichlorop	henol
Chemic	cal Substances Control Law	Reference No.: 3-931 (Trich	lorophenol (and its sodium salts)
PRTR	Law Cabinet Order No.: 1-28	37	
Molecu	ılar Formula: C ₆ H ₃ Cl ₃ O	Structural Formula:	ОН
	ılar Weight: 197.45		
			Ċı

1. General information

The aqueous solubility of this substance is 690 mg/1,000g (25°C), the partition coefficient (1-octanol/water) (log K_{ow}) is 3.69, and the vapor pressure is 0.024 mmHg (3.2 Pa) (25°C). Biodegradability (aerobic degradation) is judged to be good. Furthermore, its half-life for hydrolysis exceeds 8×10⁶ years (neutrality).

This substance is designated as a Class 1 Designated Chemical Substance under the Law Concerning Reporting, etc. of Releases to the Environment of Specific Chemical Substances and Promoting Improvements in Their Management (PRTR Law). The main uses of this substance are as a raw material for dyestuffs and bactericides, and as preservatives for timber. The production and import quantity from fiscal 2011 to fiscal 2013 was not disclosed because the number of reporting businesses was not more than two.

2. Exposure assessment

Total release to the environment in fiscal 2013 under the PRTR Law was 0 t. In addition, approximately 0.037 t was transferred to waste materials. The sole source of reported releases was the chemical industry. Predictions of proportions distributed to individual media by using a Mackay-type level III fugacity model indicated that if equal quantities were released to the atmosphere, water bodies, and soil, the proportions distributed to soil and water bodies would be largest.

The maximum expected concentration of exposure to humans via inhalation, based on general environmental atmospheric data, was around less than $0.013 \ \mu g/m^3$. The maximum expected oral exposure was estimated to be around $0.0011 \ \mu g/kg/day$ on the basis of calculations from data for public freshwater bodies. In addition, past data show that estimating oral exposure through ingestion of fish for a limited water body area using seawater data is likely to be higher than when using public freshwater body data.

The predicted environmental concentration (PEC), which indicates exposure to aquatic organisms, was reported to be around 0.027 μ g/L for public freshwater bodies and around 0.004 μ g/L for seawater. Furthermore, although the data are not from within the past 10 years, there is a report (1997) of around 5.4 μ g/L in a survey of a limited area of seawater.

3. Initial assessment of health risk

This substance is severely irritating to the eyes, skin and respiratory tract. Contact with the eyes or skin causes redness and pain. Inhalation of the substance causes coughs and sore throat. Oral exposure to the substance causes vomiting, burning sensation and diarrhea.

As sufficient information on the carcinogenicity of the substance was not available, the initial assessment was conducted on the basis of information on its non-carcinogenic effects.

The NOAEL of 0.3 mg/kg/day for oral exposure (based on liver weight gain), determined from reproductive and developmental toxicity tests in rats, was divided by a factor of 10 to account for extrapolation from

sub-chronic to chronic exposure. The obtained value of 0.030 mg/kg/day was deemed to be the lowest reliable dose and was identified as the 'non-toxic level*' of the substance for oral exposure.

The 'non-toxic level*' for inhalation exposure could not be identified.

With regard to oral exposure, assuming the substance is absorbed via public freshwater bodies, the predicted maximum exposure level was approximately 0.0011 µg/kg/day. The MOE (Margin of Exposure) would be 550, when calculated from the predicted maximum exposure level and the 'non-toxic level*' of 0.030 mg/kg/day, and subsequently divided by a factor of 10 to account for extrapolation from animals to humans and another factor of 5 to account for carcinogenicity. Therefore, no further work would be required at present to assess the health risk of this substance via oral exposure. It should be noted that the MOE could be less than 100, if the oral exposure level is determined based on the 1997 data of some enclosed marine areas, with the assumption that the substance is ingested via fish.

With regard to inhalation exposure, owing to lack of identified 'non-toxic level*', the health risk could not be assessed. For comparison, assuming that 100% of the ingested substance is absorbed, the 'non-toxic level*' of inhalation exposure, derived by converting that of oral exposure, would be 0.1 mg/m^3 . The MOE would be over 150, when calculated from the converted 'non-toxic level*' of inhalation exposure and the predicted maximum exposure concentration of less than 0.013 µg/m^3 approximately, and subsequently divided by a factor of 10 to account for extrapolation from animals to humans and another factor of 5 to account for carcinogenicity. Therefore, collection of further information would not be required to assess the health risk of this substance via inhalation in ambient air.

Toxicity						Exposure assessment						
Exposure Path	Criteria fo	Criteria for risk assessment		Animal	Criteria for diagnoses (endpoint)	Exposure medium	Predicted maximum exposure dose and concentration		Result of risk assessment			Judgment
	Non toxic				Increased	Drinking water		µg/kg/day	MOE	_	×	
Oral	'Non-toxic level*'	0.030 mg/kg/day	Rat	Increased liver weight	Public freshwater bodies	0.0011	µg/kg/day	MOE	550	0	0	
Inhalation	'Non-toxic		m a /m ³	_	_	Ambient air	< 0.013	$\mu g/m^3$	MOE	_	×	(())
malation	level*'		— mg/m ³			Indoor air	—	$\mu g/m^3$	MOE	_	×	×

Non-toxic level *

- When a LOAEL is available, it is divided by 10 to obtain a NOAEL-equivalent level.
- When an adverse effect level for the short-term exposure is available, it is divided by 10 to obtain a level equivalent to an adverse effect level for the long-term exposure.

4. Initial assessment of ecological risk

With regard to acute toxicity, the following reliable data were obtained: a 96-h EC₅₀ of 820 μ g/L for growth inhibition in the green algae *Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata*, a 48-h EC₅₀ of 1,170 μ g/L for swimming inhibition in the crustacean *Daphnia magna*, a 96-h LC₅₀ of 410 μ g/L in the fish species *Lepomis macrochirus* (bluegill), and a 96-h LC₅₀ of 1,200 μ g/L for the African clawed frog *Xenopus laevis*. Accordingly, based on these acute toxicity values and an assessment factor of 100, a predicted no effect concentration (PNEC) of 4.1 μ g/L was obtained.

With regard to chronic toxicity, the following reliable data were obtained: a 21-d NOEC of 500 µg/L for reproductive inhibition in the crustacean *D. magna*, an NOEC of 970 µg/L for mortality or 30-d post-hatching growth inhibition in the fish species *Pimephales promelas* (fathead minnow), and a 48-h NOEC of 300 µg/L for reproductive inhibition in the marine rotifer *Brachionus calyciflorus*. Accordingly, based on these chronic toxicity values and an assessment factor of 100, a PNEC of 5 µg/L was obtained.

The value of 4.1 μ g/L obtained from the acute toxicity to the fish species was used as the PNEC for this substance.

The PEC/PNEC ratio is 0.007 for freshwater bodies and 0.001 for seawater. Accordingly, further work is considered unnecessary at this time. Furthermore, although not reported within the past 10 years, there is a report (1997) of around 5.4 μ g/L for a limited area of seawater. Because the ratio of this concentration to the PNEC is 1.3, no further collection of data regarding this area of seawater is considered necessary.

]	Hazard Assessment (Basis for PNEC)				Predicted no	Exposure Assessment			Judgment	
	Species	Acute/ chronic	Endpoint	Assessment Coefficient	effect concentration PNEC (µg/L)	Water body	Predicted environmental concentration PEC (µg/L)	PEC/PNEC ratio	based on PEC/PNEC ratio	Assessment result
	Fish		LC ₅₀	100		Freshwater	0.027	0.007	((
	(bluegill)	Acute	mortality	100	4.1	Seawater	0.004	0.001	0	0

	Conclusions						
	Oral exposure	No need for further work at present.					
Health risk	Inhalation Although risk to human health could not be confirmed, collection of further information would not be required.						
Ecological risk	No need for fu	irther work at present.	0				
[Risk judgmer	nts] O: No ne	ed for further work A: Requiring information collection					
	: Candio	dates for further work ×: Impossibility of risk characterization					
(\bigcirc) : Although risk to human health could not be confirmed, collection of furth							
	informatio	on would not be required.					
	(▲) · Fui	rther information collection would be required for risk characterization	m.				