

From: [Nancy Golden](#)
To: [Carolyn Marn](#)
Cc: [Gerry McChesney](#); [Sonce deVries](#)
Subject: Re: Fw: Brodifacoum vs. Diphacinone paper
Date: 10/13/2011 08:13 PM

So the issue with this paper is that it contradicts previously bait trials with the same Ramik products. Katie (who performed the previous trials) and Will Pitt (who performed these trials) are trying to figure out why that would be, as both studies appear sound, and there has been no evidence of any bait acceptance issues in field use. There are currently only 3 bait products total for conservation use (2 brodifacoum and 1 diphacinone) and Katie has been gathering data for others, but does not want to move forward until we have complete data sets. It takes a lot to register a new pesticide in a manner that's comprehensive, so it's not an inconsequential step to consider the use of an unregistered product.


Again, more reasons to consult with Katie, she has the most expertise on these issues.

Nancy

▼ [Carolyn Marn/SAC/R1/FWS/DOI](#)

**Carolyn
Marn/SAC/R1/FWS/DOI**

10/13/2011 07:56 PM

To: Nancy Golden/ARL/R9/FWS/DOI@FWS
cc: Gerry McChesney/SFBAY/R1/FWS/DOI@FWS, Sonce deVries/R8/FWS/DOI@FWS
Subject: Re: Fw: Brodifacoum vs. Diphacinone paper 

Gerry,

Here is a recent paper on efficacy of rodenticides for rodents in Hawaii that determined that "Rodenticide products currently registered for use in Hawaii performed less effectively in this study than other available products not yet registered." Only 2 diphacinone bait products are available for use in Hawaii...It would be good to follow-up with them on the field trials.


[attachment "efficacy of baits to rodents.pdf" deleted by Nancy Golden/ARL/R9/FWS/DOI]

Carolyn Marn
Environmental Contaminants Division
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
2800 Cottage Way Room W-2605
Sacramento, CA 95825
(916) 414-6602
fax (916) 414-6713
Carolyn_Marn@fws.gov

▼ Nancy Golden/ARL/R9/FWS/DOI

**Nancy
Golden/ARL/R9/FWS/DOI**

10/13/2011 07:52 AM

To Gerry McChesney/SFBAY/R1/FWS/DOI@FWS
cc Carolyn Marn/SAC/R1/FWS/DOI@FWS, Sonce
deVries/R8/FWS/DOI@FWS
Subject Re: Fw: Brodifacoum vs. Diphacinone paper 

Hi Gerry,

Thanks for the paper and sorry not to get back to you sooner on this and the question of mouse trials with diphacinone. I was out of the office last week and now I've got a sudden and looming deadline on something else, so don't let on that I'm actually take a minute to think about other stuff....

The paper's interesting, but it makes it pretty clear that of 6 aerial attempts for diphacinone, 4 of them might not be due to the rodenticide at all but other factors (so much so that they're rebaiting with diphacinone). The same could probably be said for Lehua (rodenticide use restricted from placement near the shoreline at the 11th hour). Which reduces it to an N of 1 (and an N of 1 for mice eradication attempts), so I think it's hard to draw any definitive conclusions. As you're aware, so many of these eradications have such distinct challenges and circumstances that I'm a bit wary of them being lumped like that. I hope it doesn't appear that I'm denial here, but I think it does a disservice to the science not to ask what the circumstances were that led to the failures.

Concerning the question of whether to go forward with mouse trials for diphacinone, our folks working on large-scale rodent control in Hawaii feel that the lab data supports moving forward with field trials for mice in Hawaii and they already have two field studies funded on the Ramik (diphacinone) bait to test this. I would suggest contacting Katie Swift out there to get a timeline for their studies and how they might be able to inform your decisions. There also might be an opportunity for collaboration to generate data specific to your eradication since they're already moving forward with these trials.

Thanks, Nancy

▼ Gerry McChesney/SFBAY/R1/FWS/DOI

**Gerry
McChesney/SFBAY/R1/FWS/DOI**

To Carolyn Marn/SAC/R1/FWS/DOI@FWS,

10/07/2011 08:50 PM

Nancy Golden/ARL/R9/FWS/DOI@FWS,
Sonce deVries/R8/FWS/DOI@FWS,
vitulano.karen@epa.gov

cc

Subject Fw: Brodifacoum vs. Diphacinone paper

FYI,

Attached is a recent paper summarizing differences in failure rates between Brodifacoum and Diphacinone in island rodent eradication attempts. Basically, Brodifacoum has substantially lower rates of failure, especially in aerial applications. Diphacinone has especially high failure rates in mouse eradication attempts.

We're still working on our alternative selection matrix. It is a very involved process. Also planning for some additional field trials later this fall on the island. I'll be back in touch with more updates soon.

Gerry

Gerry McChesney
Manager, Farallon National Wildlife Refuge and
Common Murre Restoration Project
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge Complex
9500 Thornton Ave.
Newark, CA 94560
Phone: 510-792-0222, ext. 222, cell: 510-435-9151
Fax: 510-745-9285
Email: Gerry_McChesney@fws.gov
<http://www.fws.gov/sfbayrefuges/murre/murrehome.htm>
<http://www.fws.gov/sfbayrefuges/Farallon/>
