

Shaughnessy Number: ⁷078001
DP Barcode: 159825

Date Out of EFGWB: APR 10 1991

TO: Eric B. Feris
Special Review and Registration Division (H7508C)

FROM: Michael R. Barrett, Acting Head (H7507C)
Ground Water Section
Environmental Fate & Effects Branch/EFED

THRU: Henry Jacoby, Chief (H7507C) *Henry Jacoby*
Environmental Fate & Effects Branch/EFED

Reg./File #: 078701

Chemical Name: DCPA

Type Product: Herbicide

Company Name: Fermenta ASC Corporation

Purpose: Clarification of Data Package Record - Bean Sheet

Date Received: _____ Action Code: 660

Date Completed: _____ EFGWB#: 91-0304

Summary:

This document is intended to clarify the Bean Sheet associated with EFGWB # 91-0394. Based upon a dialogue with SRRD, the review of all documents pertaining to the "Draft" ground-water monitoring study protocol for DCPA has been completed; no further review is necessary at this time. The submitted information was incorporated in my review, EFGWB # 91-100, dated February 7, 1991.

Reviewed by:

James K. Wolf
Soil Scientist
OPP/EFED/EFGWB/Ground Water Section

Signature: *James K. Wolf*
Date: 4/10/91

Approved by:

Michael R. Barrett
Acting Head
OPP/EFED/EFGWB/Ground Water Section

Signature: *Michael R. Barrett*
Date: 4/10/91

Discussion:

I received a draft protocol document for a pre-meeting review, through Betsy Behl, submitted by Fermenta ASC Corporation to Mr. Eric Feris - dated December 11, 1990 from Mr. Jerry R. Lucietta. However, no Bean Sheet accompanied the submitted package.

Following the meeting, a document was formally submitted which resulted in a bean sheet being issued. The registrant submitted information (12/11/90) including DCPA use for turf grass and other sales information for 1988, 1989, 1990, in response to the November 5, 1990 meeting. There have been no submittals since 12/11/90 concerning this protocol.

This information was incorporated in my review, EFGWB # 91-100, dated February 7, 1991 and DP barcode 157920.

Mr. Eric Ferris of the Special Review and Reregistration Division was able to clear up the confusion concerning the information submitted by the registrant.

In conclusion, all materials submitted by the registrant concerning the "draft" ground-water monitoring protocol have been reviewed and the deficiencies noted.