



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

OFFICE OF  
PREVENTION, PESTICIDES AND  
TOXIC SUBSTANCES

MEMORANDUM

Subject: EPA Reg. No.: 612-8

From: Mark J. Perry, Biologist  
Precautionary Review Section  
Registration Support Branch  
Registration Division (H7505W)

To: Cynthia Giles-Parker, PM 22  
Fungicide-Herbicide Branch  
Registration Division (H7505C)

Thru: Thomas C. Ellwanger, Section Head  
Precautionary Review Section  
Registration Support Branch  
Registration Division (H7505W)

MJP  
8-18-93

Received on  
PM 22 Team  
JAN 10 1994

Applicant: Unocal Corp.  
1201 W. 5th Street  
Los Angeles, CA

FORMULATION FROM LABEL:

	<u>% by wt.</u>
<u>Active Ingredient(s):</u> 2-Hydroxypropionic acid .....	80.0%
<u>Inert Ingredient(s):</u> .....	20.0%
Total:	100%



Recycled/Recyclable  
Printed with Soy/Canola Ink on paper that  
contains at least 50% recycled fiber

2

## BACKGROUND

Unocal Corporation has provided additional data as requested by W. Woodrow (1/30/92) in the review of an inhalation study submitted in support of the product Propel (EPA Reg. No. 612-8). Propel is a plant growth regulator with 2-Hydroxy-propionic acid (80.0%) as the active ingredient. The additional acute inhalation data was submitted under MRID number 426594-01 and the initial study (MRID # 404907-01) was performed by Microbiological Associates, Inc.

## RECOMMENDATION

The data submitted in response to the 1/30/93 PRS review is acceptable. However, after re-review of this study, PRS has additional questions:

a. Under the "Conditions for Animal Exposures" section, the study report states that "Five rats were restrained per unit, 10 per group (5 male and 5 female)." As a result, PRS requests a complete description of the animal exposure chamber including the "unit" component mentioned above. Further, a statement which explains exactly how the animals were exposed and whether or not all ten animals were exposed to the same test atmosphere at the same time is requested.

b. There seems to be some confusion regarding the actual (gravimetric) and the nominal concentrations. On pages 8 and 12 of the study report the nominal concentration is stated to be 7.94 mg/L. However, the study report also states that the "time-weighted average" was 7.94 mg/L. Further, the "time-weighted average" or gravimetric concentration claim is supported by the sampling data. PRS requests that the registrant provide clarification on this point. More specifically, are the nominal and gravimetric concentrations exactly the same? If not, what is the actual nominal concentration for this study?

This study may be upgraded following the submission of the above requested study information.

## LABELING

The appropriate labeling will be determined following the submission of the requested data.

NOTE TO PM: Due to eye and skin irritation, this product meets the criteria for restricted use classification. The PM should decide if the label contains sufficient alternative labeling language to offset the hazard and the need for this classification.

2

ACUTE TOXICITY PROFILE

Acute Oral.....Category III  
Acute Dermal.....Category III  
Acute Inhalation.....Supp  
Eye Irritation.....Category I  
Dermal Irritation.....Category I  
Dermal Sensitization.....Negative

\* See 1/30/92 W. Woodrow review