



7-17-92

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

OFFICE OF
PREVENTION, PESTICIDES
AND TOXIC SUBSTANCES

MEMORANDUM

DP Barcode: D173915, D176273
EFGWB #: 92-0481, 92-0690
PC Code: 012301, 012302

SUBJECT: Bromacil and its Lithium Salt- Label Amendment and Data Waiver Requests submitted by E.I. Du Pont de Nemours and Company. Letters dated October 11, 1990 and January 16, 1992 respectively.

FROM: Dana S. Spatz, Chemist
Chemistry Review Section #2
Environmental Fate and Ground Water Branch
Environmental Fate and Effects Division (H7507C)

TO: Lois Rossi, Chief
Reregistration Branch
Special Review and Reregistration Division (H7508W)

THRU: Emil Regelman, Supervisory Chemist
Chemistry Review Section #2
Environmental Fate and Ground Water Branch
Environmental Fate and Effects Division (H7507C)

Henry Jacoby, Chief
Environmental Fate and Ground Water Branch
Environmental Fate and Effects Division (H7507C)

JUL 17 1992

Du Pont has requested data waivers for several Environmental Fate data requirements and has submitted a label amendment request. EFGWB has the following conclusions on each of these requests.

A. WAIVER OF ALL DATA REQUIREMENTS FOR THE LITHIUM SALT OF BROMACIL

It is Du Pont's position that in the environment, the lithium salt of bromacil does not exist as such under normal conditions because the lithium salt is protonated to form un-ionized bromacil in the pH 2 to 9 range. The pKa of bromacil is 9.1 and the solubility at pH's of environmental significance is 815 ppm.

EFGWB concurs with this assessment and agrees that studies conducted with bromacil can also serve to satisfy the environmental fate data requirements for the lithium salt. The data requirements for the lithium salt should not be waived, but should remain in effect until satisfied by studies conducted with bromacil.

B. **WAIVER OF THE ACCUMULATION IN CONFINED ROTATIONAL CROPS (165-1) DATA REQUIREMENT**

It is Du Pont's position that since alternate crops are not rotated in pineapple or citrus groves, this data requirement does not apply.

This data requirement should be reserved. The only bromacil food crop registrations at this time are citrus and pineapple. These crops are not typically rotated, therefore the data requirement does not apply. However, should additional registrations on other crops be sought in the future, an assessment must then be made if the Accumulation in Confined Rotational Crops study is needed.

C. **WAIVER OF THE LONG-TERM SOIL FIELD DISSIPATION (164-5) DATA REQUIREMENT**

It is Du Pont's position that the soil field dissipation study (MRID 41677101) shows that there is no need for a long term soil dissipation study.

Because the soil field dissipation study is currently under review within the Branch, EFGWB cannot, at this time, draw any conclusions based on that data. However, for compounds such as bromacil, which are persistent (and could trigger the Long-Term Field Dissipation data requirement), and also show a tendency to leach, EFGWB has been favoring the Ground Water Monitoring studies to provide the information necessary to address concerns about the potential for the pesticide and/or its degradates to contaminate ground water. Therefore, the Long-Term Field Dissipation data requirement may be waived.

D. **LABEL REVISION REDEFINING WETLAND AREAS AND EXCLUDING THE USE OF BROMACIL ON AQUATIC SITES**

With the label revision, Du Pont has attempted to; 1) provide a definition of wetlands and 2) exclude the use of the herbicide from the inside of drainage ditches and any other body of water. One of Du Pont's goals with the label revision was to eliminate any use that triggered environmental fate aquatic studies.

EFGWB concurs with the conclusions made in the Agency letter dated December 6, 1990 from Robert Taylor (PM 25) to Ian Wellings (Du Pont) concerning the application for the amended label. However, there is a concern about a particular statement that was added to the label. It is not apparent from the label statement on page 3 of the HYVAR X label under the Brush Control section which states:

"It is permissible to treat the berm of ditches, seasonally dry flood plains, deltas, marshes, swamps, bogs and transitional areas between upland and lowland sites."

that all uses which trigger aquatic studies have been eliminated. With this statement on the label, the imposed aquatic data requirements (162-4, 164-2, 165-3, and 165-5) should remain in effect. If this statement is removed, then these data requirements can be waived.

As for the ground water statement currently in the Environmental Hazards section of the label, EFGWB recommends that it be replaced with the following label statement:

GROUND WATER ADVISORY

"Bromacil is known to leach through soil and has been found in ground water as a result of normal field use. Users are advised not to apply in areas where soils are permeable, particularly where ground water is used for drinking water. Consult with the pesticide state lead agency for information regarding soil permeability and aquifer vulnerability in your area."

E. **WAIVER OF THE AEROBIC AQUATIC METABOLISM, AQUATIC FIELD DISSIPATION, ACCUMULATION IN IRRIGATED CROPS, AND BIOACCUMULATION IN AQUATIC NON-TARGET ORGANISMS STUDIES**

See discussion above.

EPG WB BROMACIL REVIEW

Pages 4 through 8 are not included.

☐ Identity of product inert ingredients.
☐ Identity of product impurities.
☐ Description of the product manufacturing process.
☐ Description of quality control procedures.
☐ Identity of the source of product ingredients.
☐ Sales or other commercial/financial information.
☒ A draft product label: _____
☐ The product confidential statement of formula.
☐ Information about a pending registration action.
☐ FIFRA registration data.
☐ The document is a duplicate of page(s) _____
☐ The document is not responsive to the request.

The information not included is generally considered confidential by product registrants. If you have any questions, please contact the individual who prepared the response to your request.

BROMACIL SOLUBILITY VS PH

