

JR

SHAUGHNESSY NO.

REVIEW NO.

EEB REVIEW

DATE: IN 05/06/86 OUT 07/07/86

FILE OR REG. NO. 8340-13

PETITION OR EXP. PERMIT NO. _____

DATE OF SUBMISSION 12/31/85

DATE RECEIVED BY HED 05/01/86

RD REQUESTED COMPLETION DATE 06/27/86

EEB ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE 06/20/86

RD ACTION CODE/TYPE OF REVIEW 661

TYPE PRODUCT(S): I, D, H, F, N, R, S Insecticide

DATA ACCESSION NO(S). 260674

PRODUCT MANAGER NO. G. LaRocca (15)

PRODUCT NAME(S) Endosulfan

COMPANY NAME American Hoechst Corporation

SUBMISSION PURPOSE Registrant response to previous review

SHAUGHNESSY NO.	CHEMICAL & FORMULATION	% AI
_____	<u>Endosulfan technical</u>	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

29 JUL 1986

OFFICE OF
PESTICIDES AND TOXIC SUBSTANCES

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dana Pillit, Team 15
Insecticide-Rodenticide Branch
Registration Division TS 767C

FROM: John Bascietto *John Bascietto*
Ecological Effects Branch
Hazard Evaluation Division TS 769C

THRU: Douglas Urban, Head Sec. *Douglas Urban*
EEB/HED TS 769C

THRU: Mike Slimak, Chief *Mike Slimak*
EEB/HED TS 769C

SUBJECT: Review of Rebuttal Comments Regarding Avian
Reproduction Study Review: File No. 8340-14:
Endosulfan.

EEB reviewed the rebuttal comments to our previous review of the bobwhite quail reproduction study for endosulfan. There was no acceptable data or explanation therein, which would allow us to upgrade the "invalid" status of the previous reproduction study (Roberts, et al, 1984: Performed by Huntingdon Research, Cambridgeshire, England; submitted by American Hoechst in response to 71-4 generic data requirement for avian reproduction on upland game bird. The study did not meet the requirements of the Pesticide Assessment Guideline 71-4; the status of controls, particularly the amount of control mortality, prevents further consideration of this study.

The registrant is reminded that this requirement is outstanding and, as per the Agency's established time frames for fulfilling generic requirements, a new study (71-4) of an upland game bird will be required to be submitted within twenty-four (24) months from receipt of notification of these findings.

Since no additional mallard duck reproduction study was required, we did not review the comments on the mallard study.

2