

Shaugh. No. 080803

Date out of EAB: 6/25/87

To: R. Taylor
Product Manager 25
Registration Division (TS-767)

From: Matthew N. Lorber, Acting Program Manager ^{ML}
Ground Water Program
Exposure Assessment Branch, HED (TS-769)

Attached, please find the environmental fate review of:

Reg./File No.: Control # 86

Chemical: Atrazine

Type Product: Herbicide

Product Name: Atrazine

Company Name: CIBA-GEIGY Corporation

Submission Purposes: Submission of monitoring findings

ACTION CODE: 350

EAB #(s): 70574

Date In: 5/12/87

TAIS Code: 302

Date Completed: 6/24/87

Total Reviewing Time: .1

Monitoring study requested: ☐

Monitoring study voluntarily: ☐

Deferrals To: ☐ Ecological Effects Branch

☐ Residue Chemistry Branch

☐ Toxicology Branch


EVALUATION OF MONITORING DATA

1. CHEMICAL:

Chemical name: 2-chloro-4-ethylamino-6-isopropyl-amino-1,3,5-triazine

Common name: atrazine

Structure:



2. TEST MATERIAL:

Not applicable.

3. STUDY/ACTION TYPE:

Evaluation of monitoring data.

4. STUDY IDENTIFICATION:

Title: letter from Thomas Parshley to Robert Taylor dated April 28, 1987

Author: Thomas J. Parshley, Regulatory Specialist

Submitted by: CIBA-GEIGY Corporation

Agricultural Division

P.O. Box 18300

Greensboro, North Carolina 27419

Control #: 86

Issue Date: May 12, 1987

Accession No: not given

Record No: 195,789

5. REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY:

Matthew N. Lorber, Acting Program Manager
Ground Water Program/EAB/HED

Matthew Lorber Date 6/25/87

6. CONCLUSIONS:

The concentrations reported were not the result of normal use of atrazine, but rather were the result of an unidentified practice at a CIBA-GEIGY production facility.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS:

Results will be filed in EAB appropriately - no recommendations otherwise.

8. BACKGROUND:

According to the cover letter, these findings were submitted "In keeping with the intent of EPA's proposed Interpretive Rule on Adverse Effects", although they pointed out that, "CIBA-GEIGY is not making a finding that this constitutes an adverse effect; rather this letter is being provided for the Agency's information." CIBA-GEIGY has not been able to identify the precise cause of the findings, but will continue to attempt to identify the source, and as well, have submitted a plan to the state of North Carolina for fully investigating the extent of ground water contamination at the Greensboro facility. They also will keep EPA informed of further developments.

9. DISCUSSION

Findings from the two wells, MW-1 and MW-6, were reported as 20 ppb and 190, 212 ppb (the second reading on the second well was identified as "reinjecting"), respectively. Not reported in this letter was information on how many wells were tested for atrazine, nor was there information on location of wells with respect to the buildings at the facility, depth of wells, location of water table, etc.