			Dat	e out of	EAB	JUL	2	1987
			Sha	ughnessy	No:	090501 080803 100101 035506	-A	i lachlor
To:	Product	iamporcaro Manager ation Division	(TS-767)		1	101101 108801 080807	)	etolaci
From:	Environm Exposure	K. Offutt, Chinental Processe Assessment Br Evaluation Divi	es and Guide	lines Se	ction		-B	utylate
Attache	ed, pleas	e find the EAE	review of.	• •		* 8		
Reg./Fi	lle #:							
Chemica	al Name:	property of the property of the same of th	Alternatives	_		The same of the sa	- - -	ofile
•			rifluralin,	Butylate	e (gr	ound	-	•
Tuna Pr	odvat .		oring only)		·		-	
Type Pr Product	•	Herbicide	-1.		· · · · · · · ·	<del> </del>		
Company	-	Monsanto	alternatives	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		4-	<del>-</del>	
Purpose	-		985 Surface	and Grou	ınd W	ater		
	Screening	Results for						
Action (	Code:	870	EAB #(s):	70164 a	nd 7	0240		
Date Red	ceived:1/	/5/87 & 2/5/87	TAIS Code	<b>.</b>	<del></del>			
		7/1/87		iewing T	ime:	7		
		requested:						
Monitori	ing study	voluntarily s	submitted: X					
Deferral	s to:	Ecolo	gical Effect	s Branch				
		Residu	e Chemistry	Branch				
		Y Torico	logy Pranch					

#### 1. CHEMICALS:

C			Shaughnessy	No.
Common	names:	Alachlor	090501	
		Atrazine	080803	
		Cyanazine	100101	
		Linuron	035506	
		Metribuzin	101101	
		Metolachlor	108801	
		Simazine	080807	
		Trifluralin	036101	
		Butylate (Ground	041405	
		Water Monitorin	g	
		Only)		

#### 2. TEST MATERIAL:

Surface and/or ground water

### 3. STUDY/ACTION TYPE:

Review of 1985 Surface and Ground Water Screening Results for chemicals, listed above, which are alternatives to Monsanto's herbicide product, alachlor. This study was voluntarily conducted by Monsanto and submitted in response to the May 7, 1986, request by EPA.

### 4. STUDY IDENTIFICATION:

Title: "Analytical Results from Surface and Ground Water Monitoring for Selected Herbicides Conducted by Monsanto Company During 1985," Four Volumes, R.D. No. 691.

Author: Compiled by S.R. Meunch Submitted By: Monsanto Company

Submitted By: Monsanto Company
Issue Date: June 25, 1986
Pack No.: 19,770 and 19,982
Record No.: 187,391 and 189,067
Accession No.: 265,683 and 265,683
EAB No.: 70,164 and 70,240

### 5. REVIEWED BY:

Chemist
Environmental Processes and Guidelines Section, EAB 7/:/87

### 6. APPROVED\_BY:

Carolyn K. Offutt, Chief
Environmental Processes and Guidelines Section
Exposure Assessment Branch, HED (TS-769C)

7/2/87

### 7. CONCLUSIONS:

Quantitative conclusions concerning the amount of atrazine, cyanazine, linuron, metolachlor, metribuzin, simazine, trifluralin, and butylate in surface and ground water monitored by Monsanto are included in the attached tables. Data submitted are insufficient to allow validation. Exact sample locations must also be clarified for the reported data.

Although the monitoring data are inconclusive due to problems in quality control and proper confirmatory analyses, the following generalizations appear to be true:

- a. Herbicides found in untreated, raw surface water also appear to be present in treated, tap water.
- b. Concentrations of herbicides in tap water often are almost as high as concentrations in raw water.
- c. Surface water concentrations (unconfirmed) of atrazine were, by far, the highest—up to 22.0 ppb maximum, with an annualized mean concentration (AMC) or estimated yearly average concentration of 5.98 ppb. Contamination due to cyanazine and metolachlor peaked at maximums of 8.8 ppb and 9.2 ppb with AMC's estimated at 2.3 ppb and 2.0 ppb, respectively. Simazine, linuron and metribuzin maximum concentrations were 1.2 ppb, 1.0 ppb and 0.7 ppb, respectively, and had estimated AMC's between 0.2-0.4 ppb. Only trifluralin was reported to be less than or equal to the detection limit (0.2 ppb) at all locations.
- d. Ground water screening (unconfirmed) for July 1985 samples showed that maximum concentrations were atrazine, 6.5 ppb; cyanazine, 4.5 ppb; metolachlor, 0.4 ppb; and butylate, 0.4 ppb. No more than than 14 of 243 wells screened were positive for any of the four herbicides monitored (this is less than 6% of the total wells).
- e. Maximum confirmed concentration of ground water sampled October 1985 showed metolachlor contamination in a well site in Hertford, NC was 48.0 ppb (this site had no detectable screening values reported in July 1985)! This amount is over 100x higher than the highest amount of metolachlor found in any well during previous July 1985 screening. Monsanto should clarify whether any sample was taken in Hertford, NC in July 1985. Maximum confirmed ground water contamination for atrazine was 2.0 ppb. Either no confirmation test was completed for cyanazine or butylate or neither pesticide was present in October 1985. Monsanto should clarify which is the

case in a revised submission. They should make clear also exactly how many samples were taken at any time, and how many of those were positive. This is not always clear from their tables.

The analytical methods used to detect the above eight herbicides in surface and well water were not reviewed because insufficient quality assurance information was provided.

### 3. RECOMMENDATIONS:

The monitoring data submitted for atrazine, cyana-zine, linuron, metolachlor, metribuzin, simazine, trifluralin, and butylate should be considered unvalidated and preliminary.

Additional quality assurance information is necessary to validate the data, including information listing which positive samples were confirmed to be positive with the more reliable gas chromatography/mass spectrophotometry (GC/MS) method (if any) and which samples were unconfirmed positives (See Discussion section for details).

The specific city and state location for each sample should be clarified by Monsanto in a revised submission for the results to be meaningful.

If the quality assurance and location information is adequately furnished in a future submission from Monsanto, the data may be validated following their review.

The Agency may wish to consider omitting these data from the Alachlor PD4 due to the uncertainty of the data. If the data are included, appropriate language should describe the uncertainty of the reported values.

### 9. BACKGROUND:

Surface and ground water screening of herbicides atrazine, cyanazine, linuron, metolachlor, metribuzin, simazine, trifluralin, and butylate was reported by Monsanto (competitor to the manufacturers of the alternative herbicides). This study was voluntarily conducted by Monsanto and submitted in duplicate, in response to a May 7, 1986, request by EPA, first on January 5, 1987, and then later on February 5, 1987. The Special Review Branch has requested that EAB complete this review for consideration in developing the Alachlor PD4. A preliminary summary of the data was submitted to David Giamporcaro, Product Manager, on January 22, 1987. In response to another request by EPA (June 26, 1987),

Monsanto sent a July 1, 1987, letter which waives any claims to confidentiality of the data in the subject report.

#### 10. DISCUSSION:

## A. Analytical Methodology

Review of the analytical methodology used for the eight herbicides monitored in this study will be considered if additional information is received in future submissions by Monsanto. Although the methods may be satisfactory, not enough quality assurance information is given for each of the eight herbicides monitored to comment on the validity of the data or the methodology.

Additional quality assurance data is needed as follows:

- \* Purity of all reference standards.
- \* The recovery percentages which were obtained for each of the eight herbicides at concentrations comparable to those found in the samples.
- \* Analytical results for "negative control" or blank samples.
- \* Analytical results for "positive control" or spiked samples.
- \* All duplicate results. Needed to determine repeatability of results (as opposed to a simple average, which was given)  $_{\bullet}$
- \* Plots of standard concentrations versus machine reading -to determine level of skill and care of the analyst as
  well as method reliability for all herbicides.
- \* Plots of sample concentrations (including duplicate value) and machine reading to determine level of skill and care of the analyst as well as method reliability for all herbicides.
- \* Sample calculations for each herbicide.
- \* Storage stability data for each herbicide.
- \* Data concerning the amount of time between sampling and analysis for each herbicide.
- \* Presence or absence of confirmatory results such as GC/MS to ensure that positive values are really positive and to determine the amount of error associated with their quantitative values.

- \* Data listing preliminary screening values and the corresponding values resulting from the confirmatory method for each herbicide to help detect any bias in the screening method which is not present in the longer, but more accurate, confirmatory method.
- \* Exact city and state for each location submitted. All the surface water results listed only the city name. In addition, the exact identity of ground water samples often appears as if it may be in error.

Because of the almost total lack of demonstrated quality assurance information given with this submission, this monitoring information should be considered only as a possible supplement to validated studies. Unless the petitioner submits additional quality assurance information, and confirms the reliability of the data, the data probably are not appropriate for the basis of regulatory decision by the Agency.

These data should be considered for  $\underline{\text{exclusion}}$  in the PD4 for the reasons given below:

- 1) the questionable validity of the data,
- 2) the lack of proper quality assurance information,
- 3) the analytical methods are not validated, and
- 4) the lack of definite identity of samples.

## B. Monitoring Results

Monsanto's monitoring of <u>surface water</u> herbicides should be considered preliminary due to lack of quality control information. The reported results are incomplete without additional clarification of the state associated with each city listed by "location." None of the surface water positive results were reported to be validated with a confirmatory method.

The identity of the locations listed for all the surface water monitoring were given by city only; no identity of state was mentioned anywhere in this review. It is very likely that the states associated with these cities correspond to those which were reported previously, in the PD 2/3, namely the following:

City Screened Surface Water Herbicide Contamination	for	Most Likely State for the Reported City
BETHANY		МО
BLANCHESTER		ОН
BREESE		IL
CHARLESTON		IL
CLARINDA		IA
COLUMBUS		OH
DAVENPORT	ě.	IA
DECATUR		IL
GREENVILLE		NC
KANKAKEE		IL
LEXINGTON		MO
MARION		IL
MI. CITY		IN
MONROE		MI
MOUNT VERNON		IN
MUNCIE		IN
PIQUA		ОН
OUINCA	·	IL
RICHMOND		IN
ROANOKE RAPDS		NC
TOLEDO	1	OH
U OF IOWA		IA
WYACONDA	İ	MO
YPSILANTI	i	IM

However, the exact location of these surface water monitoring samples should be explicitly reported in a revised submission from Monsanto.

Monsanto monitoring of ground water herbicides should also be considered preliminary due to quality control questions. Although both city and state are given for the ground water data, they should be verified if they are to have any meaning; e.g., is it really Decatur, IN, or IL; is it Tift, GA, or should it be Tifton, GA? Although ground water results for October 1985 were reportedly confirmed with GC/MS, the corresponding screening results were not given. No conclusion may be reached, therefore, by contrasting screening results with GC/MS results. Accuracy of all the screening results, including all the surface water results and all the July 1985 well water results, should be validated by confirmatory analyses and submission of QA/QC information. It is significant that only four out of twelve locations which screened positive in July of 1985 were confirmed to be positive in October of that same year, i.e., less than 34% were confirmed positive in the later month. Insufficient data is present to determine whether this is due to seasonal variance in ground water contamination or excessive positive samples reported by

the screening method. If the latter is the case, the number of positive herbicides reported may well be overestimated by the screening method at least by a factor of 3x higher than they should have been.

Review of the unvalidated screening of the selected herbicides in surface water shows that when herbicides are present in raw water, they are usually also present in finished (tap) water. Monsanto data suggests that the treatment of raw water usually reduces the maximum concentration of the herbicide only by 50% or less in the finished water. Details concerning the level of water treatment at each location were not given; however, it is likely that use of granualted activated carbon filters could reduce the herbicide concentration in finished water (This is an extremely expensive solution which is not practical in many locations).

Details concerning reported values are summarized in the tables.

Briefly, in finished surface water, maximum values of herbicides and annualized mean concentrations (AMCs) were as follows:

Herbicide	Finished Surface Maximum Weekly Concentration (ppb)	Water Annualized Mean Concentration (ppb)
Atrazine	22.20 (in Blanchester)	5.98
Cyanazine	8.78 (in Blanchester)	2.28
Linuron	0.96 (in Picqua)	0.22
Metolachlor	9.15 (in Columbus)	2.05
Metribuzin	0.72 (in Mt. Vernon)	0.21
Simazine	1.24 (in Richmond)	0.37
Trifluralin	<pre>     Detection limit at all     locations (&lt;0.20 ppb) </pre>	<pre>     Detection limit at all     locations (&lt;0.20 ppb) </pre>
Alachlor*	10.9* (in Columbus, OH)	1.4*

<sup>\*</sup>from "Alachlor Special Review Technical Support Document" (Table E)

In ground water, the following results were reported (See attached table for more details):

Alachlor*		
Metolachlor	0.37 (in Pulaski, IN) Only 12 of 243 wells were positive	48.0 (in Hertford, NC)
Cyanazine	4.5 (in Iroquois, IL) Only 3 of 243 wells were positive	<del>*</del>
Butylate	0.38 (in Miller, GA) Only 1 of 243 wells was positive	. <del></del>
Herbicide Atrazine	Ground Water Maximum Concentration (ppb) 7/85 Screening 6.5 (in Decatur, IN) Only 14 of 243 wells were positive	Maximum Concentration Confirmed 10/85 (ppb) 2.0 (in Decatur, IN)

<sup>\*</sup>from "Review of Ground Water Monitoring Study," completed 4/17/87, by Matthew Lorber, EAB #6871-2

The "Analytical Results from Surface and Ground Water Monitoring for Selected Herbicides Conducted by Monsanto During 1985," submitted JUNE 25, 1986 (4 Volumes), is summarized in the attached tables. They contain monitoring information for the following chemicals in surface and ground water:

ATRAZINE
CYANAZINE
LINURON
METOLACHLOR
METRIBUZIN
SIMAZINE
TRIFLURALIN
BUTYLATE (GROUND WATER ONLY)

# 11. COMPLETION OF ONE-LINER:

Not applicable.

## 12. CBI APPENDIX:

Not applicable.

# TABLE 1 - ATRAZINE IN CWS

## FINISHED WATER

BETHANY BLANCHESTER BREESE CHARLESTON CLARINDA COLUMBUS DAVENPORT DECATUR GREENVILLE KANKAKEE LEXINGTON MARION MI. CITY MONROE MOUNT VERNON MUNCIE PIQUA QUINCY RICHMOND ROANOKE RAPDS TOLEDO U OF IOWA WYACONDA	4/24/85 6/4/85 5/29/85 8/21/85 none 12/25/85 5/10 5/2 5/8 6/10 5/8	<pre>&lt;0.20-1.64 &lt;0.20-3.11 &lt;0.20-1.59 &lt;0.20 &lt;0.20-0.26 &lt;0.20-4.62 &lt;0.20-7.31 &lt;0.20-1.73 &lt;0.20-1.24</pre>	0.55-0.57 5.96-5.98 2.00-2.02 0.22-0.26 0.61-0.67 4.11-4.13 0.09-0.22 0.52-0.58 0.02-0.20 0.37-0.44 0.59-0.63 0.48-0.55 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.60-0.68 0.68-0.78 0.38-0.44 0.41-0.45 2.04-2.09 0.00-0.20 0.01-0.20 0.57-0.61	MEAN	CONC*
WYACONDA	4/12	0.32-1.13	0.60-0.63		
YPSILANTI	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		

LOCATION	DATE OF MAX	RANGE OF CONC(PPB)	ANNUALIZED MEAN CONC*
BETHANY	5/2/85	0.48-1.13	0.63-0.66
BLANCHESTER	7/10/85	0.30-22.77	6.38-6.40
BREESE	6/6/85	<0.20-18.84	1.97-2.00
CHARLESTON	6/12/85	<0.20-0.60	0.29-0.32
CLARINDA	6/26/85	<0.20-3.86	0.65-0.71
COLUMBUS	5/8/85	0.99-24.31	4.67-4.69
DAVENPORT	5/14/85	<0.20-1.20	0.28-0.33
DECATUR	7/16/85	<0.20-1.52	0.56-0.61
GREENVILLE	4/17/85	<0.20-0.59	0.06-0.21
KANKAKEE	6/4/85	<0.20-1.42	0.40-0.45
LEXINGTON	5/29/85	0.23-5.43	0.96-1.00
MARION	7/10/85	<0.20-1.31	0.58-0.62
MI. CITY	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MONROE	7/31+8/7	<0.20-0.58	0.18-0.27
MOUNT VERNON	5/10	<0.20-4.80	0.74-0.79
MUNCIE	5/2	<0.20-4.52	0.60-0.65
PIQUA	5/8	0.21-2.42	0.60-0.62
QUINCY	4/29	<0.20-1.33	0.40-0.45
RICHMOND	5/8	-9.07	2.23-2.27
ROANOKE RAPDS		0.26	0.00-0.20
TOLEDO	11/18	-0.35	0.10-0.22
U OF IOWA	5/29	<0.20-2.76	0.60-0.65
WYACONDA	5/14	0.35-1.85	0.86-0.90
YPSILANTI	7/16	<0.20-0.31	
	// 10	VU. ZU-U. 3 I	0.06-0.21

<sup>\*</sup>LOW AMC VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.00 PPB; HIGH VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.20 PPB; /D
THE LIMITS OF DETECTION WERE REPORTED AS 0.20 PPB

# TABLE 2 - CYANAZINE IN CWS

## FINISHED WATER

LOCATION BETHANY BLANCHESTER BREESE CHARLESTON CLARINDA COLUMBUS DAVENPORT DECATUR GREENVILLE KANKAKEE LEXINGTON MARION MI. CITY MONROE MOUNT VERNON MUNCIE PIQUA QUINCY RICHMOND ROANOKE RAPDS TOLEDO U OF IOWA WYACONDA	6/26/85 7/03/85 7/9/85 5/22/85 7/17/85 none none 5/10 5/2 5/1 4/29 5/8 none none 5/21 8/19	RANGE OF CONC(PPB)  0.53-1.02  <0.20-8.78  <0.20-2.68  <0.20-0.23  <0.20-1.30  <0.20-4.04  <0.20-0.25  <0.20-0.33  <0.20-0.33  <0.20-0.21  <0.20-0.59  <0.20-0.29  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20-1.36  <0.20-1.36  <0.20-0.44  <0.20-0.45  <0.20-0.45  <0.20-0.45  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20  <0.20	0.65-0.67 2.22-2.28 0.35-0.46 0.00-0.20 0.33-0.43 0.58-0.67 0.03-0.20 0.10-0.22 0.00-0.20 0.06-0.21 0.07-0.22 0.01-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.13-0.27 0.05-0.23 0.09-0.23 0.10-0.24 0.65-0.73 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.01-0.20
YPSILANTI	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20

LOCATION BETHANY	DATE OF MAX	RANGE OF CONC(PPB)	
	4/25/85	0.76-1.66	0.85-0.89
BLANCHESTER	7/17/85	<0.20-12.44	2.97-3.02
BREESE	4/26/85	<0.20- 2.76	0.30-0.40
CHARLESTON	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
CLARINDA	6/26/85	<0.20-2.60	0.45-0.52
COLUMBUS	5/8/85	<0.20- 6.40	0.80-0.89
DAVENPORT	5/14/85	<0.20-0.49	0.06-0.21
DECATUR	7/23/85	<0.20-0.38	0.09-0.23
GREENVILLE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
KANKAKEE	5/28/85	<0.20-0.45	0.04-0.21
LEXINGTON	5/15/85	<0.20-1.32	0.13-0.28
MARION	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MI. CITY	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MONROE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MOUNT VERNON	5/10	<0.20-1.55	0.15-0.30
MUNCIE	5/2	<0.20-1.35	0.08-0.24
PIQUA	5/8	<0.20-0.85	0.16-0.28
QUINCY	4/29	<0.20-0.76	
RICHMOND	5/8	<0.20-4.41	0.09-0.24
ROANOKE RAPDS	none		0.91-0.99
TOLEDO		<0.20	0.00-0.20
	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
U OF IOWA	5/21	<0.20-1.51	0.23-0.34
WYACONDA	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
YPSILANTI	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20

<sup>\*</sup>LOW AMC VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.00 PPB; HIGH VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.20 PPB; || THE LIMITS OF DETECTION WERE REPORTED AS 0.20 PPB

# TABLE 3 - LINURON IN CWS

## FINISHED WATER

LOCATION	DAME OF WALL			
BETHANY	DATE OF MAX	RANGE OF CONC(PPB)	ANNUALIZED MEA	N CONC*
BLANCHESTER	1/08/86	<0.20-0.24	0.02-0.20	
BREESE	6/05/85	<0.20- 0.33	0.08-0.22	
	6/06/85	<0.20- 1.46	0.28-0.39	
CHARLESTON	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20	*
CLARINDA	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20	
COLUMBUS	6/19/85	<0.20- 1.70	0.45-0.53	
DAVENPORT	12/16/85	<0.20-1.03	0.02-0.21	
DECATUR	5/13/85	<0.20-0.95	0.17-0.27	
GREENVILLE	6/26/85	<0.20-0.62	0.08-0.24	
KANKAKEE	6/18/85	<0.20-0.31	0.03-0.20	
LEXINGTON	12/04/85	<0.20-0.27	0.01-0.20	
MARION	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20	
MI. CITY	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20	
MONROE	8/21/85	<0.20-0.21	0.01-0.20	
MOUNT VERNON	9/04	<0.20-0.47	0.13-0.25	
MUNCIE	6/6	<0.20-0.44	0.04-0.22	
PIQUA	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20	
QUINCY	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20	
RICHMOND	6/12	<0.20-0.78	0.10-0.26	
ROANOKE RAPDS	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20	
TOLEDO	12/16	<0.20-2.66	0.05-0.24	
U OF IOWA	8/7	<0.20-0.20	0.00-0.20	
WYACONDA	none	<0.20		
YPSILANTI	5/2		0.00-0.20	
	J/ E	<0.20-0.57	0.03-0.21	

<sup>\*</sup>LOW AMC VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.00 PPB; HIGH VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.20 PPB; THE LIMITS OF DETECTION WERE REPORTED AS 0.20 PPB

# TABLE 4 - METOLACHLOR IN CWS

## FINISHED WATER

LOCATION BETHANY BLANCHESTER BREESE CHARLESTON CLARINDA COLUMBUS DAVENPORT DECATUR GREENVILLE KANKAKEE LEXINGTON MARION MI. CITY MONROE MOUNT VERNON MUNCIE PIQUA QUINCY RICHMOND ROANOKE RAPDS TOLEDO U OF IOWA WYACONDA YPSILANTI	05/2 8/28 06/10 5/8 none none 5/21 none	<pre>&lt;0.20-0.25 &lt;0.20-0.43 &lt;0.20 &lt;0.20 &lt;0.20-1.15 &lt;0.20-1.12 &lt;0.20-0.34 &lt;0.20-0.31 &lt;0.20-1.25 &lt;0.20 &lt;0.20 &lt;0.20 &lt;0.20 &lt;0.20 &lt;0.20 &lt;0.20&lt;&lt;0.20</pre>	ANNUALIZED MEAN CONC*  0.00-0.20  0.08-0.23  0.22-0.34  0.00-0.20  0.11-0.26  2.03-2.05  0.00-0.20  0.26-0.33  0.00-0.20  0.12-0.26  0.02-0.20  0.11-0.24  0.00-0.20  0.10-0.25  0.21-0.34  0.01-0.20  0.02-0.20  0.02-0.20  0.02-0.20  0.02-0.20  0.02-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20
YPSILANTI	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20

LOCATION BETHANY BLANCHESTER BREESE CHARLESTON CLARINDA COLUMBUS DAVENPORT DECATUR GREENVILLE KANKAKEE LEXINGTON MARION MI. CITY MONROE MOUNT VERNON MUNCIE PIQUA QUINCY RICHMOND ROANOKE RAPDS TOLEDO U OF IOWA	DATE OF MAX none 6/05-12 6/06/85 6/12 6/12 5/08/85 05/14/85 7/09/85 6/19/85 10/22/85 05/29/85 06/20 none none 9/04 5/30 08/28 05/20 6/12 none none 5/9	RANGE OF CONC(PPB)  <0.20 <0.20-0.62 <0.20-0.22 <0.20-0.68 <0.20-9.74 <0.20-0.55 <0.20-0.82 <0.20-0.82 <0.20-0.23 <0.20-0.41 <0.20-0.47 <0.20-0.41 <0.20-0.35 <0.20-0.41 <0.20-0.35 <0.20-0.41 <0.20-0.35 <0.20-0.40 <0.20-0.35 <0.20-1.92 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20-0.41	ANNUALIZED MEAN CONC*  0.00-0.20  0.11-0.26 0.27-0.39 0.00-0.25 2.40-2.43 0.01-0.20 0.34-0.40 0.01-0.20 0.13-0.26 0.14-0.28 0.11-0.24 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.02-0.20 0.02-0.20 0.034-0.46 0.00-0.20 0.05-0.20
TOLEDO	none	<0.20	0.05-0.20
WYACONDA	5/9 none	<0.20-1.80 <0.20	0.18-0.31 0.00-0.20
YPSILANTI	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20

<sup>\*</sup>LOW AMC VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.00 PPB; HIGH VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.20 PPB; THE LIMITS OF DETECTION WERE REPORTED AS 0.20 PPB

# TABLE 5 - METRIBUZIN IN CWS

# FINISHED WATER

MARION MI. CITY MONROE MOUNT VERNON MUNCIE PIQUA QUINCY RICHMOND ROANOKE RAPDS TOLEDO U OF IOWA WYACONDA	none none none 5/10 none none none 5/22+29 none 6/19 none none	<0.20 <0.20-0.72 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20-0.24 <0.20 <0.20-0.27 <0.20 <0.20	0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.01-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.01-0.21 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.01-0.20 0.01-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20
YPSILANTI I	none		0.00-0.20

LOCATION BETHANY BLANCHESTER BREESE CHARLESTON CLARINDA COLUMBUS DAVENPORT	DATE OF MAX none none 6/06/85 none none 6/19/85 none	RANGE OF CONC(PPB) <0.20 <0.20 <0.20-1.81 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20-1.91 <0.20	ANNUALIZED MEAN CONC*  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.09-0.25  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.27-0.35  0.00-0.20
DECATUR	5/06/85	<0.20-0.31	0.01-0.20
GREENVILLE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
KANKAKEE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
LEXINGTON	05/29/85	<0.20-0.40	0.01-0.20
MARION MI. CITY MONROE MOUNT VERNON	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MUNCIE PIQUA QUINCY	none 6/13 none	<0.20 <0.20-0.68 <0.20 <0.20	0.00-0.20 0.02-0.21 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20
RICHMOND	5/01	<0.20-1.12	0.08-0.23
ROANOKE RAPDS	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
TOLEDO	12/16	<0.20-2.66	0.05-0.24
U OF IOWA	7/10	<0.20-0.28	0.01-0.20
WYACONDA	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
YPSILANTI	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20

<sup>\*</sup>LOW AMC VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.00 PPB; HIGH VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.20 PPB; 14

# TABLE 6 - SIMAZINE IN CWS

## FINISHED WATER

0.20 0.00-0.20	LOCATION BETHANY BLANCHESTER BREESE CHARLESTON CLARINDA COLUMBUS DAVENPORT DECATUR GREENVILLE KANKAKEE LEXINGTON MARION MI. CITY MONROE MOUNT VERNON MUNCIE PIQUA QUINCY RICHMOND ROANOKE RAPDS TOLEDO U OF IOWA WYACONDA	DATE OF MAX none 8/21 7/11 none none 6/05/85 none 9/17 none none none 7/04 8/01 8/7+14 none 6/19 none none none	<0.20-0.23 <0.20 <0.20-1.24 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20	ANNUALIZED MEAN CONC*  0.00-0.20  0.06-0.21  0.06-0.22  0.00-0.20  0.15-0.27  0.00-0.20  0.02-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.10-0.23  0.00-0.20  0.10-0.23  0.05-0.21  0.01-0.23  0.05-0.21  0.01-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20
	YPSILANTI	none		0.00-0.20

LOCATION BETHANY	DATE OF MAX	RANGE OF CONC(PPB)		CONC*
	9/25	<0.20-0.41	0.01-0.20	
BLANCHESTER BREESE	7/24	<0.20-0.64	0.10-0.24	
	6/14/85	<0.20- 0.37	0.04-0.20	
CHARLESTON	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20	
CLARINDA	10/25	<0.20-0.27	0.01-0.20	
COLUMBUS	6/12/85	<0.20- 0.90	0.27-0.36	
DAVENPORT	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20	
DECATUR	5/06/85	<0.20-0.29	0.01-0.20	
GREENVILLE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20	
KANKAKEE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20	
LEXINGTON	05/01/85	<0.20-0.86	0.02-0.21	
MARION	7/10	<0.20-0.35	0.12-0.24	
MI. CITY	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20	
MONROE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20	
MOUNT VERNON	5/10	<0.20-0.62	0.10-0.23	
MUNCIE	7/25		0.11-0.26	
PIQUA	7/24+31		0.01-0.20	
QUINCY	none		0.00-0.20	
RICHMOND	6/19		0.38-0.47	
ROANOKE RAPDS	none		0.00-0.20	
TOLEDO	none		0.00-0.20	
U OF IOWA	7/10	10 00 0 0	0.01-0.20	14 Y
WYACONDA	none		0.00-0.20	
YPSILANTI	6/12			
	U/ 12	<0.20-0.33	0.02-0.20	

<sup>\*</sup>LOW AMC VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.00 PPB; HIGH VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.20 PPB; THE LIMITS OF DETECTION WERE REPORTED AS 0.20 PPB

# TABLE 7 - TRIFLURALIN IN CWS

## FINISHED WATER

COLUMBUS none	20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 2	
---------------	---	--

LOCATION	DATE OF MAX	RANGE OF CONC(PPB)	ANNUALIZED MEAN CONC*
BETHANY	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20 -
BLANCHESTER	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
BREESE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
CHARLESTON	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
CLARINDA	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
COLUMBUS	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
DAVENPORT	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
DECATUR	8/13/85	<0.20-0.20	0.00-0.20
GREENVILLE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
KANKAKEE	6/18/85	<0.20-0.32	0.01-0.20
LEXINGTON	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MARION	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MI. CITY	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MONROE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MOUNT VERNON	12/10/85	<0.20-0.21	0.00-0.20
MUNCIE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
PIQUA	none	<0.20	
QUINCY	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
RICHMOND	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
ROANOKE RAPDS	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
TOLEDO	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
U OF IOWA	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
WYACONDA	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
YPSILANTI	none		0.00-0.20
O T TICKLE I	HOHE	<0.20	0.00-0.20

<sup>\*</sup>LOW AMC VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.00 PPB; HIGH VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.20 PPB;

TABLE 8

MONSANTO 1985 GROUNDWATER MONITORING PROGRAM
OF SELECTED WELLS - SUMMARY OF POSITIVE SAMPLES

LOCATION	RANGE OF POSITIVE RESULTS FROM 243 WELLS SAMPLED JULY 1985 (PPB)	RESULTS FROM 246 WELLS SAMPLED OCT. 1985 (PPB)	TOTAL NUMBER OF POSITIVE WELLS AT SAMPLING LOCATION
	ATRAZIN	<u>IE</u>	
Fayette, IA	<0.22 - 1.4	0.80	4
Decatur, IN**	0.39 - 6.5**	2.0**	2
Crisp, GA	0.34	-	1
Dane, WI	0.34 - 1.1	0.34 - 1.7	7
	BUTYLAT	<u>E</u>	
Miller, GA	0.38	-	1
	CYANAZIN	<u>E</u>	
Iroquois, IL**	4.5**	-	1
Tift, GA	0.27	-	1
Turner, GA	<0.23	-	1
	METOLACHLO	<u>or</u>	-
Houston, AL	0.35	0.55	1
Kossuth, IA	0.22 - 0.28		6
Knox, IN	0.28 - 0.30	_	2
Pulaski, IN**	0.37**	-	1
Turner, GA	-	3.2	1
Hertford, NC**	-	48.0**	1

<sup>\*</sup>NOTE: "\*\*" Indicates Areas of High Concentration.

Results expressed as the Average of Duplicate Determinationa.

Limit of Detection was 0.20 ppb.

Results obtained with GC/ECD; not confirmed with GC/MS for July 1985 samples, but confirmed with

GC/MS for Oct 1985 samples.

STATIL NO.:		- <u>ro</u>	istration of Ze used for f	EVIEW OF STU	DIES PPA	ONLY—		(HED FROVILE)
•		> .	Confidential R	Nsiness Info	rme til on-			PACK No.14982 K
		Does Not	Contain Natio	mal Security	Info. (E	.0. 120	(65)	12/5/8.7
TEMICAL NAME:	AL.	ACHLOR		•		•		(RD RECVILE) SHAUGNESSY NO. 090501
•		,			Revie			(HED/BUD/TSS Complete)
ientifying /	Ref Action enc	er-	Study Aut		Submi	ssion		Study found to be Acceptable (A)/
	Action end Code Mum			Description	Crite (SEE )	rla Belch)	Accession Number	Unacceptable(U) for review or reviewer comment
090501	870 /	89661	1	Aco and			265683	review of reviewer comment
				V 1			203883	
i			Shand		<del></del>			
				ng Real				
				cted Harbi	<u>-                                     </u>	#	1842	
			1 cides					
ODUCT MANAGER		MANAGER DAVID	(RM) AND NUM GIAMP	ER:	RM 7	9	PM/RM TEAM	MEMBER AND NAMER:
(Ch received (	EPA):	16/86		PRINCH CHIEF			×	
ECK APPLICABL		16/86		<del> </del>	wi	- $Q$ .	<u>~</u>	
77	Adverse 60	(a)(2) Data (4	105.406) <i>(</i>	7 Produce s-	ant Pia R	.e. /8-		n) (655,656)
•	Suspect Dat		· ·					· · ·
		•	115,416)	7 Generic Da	-		_	61)
	IBT Data	- (4	185,486) <u>/</u> V	Special Re	rview Date	a (870,	871)	11/
TEST OF LIDIV	ILUAL STUDI	ES SUEMINATE	1.14	VOLUME	< 1	m se	COMPLETED	7
ANT OF THE	ABOVE STUD	IES (In woole	OR IN NAME	BEST BEFFOR	200			
		CTE: AGT OL U			L L.			
x17(1es):			n, m Aez, bi	ease Mentir	y the	DATE	SENT TO HED	VBUD/TSS: 2-5-87
TA(Tes):	. No	<del></del>		esse Identii	y the	DATE	SENT TO HED Lex NUMBER:	/BUD/TSS: 2-5-87
ATED ACTIONS	. No			ese menui	y the	PRICR	SENT TO HED LLY NUMBER: CHES REQUEN	
CATED ACTIONS: STRUCTIONS:	No Spec	IAL RE	EVIEW		y the	PRICR	LEY NUMBER:	DATE: 5-5-87
ATED ACTIONS:	No SPEC	CIAL RE	FOR PE		y the	PRICR	LEY NUMBER:	
ATED ACTIONS:	No Spec	IAL RE	FOR PE	) '{.		PRICR	LEY NUMBER:	DATE: 5-5-87
ATED ACTIONS:	No SPEC	CIAL RE	FOR PE	) '{.	da	PRICR	LEY NUMBER:	DATE: 5-5-87
ATEU ACTIONS: PROCTIONS: Please Reg	No SPEC Lease of	CIAL RE	FOR PE	) ". H. Ling	da	PRICR	LEY NUMBER:	DATE: 5-5-87
ATED ACTIONS:  TRUCTIONS:  Repl Repl Repl Repl Repl Repl Repl Rep	No SPEC Sease of Her to	Caroly	for P.E.	) 4. H. Ling Kut	za nev	PROJE PROJE DATE	TITY NUMBER:	DATE: 5-5-87
ATED ACTIONS: FRUCTIONS:  Repl Repl Repl Repl Repl Repl Repl Rep	No SPEC Sease of Her to	Caroly	for P.E.	) 4. H. Ling Kut	za neu	PROJECT DATE	TITY NUMBER:	DATE: 5-5-87
ATED ACTIONS:  TRUCTIONS:  ACTIONS:  CTIONS: AC	No SPEC Pease no Gen to	Caroly	for P.E.	) 4. H. Ling Kut	za nev	PROJECT DATE	TITY NUMBER:	DATE: 5-87  RD (HED/BUD/TSS FROVIDE):  FOR DATA SUBMITTED UNDER
ATED ACTIONS:  FRUCTIONS:  ATED ACTIONS:  CTIONS: ACT	No SPEC Pease no Gen to	Caroly	for PE n Office	) 4. H. Ling Kut	EDD: 1	PRICE PROJE DATE  TEAB	ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	DATE: 5-5-87 RD (HED/BUD/TSS PROVIDE):
ATED ACTIONS:  FRUCTIONS:  ATED ACTIONS:  CTIONS: ACT	No SPEC Pease M	Caroly	for PE n Office	H, Ling Kut Mare	EDD: 1	PRICE PROJE DATE  TEAB	ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	DATE: 5-87  RD (HED/BUD/TSS FROVIDE):  FOR DATA SUBMITTED UNDER A REGISTRATION STANDARD: REVIEW Submission Criteria
ATED ACTIONS:  ATED ACTIONS:  ACTIONS:  ACTIONS:  ACTIONS:  ATED ACTIONS:  CTIONS:  ACTIONS: ACTIO	No SPEC	Caroly	for PE n Office	H, Ling Kut Mare	EDD: 1	PRICE PROJE DATE  TEAB	ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	DATE: 5-87  RD (HED/BUD/TSS PROVIDE):  FOR DATA SUBMITTED UNDER A REGISTRATION STANDARD: REView Submission Criteria  Policy Note #31
ATED ACTIONS:  ATED ACTIONS:  CTIONS:  ACTIONS: ACTIO	No SPEC  Caze  Caz	Caroly	for PE n Office	H, Ling Kut Mare	EDD: 1	PRICE PROJE DATE  TEAB	ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	POR DATA SUBMITTED UNDER A REGISTRATION STANDARD: Review Submission Criteria  Policy Note #31  1 = data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet
ATED ACTIONS:  TRUCTIONS:  ATED ACTIONS:  CTIONS: ACTIONS	No SPEC  Pease  PROB  EVIEW  L Effects  hemistry	Caroly	for PE n Office	H, Ling Kut Mare	EDD: 1	PRICE PROJE DATE  TEAB	ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	Policy Note #31  1 = data which meet
ATED ACTIONS:  ATED ACTIONS:  CTIONS:  ACTIONS: ACTIO	No SPEC  Caze  Caz	Caroly	for PE n Office	H, Ling Kut Mare	EDD: 1	PRICE PROJE DATE  TEAB	ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	FOR DATA SUBMITTED UNDER A REGISTRATION STANDARD: Review Submission Criteria Policy Note #31  1 = data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet 3(c)(2)(B) flagging criteria
ATED ACTIONS:  ATED ACTIONS:  CTIONS: ACTI	No SPEC  Pease  PROB  PROB  EVIEW  V  Assessment	Caroly	for PE n Office	H, Ling Kut Mare	EDD: 1	PRICE PROJE DATE  TEAB	ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	POLICY Note #31  1 = data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet 3(c)(2)(B) flagging
ATED ACTIONS:  ATED ACTIONS:  CTIONS: ACTIONS:	No SPEC  Pease  PROB  PROB  EVIEW  V  Assessment	Caroly	for PE n Office	H, Ling Kut Mare	EDD: 1	PRICE PROJE DATE  TEAB	ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	POR DATA SUBMITTED UNDER A REGISTRATION STANDARD: Review Submission Criteria Policy Note #31  1 = data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet 3(c)(2)(B) flagging criteria  2 = data of particular concern
ATED ACTIONS:  ATED A	No SPEC  Caze  Caz	Caroly	FOR PE	H, Ling Kut Mare	EDD: 1	PRICE PROJE DATE  TEAB	ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	FOR DATA SUBMITTED UNDER A REDISTRATION STANDARD: Review Submission Criteria  Policy Note #31  1 = data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet 3(c)(2)(B) flagging criteria  2 = data of particular concern  3 = data necessary to- determine tiered
ATED ACTIONS:  ATED ACTIONS:  CTIONS: ACTION	No SPEC  Caze  Caz	Caroly	FOR PE	H, Ling Kut Mare	BUD: // Special	PRICE PROJE DATE  TEAB	ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	FOR DATA SUBMITTED UNDER A REGISTRATION STANDARD:  Review Submission Criteria  Policy Note #31  1 = data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet 3(c)(2)(B) flagging criteria  2 = data of particular concern  3 = data necessary to-
ATED ACTIONS:  ATED ACTIONS:  ACTIONS:  ACTIONS:  ACTIONS:  ATED ACTIONS:  CTIONS: ACTIONS:	No SPEC  Caze  Caz	Caroly	FOR PE	H, Ling Kut Mare	BUD: // Special	PRICE PROJE DATE  TEAB	ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	FOR DATA SUBMITTED UNDER A REDISTRATION STANDARD: Review Submission Criteria  Policy Note #31  1 = data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet 3(c)(2)(B) flagging criteria  2 = data of particular concern  3 = data necessary to- determine tiered

=

CASHFILL NO.:					al Sundanian S. A.	mation-	_	<	19770
			Co Does Not C	nfidenti ontain N	at nusiness inro ational Security	Tefa /E	-		
HPMICAL NAME	E:	ALAC		GILALLI: N	acidizal Security	Into. (F	1.0. 120	165)	RD ROVIDE) SHAUGNESSY NO.
lentifying	Action Code	Refer-	Record Number	_	Guideline or mive Description	Crite	w .ssion	Accession Number	O 90 50 / (HFD/BUD/TSS Complete) Study found to be Acceptable (A)/ Unacceptable(U) for
09151	870	Ro	7,391		Surface an		LLLC#)	2656 <i>?3</i>	review or reviewer comm
				. Dion.	eduate				
<u> </u>			· ·	Scree	sing Result	4			
				for be	lected Herbici	dea			
ODUCT MANAG	ER (PM) C	on REVIEW	MANAGER	2M) 43fD	MIMPSE.				
TR RECEIVED	DAIL	0 - i A	mporc	ARO	RM 79 RD BRANCH CHIEF	<b>71110747</b> 3		PM/RM TEAM	MEMBER AND NUMBER:
ECK APPLICAL		0/6/	36		ND BRANCE CALLS	INTELALS	. 80	٠٤.	
e any of the Mitted for	IVIDUAL S	STUDIES	JEMITTED:	/ or in ne	Special Re  (4 Volume  re) BEEN PREVIOUS  Please identifi	ta )	TO BE	COMPLETED	
E ANY OF THE MITTED FOR DAY (1es): ATED ACTION TRUCTIONS:	IVIDUAL S TE ABOVE REVIEW?  NO SE:	TUDIES ST STUDIES ( (circle:	JEMITTED: (in whole yes or no	or in pa ) If yes	(11 11-2	ta )	TO BE DATE PRIOR	COMPLETED SENT TO HED, LTY NUMBER:	/BUD/TSS: /- 5- 8/
E ANY OF THE MITTER FOR THE MITTER FOR THE MITTER ACTION TRUCTIONS:	IVIDUAL S HE ABOVE REVIEW?  NO IS:  Case D 4	TUDIES ST STUDIES (circle:	JEMITED: (in whole yes or no	or in pa	(4 Volume rt) BEEN REVIO , please identii	USLY fy the	DATE PROJE	COMPLETED  SENT TO HED,  THY NUMBER:  CTED RETURN  RETURNED TO	DATE: 4-5-87
E ANY OF THE MITTED FOR MITTED FOR THE ACTION TRUCTIONS:	IVIDUAL S HE ABOVE REVIEW?  NO IS:  Case D 4	TUDIES ST STUDIES (circle:	JEMITED: (in whole yes or no	or in pa	rt) BEEN REVIOUS, please identii	USLY fy the	DATE PROFE DATE	COMPLETED  SENT TO HED,  THY NUMBER:  CTED RETURN  RETURNED TO	DATE: 4-5-87  RD (HED/BUD/TSS PROVIDE):
E ANY OF THE MITTED FOR THE TOTAL FOR THE TO	IVIDUAL S IE ABOVE REVIEW?  NO IS:  TTB //F	TUDIES ST STUDIES (circle:	JEMITED: (in whole yes or no	or in pa ) If yes	rt) BEEN REVIOUS, please identii	BUD:	DATE PROF PROF DATE	SENT TO HED, ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	DATE: 4-5-87  RD (HED/BUD/TSS PROVIDE):
E ANY OF THE MITTED FOR THE TOTAL FOR THE TO	IVIDUAL S IE ABOVE REVIEW?  O:  /TB //F  REVIEW	TUDIES ST STUDIES ( Circle:	JEMITED: (in whole yes or no	or in pa ) If yes	TO: /TSS	BUD:	DATE PROF PROF DATE	SENT TO HED, ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	DATE: 4-5-87  RD (HED/BUD/TSS PROVIDE):  FOR DATA SUBMITTED UNDE  A REGISTRATION STANDARY
E ANY OF THE MITTED FOR MITTED FOR THE METERS SENT TO TYPE OF TOXICOLOGICAL Ecological Property of the Meters of t	IVIDUAL S IE ABOVE REVIEW?  O:  /TB //F  REVIEW  cal Effec	TUDIES ST STUDIES (circle:	JEMITED: (in whole yes or no	or in pa ) If yes	TO: /TSS	BUD:	DATE PROF PROF DATE	SENT TO HED, ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	POLICY Note #31  1 - 8-87  PATE: 4 - 5 - 87  PAT
E ANY OF THE MITTED FOR THE TOTAL FOR THE TO	IVIDUAL S IE ABOVE REVIEW?  NO IS:  Case O:  TEB //F  REVIEW  Chemistr	TUDIES ST STADIFS (circle:	JEMITED: (in whole yes or no	or in pa ) If yes	TO: /TSS	BUD:	DATE PROF PROF DATE	SENT TO HED, ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	POLICY Note #31
E ANY OF THE MITTED FOR dy(les):  ATED ACTION IROCTIONS:  TYPE OF  Toxicolo Ecologic Residue  Exposure	IVIDUAL S IE ABOVE REVIEW?  O:  /TB //F  REVIEW  cal Effec	TUDIES ST STUDIES (circle:	JEMITED: (in whole yes or no	or in pa ) If yes	TO: /TSS	BUD:	DATE PROF PROF DATE	SENT TO HED, ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	FOR DATA SUBMITTED UNDE A REGISTRATION STANDARI Review Submission Criter  Policy Note #31  1 = data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet 3(c)(2)(B) flagging criteria  2 = data of particular
E ANY OF THE MITTED FOR dy(les):  ATED ACTION IROCTIONS:  TYPE OF  Toxicolo Ecologic Residue  Exposure	IVIDUAL S IE ABOVE REVIEW O: /TB //F REVIEW Chemistr	TUDIES ST STUDIES (circle:	JEMITED: (in whole yes or no	or in pa ) If yes	TO: /TSS	BUD:	DATE PROF PROF DATE	SENT TO HED, ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	POR DATA SUBMITTED UNDER A REGISTRATION STANDARD Review Submission Criter  Policy Note #31  1 = data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet 3(c)(2)(B) flagging criteria  2 = data of particular concern  3 = data necessary to
E ANY OF THE MITTED FOR Edy(les):  ATED ACTION TRUCTIONS:  TRUCTIONS:  TYPE OF  Toxicold Ecologic Residue  Product  Efficacy	IVIDUAL S IE ABOVE REVIEW?  O:  O:  OTB //F  REVIEW  OSY  Chemistr  Chemistr	TUDIES ST STUDIES (CIrcle: ) Acade  ACB ME	JEMITED: (in whole yes or no	or in pa ) If yes	TO: /TSS	BUD:	DATE PROF PROF DATE	SENT TO HED, ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	POLICY Note #31  1 = data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet 2 = data of particular concern
TYPE OF  Toxicolc  Ecologic  Residue  Product  Efficacy	IVIDUAL S IE ABOVE REVIEW?  O:  OTB //F  REVIEW  Case Chemistr  Assessm  Chemistr	TUDIES ST STUDIES (CIrcle: ) Acade  ACB ME	AB / EPB	or in pa ) If yes	TO: /TSS	BUD:	DATE PROF PROF DATE	SENT TO HED, ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	POR DATA SUBMITTED UNDER A REGISTRATION STANDARD Review Submission Criter  Policy Note #31  1 = data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet 3(c)(2)(B) flagging criteria  2 = data of particular concern  3 = data necessary to- determine tiered