				Date	out	of	EAB		2 1
				Shauç	hnes	ssy	No:	090501 080803 100101 035506	
To:	Product	lamporcaro Manager ition Division (. 1	1	101101 108801 080807 036101	_)} ∈
From:	Environm Exposure	K. Offutt, Chie mental Processes Assessment Bra valuation Divis	and Gu	ideli	nes	Sec	ction	041405 n	<u>.</u> (************************************
Attache	ed, pleas	e find the EAB	review o	of				•	
Reg./Fi	.le #:								
Chemica	l Name:	Alachlor & A	lternati	lves:	At	raz	ine,	Cyana-	- - UN
		zine, Linuro			٠.				_
		Simazine, Tr	iflurali	n', B	utyl	ate	(gr	ound	_
	-	water monitor	ring onl	y)					.
Type Pr	oduct:	Herbicide							-
Product	Name:	Alachlor & al	lternati	ves					
Company	Name:	Monsanto						•	-
Purpose	•	Review of 198	85 Surfa	ce ar	nd Gr	our	nd Wa	ater	
	Screening	Results for Se							
Action (Code:	870	EAB #(s):_7	70164	l ar	nd 70	0240	
Date Rec	ceived:1/	5/87 & 2/5/87	TAIS C	ode:_					
Date Com	pleted:_	7/1/87	Total	Revie	wing	, Ti	ime:	7	
Monitori	ng study	requested:	-						
Monitori	ng study	voluntarily su	bmitted	:_X_	-				
Deferral	s to:	Ecologi	cal Eff	ects	Bran	ch			
		Residue	Chemis	try B	ranc	:h			

X Toxicology Branch

1. CHEMICALS:

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

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 June 25, 1986

Issue Date: 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:

Linda L. Kutney

Chemist

Environmental Processes and Guidelines Section, EAB 7/2/87

6. APPROVED BY:

Carolyn K. Offutt, Chief

Environmental Processes and Guidelines Section

Exposure Assessment Branch, HED (TS-769C)

7/7/87

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).
- * 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 <u>exclusion</u> 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 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	-	MO OH IL IL IA OH IA IL NC IL MO IL IN MI IN IN OH IL IN OH IL IN OH IL
YPSILANTI		MO MI

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 (<0.20 ppb) </pre>	<pre> Detection limit at all locations (<0.20 ppb) </pre>
Alachlor*	10.9* (in Columbus, OH)	1.4*

^{*}from "Alachlor Special Review Technical Support Document" (Table E)

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

Alachlor*	1.33* (in Hertford, NC)	21.8*(in Pulaski, IN)
Metolachlor	0.37 (in Pulaski, IN) Only 12 of 243 wells were positive	48.0 (in Hertford, NC)
Cyanazine	4.5 (in Irochois, IL) Only 3 of 243 wells were positive	•• •• •• • · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Butylate	0.38 (in Miller, GA) Only 1 of 243 wells was positive	 -
Herbicide Atrazine	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)
	Ground Water	

^{*}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

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 7/17/85 7/10/85 6/6/85 7/3+10/85 5/8/85 5/8/85 5/14/85 7/16/85 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 none 11/27 5/29 4/12	<pre><0.20-7.31 <0.20-1.73 <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
WYACONDA	4/12	0.32-1.13	0.60-0.63
YPSILANTI	none		0.00-0.20

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

^{*}LOW AMC VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.00 PPB; HIGH VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.20 PPB; /O THE LIMITS OF DETECTION WERE REPORTED AS 0.20 PPB

TABLE 2 - CYANAZINE IN CWS

FINISHED WATER

U OF IOWA 5/21	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	<0.20 <0.20-1.54 <0.20-0.28	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
----------------	----------	---	-----------------------------------	---

	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 4/25/85 7/17/85 4/26/85 none 6/26/85 5/8/85 5/14/85 7/23/85 none 5/28/85 5/15/85 none none none none 5/10 5/2 5/8 4/29 5/8 none none 5/21 none	RANGE OF CONC(PPB) 0.76-1.66 <0.20-12.44 <0.20-2.76 <0.20 <0.20-2.60 <0.20-6.40 <0.20-0.49 <0.20-0.38 <0.20 <0.20-0.45 <0.20-1.32 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35	0.85-0.89 2.97-3.02 0.30-0.40 0.00-0.20 0.45-0.52 0.80-0.89 0.06-0.21 0.09-0.23 0.00-0.20 0.04-0.21 0.13-0.28 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.15-0.30 0.08-0.24 0.16-0.28 0.09-0.24 0.91-0.99 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20
YPSILANTI none <0.20 0.00-0.20			<0.20 <0.20	0.00-0.20

^{*}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

U OF IOWA 5/1		none	<0.20	0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.01-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.04-0.22 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 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	CONC*
---------------	--	------	-------	---	-------

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	12/16 8/7	<pre><0.20-0.24 <0.20-0.33 <0.20-1.46 <0.20 <0.20-1.70 <0.20-1.03 <0.20-0.95 <0.20-0.62 <0.20-0.31 <0.20-0.27 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20-0.47 <0.20-0.47 <0.20-0.44 <0.20 <0.20-0.20</pre>	ANNUALIZED MEAN CONC* 0.02-0.20 0.08-0.22 0.28-0.39 0.00-0.20 0.45-0.53 0.02-0.21 0.17-0.27 0.08-0.24 0.03-0.20 0.01-0.20 0.01-0.20 0.13-0.25 0.04-0.22 0.00-0.20 0.10-0.26 0.00-0.20 0.05-0.24 0.00-0.20
		<0.20-0.20	0.05-0.24 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.03-0.21

^{*}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 DATE OF MAX none RANGE OF CONC(PPB) ANNUALIZED MEAN CO BLANCHESTER BREESE 7/03/85 <0.20 0.00-0.20 0.20-0.52 0.08-0.23 0.20-2.72 0.22-0.34	
CHARLESTON none	MEAN CONC*

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	none none 5/9 none	<pre><0.20-1.23 <0.20-0.48 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20-0.47 <0.20-1.94 <0.20-0.35 <0.20-1.92 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20</pre>	ANNUALIZED MEAN CONC* 0.00-0.20 0.11-0.26 0.27-0.39 0.00-0.20 0.09-0.25 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 0.13-0.25 0.26-0.38 0.02-0.20 0.02-0.20 0.34-0.46 0.00-0.20 0.18-0.31 0.00-0.20
YPSILANTI			0.00-0.20
	•	**	

^{*}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

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 none 6/06/85 none none 6/19/85 none 5/06/85 none none none none none follows none 12/16 7/10	RANGE OF CONC(PPB) <0.20 <0.20-1.81 <0.20 <0.20-1.91 <0.20 <0.20-0.31 <0.20 <0.20-0.40 <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	ANNUALIZED MEAN CONC* 0.00-0.20 0.09-0.25 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.27-0.35 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 0.00-0.20 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 0.00-0.20
			0.01-0.20 0.00-0.20
	-		0.00-0.20

^{*}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 6 - SIMAZINE 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	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 none	<pre><0.20 <0.20-0.71 <0.20-0.50 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20-0.77 <0.20 <0.20-0.59 <0.20 <0.20-0.41 <0.20-0.54 <0.20-0.54 <0.20-0.23 <0.20 <0.20</pre>	ANNUALIZED MEAN CONC* 0.00-0.20 0.06-0.21 0.06-0.22 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.15-0.27 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.10-0.23 0.00-0.20 0.10-0.23 0.05-0.21 0.01-0.20 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 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20
YPSILANTI	none	40.00	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	7/25 7/24+31 none 6/19 none none	<0.20-0.62 <0.20-1.62 <0.20-0.23 <0.20 <0.20-1.76 <0.20 <0.20	0.01-0.20 0.10-0.24 0.04-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.01-0.20 0.27-0.36 0.00-0.20 0.01-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.02-0.21 0.12-0.24 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.10-0.23 0.11-0.26 0.01-0.20 0.038-0.47 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20
	7/10	<0.20 <0.20-0.28	
YPSILANTI	none 6/12	10 00 0	0.00-0.20 0.02-0.20

^{*}LOW AMC VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.00 PPB; HIGH VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.20 PPB; 15

TABLE 7 - TRIFLURALIN IN CWS

FINISHED WATER

	DATE OF MAX none none none none none none none non	RANGE OF CONC <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	(PPB) ANNUALIZED MEAN CONTO 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.2	<u>NC</u> *
II OR TOUR		•		

^{*}LOW AMC VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.00 PPB; HIGH VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.20 PPB; 16

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)	RANGE OF POSITIVE RESULTS FROM 246 WELLS SAMPLED OCT. 1985 (PPB)	TOTAL NUMBER OF POSITIVE WELLS AT SAMPLING LOCATION
	ATRAZI	NE	
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>CE</u>	
Miller, GA	0.38	-	1
•	CYANAZIN	<u>E</u> -	
Iroquois, IL**	4.5**	_	,
Tift, GA	0.27	_	1
Turner, GA	<0.23	-	1
	METOLACHL	OR	1
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

^{*}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.

CASTALL, NO.: ————————————————————————————————————	TIEN RECORD		NAED PROVIDE.
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	_		PACK 16.19982
Confidential Rusiness Infor	mation—	1651	
75347 A.P. 37434P	HEG. (5.9. 120	165)	(2/5 /2.7 (20 acriss)
ALACHLOR			SHAUGNESSY NO.
	Reg. Std.		(HED/BUD/TSS Complete)
Refer- Study Guideline	Review	j	Study found to be
entifying Action ence Record or	Submission Criteria	Accession	Acceptable (A)/ Unacceptable(U) for
moer Code Mamber Mamber Narrative Description	(SEE BETCH)	Number	LEATER OF LEATERED COME
090501 870 /34/667 1985 Sulace and	/	265683	
	,		
Screening Realt	6		
la Schoted Harle	1500 #	1842	
- Lides			
		- 1	
		<u> </u>	
DAVID GIAM PORCARO	RM 79	PM/RM TEAM M	EMER AND MOMER:
F. RECELIED (EPA):	NEELALS:		
CK APPLICATE SCX:	X		
·			
	cific Data (Re	registration) (655,656)
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	a (Reregistrat	•	1)
☐ Data (485,486)	riew Data (870,	871)	11/
SE OF DOTTOM			-21/
TO LILLY LEUGH. STRIPLES STEMPINGS			
ANY OF THE ABOVE STITLES (IN MODILE OF IN THE ABOVE STITLES		COMPLETED 3	Y RSERB
ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) ABOV PREVIOUS GITTED FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identified	1.17		
ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN PREVIOUS (ITED FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identify by(ies):	the DATE	SENT TO RED/	Y RSEAB SUDJESS: 2-5-87
ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) AEAN FREVIOUS (TITED FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identify $\sqrt{0}$	the DATE		500/tss: 2-5-87
THE ACTIONS: SPECIAL REVIEWS (in whole or in part) AEM FREVIOUS (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identify (D) ACTIONS: SPECIAL REVIEWS	the DATE	SENT TO RED/	m/ts: 2-5-87
THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) AEM FREVIOUS (TITED FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identify by (ies): NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) AEM FREVIOUS (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identify by (ies): NO RUCTIONS:	the DATE :	SENT TO RED/ LTT NOMBER: CTED REPURN	500/tss: 2-5-87
ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) ABOVE PREVIOUS (TITED FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identify by (les): NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) ABOVE (dentify yes) NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) ABOVE (dentify yes) NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) ABOVE (dentify yes) NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) ABOVE (dentify yes) NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) ABOVE (dentify yes) NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) ABOVE (dentify yes) NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) ABOVE (dentify yes) NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) ABOVE (dentify yes) NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) ABOVE (dentify yes) NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) ABOVE (dentify yes) NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) ABOVE (dentify yes) NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (dentify yes) NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) ABOVE (dentify yes) NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) ABOVE (dentify yes) NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) ABOVE (dentify yes) NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) ABOVE (dentify yes) NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (dentify yes) NO THE AB	the DATE :	SENT TO RED/ LTT NOMBER: CTED REPURN	m/ts: 2-5-87
ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS TITED FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identify Y(les): NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS RUCTIONS: RUCT	The DATE:	SENT TO RED/ LTT NOMBER: CTED REPURN	500/tss: 2-5-87
ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS TITLD FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identify y(les): NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or	The DATE :	SENT TO RED/ LTT NOMBER: CTED REPURN	500/tss: 2-5-87
ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS TITLD FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identify y(les): NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or	The DATE :	SENT TO RED/ LTT NOMBER: CTED REPURN	500/tss: 2-5-87
ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS ITED FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identify y(les): NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS PLOT ACTIONS: PLEASE SPECIAL REVIEW RECTIONS: Refer to Carolyn Office Juna Liste	The DATE :	SENT TO RED/ LTT NOMBER: CTED REPURN	500/tss: 2-5-87
ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS TIED FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identify Y(les): NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS	THE DATE :	SENT TO RED/ TO NOMBER: CTED RETURN (500/tss: 2-5-87
ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS THE FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identify Y(1es): NO SPECIAL REVIEW RUCTIONS: SPECIAL REVIEW RUCTIONS: Clease review for PD 4. Refler to Carolyn Offict, Lina Kuto EAS SENT TO:	THE DATE :	SENT TO RED/ TO NOMBER: CTED RETURN (500/tss: 2-5-87
ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS ITED FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identify y(les): NO THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS FROM ACTIONS: PLEASE PERIOD FOR POWER RUCTIONS: PLEASE PERIOD OF HELD LINE WES SENT TO: TSIS TE TROS FREE FEED RD: TISS	THE DATE :	SENT TO RED/ TO NOMBER: CTED RETURN (50D/TSS: 2-5-87 DMS: 5-5-87 TO (HED/SUD/TSS PROVIDE):
ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS INTED FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identify y(les): NO SPECIAL REVIEW RUCTIONS: SPECIAL REVIEW RUCTIONS: Clease review for PD 4. Refer to Carolyn Officht. Lind Kuth MINESE MINE	PROJECT PROJECT DATE 1	SENT TO RED/ LTY MUMBER: CHED REPURN RETURNED TO	FOR DATA SUBMITTED UNDER A REGISTRATION STANDARD
ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS TITLED FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identify Y(les): NO THE ACTIONS: SPECIAL REVIEW REFER TO CAROLYN Office! ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS THE ACTIONS: REFER TO CAROLYN OFFICE! THE TRUE TROST TO: THE TROST TO: REPORT TO:	PROJECT PROJECT DATE 1	SENT TO RED/ LTY MUMBER: CHED REPURN RETURNED TO	FOR DATA STEMPTED UNDER
ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS TITLD FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identify NO THE ACTIONS: SPECIAL REVIEW RUCTIONS: Clease review for PD 4. Refer to Carolyn Officht, Lind Kuth CASS FINT TO: TSIS TIE TROS REAB TEES RD: TISS NOTE:	PROJECT PROJECT DATE 1	SENT TO RED/ LTY MUMBER: CHED REPURN RETURNED TO	FOR DATA SUBMITTED (INDEA REGISTRATION STANDARD
ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS TIMED FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identify KY(ies): NO RUCTIONS: SPECIAL REVIEW RUCTIONS: Carolyn Offich: Juna Carolyn Offich: Juna Carolyn Offich: Juna Carolyn Offich: Review MARKET TYPE OF REVIEW Referedistration Services Toxicology Toxicology	PROJECT PROJECT DATE 1	SENT TO RED/ LTY MUMBER: CHED REPURN RETURNED TO	FOR DATA SUBMITTED (NODE A REGISTRATION STANDARD Review Submission Criter Policy Note #31
ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS TITLED FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identify NO THE ACTIONS: SPECIAL REVIEW RUCTIONS: Carolyn Offict: Juna List MONTHER TYPE OF REVIEW Toxicology Ecological Effects	PROJECT PROJECT DATE 1	SENT TO RED/ LTY MUMBER: CHED REPURN RETURNED TO	FOR DATA SUBMITORS (NODE A REGISTRATION STANDARD Policy Note #31
ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS TIPD FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identify Y(ies): NO THE ACTIONS: SPECIAL REVIEW RUCTIONS: Carolyn Offich: Juna Carolyn Offich: Juna TOSIS TIE TROS MEAB TEES NOTES NOTES Reregistration Services	PROJECT PROJECT DATE 1	SENT TO RED/ LTY MUMBER: CHED REPURN RETURNED TO	FOR DATA SUBMITTED (NODE A REGISTRATION STANDARD Policy Note #31 1 = data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet 3(a)(2)(B) flagging
ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS THE FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identify Y(1es): NO THE ACTIONS: SPECIAL REVIEW RUCTIONS: Carolyn Offich: Juna List MONTHER TYPE OF REVIEW Toxicology Ecological Effects	PROJECT PROJECT DATE 1	SENT TO RED/ LTY MUMBER: CHED REPURN RETURNED TO	FOR DATA SUBMITTED UNDER A REGISTRATION STANDARD Policy Note #31 1 = data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet
ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS TITED FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identify NO THE ACTIONS: SPECIAL REVIEW FULLY RUCTIONS: SPECIAL REVIEW RUCTIONS: SPECIAL REVIEW FOR ACTIONS: SPECIAL REVIEW FOR SPAT TO: SPECIAL REVIEW FOR REVIEW FOR REVIEW TOXICOLOGY Ecological Effects Residue Chemistry Exposure Assessment	PROJECT PROJECT DATE 1	SENT TO RED/ LTY MUMBER: CHED REPURN RETURNED TO	FOR DATA SUBMITTED (NOE A REGISTRATION STANDARD Review Submission Criter Policy Note #31 1 = data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet 3(a)(2)(B) flagging criteria
ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS TITED FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identify invites): NO THE ACTIONS: SPECIAL REVIEW FOR REVIEW REFER TO CONSUM Office! ACTIONS: TOSIS TIE TROS MEAB TEES RO: TIES NOTHER TOXICOLOGY Ecological Effects Residue Chemistry	PROJECT PROJECT DATE 1	SENT TO RED/ LTY MUMBER: CHED REPURN RETURNED TO	FOR DATA SUBMITTED (NODE A REGISTRATION STANDARD Policy Note #31 1 = data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet 3(a)(2)(B) flagging
ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS TITTED FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identify invited actions: SPECIAL REVIEW FUCTIONS: SPECIAL REVIEW FULLY REFER TO CAROLUM Office? FULLY FIRST TO: TOSIS TIE TROS REAB TEES RO: TIESS NUMBER Residue Chemistry Exposure Assessment	PROJECT PROJECT DATE 1	SENT TO RED/ LTY MUMBER: CHED REPURN RETURNED TO	FOR DATA SUBMITTED (INDEA REGISTRATION STANDARD Policy Note #31 1 = data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet 3(c)(2)(8) flagging criteria 2 = data of particular concern
The Above Studies (in whole or in part) BEN REVIOUS TITED FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identify ly(ies): NO THE ACTIONS: SPECIAL REVIEW RECTIONS: PLEASE PERILLY for D (). Alfer to Carolyn Offlut, Jung CASS SENT TO: TOSIS TO REVIEW Reregistration S Residue Chemistry Exposure Assessment Product Chemistry Efficacy	PROJECT PROJECT DATE 1	SENT TO RED/ LTY MUMBER: CHED REPURN RETURNED TO	FOR DATA SUBMITTED (NDE 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
TITE OF REVIEW Toxicology Residue Chemistry Product Chemistry Product Chemistry TITED FOR REVIEW STUDIES (in whole or in part) REN REVIOUS TITED FOR REVIEW (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identify NO REVIEW REVIEW REVIEW REVIEW Reregistration S Residue Chemistry Product Chemistry	PROJECT PROJECT DATE 1	SENT TO RED/ LTY MUMBER: CHED REPURN RETURNED TO	FOR DATA SUBMITTED (NODE): TO (HED/BUD/TSS PROVIDE): TO (HED/BUD/TSS PROV
MITTED FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes or no) if yes, please identify in (ies): NO ATED ACTIONS: SPECIAL REVIEW RECTIONS: SPECIAL REVIEW REPOSITE TO: TOXICOLOGY Ecological Effects Residue Chemistry Efficacy Efficacy Efficacy Efficacy Efficacy	PROJECT PROJECT DATE 1	SENT TO RED/ LTY MUMBER: CHED REPURN RETURNED TO	FOR DATA SUBMITTED UNDEA REGISTRATION STANDARD Review Submission Criter Policy Note #31 1 = data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet 3(a)(2)(8) flagging criteria 2 = data of particular concern 3 = data necessary to- determine tiered testing requirement:
ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIES (in whole or in part) BEN FREVIOUS (ITTED POR REVIEW? (circle: yes or no) If yes, please identify in (ies): NO THE ACTIONS: SPECIAL REVIEW FROM CAROLING CAROLING CAROLING CAROLING FURTHER TO CAROLING OF THE CAROLING CAROLING FINE OF REVIEW TYPE OF REVIEW TOXICOLOGY Ecological Effects Residue Chemistry Exposure Assessment Product Chemistry Efficacy Precautionary Labeling/Acute Tox.	PROJECT PROJECT DATE 1	SENT TO RED/ LTY MUMBER: CHED REPURN RETURNED TO	FOR DATA SUBMITORS PROVIDE): TO (HED/BUD/TSS PR

CASTALL, NO.:				E USED ?					
		\mathcal{I}	Co Does Not C	nfidenti	al Rusiness Ir	formation			PACK No.:
HEMICAL NAME	:	_		Chicalin N	ational Securi	ty Info.	(E.O. 12	065)	(1/5/27)
	/	ALAC	HLOR				35.3		SHAUGNESSY NO.
dentifying	Action		Record		Guideline or	Revi Subi Crit	. Std. Lew mission teria	Accession	(HFD/BUD/MSS Complete) Study found to be Acceptable (A)/
(-9:50)	Code ⊘ ¬ c	Mumber	Manber 201		tive Descripti	on (SE		Mumber	Unacceptable(U) for reviewer coun
	<i>87</i> ¢	70	87,391	1975	Surface	and	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2656 ?3	
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	200	eduate.				
	-			Seree	sing less	its!			
		1		for be	facted Herle	cide			
CDUCT MANAGE	다 (AM) 6	r REVIEW	MANAGER (ans (ME	NIMBEO.		w	200	
DA RECELVED	- DA H	3 - 4	MPORC	ARO	NUMBER: RM 79 RD BRANCH CHI	37144		PMVRM TEAM	MEMBER AND <u>NUMBER</u> :
DOX APPLICAT	,	0/0/	36		UN BRANCH CHI	- INITIAL	3: K		
		61-110			_				
					/ Product				
	Suspect		(41					ion) (660,6	61)
	IBT Date	a.	(48	5.486)	M Special	Review Da	ta (870.	871)	N/
								•	_ // // // // // // // // // // // // //
EANY OF THE	VIDUAL S	TUDIES S	TEMPOTER :	<u> </u>				COMPLETED I	BY RSEAB
e any of th Mitted for 1	E ABOVE S	Sale Walled				neo)	TO BE	COMPLETED	
E ANY OF THE MITTED FOR I dy(les):	E ABOVE : REVIEW? No	STIDITS (circle:			(4- Volum	neo)	TO RE	COMPLETED	BY RSERB /BUD/TSS: /- 5- 8/
E ANY OF THE MITTED FOR I dy(les): ATED ACTIONS	E ABOVE : REVIEW? No	STIDITS (circle:			(4- Volum	neo)	DATE PRIOR	SENT TO HED,	/BUD/TSS: /- 5- 8/
E ANY OF THE MITTED FOR I dy(les): ATED ACTIONS	E ABOVE : REVIEW? No	STIDITS (circle:			(4- Volum	neo)	TO BE DATE PRIOR	SENT TO HED, LITT NUMBER:	DATE: 4-5-87
E ANY OF THE MITTED FOR DELICATION ACTIONS:	E ABOVE : REVIEW? No	STUDIES (circle:	EMITTED: in whole yes or no	or in par) If yes,	(4- Volument) appn PREVI	neo)	TO BE DATE PRIOR	SENT TO HED, LITT NUMBER:	/BUD/TSS: /- 5- 8/
E ANY OF THE MITTED FOR DELY(1es): ATED ACTIONS:	E ABOVE : REVIEW? No S:	STUDIES (circle:	EMITTED: in whole yes or no	or in par) If yes,	(4- Volum	neo)	TO BE DATE PRIOR	SENT TO HED, LITT NUMBER:	DATE: 4-5-87
E ANY OF THE MITTED FOR DOISE OF THE MITTED ACTIONS :	E ABOVE : REVISH? No S: Case	STUDIES (circle:	EMITTED: in whole yes or no	or in par) If yes,	(4- Volument) appn PREVI	neo)	TO BE DATE PRIOR	SENT TO HED, LITT NUMBER:	DATE: 4-5-87
E ANY OF THE MITTED FOR INTERPOLATIONS: ATED ACTIONS: ATED ACTIONS:	E ABOVE : REVIEW? No S: Case 0 4	Circle:	EMILIED: in whole yes or no	or in par) If yes,	(4- Volument) appn PREVI	neo)	TO BE DATE PRIOR	SENT TO HED, LITT NUMBER:	DATE: 4-5-87
E ANY OF THE MITTED FOR DELIVER OF THE MITTED ACTIONS HADDERED ACTIONS ACCIONS ACCORDANCE ACCORDANC	E ABOVE : REVIEW? No S: Case 0 4	Circle:	EMILIED: in whole yes or no	or in par) If yes,	(4- Volument) appn PREVI	COUSTY the	TO BE DATE PRIOR	SENT TO HED, THE NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	DATE: 4-5-87
E ANY OF THE MITTED FOR INTERPOLATIONS: ATED ACTIONS: AROUTIONS:	E ABOVE : REVIEW? No S: Case 0 4	Circle:	EMILIED: in whole yes or no	or in par) If yes,	rt) aben Revi , please ident	COUSTY the	DATE PROJE DATE	SENT TO HED, THE NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	DATE: 4-5-87 RD (HED/BUD/TSS PROVIDE): FOR DATA SUBMITTED UNDE
E ANY OF THE MITTED FOR INTERPOLATIONS: ATED ACTIONS: ATED ACTIONS:	E ABOVE REVISW? No S: Cease 7TB //R	Circle:	EMILIED: in whole yes or no	or in page) If yes	rt) aben Revi , please ident	BUD:	DATE PROJE DATE	SENT TO HED, ITT NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	DATE: 4-5-87 RD (HED/BUD/TSS PROVIDE):
E ANY OF THE MITTED FOR INTERPOLATION INTO THE PROCESS OF THE PROC	E ABOVE : REVIEW No S: Case D 4 D: 7TB //R	Circle:	EMILIED: in whole yes or no	or in page) If yes	TO: //TSS	BUD:	DATE PROJE DATE	SENT TO HED, ITT NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	PUD/TSS: /- 2-8/ DATE: 4-5-87 RD (HED/BUD/TSS PROVIDE): FOR DATA SUBMITTED UNDE A REGISTRATION STANDARD REVIEW Submission Criter
E ANY OF THE MITTED FOR DAY (1es): ATED ACTIONS: FROCTIONS: // FROCTIONS: // FROCTIONS: // FROCTIONS: // // // // // // // // //	E ABOVE : REVIEW No S: Case The //R REVIEW	CB ME	EMILIED: in whole yes or no	or in page) If yes	TO: //TSS	BUD:	DATE PROJE DATE	SENT TO HED, ITT NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	PUD/TSS: /- 5-87 DATE: 4-5-87 RD (HED/BUD/TSS PROVIDE): FOR DATA SUBMITTED UNDE A REGISTRATION STANDARD
E ANY OF THE MITTED FOR DAY (1es): ATED ACTIONS:	E ABOVE : REVIEW? Case Case The /TR REVIEW SY al Effect	CB ME	EMILIED: in whole yes or no	or in page) If yes	TO: //TSS	BUD:	DATE PROJE DATE	SENT TO HED, ITT NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	FOR DATA SUBMITTED UNDER A REGISTRATION STANDARD Review Submission Criter Policy Note #31 1 = data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet
E ANY OF THE MITTED FOR SYNTED ACTIONS: ATED ACTIO	E ABOVE : REVIEW? Change Cha	CB ME	EMILIED: in whole yes or no	or in page) If yes	TO: //TSS	BUD:	DATE PROJE DATE	SENT TO HED, ITT NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	POLICY Note #31 1 - S-S/ POLITIES: /- S-S/ POLICY NOTE: 4 - S-S/ POLICY Note #31 1 - data which meet
E ANY OF THE MITTED FOR DAY (les): ATED ACTIONS:	E ABOVE : REVIEW? Case The TR REVIEW Assessment	CB ME	EMILIED: in whole yes or no	or in page) If yes	TO: //TSS	BUD:	DATE PROJE DATE	SENT TO HED, ITT NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	FOR DATA SUBMITTED UNDE 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
E ANY OF THE MITTED FOR MITTED FOR MY (1es): ATED ACTIONS: TRUCTIONS: TRUCTIONS: TYPE OF Toxicolo Ecologic Residue (Product (E ABOVE : REVIEW? Case The TR REVIEW Assessment	CB ME	EMILIED: in whole yes or no	or in page) If yes	TO: //TSS	BUD:	DATE PROJE DATE	SENT TO HED, ITT NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	POLICY Note #31 1 = data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet 3(c)(2)(B) flagging criteria 2 = data of perticular concern
TYPE OF TOXICOLO Ecologic Residue (Exposure Product (Efficacy	E ABOVE : REVIEW O: TES / R REVIEW SY Assessmentstry	CB ME	AB //EDB	or in page) If yes	TO: //TSS	BUD:	DATE PROJE DATE	SENT TO HED, ITT NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	FOR DATA SUBMITTED UNDE A REGISTRATION STANDARD Review Submission Criter Policy Note #31 1 = data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet 3(a)(2)(B) flagging criteria 2 = data of particular concern 3 = data necessary to determine tiered
E ANY OF THE MITTED FOR MITTED FOR MY (1es): ATED ACTIONS: TROCTIONS: TROCTIONS: TYPE OF Toxicolo Ecologica Residue (Exposure Product (Efficacy Precautic	E ABOVE : REVIEW? Case The //R REVIEW Assessment Assessment The mary Lab	CB ME	AB //EDB	or in page) If yes	TO: //TSS	BUD:	DATE PROJE DATE	SENT TO HED, ITT NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	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 MITTED FO	E ABOVE : REVIEW? Clease O 4 REVIEW ASSESSME Chemistry Assessme Chemistry Assessme Chemistry Assessme	CB ME	AB //EDB	or in page) If yes	TO: //TSS	BUD:	DATE PROJE DATE	SENT TO HED, ITT NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	FOR DATA SUBMITTED UNDE A REGISTRATION STANDARD Review Submission Criter Policy Note #31 1 = data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet 3(a)(2)(B) flagging criteria 2 = data of particular concern 3 = data necessary to determine tiered