Date out of EAB Shaughnessy No: 090501 080803 100101 035506 To: David Giamporcaro Product Manager 080807 Registration Division (TS-767) 036101 Carolyn K. Offutt, Chief Contain 041405 From: Environmental Processes and Guidelines Section Exposure Assessment Branch Hazard Evaluation Division (TS-769C) Attached, please find the EAB review of... Reg./File #: Chemical Name: Alachlor & Alternatives: Atrazine, Cyanazine, Linuron, Metribuzin, Metolachlor, Simazine, Trifluralin, Butylate (ground water monitoring only) Type Product: Herbicide Product Name: Alachlor & alternatives Company Name: Monsanto. Purpose: Review of 1985 Surface and Ground Water Screening Results for Selected Herbicides for PD4 Action Code: 870 EAB #(s): 70164 and 70240 Date Received: 1/5/87 & 2/5/87 TAIS Code:_____ Date Completed: 7/1/87 Total Reviewing Time: 7 Monitoring study requested:____ Monitoring study voluntarily submitted: X Deferrals to: Ecological Effects Branch ____ Residue Chemistry Branch 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 Monitorine	a	
		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 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:

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. 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.

8. 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		МО
BLANCHESTER		ОН
BREESE		IL
CHARLESTON		IL
CLARINDA		IA
COLUMBUS	•	OH
DAVENPORT		IA
DECATUR		IL
GREENVILLE		NC
KANKAKEE		IL
LEXINGTON		MO
MARION		IL
MI. CITY		IN
MONROE		MI
MOUNT VERNON		IN
MUNCIE		IN
PIQUA		ОН
QUINCY		IL
RICHMOND		IN
ROANOKE RAPDS		NC
TOLEDO		OH
U OF IOWA		IA
WYACONDA		MO
YPSILANTI		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 Hartford, NC)
Cyanazine	4.5 (in Iroquois, IL) Only 3 of 243 wells were positive	
Butylațe	0.38 (in Miller, GA) Only 1 of 243 wells was positive	
Atrazine	6.5 (in Decatur, IN) Only 14 of 243 wells were positive	2.0 (in Decatur, IN)
Herbicide	Ground Water Maximum Concentration (ppb) 7/85 Screening	Maximum Concentration Confirmed 10/85 (ppb)

^{*}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	none 12/25/85 5/10 5/2 5/8 6/10 5/8	RANGE OF CONC(PPB) 0.48-0.88 <0.20-22.20 <0.20-19.07 <0.20-0.35 <0.20-2.15 0.57-17.97 <0.20-0.56 <0.20-1.20 <0.20-1.64 <0.20-1.64 <0.20-3.11 <0.20-1.59 <0.20 <0.20-0.26 <0.20-4.62 <0.20-4.62 <0.20-7.31 <0.20-1.73 <0.20-1.73 <0.20-1.24 -10.29 <0.20 -0.24 <0.20-2.95 0.32-1.13	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	<0.20	0.00-0.20

LOCATION	D100		
LOCATION . BETHANY	DATE OF MAX	RANGE OF CONC(PPB)	
BLANCHESTÉR	5/2/85	0.48-1.13	0.63-0.66
BREESE	7/10/85	0.30-22.77	6.38-6.40
	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	
RICHMOND	5/8	-9.07	0.40-0.45
ROANOKE RAPDS		0.26	2.23-2.27
TOLEDO	11/18		0.00-0.20
U OF IOWA	···	-0.35	0.10-0.22
WYACONDA	5/29	<0.20-2.76	0.60-0.65
	5/14	0.35-1.85	0.86-0.90
YPSILANTI	7/16	<0.20-0.31	0.06-0.21

^{*}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 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	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	<pre><0.20-0.33 <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 <0.20-3.67 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20</pre>	ANNUALIZED MEAN CONC* 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 0.12-0.32
U OF IOWA WYACONDA YPSILANTI	5/21 8/19 none	<0.20-1.54 <0.20-0.28	

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	5/2 5/8 4/29 5/8 none none 5/21	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 <0.20-1.32 <0.20 <0.20-1.32 <0.20 <0.20-1.55 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-1.35 <0.20-0.41 <0.20-0.85 <0.20-0.76 <0.20-4.41 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20-1.51	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
U OF IOWA	5/21	<0.20-1.51	
WYACONDA YPSILANTI	none none	<0.20 <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 3 - LINURON 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 none 6/19/85 6/06/85 none none 6/19/85 none none none none none none none 7/3 none none none 1/3 none 1/1 none	<0.20-0.23	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
U OF IOWA WYACONDA YPSILANTI	5/1 none none	<0.20-0.23 <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	12/16	<0.20-0.31 <0.20-0.27 <0.20 <0.20-0.21 <0.20-0.47 <0.20-0.44 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20-0.78 <0.20 <0.20-0.78	0.02-0.20 0.08-0.22 0.28-0.39 0.00-0.20 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 0.10-0.20 0.10-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20	MEAN	CONC*
		<0.20-2.66 <0.20-0.20 <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 4 - METOLACHLOR IN CWS

FINISHED WATER

LOCATION BETHANY	DATE OF MAX	RANGE OF CONC(PPB)	ANNUALIZED MEAN CONC*
BLANCHESTER	7/03/85	<0.20- 0.52	0.08-0.23
BREESE	6/06/85	<0.20- 2.72	0.22-0.34
CHARLESTON	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
CLARINDA	6/12	<0.20-0.82	0.11-0.26
COLUMBUS	6/19/85	<0.20- 9.15	2.03-2.05
DAVENPORT	5/14	<0.20-0.23	0.00-0.20
DECATUR	5/13	<0.20-0.74	0.26-0.33
GREENVILLE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
KANKAKEE	7/2	<0.20-0.59	0.12-0.26
LEXINGTON	5/1	<0.20-0.25	0.02-0.20
MARION	6/20	<0.20-0.43	0.11-0.24
MI. CITY	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MONROE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MOUNT VERNON	5/10	<0.20-1.15	0.10-0.25
MUNCIE	05/2	<0.20-1.12	0.21-0.34
PIQUA	8/28	<0.20-0.34	0.01-0.20
QUINCY	06/10	<0.20-0.31	0.02-0.20
RICHMOND	5/8		0.26-0.38
ROANOKE RAPDS	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
TOLEDO	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
U OF IOWA	5/21	<0.20-0.87	0.09-0.25
WYACONDA	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
YPSILANTI	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
	·. -		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 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 none	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 <0.20-0.23 <0.20-0.71 <0.20-1.23 <0.20-0.48 <0.20 <0.20-0.47 <0.20-1.94 <0.20-1.94 <0.20-0.41 <0.20-0.35 <0.20-0.41 <0.20-0.35 <0.20-1.92 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20	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 0.13-0.25 0.26-0.38 0.02-0.20 0.34-0.46 0.00-0.20 0.34-0.46 0.00-0.20 0.18-0.31 0.00-0.20
WYACONDA	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
YPSILANTI	none	<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 5 - METRIBUZIN IN CWS

FINISHED WATER

LOCATION	DATE OF MAX	RANGE OF CONC(PPB)	ANNUAL TOER MEAN COMM
BETHANY	none	<0.20	ANNUALIZED MEAN CONC*
BLANCHESTER	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
BREESE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
CHARLESTON	none	<0.20	
CLARINDA	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
COLUMBUS	5/22/85	<0.20- 0.24	0.00-0.20
DAVENPORT	none	<0.20	0.01-0.20
DECATUR	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
GREENVILLE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
KANKAKEE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
LEXINGTON	none		0.00-0.20
MARION		<0.20	0.00-0.20
MI. CITY	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MONROE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MOUNT VERNON	5/10	<0.20-0.72	0.01-0.21
MUNCIE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
PIQUA	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
QUINCY	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
RICHMOND	5/22+29	40 00 0 0 0	0.01-0.20
ROANOKE RAPDS	none		0.00-0.20
TOLEDO	6/19		0.01-0.20
U OF IOWA	none		0.00-0.20
WYACONDA	none		0.00-0.20
YPSILANTI	none		0.00-0.20
		· · · · · · ·	0.00-0.20

RAW WATER

^{*}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	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	<0.20 <0.20 <0.20-0.41 <0.20-0.54 <0.20-0.23 <0.20 <0.20-1.24	ANNUALIZED MEAN 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	CONC*
RICHMOND	6/19	<0.20- 1.24		
			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	<0.20	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	none 7/10 none	RANGE OF CONC(PPB) <0.20-0.41 <0.20-0.64 <0.20-0.37 <0.20 <0.20-0.27 <0.20-0.20 <0.20-0.29 <0.20 <0.20-0.35 <0.20 <0.20-0.35 <0.20 <0.20-0.62 <0.20-0.20 <0.20-1.62 <0.20-1.62 <0.20-1.76 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20-1.76 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20-1.76 <0.20 <0.20-0.28 <0.20 <0.20-0.28 <0.20-0.28	ANNUALIZED MEAN CONC* 0.01-0.20 0.10-0.24 0.04-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.01-0.20 0.01-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.02-0.21 0.12-0.24 0.00-0.20 0.10-0.23 0.11-0.26 0.01-0.20 0.38-0.47 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	6/12	<0.20-0.33	0.02-0.20

^{*}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 7 - TRIFLURALIN IN CWS

FINISHED WATER

LOCATION BETHANY	DATE OF MAX	RANGE OF CONC(PPB)	ANNUALIZED MEAN CONC*
	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	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
GREENVILLE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
KANKAKEE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
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	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MUNCIE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
PIQUA	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
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	
WYACONDA	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
YPSILANTI	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
		10.20	0.00-0.20

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

RELISTRATION DIVISION DATA REVIEW RECORD CASUFILI, NO.: CONFIDENTIAL NO.: CONFIDENTIAL NAME: CONTINUE RESIDENT REVIEW OF STUDIES PPA CNUX— CONFIDENTIAL NAME: CONTINUE RESIDENT REVIEW OF STUDIES PPA CNUX— CONFIDENTIAL NAME: CONFIDENTIAL NAME: ALACHLOR Reg. Std. Review Submission Criteria Accession Mumber Code Number Number Narrative Description (SEE BELCW) Number 090501 870 SUCCI 1985 Lulice and 265683	(HED PROVILE) PACK No.: 9982 /4 2/5/8-7 (RD PROVILE) SHAUGNESSY NO. 090501 (HED/BUD/TSS Complete) Study found to be
Does Not Contain National Security Info. (E.O. 12065) REFIGAL NAME: ALACHLOR Reg. Std. Review Submission Criteria Accession Theory Code Number Name Name Name (SE SEICH) Number	(FD FROVILE) SHAUGNESSY NO. 090501 (HED/BUD/TSS Complete)
ALACHLOR Reg. Std. Review Study Guideline dentifying Action ence Record or Criteria Accession comper Code Number Number Narrative Description (SEE BEICH) Number	SHAUGNESSY NO. O90501 (HFD/BUD/TSS Complete)
Reg. Std. Review Fefer Study Guideline Submission Identifying Action ence Record or Criteria Accession Amber Code Mumber Number Narrative Description (SEE SEICH) Number	090501 (HED/BUD/TSS Complete)
Review Submission Identifying Action ence Record or Criteria Accession Code Mumber Number Narrative Description (SEE BFICW) Number	
1902 Destruction of the second	- /
	review or reviewer comment
Shound Writer	
Screening Results	
lon Selected Harle - 1842	
rideo	
RODUCT MANAGER (FM) OF REVIEW MANAGER (RM) AND NUMBER:	V VEREZ AND LEAD
ADE RECEIVED (EPA): DAVID GIAM PORCARO R/1 79 RD FRANCE CHIEF INITIALS:	M MEMBER AND NUMBER:
PECK APPLICABLE BOX:	
STRUCTIONS: SPECIAL REVIEW PROJECTED RETURNS DATE REVIEWED	C
Clease review for 10%.	to no (new/Bull/153 PROVIDE):
refer to carolyn Offut, Linda	
Kulney	
NIEWS SENT TO: D:	
NUMBER OF ACTIONS TYPE OF REVIEW C. Representation Special Region Other	FOR DATA SUBMITTED UNDER A REGISTRATION STANDARD:
TYPE OF REVIEW ' Reregistration Special Review Other Toxicology	Review Submission Criteria.
Ecological Effects	Policy Note #31 1 = data which meet
Residue Chemistry	6(a)(2) or meet 3(c)(2)(B) flagging
Exposure Assessment	criteria
Product Chemistry	2 = data of particular concern
Efficacy	3 = data necessary to-
Precautionary Labeling/Acute Tox.	determine tiered testing requirements
Science Support	NOTE TO TSS: Return 1 Copy To RSERB

INCLUDE AN ORIGINAL AND FOUR (4) COPIES OF THIS COMPLETED FORM FOR EACH BRANCH CHECKED FOR REVIEW.

FD AROVIDE) ASWELL NO.:	REDISTRATION DIVISION CATA REVI TO BE USED FOR REVIEW OF STUDIE	S PPA ONLY—	/	(HED PROVIDE) PACK No.:
Does	Confidential Rusiness Informa Not Contain National Security In	tion fo. (E.O. 120	(65)	1/5/87 1
Frical NAME: ALACHLO		•		(RD MOVIDE) SHAUGNESSY NO. 09050/
Refer- entifying Action ence Rec	Study Guideline cord or aber Narrative Description	Reg. Std. Review Submission Criteria (SEE BELCW)	Accession Number	(HFD/BUD/TSS Complete) Study found to be Acceptable (A)/ Unacceptable(U) for review or reviewer comment
09/501 870 187,3			2656?3	Total of Control Collicia
	1.2 aunduater			
	Screening Results			
	los beleated Herbreide			
	U			
NAME WAVE OF A STATE OF THE STA				
DUCT MANAGER (PM) OF REVIEW MANA DAILD FLAMP F. RECEIVED (EPA):	ORCARO RM 79	1	PM/RM TEAM M	EMBER AND NUMBER:
CK APPLICABLE BOX:	RD BRANCH CHIEF IN	ITIALS:	٤	
BER OF INDIVIDUAL STUDIES SUBMITE E ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIES (in WE MITTED FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes city(ies):	ole or in pert) BEEN PRESTOURT	the DATE		Y RSERB BUD/TSS: /- 5-87
E ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIES (in we MITTED FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes o	ole or in pert) BEEN PRESTOURT	the DATE PRIOR PROJE	SENT TO HED/ ITY NUMBER: CIED RETURN	BUD/TSS: /- 5-87
E ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIFS (in windiffed for REVIEW? (circle: yes origines): No ATED ACTIONS: Please render-	nole or in part) HEN PREVIOUSL or no) If yes, please identify	the DATE PRIOR PROJE	SENT TO HED/ ITY NUMBER: CIED RETURN	BUD/TSS: 1- 5- 87 DATE: 4-5-87
E ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIFS (in wr MITTFD FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes o dy(ies): No ATED ACTIONS:	for in part) HEN FREVIOUSING PROPERTY (A LANCON CONTROL OF THE PARTY O	the DATE PRIOR PROJE	SENT TO HED/ ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	BUD/TSS: 1- 5- 87 DATE: 4-5-87
E ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIFS (in winditted for review? (circle: yes of div(ies): No ATED ACTIONS: RUCTIONS: (Case render for yes of the divine state of the divine st	for in part) HEN FREVIOUSING PROPERTY (A LANCON CONTROL OF THE PARTY O	PRIOR PROJECT	SENT TO HED/ ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	BUD/TSS: 1- 5- 87 DATE: 4-5-87 RD (HED/BUD/TSS PROVIDE):
E ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIFS (in windiffed for review? (circle: yes of divises): NO ATED ACTIONS: RUCTIONS: // Case render // D Y EWS SENT TO: // SIS // TB // RCB // EAB //	for in part) HEEN FREVIOUSING or no) If yes, please identify to for more from the formal for the formal from t	PRIOR PROJECT	SENT TO HED/ ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	EUD/TSS: /- 5-87 DATE: 4-5-87 RD (HED/BUD/TSS PROVIDE): FOR DATA SUBMITTED UNDER A REGISTRATION STANDARD:
E ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIFS (in winditted for review? (circle: yes origines): NO ATED ACTIONS: CRUCTIONS: Please review TYPE OF REVIEW	for in part) HEEN FREVIOUSING or no) If yes, please identify to for more from the formal for the formal from t	PRIOR PROJECT	SENT TO HED/ ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	BUD/TSS: /- 5-87 DATE: 4-5-87 RD (HED/BUD/TSS PROVIDE): FOR DATA SUBMITTED UNDER A REGISTRATION STANDARD: Review Submission Criteria Policy Note #31 1 = data which meet
E ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIFS (in wind the policy of the control of t	for in part) HEEN FREVIOUSING or no) If yes, please identify to for more from the formal for the formal from t	PRIOR PROJECT	SENT TO HED/ ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	FOR DATA SUBMITTED UNDER A REGISTRATION STANDARD: Review Submission Criteria Folicy Note #31 1 = data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet 3(c)(2)(B) flagging
E ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIFS (in windiffed for REVIEW? (circle: yes origines): ATED ACTIONS: CRUCTIONS: CRUCTIONS: CRUCTIONS: TYPE OF REVIEW Toxicology Ecological Effects	for in part) HEEN FREVIOUSING or no) If yes, please identify to for more from the formal for the formal from t	PRIOR PROJECT	SENT TO HED/ 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
E ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIFS (in winditted for review? (circle: yes of the actions: ATED ACTIONS: RUCTIONS: //Case result //SIS //TB //RCB //EAB // TYPE OF REVIEW Toxicology Ecological Effects Residue Chemistry	for in part) HEEN FREVIOUSING or no) If yes, please identify to for more from the formal for the formal from t	PRIOR PROJECT	SENT TO HED/ ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	FOR DATA SUBMITTED UNDER A REGISTRATION STANDARD: Review Submission Criteria Folicy Note #31 1 = data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet 3(c)(2)(B) flagging
E ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIFS (in wind the policy of the control of t	for in part) HEEN FREVIOUSING or no) If yes, please identify to for more from the formal for the formal from t	PRIOR PROJECT	SENT TO HED/ ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	EUD/TSS: /- 5-87 DATE: 4-5-87 RD (HED/BUD/TSS PROVIDE): 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
E ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIFS (in windiffed FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes only (ies): NO ATED ACTIONS: CRUCTIONS: CRUCTIONS: CRUCTIONS: Type OF REVIEW Toxicology Ecological Effects Residue Chemistry Product Chemistry	Tees RD: //TSS E	PRIOR PROJECT	SENT TO HED/ ITY NUMBER: CTED RETURN RETURNED TO	EUD/TSS: /- 5-87 DATE: 4-5-87 RD (HED/BUD/TSS PROVIDE): 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
E ANY OF THE ABOVE STUDIFS (in windiffed FOR REVIEW? (circle: yes only (ies): ATED ACTIONS: CRUCTIONS: CRUCTIONS: TYPE OF REVIEW Toxicology Ecological Effects Residue Chemistry Exposure Assessment Product Chemistry	Tees RD: //TSS E	PRIOR PROJECT	SENT TO HED/ 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- determine tiered