

Date 6/22/86

ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP

TO: (Name, office symbol, room number, building, Agency/Post)

	Initials	Date
1. Doug Urban		
2. John P. Casarotto		
3.		
4.		
5.		

Action	File	Note and Return
Approval	For Clearance	Per Conversation
As Requested	For Correction	Prepare Reply
Circulate	For Your Information	See Me
Comment	Investigate	Signature
Coordination	Justify	

REMARKS

See for comments! We need to act fast because of my delay in getting to this review.

DO NOT use this form as a RECORD of approvals, concurrences, disposals, clearances, and similar actions

FROM: (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post) M. Glavin	Room No.—Bldg. Phone No.
--	-----------------------------------

5041-102

U.S.G.P.O.: 1985:461-274/426

OPTIONAL FORM 41 (Rev. 7-76)
 Prescribed by GSA
 FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.206

Donny Idan
John Casciulli

I am going to disagree with your
final conclusion - Protocol rejected!

but basically agree with most of your
concerns, comments & criticisms. This is
by far, the most extensive field study I've seen
thus far & I think it has some
interesting elements - albeit untuned & untested.
I think I would say that the protocol
is reasonably acceptable but we - E&B - would
like clarification & understanding on a
number of points. I definitely see the
hand of Rendall in this design & I think
there are some good ideas. As to whether
it really "negates the presumption of vaguel"
already established, I'm not sure.

At any rate I'd like to meet w the
company. Perhaps we - E&B - need to meet
together to discuss some of the issues
raised here in this review. The
field studies review was rather "tense"
to say the least. This extensive protocol
requires a lot of work on the part of the
reviewer - which is obvious to me - and the
field studies committee.

Because it's been in my "intermediate
box" so long, we've probably lost anything for →

this use season. I want John B.
to review the review & indicate protocol
is accepted, providing the Co. ~~provides~~
comes in & discusses many of our
questions.

I want someone - Doug or John - to
call the American Cyanamid contact &
let him know what we're thinking.
Do you both have any problems
with my suggestions? Perhaps we
should meet to discuss further.

M. Slonick
9/22/86

I believe that we have Mark
Horse FD, not directly with the
company until the actual
meeting. We've had a poor record
etc. clear telephone communication
with the company. JSC

Observations of ... to ...

The carcass search proposals seems promising but must be specifically described in terms of the actual sites, once selected. ~~The more extensive program may be required if~~
~~modification is required~~

I recommend not emphasizing the insect work as proposed, as this information will be very difficult to interpret. While we agree that insect populations may be an important factor in bird presence, we are not interested in the particular insect population variations at the study sites per se, but rather in the specific effect of the pesticide on the birds. The insect population variation between sites is likely to be considerable. Keep in mind that the population parameters previously discussed are more important than the insect densities.

~~proceeding to the ...~~
The protocol will need to fully discuss residue monitoring. Sampling design, schedules and analytical methodology in soils, vegetation and wildlife must be discussed.

An outline for writing protocols is enclosed for use by the registrant. We strongly recommend meeting on the issue after a protocol is proposed.

10. Conclusion: Protocol accepted _____
Protocol accepted with modifications _____
Protocol rejected _____ **X**

John Bascietto

John Bascietto
Ecological Effects Branch
Hazard Evaluation Division
(HED) TS 769C

Douglas Urban 6/30/86
Douglas Urban, Head SEC. 3
Ecological Effects Branch
HED TS 769C

Ed Fite, Chairman
Terrestrial Field Study Committee
Ecological Effects Branch
HED TS-769C

Michael Slimak, Chief
Ecological Effects Branch
HED TS-769C