258835	
Record No.	Review No.
	108501
	Shaughnessey No.

# EEB REVIEW

DATE: IN <u>March 1, 1990</u> OUT <u>March 1, 1990</u>

FILE OR REG. NO. 90-MN-04			
PETITION OR EXP. NO.	angan penganangan menangan apangangan pengangangan pengandan dalah dalam dan sebagai sebagai dan sebagai sebag		
DATE OF SUBMISSION <u>January 25, 1990</u>			
DATE RECEIVED BY EFED <u>February 7, 1990</u>			
RD REQUESTED COMPLETION DATA <u>February 22, 1990</u>			
EEB ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE <u>February 22, 1990</u>			
RD ACTION CODE/TYPE OF REVIEW 510	y nagatan yang di kanalang sa kanalang manang mana kanalang da kanalang da kanalang da kanalang da kanalang da		
TYPE PRODUCTS(S): I, D, H, F, N, R, S <u>Herbicide</u>			
MRID NO(S). <u>none</u>	<u>.</u>		
PRODUCT MANAGER NO. J. Tomkins/Rebecca Cool 557-7700			
PRODUCT NAME(S) <u>Prowl 4E, Pendimethalin</u>			
COMPANY NAME <u>Minnesota Dept of Agriculture</u>			
SUBMISSION PURPOSE <u>Section 18 for use on onion field</u>			
SHAUGHNESSEY NO. CHEMICAL AND FORMULATION	% A.I.		
108501 Pendimethalin, emulsifiable	42.3%		
	<del>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </del>		
	**************************************		

1

108501 Shaughnessy No.

Emergency Use Application (Section 18)

# Pendimethalin (Prowl®)

In onion fields in Minnesota

Ecological Effects Branch Review

# 100. REASON FOR APPLICATION:

## 100.1 NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE EMERGENCY:

Applicant and Request- Jim Nichols, Commissioner

Calvin E. Blanchard, Pesticide Advisor Minnesota Department of Agriculture

90 West Plato Blvd. St. Paul, MN 55107

Knowledgeable Expert- Dr. Vincent A Fritz

Horticulturist and Assistant Professor

Southern Experiment Station University of Minnesota Waseca, MN 56093

Alternatives- Mechanical control methods damage the fragile seedling and their beds. Other herbicides cannot be used in muck soils (Paraquat<sup>®</sup>), have no residual activity (Roundup<sup>®</sup>) or give little early weed control (Fusilade and Goal).

#### 100.2 TARGET ORGANISMS:

Setaria spp. Digitaria spp. Panicum dichotomiflorum Echinochloa crusgalli Euphorbia supina

Foxtail grasses Crabgrass Fall panicum

Barnyardgrass Prostrate spurge

# 100.3 DATE AND DURATION OF THE TREATMENT:

The submission did not give the dates of the treatment, but a telephone conversation revealed that the request is for the 1990 growing season. There will be preemergence application about April 10 and, perhaps, a post emergence treatment 30 days later.

### 100.4 APPLICATION METHODS, DIRECTIONS AND RATES:

Since the label was not included, EEB called Dr. Vincent Fritz and found that it would be applied by ground broadcasting about April 10 as a preemergence (the onions are planted as seeds) herbicide. They will only apply a second treatment if prostrate spurge remained about one month later. The submission states that, "The rate of application in terms of active ingredient and product is two pounds and two quarts per acre, respectively, for a single application.

#### 100.5 TREATMENT AREAS:

Onions are grown on high organic matter soils (muck soils) primarily in southern counties. The Census of Agriculture (1987) lists Clay, Douglas, Chippewa, Hennepin, Washington, Dakota and Freeborn counties as having 34 of the 64 dry bulb onion farms in the State. Freeborn county had 566 acres under cultivation against 152 acres for the rest of the State. The total acreage will be no more than 1,000 acres.

## 100.6 PRECAUTIONARY LABELING:

Not given.

# 101. PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL PROPERTIES:

#### 101.1 NAMES:

Pendimethalin N-(1-Ethylpropyl) 3,4-dimethyl-2,6-dinitro benzenamine Prowl

# 101.2 FORMULATION:

The label was not included in the submission and the formulation was not given, but the rate given above (two pounds and two quarts per acre) show that it is Prowl 4 E.

N-(1-Ethylpropyl) 3,4-dimethyl-2,6-dinitro benzenamine 42.3% Inert ingredients 57.7 100%

#### 101.3 BEHAVIOR IN THE ENVIRONMENT:

Pendimethalin is stable at pH 5, 7 and 9 at 25 °C in the dark but volatilizes under photolysis. It is "quite persistent in an aquatic ecosystem" (Turner, EEB Chemical Profile, 1984). Its half life is 90 days and it may bioaccumulate.

#### 102. HAZARD ASSESSMENT:

#### 102.1 TOXICOLOGY:

There is enough toxicological information to make a hazard judgement for this use.

# 102.2 NON-TARGET ORGANISMS:

Terrestrial- Pendimethalin is only slightly toxic to birds (dietary  $LC_{50}>4,000$  ppm for both Bobwhite quail (Colinus virginianus) and Mallard duck (Anas platyrhynchos)). Mammalian oral  $LD_{50}$ s range form 2,000 to >5,000 mg/kg.

Aquatic- Pendimethalin is highly toxic to aquatic organisms. The Rainbow trout (Salmo gairdneri) LC<sub>50</sub> is 0.14 ppm (supplemental); the Bluegill sunfish (Lepomis macrochirus) LC<sub>50</sub> is 0.20 ppm (supplemental) and Daphnia magna's LC<sub>50</sub> is 0.28 ppm.

Plants- Test results are pending.

Discussion- The maximum expected EEC from runoff is 0.2 lbs ai/10 A. If drained directly into a one acre, six inch deep pond it would produce an EC<sub>50</sub> of 12 ppb.

### 102.3 ENDANGERED SPECIES:

The endangered plants that occur in the area are not found on cultivated land. Previous, informal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service revealed that the only endangered species, Higgins' eye pearly mussel, would not be affected unless the chemical was toxic to invertebrates at >10 ppb., which it is not.

### 102.4 ADEOUACY OF LABELING:

The submission had no labeling.

### 102.4 DISCUSSION:

Pendimethalin is slightly toxic to birds and mammals, but is highly toxic to aquatic organisms. Runoff from treated areas could pose a risk to aquatic nontarget species and endangered species. The possibility of this occurring is small because: 1) herbicide applications do not show a tendency to drift because of their large droplet size, 2) runoff is minimal since onions are grown in former swamp areas, which are level, 3) it binds to the high organic content in the "muck" soil, and 4) the area to be treated is less than 1,000 acres.

#### 103. CONCLUSIONS:

EEB has reviewed the proposed emergency exemption to use Pendimethalin in onion fields in Minnesota and has concluded that the proposed use will not result in hazard to terrestrial nontarget organisms. However, aquatic organisms in freshwater habitats near treatment areas may be at risk from the proposed use.

# 104. REVIEWED BY:

James J. Goodyear Sigr	nature: James Goodyear
Biologist, Section 1	
Ecological Effects Branch	Date: March 1, 1990
Environmental Fate and Effects Division (H7507C	<i></i>

### 105

. APPROVED BY:	
Raymond W. Matheny	Signature: 1 1 100 (190) With the
Head, Section 1	
Ecological Effects Branch	Date: $3/1/90$
Environmental Fate and Effects Division (H7	507C)
James W. Akerman	Signature: Jour W. Jun
Branch Chief	79000
Ecological Effects Branch	Date: 3/1/4/
Environmental Fate and Effects Division (H7	(507C)

# LITERATURE CITED

Census of agriculture. 1987. Geographic area series. Superintendent of Documents no. C 3.31/4:987/v.1. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.