

ENVIRONMENTAL FATE AND GROUND WATER BRANCH**Review Action**

To: Walter Waldrop, PM # 71
Special Review and Reregistration Division (7508W)

From: Elizabeth Behl, Section Head
Ground Water Technology Section
Environmental Fate & Ground Water Branch/EFED (7507C)

Thru: Henry Jacoby, Chief
Environmental Fate & Ground Water Branch/EFED (7507C)

Attached, please find the EFGWB review of...

Common Name:	Metolachlor	Trade name:	Dual, Medal
Company Name:	CIBA-GEIGY Corporation		
ID #:			
Purpose:	Review of quarterly report for metolachlor small-scale prospective monitoring study		

Type Product:	Action Code:	EFGWB #(s):	Review Time:
Herbicide	001		0.5 day

STATUS OF STUDIES IN THIS PACKAGE:

Guideline	MRID	Status ¹
166-1		

**STATUS OF DATA REQUIREMENTS
ADDRESSED IN THIS PACKAGE:**

Guideline	Status ²
166-1	S

¹Study Status Codes:²Data Requirement Status Codes:

A=Acceptable U=Upgradeable C=Ancillary I=Invalid.

S=Satisfied P=Partially satisfied N=Not satisfied R=Reserved W=Waived.

1. CHEMICAL:

Chemical name: 2-Chloro-N-(2-ethyl-6-methylphenyl)-N-(2-methoxy-1-methylethyl)acetamide

Common name: Metolachlor
Trade names: Dual and Medal
Structure:

2. TEST MATERIAL:

Metolachlor

3. STUDY/ACTION TYPE

~~Review of quarterly report for metolachlor small-scale prospective monitoring study~~

4. STUDY IDENTIFICATION:

Title: A Small-Scale Prospective Ground Water Monitoring Study for Metolachlor (Dual) at a Worst-Case Vulnerable Site in the Southeastern United States. Progress Report #1.

By: Christopher Stone
Stone Environmental, Inc.

For: CIBA-GEIGY Corporation
P.O. Box 18300
Greensboro, NC 27419

5. REVIEWED BY:

Kevin Costello, Geologist
OPP/EFED/EFGBW/Ground Water Technology Section

Signature: Kevin Costello

Date: 10/31/95

6. APPROVED BY:

Elizabeth Behl, Section Chief
OPP/EFED/EFGBW/Ground Water Section

Signature: Elizabeth Behl

Date: 11/3/95

7. CONCLUSIONS:

This quarterly report is acceptable. The amendments to the protocol are noted, and are not objectionable. These include increasing the rate of application of metolachlor from 3 to 4 lb-ai/acre, distance of the control area from the test plot, and other minor changes. Protocol deviations were also minor, corresponding to depth, abandonment or backfilling of specific wells or characterization cores.

The registrant should continue to follow up positive bromide or immunoassay screen detections with LC/MS analyses. However, the background bromide concentration of 200 ppb seems to be high, and is twice the level that the field crew apparently had expected. The registrants should identify the method being used to measure bromide concentrations in the field and ensure that the method is accurate by confirming the concentration using another analytical method. A background level of 200 ppb does not warrant a trigger of 1.0 ppm for LC/MS analysis of metolachlor. ~~The trigger was to be based on the breakthrough of bromide.~~ Thus, any detections of bromide greater than background (whatever that is determined to be) should be followed up by analysis for metolachlor using LC/MS.