UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

NOV 26 1992

OFFICE OF
PREVENTION, PESTICIDES
AND TOXIC SUBSTANCES

Memorandum:

SUBJECT: PP#9F3787. Revised Section F. Avermectin B_1 in/on pears. (No MRID#, CB#10644, Barcode#D182971).

FROM: Jerry B. Stokes, Chemist
Chemistry Branch/Tolerance Support
Health Effects Division (H7509C)

THRU: Philip V. Errico, Section Head
Chemistry Branch/Tolerance Support
Health Effects Division (H7509C)

TO: George LaRocca/Adam Heyward, PM-15
Fungicide-Herbicide Branch
Registration Division (H7505C)

and

Toxicology Branch
Health Effects Division (H7509C)

Merck Sharp & Dohme Research Laboratories, Merck & Co., Inc., proposed that a tolerance be established for the residues of the miticide avermectin B_1 and the delta 8,9 geometric isomer of avermectin B_1a in/on pears at 0.035 ppm.

CBTS had recommended a 0.05 ppm tolerance in/on pears based upon the residue data submitted (See memo of 3/22/91, J. Stokes). The proposed PHI was 14 days. CBTS also requested a revised Section F.

In addition, the petitioner submitted the pear residue data using the analytical method No. 8000 for analysis of the residues. CBTS does not consider this method acceptable for enforcement purposes, and CBTS has requested additional data for this method (See memo of 4/16/92, J. Stokes).

The petitioner has now submitted a cover letter dated 9/23/92 and a Section F requesting that the tolerance of 0.035 ppm be established for pears. The petitioner has also requested that the 14-day PHI be increased to a 21-day PHI.

Conclusions/Recommendations:

CBTS continues to recommend that a tolerance of 0.05 ppm be established for the combined residues of avermectin B_1 and 8,9-Z-avermectin B_1 in/on pears. Additional data with the proposed 21-day PHI must be submitted before CBTS can consider the petitioner's request because of, 1) the nonlinear decline of residue after treatment, 2) the large variation of residues levels found on treated fruit within the same field trial, and between different field trials, and 3) the large differences in residue levels observed with high dilution aqueous spraying vs. low volume oil spraying.

cc: PP#9F3787; J. Stokes (CBTS); R.F.; Circu.
RDI: PErrico:11/19/92:RLoranger:11/19/92
H7509C:CBTS:JStokes:js:Rm 803:CM#2:305-7561:11/23/92