

196811,196812  
RECORD NO.

122804  
SHAUGHNESSEY NO.

REVIEW NO.

EEB REVIEW

DATE: IN 6-09-87 OUT 7-8-87

FILE OR REG. NO 618-EUP-12 50658-EUP-2

DATE OF SUBMISSION 5-26-87

DATE RECEIVED BY HED 6-03-87

RD REQUESTED COMPLETION DATE 8-24-87

EEB ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE 8-17-87

RD ACTION CODE/TYPE OF REVIEW 754

TYPE PRODUCT(S) : I, D, H, F, N, R, S Miticide

PRODUCT MANAGER NO. G. LaRocca (15)

PRODUCT NAME(S) Avermectin

COMPANY NAME Merck Sharp and Dohme

SUBMISSION PURPOSE Amendment to EUP's

SHAUGHNESSEY NO. 122804 CHEMICAL, & FORMULATION % A.I.

197790  
RECORD NO.

122804  
SHAUGHNESSEY NO.

REVIEW NO.

EEB REVIEW

DATE: IN 6-23-87 OUT 7-8-87

FILE OR REG. NO 50658-EUP-2

DATE OF SUBMISSION 6-10-87

DATE RECEIVED BY HED 6-19-87

RD REQUESTED COMPLETION DATE 9-7-87

EEB ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE 9-7-87

RD ACTION CODE/TYPE OF REVIEW 711

TYPE PRODUCT(S) : I, D, H, F, N, R, S Insecticide/Miticide

PRODUCT MANAGER NO. G. LaRocca (15)

PRODUCT NAME(S) Avermectin

COMPANY NAME Merck Sharp and Dohme

SUBMISSION PURPOSE Revisions to Current EUP

SHAUGHNESSEY NO. 122804 CHEMICAL, & FORMULATION 8 A.I.

2



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

OFFICE OF  
PESTICIDES AND TOXIC SUBSTANCES

MEMORANDUM

July 8, 1987

SUBJECT: Modifications to EUP's 50658-EUP-2 and 618-EUP-12 for  
Use of Abamectin on Cotton and Citrus, Respectively

FROM: *Daniel Rieder* 7-8-87  
Daniel Rieder, Wildlife Biologist  
Ecological Effects Branch  
Hazard Evaluation Division TS-769C

THRU: *for Allen W. Vaughan* 7-8-87  
Norman J. Cook, Head, Section 2  
Ecological Effects Branch  
Hazard Evaluation Division TS-769C

THRU: *M. Slimak* 7/8/87  
Michael W. Slimak, Chief  
Ecological Effects Branch  
Hazard Evaluation Division TS-769C

TO: George LaRocca, PM(15)  
Insecticide and Rodenticide Branch  
Registration Division TS-767C

With this memorandum EEB is responding to modifications submitted by Merck, Sharp and Dohme. The concern with these EUP's was possible effects to endangered species.

Cotton

In EEB's previous review on 50658-EUP-2 dated February 11, 1986 several counties were identified where Abamectin could not be used to avoid possible effects to endangered species. See attachment 1. In their June 26, 1987 letter (attachment 2), Merck indicated that their cotton EUP program would avoid most of the counties identified in the February 11 review. One exception is Burleson County, Texas. There they indicate they will avoid the area around Lake Woodrow. Further, based on telephone conversations with David Tilton, USFWS in Ft. Worth, TX, they identified several other Texas locations which they will avoid to preclude possible adverse effects to endangered species. They also specify areas in Kern County, California, to which the use of Abamectin will be limited. These locations of testing and areas from which Abamectin will be prohibited will preclude possible exposure and effects to endangered species. These areas, identified in their June 26 letter, were confirmed by telephone conversation to David Tilton, on July 7, 1987.

### Citrus

In previous correspondence from Merck, dated May 22, 1987 (attachment 3), the areas where Abamectin would not be used, or where it would be used exclusively, in the Citrus EUP program were identified. These locations were confirmed by telephone conversation with Dr. Singleton of the Sacramento USFWS Office on June 25, 1987. The EEB concludes, therefore, that the Citrus EUP program with Abamectin may be conducted without effecting endangered species. See review dated February 19, 1987.

### Conclusion

The EEB has reviewed both the Cotton EUP (50658-EUP-2) and the Citrus EUP (618-EUP-12) proposed by Merck for Abamectin. If the location restrictions and prohibitions which are identified in attachments 2 and 3 are included in the EUP's, the potential for effects to endangered species will be eliminated.

The available data, therefore, indicate these EUP's will have minimal adverse effects to nontarget organisms and no effects to endangered species.

### Attachments

4

## UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

## MEMORANDUM

July 8, 1987

**SUBJECT:** Modifications to EUP's 50658-EUP-2 and 618-EUP-12 for Use of Abamectin on Cotton and Citrus, Respectively

**FROM:** Daniel Rieder, Wildlife Biologist  
Ecological Effects Branch  
Hazard Evaluation Division TS-769C

**THRU:** Norman J. Cook, Head, Section 2  
Ecological Effects Branch  
Hazard Evaluation Division TS-769C

**THRU:** Michael W. Slimak, Chief  
Ecological Effects Branch  
Hazard Evaluation Division TS-769C

**TO:** George LaRocca, PM(15)  
Insecticide and Rodenticide Branch  
Registration Division TS-767C

With this memorandum EEB is responding to modifications submitted by Merck, Sharp and Dohme. The concern with these EUP's was possible effects to endangered species.

Cotton

In EEB's previous review on 50658-EUP-2 dated February 11, 1986 several counties were identified where Abamectin could not be used to avoid possible effects to endangered species. See attachment 1. In their June 26, 1987 letter (attachment 2), Merck indicated that their cotton EUP program would avoid most of the counties identified in the February 11 review. One exception is Burleson County, Texas. There they indicate they will avoid the area around Lake Woodrow. Further, based on telephone conversations with David Tilton, USFWS in Ft. Worth, TX, they identified several other Texas locations which they will avoid to preclude possible adverse effects to endangered species. They also specify areas in Kern County, California, to which the use of Abamectin will be limited. These locations of testing and areas from which Abamectin will be prohibited will preclude possible exposure and effects to endangered species. These areas, identified in their June 26 letter, were confirmed by telephone conversations to David Tilton, on July 7,

SYMBOL	1987 TS-767C	TS-769C	TS-769C					
SURNAME	Rieder	Vaughan	Shumaker					5
DATE	7-8-87	7-8-87	7/8/87					

## Citrus

In previous correspondence from Merck, dated May 22, 1987 (attachment 3), the areas where Abamectin would not be used, or where it would be used exclusively, in the Citrus EUP program were identified. These locations were confirmed by telephone conversation with Dr. Singleton of the Sacramento USFWS Office on June 15, 1987. The EEB concludes, therefore, that the Citrus EUP program with Abamectin may be conducted without effecting endangered species. See review dated February 19, 1987.

## Conclusion

The EEB has reviewed both the Cotton EUP (50658-EUP-2) and the Citrus EUP (618-EUP-12) proposed by Merck for Abamectin. If the location restrictions and prohibitions which are identified in attachments 2 and 3 are included in the EUP's, the potential for effects to endangered species will be eliminated.

The available data, therefore, indicate these EUP's will have minimal adverse effects to nontarget organisms and no effects to endangered species.

Attachments

Avermectin science review

---

Page \_\_\_\_\_ is not included in this copy.

Pages 7 through 20 are not included in this copy.

---

The material not included contains the following type of information:

- ☐ Identity of product inert ingredients
  - ☐ Identity of product impurities
  - ☐ Description of the product manufacturing process
  - ☐ Description of product quality control procedures
  - ☐ Identity of the source of product ingredients
  - ☐ Sales or other commercial/financial information
  - ☐ A draft product label
  - ☐ The product confidential statement of formula
  - ☐ Information about a pending registration action
  - ☒ FIFRA registration data
  - ☐ The document is a duplicate of page(s) \_\_\_\_\_
  - ☐ The document is not responsive to the request
- 

The information not included is generally considered confidential by product registrants. If you have any questions, please contact the individual who prepared the response to your request.

---