

125401

Date Out EFB:

AUG 12 1986

To: Robert Taylor
Product Manager 25
Registration Division (TS-767)

From: Samuel M. Creeger, Chief *SM*
Review Section No. 1
Exposure Assessment Branch
Hazard Evaluation Division (TS-769)

Attached please find the environmental fate review of:

Reg./File No.: 279-EUP-109

Chemical: Dimethazone (FMC-57020)

Type Product: Herbicide

Product Name: COMMAND

Company Name: FMC

Submission Purpose: RCB request for soil persisitence information.

Date In: 6/4/86

Action Code: 701

Date Completed: AUG 12 1986

EAB # 6672

Days - 0.2

Deferrals To:

 Ecological Effects Branch

 Residue Chemistry Branch

 Toxicology Branch

Monitoring study requested by EAB: ☐

Monitoring study voluntarily conducted by registrant: ☐

709

1. CHEMICAL: Dimethazone.
2. TEST MATERIAL: N/A.
3. STUDY/ACTION TYPE: RCB request for soil persistence information from EAB.
4. STUDY IDENTIFICATION: N/A.
5. REVIEWED BY: Samuel M. Creeger, Chief
Section #1/EAB
Hazard Evaluation Division
6. APPROVED BY: Samuel M. Creeger
7. CONCLUSIONS: Field dissipation data previously submitted by FMC and evaluated by EAB in the August 27, 1985 evaluation, indicate that low levels of dimethazone residues can be expected in soil at 10 months post-application. This is based on residues actually found at 7 months post-application of 0.06-0.14 ppm and residues actually found at one year post-application of 0.02-0.16 ppm. (Soil samples were not taken at 10 months).

Although residues were not found to be taken up by rotational crops when a 10 month rotational interval was observed, recent data indicate the potential for phytotoxicity when low levels of residues are in the soil.
8. RECOMMENDATIONS: The above CONCLUSIONS should be relayed to the RCB/HED in response to their request for same.
9. BACKGROUND: RCB is asking for soil persistence data of dimethazone so they can determine if application to fallow land, which will then be planted to wheat at 10 months post-application, is a food or a non-food use. Refer to the memo from RCB dated Aug. 2, 1985 (attached).
10. DISCUSSION OF INDIVIDUAL STUDIES: N/A.
11. ONE-LINER: New information was not included with this submission; therefore, the one-liner was not amended.
12. CBI: no CBI was included with this submission.

Sam Creeger
AUG 12 1986

710



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

AUG 2 1985

OFFICE OF
PESTICIDES AND TOXIC SUBSTANCES

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: EPA Reg. No. 279-EUP-RNO. Command® on fallow land.
Accession No. 258105. RCB No. 1087.

FROM: Linda S. Propst, Chemist
Residue Chemistry Branch
Hazard Evaluation Division (TS-769)

Linda S. Propst

THRU: Charles L. Trichilo, Chief
Residue Chemistry Branch
Hazard Evaluation Division (TS-769)

[Signature]

TO: Robert Taylor, PM 25
Fungicide-Herbicide Branch
Registration Division (TS-767)

The Agricultural Chemicals Group, FMC Corporation is requesting an Experimental Use Permit to ship and use Command® 6 EC containing 2-(2-chlorophenyl)methyl-4,4-dimethyl-3-isoxazolidinone on fallow land.

Command® 6 EC whose Confidential Statement of Formula was submitted with PP#4F3128 contains 6 lbs of active ingredient per gallon. The inert ingredients of this formulation have been cleared under Section 180.1001 (c) or (d).

This Experimental Use Permit request is for a period of two years (July 1, 1985 through July 1, 1987) and involves 183 gallons (1,098 lbs. active) of Command® 6 EC to be applied in Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to 1,100 acres per year (2,200 acres total).

Command® 6 EC is to be applied alone or in tank mix combination at rates of 0.5 to 1.25 lbs a.i./A in a surface applied broadcast application with ground equipment using a finished spray volume of 5 to 40 gallons per acre. In areas where the winter wheat-fallow-winter wheat cropping system is practiced, make application after wheat harvest but before germination of volunteer wheat and other fall germinating winter annual weeds. Do not plant wheat sooner than 10 months after a late summer or fall application.

Providing EAB finds no residues remaining in the soil at the time of planting the subsequent crop, we would consider this to be a non-food use.

711

3


Conclusions and Recommendations

We defer to EAB as to their concerns about residues remaining in the soil at the time of planting the subsequent crop. If there are no residues remaining in the soil at the time of planting the subsequent crop, we would consider this to be a non-food use and would have no objections to the proposed EUP. If there are residues in the soil, this would be considered a food use and would require tolerances for residues in the subsequent crop.

TS-769:RCB:LSP:lsp:CM#2:Rm810:X77324:8/1/85

RDI: R. Loranger, 8/1/85; R.D.Schmitt, 8/1/85

cc: Reading File, Circulation File, Subject File, Reviewer, EAB
PMSD/ISB



712

4