

242707
RECORD NO.

125401
SHAUGHNESSEY NO.

EEB REVIEW

DATE: IN 04-05-89 OUT APR 13 1989

FILE OR REG. NO. 89-VA-07

PETITION OR EXP. NO. _____

DATE OF SUBMISSION 03-29-89

DATE RECEIVED BY EFED 04-05-89

RD REQUESTED COMPLETION DATE 04-15-89

EEB ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE 04-15-89

RD ACTION CODE/TYPE OF REVIEW 510

TYPE PRODUCT Herbicide

DATA ACCESSION NOS. _____

PRODUCT MANAGER NO. D. Stubbs (41)

PRODUCT NAME(S) Command 4EC

COMPANY NAME State of Virginia

SUBMISSION PURPOSE Proposed Section 18 for use on
sweet potatoes

SHAUGHNESSEY NO.	CHEMICAL & FORMULATION	%AI
<u>125401</u>	<u>Command herbicide</u>	<u>47.1%</u>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

871

EEB BRANCH REVIEW

Command Herbicide (Clomazone)

100 Submission Purpose and Label Information100.1 Submission Purpose and Pesticide Use

The State of Virginia is requesting an emergency exemption (Section 18) for the use of Command herbicide to control annual broadleaf weeds and grasses in sweet potatoes. No data were submitted with this request.

100.2 Formulation InformationCommand 4EC

ACTIVE INGREDIENT:

2-(2-Chlorophenyl) methyl-4,4-dimethyl-
3-isoxazolidinone 47.1%
INERT INGREDIENTS 52.9%

This product contains 4 lb ai per gallon.

100.3 Application Methods, Directions, Rates

A. Timing and Method of Application

Preplant incorporated: Command may be applied preplant incorporated from May 1 to July 1, 1989. Incorporate as outlined on the Command label.

B. Rate and Number of Applications

Command will be applied at a rate of 1.5 pt (0.75 lb ai) per acre preplant incorporated. One application will be allowed under this exemption.

100.4 Target Organisms

Target organisms are the following annual grasses and broadleaf weeds:

Common lambsquarters	Crabgrass (large, smooth)
Jimsonweed	Panicum (Texas, fall)
Purslane	Foxtail (giant, green, yellow,
Common ragweed	robust)
Pennsylvania smartweed	Field sandbur
Velvetleaf	Barnyardgrass
Spurred anoda	

872

100.5 Precautionary Labeling (from Command label)APPLICATION PRECAUTIONS

Do not apply Command 4EC herbicide preemergence to fields that are within 1500 feet of the areas listed below:

Residences

Towns and subdivisions

Commercial vegetable production (except sweet corn)

Commercial fruit production

Commercial nurseries

Commercial greenhouses

Small grain fields

Caution must be taken to minimize spray drift as off-site movement can cause temporary whitening or yellowing of plants. Consult the label for information on the reduction of drift. Prior to making applications, it is recommended that adjacent properties be checked and if susceptible and desirable plant species are present, that preemergence spraying within 1500 feet be avoided.

101 Hazard Assessment101.1 Discussion

The state of Virginia is requesting an emergency exemption for the use of Command herbicide to control annual grasses and broadleaf weeds in sweet potatoes. Proposed maximum application rate is 1.5 pt (0.75 lb ai) per acre, with one application allowed. Exemption period is May 1 through July 1, 1989. This request is for use on 1500 acres of sweet potatoes.

Command herbicide is currently registered for use on soybeans, which are grown on approximately 600,000 acres in Virginia (1982 Census of Agriculture).

101.2 Likelihood of Adverse Effects on Nontarget OrganismsTerrestrial

Data from previous EEB reviews indicate that Command is practically nontoxic to birds on both an acute oral basis and a dietary basis (bobwhite quail and mallard LD50's > 2510 mg/kg, LC50's > 5620 ppm). The available data on rats suggest that the chemical also has a low mammalian toxicity. Thus, significant acute hazards to nontarget terrestrial organisms are not anticipated from use under the proposed exemption.

Data from hydrolysis, photolysis, and soil metabolism studies indicate that Command herbicide may persist in the environment. However, chronic hazards to avian and mammalian species are

unlikely, as the probability of exposure is low, acreage to be treated is limited, and the herbicide will only be applied once per season.

No data are available on effects on pollinators, but in view of the low exposure potential of the proposed use, Command would not be expected to impact honey bees.

Aquatic

Data from previous EEB reviews indicate that Command is slightly toxic to freshwater fish, with reported LC50's of 19 mg/L for rainbow trout and 34 mg/L for bluegill sunfish. A daphnid study indicated that Command is moderately toxic to aquatic invertebrates (LC50 = 5.2 mg/L). And the MATC for Command technical to Daphnia was determined to be between 2.20 and 4.38 mg/L.

The Exposure Assessment Branch determined the aquatic EEC for the soybean use to be 0.05 ppm, based on one application at 1.0 lb ai per acre. For the purposes of this review, EEB will assume a similar scenario for the proposed uses. At the maximum rate (0.75 lb ai per acre), calculated aquatic EEC would be 0.0375 ppm. Based on these figures, EEB has determined that no acute hazards to populations of freshwater aquatic organisms are anticipated from use under the proposed exemption.

As noted above, environmental fate data indicate a potential for Command to persist in the environment. Under the conditions of the proposed Sec. 18, however, (single application, limited acreage), hazard to aquatic organisms is not expected.

Nontarget Plants

The Agency record on Command herbicide contains numerous reported incidents of adverse effects on nontarget plants. This potential to impact nontarget plants is reflected in the number of prominent warnings and precautions on the product label.

Data from a number of tests are required prior to registration of this product for any new agricultural use. See EEB review by Vaughan (EUP, field corn, Oct 31, 1988) for a listing of the data requirements. EEB will defer development of a final hazard assessment on nontarget plants, pending receipt of data from these tests. However, it may be concluded that soil incorporation will reduce the potential hazard to nontarget plants.

101.3 Endangered Species Considerations

On the basis of the above discussion, the only endangered organisms of concern would be plants. Information on file indicates that no endangered plant species are associated with sweet potatoes in Virginia. Thus, hazard to endangered species of

874

plants is not anticipated under the proposed exemption.

101.4 Adequacy of Toxicity Data

Available data are sufficient to assess hazard under the proposed Section 18. Note that there are still a number of outstanding data gaps for data required to support a full registration on any agricultural crop.

103 Conclusions

EEB has reviewed the proposed emergency exemption for Command herbicide on sweet potatoes in Virginia. Based on the substantial volume of ecological effects data submitted by the registrant, EEB concludes that the proposed use presents minimal hazard to nontarget organisms other than plants. EEB is unable to complete a risk assessment for plants because data from nontarget plant studies and drift studies are lacking. Use under the proposed exemption will not present a hazard to any endangered species in Virginia.

Allen W. Vaughan 4-11-89
Allen W. Vaughan, Entomologist
Ecological Effects Branch
EFED (H7507C)

Norman J. Cook 4-11-89
Norman J. Cook, Supervisory Biologist
Ecological Effects Branch
EFED (H7507C)

James W. Akerman 4/14/89
James W. Akerman, Chief
Ecological Effects Branch
EFED (H7507C)

875

5