PMSD

0136

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)

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

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.

XX 458

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

459 2