


US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT



15/OPP#34134B

21PP



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

OFFICE OF
PREVENTION, PESTICIDES
AND TOXIC SUBSTANCES

November 5, 1999

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Phase 5 -- Meeting with Bayer Corporation

From: Todd Peterson, Ph.D.
Chemical Review Manager
Reregistration Branch 3
Special Review and Reregistration Division

To: OPP Docket Room

Please enter the enclosed meeting minutes (1 page) and paper copy of the registrant's handout (19 pages) into the fenamiphos OP docket (**OPP-34134B**)

If you have questions concerning this material, I can be reached at 308-7224.

1921
20 11/10/99 11:00

Fenamiphos Meeting Minutes

November 2, 1999

The OP/Pilot process is separated into six phases. During the current phase for fenamiphos, Phase 5 (September 2 to November 14), the Agency is available to meet with any stakeholder who wishes to present information concerning risk management. Bayer Corporation requested this meeting to discuss risk management issues in relation to the Agency's surface-, ground-, and drinking water assessments.

The two hour meeting was held November 2, from 10 AM to Noon, in Arlington, Virginia. The Agency was represented by B. Behl (EFED), S. Knizner (HED), Michael McDavit (SRRD), and T. Peterson (SRRD). The registrant was represented by M. Tolliver, V. Clay, P. Coody, and D. Dyer.

Bayer presented information in a format that is illustrated by a set of overheads (see handout with slides printed two to a page). The registrant initially presented information on surface water followed by a summary of issues related to ground water. The Agency acknowledged receiving Bayer's recent submission of: 1) the final report of the Georgia prospective ground water study, and 2) the quarterly report of the ongoing California prospective ground water study. The meeting concluded with a brief discussion of additional information the registrant can supply to the Agency and on how a more comprehensive interim report may be compiled to describe the California study.

2921



Fenamiphos Exposure via Drinking Water:

Clarifying the Issues...
Working for Solutions...

November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues



Status of the FQPA Assessment for Fenamiphos

- Dietary Risk is Low at 99.9th Percentile Exposure
 - US population: 28% aPAD 4% cPAD
 - Nursing Infants: 68% aPAD 14% cPAD
- Drinking Water Risk is High based on Tier I/II surface water modeling and limited ground water monitoring in vulnerable areas.
- Drinking water exposure exceeds the aPAD
- Aggregate (FQPA) risk is High due to drinking water


November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues

Evaluation of Product Usage

- Product usage is a primary driver of exposure.
- Analysis of the 1998 product usage suggests the potential for exposure is geographically limited.
 - Nematode pressure is highest in warm, light-textured soils
 - Pest control costs typically limit usage to high-margin crops:
 - Tobacco
 - Cotton
 - Grapes
 - Citrus

November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues

1998 Nemacur Use (lb. a.i.) on Crops




November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues

Focusing on Surface Water


- Current risk analysis is based on Tier I (turf) and Tier II (other crops) predictions.
- All agree that monitoring data are limited, and generally do not include important degradates.
- Current EPA policy suggests that predictive models will not be used in final tolerance assessment decisions:
 - Stephen Johnson Memo of November 17, 1997 to OPP Directors
 - EPA Science Policy 5


November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues

Surface Water CWS in the United States



November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues



Bayer 

Clarification of the SW Issue

“Reliable Exposure Data” are clearly needed to refine the SW exposure assessment

- Product Use is a driver of exposure. Where are the “hot spots” of concern
- Runoff data can be used to refine the assessment and provide “a reality check”
- Where do we go from here as the product is in Phase 5 of the regulatory process with insufficient exposure analyses for surface water?
 - What can Bayer and EPA do to help resolve this shortcoming at this time?

November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues

Using Field-Measured Runoff Results in a Refined (Tier 2.5?) Drinking Water Assessment

- Runoff studies were performed by Bayer (1990) and Wauchope (in 1992-3, unpublished)
 - Bayer: Tobacco and Cotton seedbeds in Meigs, GA
 - Wauchope: Corn seedbed in Tifton, GA
- Typical “meso-plot” methods were used in both studies, making them very similar in design - the results can be directly compared.
- This drinking water assessment summarizes the runoff results and uses the EPA Farm Pond as the basic exposure scenario
- This is consistent with EPA Tier I/II modeling.


November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues

Overview

- Briefly describe meso-plot runoff study concepts
- Show results for two similar field studies
- Detail how results are used in an exposure assessment to provide a more reliable “worst case exposure”
- Present results and describe limitations
- Compare to existing exposure results
- Seek the Agency’s input on this concept as means of moving toward “reliable information” for a fenamiphos exposure assessment

November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues

Meso-Plot Runoff Concepts



November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues

Meso-Plot Runoff Testing

- Farming practices are performed with commercial equipment - typical farm practices
- Test compound is applied following normal practices
- Heavy rainfall can be imposed any time after treatment as needed for exposure assessment
- Field staff is present for critical runoff sampling and test plot maintenance
- A *relatively* controlled test system at the field scale

November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues

Summary of Bayer Runoff Study in GA

	Test Plot				
	EP1	EP2	EP3	GP1	GP2
Crop	Tobacco	Tobacco	Tobacco	Cotton/Peanut	Cotton/Peanut
Formulation	3 EC	3 EC	3 EC	15G	15G
Treatment (lb ai/acre)	6	6	6	2.55/banded	2.55/banded
Incorporation	Disked/bedded	Disked/bedded	Disked/bedded	Scratch Incorp.	Scratch Incorp.
Days from Applic. To Runoff	1	2	3	1	2
Rainfall (cm)	9.22	5.18	9.60	4.78	9.40
Rainfall (L)	64,242	36,103	66,896	33,271	65,481
Runoff (Ft)	634	181	677	31	504
Runoff (L)	17,670	5,125	19,171	878	14,272
Runoff (%)	28	14	29	3	22
Fenamiphos Residues (mg)	982	651	1,867	334	405
Sulfoxide Residues (mg)	728	319	1,219	71	2,703
Sulfone Residues (mg)	Not Detected	Not Detected	Minor Detection	Not Detected	Not Detected
Total Residues (mg)	1,711	967	3,086	405	2,703

November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues

Wauchope Runoff Study in GA

Test Plot ID	1992		1993	
	A	B	A	B
Crop	Corn	Corn	Corn	Corn
Formulation	3 EC	3 EC	3 EC	3 EC
Treatment (lb ai/acre)	5.98	5.98	5.98	5.98
Incorporation (REQUIRED)	Rototilled	Rototilled	Rototilled	Rototilled
Days from Applic. To Runoff	1	1	1	1
Rainfall (cm)	5	5	5	5
Rainfall (L)	30,958	30,958	30,958	30,958
Runoff (L)	4,372	5,624	9,360	8,301
Runoff (%)	14	18	30	27
Fenamiphos Residues (ug/L)	293	394	94	93
Sulfoxide Residues (ug/L)	322	322	427	269
Sulfone Residues (ug/L)	2	0	4	4
Total Residues (mg)	2,699	4,027	4,915	3,034

November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues

A Simple Exposure Assessment

Measured runoff data is used with the EPA's Farm Pond

Note: linear spatial scaling leads to overestimating runoff losses at the field scale



Runoff is from extreme storm events in the field studies

Runoff results are projected to the larger field area.

Water concentrations are based on fixed pond volume.

Aquatic degradation is not represented

November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues


Exposure Summary

	Mobay Corporation Study Number 102638					Wanchopy, 1999 (personal communication)			
	Location: Mingo, GA		Soil: Tifton Loamy Sand			Location: Tifton, GA		Soil: Tifton Loamy Sand	
Growing Season	1990	1990	1990	1990	1990	1992	1992	1993	1993
Crop/Seedbed	Tobacco	Tobacco	Tobacco	Cotton/Peanuts	Cotton/Peanuts	Corn	Corn	Corn	Corn
Formulation	3EC	3EC	3EC	15G	15G	3EC	3EC	3EC	3EC
Treatment (lb a/ac)	6.0	6.0	6.0	2.55/banded	2.55/banded	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0
Application Placement	Broadcast	Broadcast	Broadcast	Banded	Banded	Broadcast	Broadcast	Broadcast	Broadcast
Incorporation	Disks/bedded	Disks/bedded	Disks/bedded	Scratch	Scratch	Rotolled	Rotolled	Rotolled	Rotolled
Days from Apply. To Runoff	1	2	3	1	2	1	1	1	1
Plot Size (ha)	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.070	0.062	0.062	0.062	0.062
Rainfall (cm)	9.2	5.2	9.6	4.8	9.4	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Runoff (%)	27.5	14.2	28.7	2.6	21.8	14.1	18.2	30.2	23.8
Fenamiphos Residues (mg)	981.9	651.6	1267.2	334.2	405.5	293.0	394.0	54.0	89.0
Sulfonate Residues (mg)	728.0	319.3	1219.2	71.3	2,703.3	302.0	322.0	421.0	269.0
Sulfone Residues (mg)	Not Detected	Not Detected	Minor Detection	Not Detected	Not Detected	2.3	0.0	4.1	3.5
Total Residues (mg)	1,711	967	3,086	405	2,203	2,69	4,027	491.5	504
EPA's Worst Case Drinking Water Exposure Result (ppb)	12.3	7.1	22.1	2.9	19.4	21.8	32.5	39.7	24.5

November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues

107.21

Comparison of Results (conservative farm pond concentrations)



November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenaminhos Drinking Water Issues

Refined Exposure Summary

- The refined (Tier 2.5) exposure assessment provides values on the range of 0.1 (cotton) to 1 (peanuts) times EPA Tier II values.
- The refined results are still *very conservative* based on the following assumptions
 - Drinking water comes from farm ponds with 100% application in watershed
 - Runoff results can be scaled linearly from meso-plot to field (this conservative method violates MUSLE)
- The worst case numbers are slightly above the DWLOC, but considering the conservative nature suggest the real world exposure should be within the "Risk Cup".
- This case study is not fully developed, but may provide a reality check for the current regulatory values.

November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenaminhos Drinking Water Issues

Clarification of the GW Issue

- Current exposure assessment is based on Florida PGW monitoring results: The history and results of that study in a regulatory setting.
- Details of two new studies not considered in the current exposure assessment.
- Where do we go from here?

November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues


Florida Retrospective Study -- 1989

- **Location:** Lake Placid, Highlands County, Florida
- **Crop:** Citrus
- **Soils:** Sand (to water table)
- **Application:**
 - NEMACUR 3EC; 10 lb a.i./acre
 - 50% Band (20 lb a.i./acre in treated zone); Incorporated via irrigation
- **Results:** Maximum Concentration --
fenamiphos + sulfoxide + sulfone = 253 µg/L
- **Actions:**
 - Label Rate for Citrus reduced to 5 lb/acre.
 - FL PGW Study required to study mitigation measures

November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues


12821

Florida PGW 1995 -- Ground Water



November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues

Florida PGW 1995 -- Ground Water



November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues

14821


Georgia PGW 1996 -- Study Overview

- **Location:** Byromville, Dooly County, Georgia
- **Crop:** Tobacco
- **Soils:**
 - 0-6" loamy sand; 87% sand, 8% clay; 1.4% OM; pH 5.6
 - 0.5-12ft loamy sand; 88-82% sand, 6-14% clay, <2.2% OM
 - >12 ft sand (predominantly)
- **Depth to Water:** ~27 feet
- **Application: June 5, 1996**
 - NEMACUR 3EC; 6.6 lb a.i./acre (110% of maximum label)
 - Broadcast Spray; Mechanical Incorporation to ~4 inches
 - KBr -- Applied at 50 lb/acre as a broadcast spray
- **Water: 200 inches (147% of 30-year average)**
- **Status: Final Report Submitted October 1999**

November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues

Georgia PGW 1996 -- Soil-Pore Water

Fenamiphos detected in 3 samples, fenamiphos sulfoxide detected in 5 samples.




November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues

15821

Georgia PGW 1996 -- Ground Water

Fenamiphos sulfoxide detected in 2 samples (0.05 and 0.04 µg/L, 153 DAT).



November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues


California PGW 1997 -- Study Overview

- **Location:** Sanger, Fresno County, California
- **Crop:** Grapes
- **Soils:**
 - 0-6" loamy sand; 86% sand, 6% clay; 0.8% OM; pH 6.8
 - 0.5-8ft loamy sand; 90-79% sand, 3-13% clay, <0.2% OM
 - >8 ft sand (predominantly)
- **Depth to Water:** ~20 feet
- **Application: October 15, 1997**
 - NEMACUR 3EC; 6.6 lb a.i./acre (110% of maximum label)
 - 50% Band (13 lb a.i./acre in treated zone); Incorporated via irrigation
 - KBr -- Applied at 55 lb/acre as 50% band
- **Water: 60 inches (through April 1999)**
- **Status: Progress Report Submitted October 1999 (610 DAT)**

November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues

16721


California PGW 1997 -- Soil-Pore Water



November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues

California PGW 1997 -- Ground Water

Fenamiphos detected in 1 sample, sulfoxide in 13 samples, sulfone in 1 sample.
Maximum Total Fenamiphos Residue = 2.1 µg/L



November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues

17821

Vulnerability Assessment – Tobacco

- Soils suitable for tobacco production selected from NRCS's NRI database.
- Limited to states with significant NEMACUR use and tobacco production:
 - NC, GA, SC, VA, MD, FL
- PRZM3 used to model soil/weather combinations.
- Weather Data -- Artificial year of rainfall at 120% of the 30-year average was constructed from 30-year history for each of the regional stations.
 - Irrigation is not typical for tobacco except during drought.
- 340 modelling runs

November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues

Vulnerability Assessment – Tobacco

- Scenarios run for 5 consecutive years.
- Concentration of fenamiphos, fenamiphos sulfoxide and fenamiphos sulfone, measured at 6 feet below ground surface.
- Concentrations summed (fenamiphos + sulfoxide + sulfone), and ranked by concentration.
- Acres associated with the individual soils/runs was then summed from low to high concentration.
- Total acreage percentiles determined for the GA ground water soil (Lucy loamy sand).

November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues

18221

Adsorption to PGW Soils

- To determine a possible unique binding in the soil from the Georgia PGW, single point adsorption coefficients were determined.
- 0 to 6-inch and 18 to 24-inch soils from the GA and CA PGW sites were studied.
- The GA 18-24 inch soils were slightly heavier and had a strong red color, both factors that suggested this layer could have higher binding capacities.
- **Results: No extreme differences in binding of fenamiphos, sulfoxide or sulfone in the GA or CA soil (fenamiphos Kd in GA 18 to 24-inch soil ~75% greater than 0 to 6-inch); Kd for fenamiphos (171 to 345 L/kg) was similar to Kf values.**


November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues

Are Fenamiphos Residues Persistent in Ground Water?

- Page 27 of EFED's Environmental Risk Assessment:
"...but persistent contaminants (such as the fenamiphos degradates) could eventually find their way into drinking water supplies."
- Although laboratory data suggest that fenamiphos residues are stable to hydrolysis, field data suggests that fenamiphos residues dissipate in ground water.
- Compared fenamiphos residue dissipation (degradation+dilution) to bromide dissipation (dilution only), with depth and distance from Test Plot (FL PGW 1995).

November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues

Are Fenamiphos Residues Persistent in Ground Water?



November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues

Are Fenamiphos Residues Persistent in Ground Water?

- Decrease of fenamiphos residues with well depth and distance from Test Plot is significantly greater than bromide decreases.
- Assuming bromide decreases are due to lateral and vertical movement (dilution) in the ground water, **the greater decrease in fenamiphos residues must be due to degradation or other factors.**
- Impact to drinking water may not be significant, unless wells are located very near a treated field.

November 2, 1999 Meeting with EPA on Fenamiphos Drinking Water Issues

21921