107901

FILE

TO: Hank Jacoby
          Product Manager 21
          Registration Division
          TS-767

FROM: Samuel M. Creeger, Chief
          Review Section No. 1
          Exposure Assessment Branch
          Hazard Evaluation Division

Attached please find the environmental fate review of:

Reg./File No.: 279-EUP-96

Chemical: Triforine

Type Product: Fungicide

Product Name: Funginex 1.6 EC

Company Name: FMC Corporation

Submission Purpose: Extension of EUP on almonds

Date in: 11/15/84

Date Completed: 1/17/85

ACTION CODE: 716

EFB # 5153

TAIS (level II) Days

      52   1

Deferrals To:

_____ Ecological Effects Branch

_____ Residue Chemistry Branch

_____ Toxicology Branch

1.0 INTRODUCTION

FMC Corporation has submitted a request for extension of the experimental use permit (EUP) issued to evaluate the use of Funginex 1.6 EC (triforine, as a. i.) on almonds for control of Monilinia laxa (brown rot blossom blight). EM Laboratories authorized use of their data in support of this request.

EAB considered the application for the EUP in the review dated 3/29/83. In this review, EAB concurred with the EUP. The review noted that in EAB reviews dated 6/3/80 and 1/5/82, EAB (then EFB) concurred with conditional registration of triforine for this use.

1.1 Chemical

See previous review dated 3/29/83.

2.0 DIRECTIONS FOR USE

The proposed label directions are attached to this review.

3.0 DISCUSSION OF DATA

3.1 No additional data were included in the submission. Data previously considered for the EUP include:

Hydrolysis- Triforine rapidly hydrolyzed in unbuffered aqueous solution maintained at room temperature. No half-life was calculated. No degradation products were identified.

Aerobic soil metabolism- Triforine degraded under aerobic, anaerobic and sterile conditions. The route of degradation seemed to be chemical rather than microbial. Soil bound residues accounted for a large portion of the applied ^{14}C.

Leaching- Leaching of the formulated product did not occur. However, aged residues of ^3H-triforine were very mobile in soil. Thus, aged residues would have a potential to leach.

Fish accumulation- A preliminary report showed that triforine did not accumulate in edible tissues of fish. EAB concluded that accumulation in fish was not expected. Note: The final report of this study was requested (but evidently never received).

3.2   Data not required to support the EUP:

     Rotational crop- Data are not needed since almond orchards are not usually rotated.

4.0   RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1   Adequate data are available to support the request for an extension of the EUP.

4.2   The registrant should be informed that the environmental fate data supporting triforine is old. In many cases, the data would not be considered adequate to support registration when compared to current Environmental Fate Guideline requirements. When application for future registration is requested, these studies will be re-considered in light of the current Environmental Fate Guideline requirements.

Clinton Fletcher
Review Section No. 1
Exposure Assessment BRanch
Hazard Evaluation Division

Triforine

Page_____ is not included in this copy.

Pages __4__ through __5__ are not included.

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 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.