

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

111601

SHAUGHNESSEY NO.

REVIEW NO.

EEB BRANCH REVIEW

DATE: IN 1/5/81 OUT 1/26/81

FILE OR REG. NO. 707-145

PETITION OR EXP. PERMIT NO.

DATE OF SUBMISSION

DATE RECEIVED BY HED

RD REQUESTED COMPLETION DATE

EEB ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE

REACTION CODE/TYPE OF REVIEW

TYPE PRODUCT(S): I, D, (H), F, N, R, S Herbicide

DATA ACCESSION NO(S).

PRODUCT MANAGER NO. Mountfort

PRODUCT NAME(S) Goal 2E

COMPANY NAME Rohm and Haas

SUBMISSION PURPOSE Submission of Hydrosoil Sampling Data

SHAUGHNESSEY NO.

CHEMICAL, & FORMULATION

% A.I.

SHAUGHNESSEY NO.	CHEMICAL, & FORMULATION	% A.I.

Handwritten signature and '1/2'.

100.0 Pesticide Label Information

The registrant, in this submission, is presenting data, which allegedly show that no harmful hydrosol residues accrued due to the use of Goal 2E in Ohio soybean fields.

104 Adequacy of Data

Although the submission is over 60 pages long it contains only 10 sentences of explanatory text. The maps might have provided information concerning the size of the fields, slope, percentage vegetation cover and other very relevant information. Unfortunately, the copies of the maps were all illegible. In the conclusions, I have listed the types of information which are generally, pertinent to a field monitoring study.

107.7 Conclusions

Application techniques, meteorological measurements, hydrological measurements, chemical analytical techniques, and chemical sampling techniques were not explained in the sixty pages of raw data submitted with S.F. Krzeminsk's 18 December 1980 letter. Site maps were included but, were illegible.

This reviewer, with the aid of the Environmental Fate Branch, has routed an outline for acceptable field monitoring submissions thru the Special Pesticide Review Division for the registrant's use.

Without site descriptions, this reviewer can not determine whether the monitoring information with the 18 December 1980 letter could be expected to be typical for the soybean use pattern. Without knowing if the sites typify soybean fields (or, hopefully, provide a somewhat worse than average scenario for pesticide transport), this reviewer can not determine whether the study might be acceptable. It is suggested that the registrant review the outline from SPRD before resubmitting the current study and before planning additional Goal field monitoring.

Robert K. Hitch

Robert K. Hitch
Fish and Wildlife Biologist

Date: 1/30/81

David Coppage 1/30/81

David Coppage,
Head, Section #3,
Ecological Effects Branch

Date:

Norman Cook for CB
Clayton Bushong
Chief, Ecological Effects Branch

Date: 1/30/81

16

2/2