US ERA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

EEB BRANCH REVIEW

| FILE OR REG. NO | | 524 – G | UI | | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , |
|---------------------|--|----------------|-------------|--|---|
| PETITION OR EXP. PE | RMIT NO. | | | | , |
| DATE OF SUBMISSION | | 9-20- | 83 | e de la companya del la companya de | e en |
| | | | | | |
| RD REQUESTED COMPLE | TION DATE | 1-25-8 | 4 | and the state of the | |
| EEB ESTIMATED COMPL | ETION DAT | E1/18/8 | 4 | والمعارضة والمعارضة والمناز وا | |
| RD ACTION CODE/TYPE | OF REVIEW | W 110/New | Chemical | | |
| TYPE PRODUCT(S): I | , D, H, F | | | Herbicide | |
| | | | | alan da santa da san | |
| PRODUCT MANAGER NO. | R | . Taylor (25) |) | and the state of the | |
| PRODUCT NAME(S) | Н | arness | | | |
| - | | | | | |
| COMPANY NAME | Monsanto Company | | | | |
| SUBMISSION PURPOSE | Proposed full registration of corn, soybeans, peanuts, | | | | |
| | and g | rain sorghum | | | |
| SHAUGHNESSEY NO. | CHEMICAL, & FORMULATION | | | | |
| 121601 | 2-chloro-N-ethoxymethyl-N-(2-ethyl-6-methyl phenyl) | | | | |
| | acetamide | | | | 85.5% |
| | | | · | and the second section of the section of the second section of the second section of the section of th | _ |
| | | | | and the state of t | |



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

24 JAN 1984

OFFICE OF PESTICIDES AND TOXIC SUBSTANCES

MEMORANDUM

To:

Robert Taylor, PM 25

Registration Division (TS-767C)

Thru:

Raymond W. Matheny, Head KWM Section 1, Ecological Effects Branch Hazard Evaluation Division (TS-769C)

Thru:

Clayton Bushong, Chief

Ecological Effects Branch

Hazard Evaluation Division

Subject:

Addendum to the December 12, 1983 Ecological Effects Branch Review on Acetochlor (Reg. No. 524-GUI) for use on Corn, Soybeans, Peanuts

and Grain Sorghum

Inadvertently the subject submission was addressed without considering the unsolicited data available in Acc. No. 071973 (attached). This contained both a rainbow trout and a honey bee study. The rainbow trout study was found to meet the guideline requirements and the honey bee study was scientifically sound. These results would not change the conclusions of the previous review (12-19-83, No. 5).

Please contact me if you have any questions @ 557-7560.

Dennis J. McLane Wildlife Biologist

EEB/HED