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MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Command Herbicide - Status of EEB Data Requirements

FROM: Allen W. Vaughan
Entomologist
Ecological Effects Branch
Hazard Evaluation Division (TS-769)

TO: Jim Yowell, PMT-25
Fungicide-Herbicide Branch
Registration Division (TS-767)

THRU: Norman Cook
Head, Section 2
Ecological Effects Branch
Hazard Evaluation Division (TS-769)

Michael Slimak, Chief
Ecological Effects Branch
Hazard Evaluation Division (TS-769)

EEB's earlier review of Command herbicide (full registration for use on soybeans; review dated 29 November, 1984) reached the following conclusions regarding ecological effects data requirements and endangered species concerns:

1. An aquatic invertebrate life cycle study may be indicated, based on preliminary fate data and extensive use pattern;

2. Acute toxicity tests for estuarine and marine organisms may be required, as there is extensive soybean acreage in coastal areas;

3. The aquatic EBC indicates no hazard to endangered/threatened species of aquatic organisms would be expected from the proposed use.

In all the above cases, EEB deferred a final decision, pending receipt of EAB's review of the registrant's aquatic EBC and/or EAB's finalized fate review.
EAB recently completed its review of additional data submitted by the registrant, including the aquatic EEC. The EAB review (dated 17 June, 1985) indicated that the following data requirements have not been satisfied: aquatic photolysis, soil photolysis, and field dissipation. The EAB review of the aquatic EEC (dated 2 July, 1985) requested additional information but concluded that data submitted were sufficient to develop the EEC.

The registrant has submitted an aquatic invertebrate life-cycle study (received by HED 20 June, 1985) using *Daphnia*. EEB review of the study will determine if the requirement outlined in Item 1, above, has been met.

With regard to the requirement for acute toxicity testing on estuarine and marine organisms, further discussion with EEB personnel indicates that these tests should be required for the soybean use. Thus, data to satisfy the requirements of section 72-3 (Acute toxicity tests for estuarine and marine organisms) will be required prior to registration.

As pertinent environmental data requirements have not been satisfied, EEB will continue to defer any decision regarding endangered/threatened species of aquatic organisms, pending EAB review of the required fate data.
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