
Section 18 Support from IR-4

Over the years, IR-4 residue data have been used to support many Section 18 approvals by EPA. For example, in 2001 EPA established 57 Section 18 time-limited tolerances based on data generated from IR-4 GLP residue studies. These Section 18 tolerances supported 66 minor crop uses, and many of these tolerances supported uses in more than one state. Sandy Perry's project capturing economic loss data from state Section 18 requests using IR-4 residue data has demonstrated in economic terms the value of IR-4 programs. For the 4-year period from 1998 to 2001, IR-4's data contribution to residue tolerances for Section 18 emergency needs saved US agriculture from an estimated \$4 billion in potential crop losses.

As you can see, IR-4 has been and will continue to be a major contributor in the process of states securing Section 18 approvals when emergency pest situations develop for which current management practices are insufficient to main-

tain economic control. Year-round, IR-4 regional offices and Headquarters staff receive requests for letters of support and status of progress towards registration. These requests receive immediate attention by the appropriate Study Director at Headquarters, with a letter addressed to the state contact person indicated by the requester. The letter can provide project status and study details (rate, # of applications, PHI, etc.) that are needed, along with draft or final residue data if requested and available. Sometimes, simply an e-mail message to the designated contact is all that is required. We provide documentation of IR-4 support in whatever form is needed.

Letters of support from IR-4 can be a critical component of a state's Section 18 request package. This is an important service we provide at IR-4 Headquarters. If you have a Section 18 need and IR-4 has an active project, please contact us for support and advice!

Article by Van Starner

EPA/IR-4 Technical Working Group Meeting

The EPA/IR-4 Technical Working Group (TWG) has convened for a series of meetings between the IR-4 Headquarters and key scientists from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), intended to produce a more efficient system of IR-4 data submission and EPA review. These meetings have been held at approximately quarterly intervals, generally at the offices of one or the other organization.

A TWG meeting was held on January 30, 2002, in Crystal City, Virginia. Participants from the EPA included Hoyt Jamerson, Peter Caulkins, Sidney Jackson, Shaja Brothers, Jeff Herndon, Bernie Schneider, Will Donovan, John Redden, Pat Cimino, Luis Suguiyama, Steve Robbins, Kathleen Knox, Kathryn Boyle, Kate Bouve, Amy Breedlove, Steve Funk, Tom Bloem, and Terri Stowe. Additional participants from outside IR-4 Headquarters who attended included Neal Thompson, Administrative Adviser, from the Southern Region, Sandy Perry as National Outreach Specialist, Paul Schwartz, Jim Parochetti, and Don Wauchope from USDA. Those who participated by telephone included Rebecca Sisco (IR-4 Western Region), Craig Hunter, Doug Rothwell, and Shirley Archambault from Canada, and from California Dept. of Pesticide Regulation (Cal DPR)—Tom Leffingwell, Wes Carr, and Roberta Firoved.

Kate Bouve gave the OPP perspective on updating the Residue Chemistry Data Evaluation Record, the summary form for residue submissions used by reviewers at EPA. Jeff Herndon announced that Keith Dorschner's request for data reduction (AKA "super crop group") for bifenazate had been reviewed and suggested that another proposal focusing on ultra-minor crops (including tropicals and herbs) be submitted. Tom Bloem stated that the carfentrazone (row middles, shielded sprayer) expedited registration proposal submitted by Michael Braverman had been accepted. Johannes Corley and Jeff Herndon discussed the IR-4 proposal to have the use of ethephon on dormant peaches (to delay bloom) designated as a non-food use. Dave Thompson's proposal to test only leaf

lettuce and tomato at an exaggerated rate to represent all captan-treated transplanted crops was also accepted. (Approval for Captan use on transplants will be granted if no residues are detected on lettuce and tomato treated at a 10X rate.)

Steve Funk discussed the world-wide climatic zones being considered for food crop residue trials to promote harmonization of tolerances (maximum residue limits). Five zones have been proposed: temperate wet, temperate dry, cold, polar, and tropical. Of these, only the first three include sites in the contiguous U.S. Data on pesticide residues, rainfall, irrigation, mean temperatures, and day length are being evaluated as part of the effort to create these new zones.

Hoyt Jamerson suggested that IR-4 create an electronic site, accessible to EPA, where Notices of Filing supporting tolerance requests could be stored. Sandy Perry discussed the current status of the National Organic Program. The Crop Groups Symposium scheduled for October in conjunction with the IR-4 Annual Meeting was discussed by George Markle.

In the afternoon, the following items were reviewed: EPA's Fiscal Year 2002 Workplan and the draft Fiscal Year 2003 Workplan (Dan Kunkel), the California DPR review of IR-4 petitions (Roberta Firoved), the Registration Division ARIA Team (John Redden), the Canadian IR-4 research program (Shirley Archambault), the NAFTA Joint Review (Terri Stowe and Amy Breedlove), the EPA Minor Use Team (Pat Cimino), the project to assess IR-4's economic impact on Section 18 uses (Sandy Perry), and biopesticide registrations (Kathleen Knox and Michael Braverman). Ken Samoil discussed the Agricultural Tour planned for June on the Eastern Shore of Maryland and solicited requests for preferred demonstrations for the tour.

The second TWG meeting for this year was held Tuesday, March 19, 2002. Results will be reported in the next Newsletter.

Article by Ken Samoil