
Malathion Use Pattern Requirements for Hawaii

Date: July 19, 2006

To: [Paul Whatling](#)

CC: [Thomas Moriarty](#), [Rick Melnicoe](#), [Teung Chin](#)

From: [Cathy Tarutani](#)

Subject: Malathion Use Pattern Requirements for Hawaii

[Attachment](#)

Mr. Whatling,

I received your phone message reply to my phone call of this morning (about 8:45 a.m., Hawaii'i time, Tuesday, July 18). Thank you.

I have attached a letter which includes the highlights of our concerns about Hawaii's malathion use patterns. These are the concerns which remain after examining EPA's proposed final decisions.

The letter is not intended to substitute for the documentation sent first on May 25 and again on July 17. Instead, I hope it facilitates understanding of our input and serves as a navigation guide to our documentation, especially to the rather lengthy tables, which EPA has seen fit to re-organize. You probably have a lot of material to digest in a short period of time and I want to make every effort to effectively communicate the needs of Hawaii's agriculture stakeholders.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact either Mike Kawate (mike@hpirs.stjohn.hawaii.edu, 808/956-6008) or me.

Thank you,
Cathy

On 18 Jul 2006 at 15:11, Paul Whatling, Washington wrote:

Hi Cathy

Thank you for your response! I had noticed that EPA did not included your comments in its table and sent an e-mail to Tom Moriarity at EPA informing him of this. EPA did not respond, but it has asked to meet with us (Cheminova) on Thursday afternoon (East Coast Time) of this week to discuss EPA's final proposed use patterns, so if you can get back with me before that, it would be much appreciated.

Best Regards,

Paul Whatling
Cheminova, Inc.

From: Cathy Tarutani [mailto:cathy@hpirs.stjohn.hawaii.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, July 18, 2006 12:01 AM
To: Paul Whatling, Washington; Teung.F.Chin@aphis.usda.gov
Cc: Rick Melnicoe; Mike
Subject: Re: FW: tables 1 and 2 for malathion proposed final rates

Dear Mr. Whatling and Teung,

Our answer to question #2 in your message, below, "Does it appear that EPA has included your comments in its tables?" is: Absolutely not.

On May 25, 2006, I sent responses to two sets of questions regarding malathion reregistration and risk mitigation to Teung and Tom Moriarty, EPA-SRRD.

I have attached the files which were sent to Teung and Mr. Moriarty. There is one correction in the cucumber section of the "response" file. In "table 1" there are corrections to the "Pasture and Rangeland" and "Guava" sections. Our stakeholders' proposed values (where different from EPA's then-proposed values) are still indicated in red and, additionally, I have highlighted the cells which contain the crops of concern and our growers' values for them in yellow. The cover letters and the rest of the files are identical to those which were transmitted on May 25.

As you will see, our answer to your question #3, below, "Do you agree that EPA's final proposed use patterns will not hurt your (growers') ability to manage insect pests on the crops of interest to (them)?" is also: Absolutely not.

I will be contacting the pineapple growers about the acceptability of the proposed final value for the REI for pineapple.

Question: when do you need this (or any other) additional information?

If you any questions or concerns about the attached information, or if you require additional information, please contact either Mike Kawate (mike@hpirs.stjohn.hawaii.edu, 808/956-6008) or me.

Cathy

On 14 Jul 2006 at 19:31, Paul Whatling, Washington wrote:

Hi All:

Some of you were inadvertently left off of the list of recipients to the e-mail below. My apologies.

Sincerely,

Paul Whatling
Cheminova, Inc.

From: Paul Whatling, Washington
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2006 12:36 PM
To: Jane Thomas; 'cathy@hpirs.stjohn.hawaii.edu'; 'rsmelnicoe@ucdavis.edu'; 'mik@hpirs.stjohn.hawaii.edu'; 'et al

Subject: FW: tables 1 and 2 for malathion proposed final rates

Dear Friends and Colleagues:

Many thanks to all of you that have provided me or Teung Chin (USDA) with information on the need for malathion on various crops that are important to you. We very much appreciate your efforts to ensure the availability of the tools needed by the farmers of America to grow our food and to provide well for their families. Teung and I have forwarded to EPA all of the comments received to date. If you have not yet provided us with your comments, we would very much like to hear from you.

At this point in time, EPA has completed its review of all of the comments received to date. EPA has prepared the attached tables that summarize these comments and gives EPA's proposed final decisions concerning the malathion use patterns to be allowed for registration. Unless we can challenge EPA proposed use patterns, these will likely become EPA's final decision to be published in the interim-reregistration eligibility decision (iRED) document later this summer.

We are asking that you take a few moments to review these tables and then let me and/or Teung know the following:

1. Are there any crops missing from the tables that are of interest to you?
2. Does it appear that EPA has included your comments in its tables? If so, has EPA accurately summarized your comments in its tables?
3. Do you agree that EPA's final proposed use patterns will not hurt your ability to manage insect pests on the crops of interest to you. If EPA's proposed use patterns will be problematic, please let us know what growers in your area need and we will fight for it.

In addition to the information provided in the tables, EPA is asking for more information on the following:

For the emulsifiable concentrate (EC), wettable powder (WP), and dust formulations:

- 1) EPA is proposing to cancel aerial applications for all berry crops. Please let us know if this will be acceptable to these growers.
- 2) EPA needs to know the pre-harvest interval needed for celery and for dates.
- 3) EPA needs information on how malathion is used on: "grain crops", "grain elevators", and "stored grains" as it could not locate much information on these sites.
- 4) EPA needs additional information on application rate needed for nectarine (is it okay to set the highest single application rate at 3.0 lbs ai/A as EPA proposed?)

For the ultra-low volume (ULV) and ready to use (RTU) formulations:

- 1) EPA needs more information on desired re-treatment interval for the uses on pasture and rangeland.

Please note that for those crops that you feel EPA's proposed use patterns will not be sufficient, we intend to continue our fight with EPA to defend your needs. Again, we appreciate your efforts to defend the existing malathion uses.

If you have any questions about this e-mail, or if you want to discuss anything about EPA's risk assessments for malathion, please feel free to give me a call.

Sincerely,

[Paul Whatling](#)

Senior Manager, Regulatory Science
Cheminova, Inc.
1620 Eye Street NW, Suite 615
Washington, DC 20006
Ph: 202-463-1491

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII AT MĀNOA

College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources
Department of Plant and Environmental Protection Sciences

July 18, 2006

Paul Whatling
Regulatory Science
Cheminova, Inc.
1620 Eye Street NW, Suite 615
Washington, DC 20006

Subject: Malathion Use Pattern Requirements for Hawai'i

The following comments are being submitted in response to your July 14, 2006 email message requesting feedback on tables prepared by EPA summarizing comments received and proposed final decisions for malathion use patterns. These comments are being submitted on behalf of the Western Integrated Pest Management Center and provide input on malathion use pattern requirements for agriculture stakeholders in Hawai'i.

The letter is not intended to substitute for the documentation sent first on May 25 and again on July 17. Instead, I hope it facilitates understanding of our input and serves as a navigation guide to our documentation, especially to the rather lengthy *Table 1* which is in the original alphabetic order.

These are the highlights of our concerns regarding EPA's final proposed application values for malathion which will result in problems or hardships, at the very least, for our growers. (All of these relate to *Table 1-ecwp*; Hawai'i is not submitting information or requests regarding ULV formulations of malathion.) The items below were initially submitted to EPA-SRRD (Tom Moriarty) and USDA-OPMP (Teung Chin) on May 25 and remain our concerns after reviewing EPA's proposed final values (updated July 6, 2006).

1. **Watercress** is a crop of great concern to us. It is missing from the July 6 version of the table. We are requesting **eight (8) applications per year**, a value higher than EPA proposed (3). We also are requesting a shorter **REI (12 hours)** than EPA was supporting (2 days).
2. We are requesting a **higher application rate (1.25 lb ai/A)** for **Pasture and rangeland** (Group 3) than EPA has proposed (0.9375 lb ai/A). This rate is needed to provide adequate control of the yellow sugarcane aphid and is consistent with the application rate for Grasses, Bermuda, forage and no higher than current label rates. Please note: This is the only request we have for a higher application rate than EPA was supporting. We are also requesting **eight (8) applications per year** for **Pasture and rangeland**, than EPA's final proposed value (1).
3. For **papaya** (Group 3) we are requesting **15 applications per year**. EPA's final proposed value was a maximum of four (4) applications per year.

3050 Maile Way, Gilmore Hall 310, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

Telephone: (808) 956-7076, Facsimile: (808) 956-2428, E-mail: peps@ctahr.hawaii.edu, Web: www2.ctahr.hawaii.edu

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution

4. For **mango** (Group 3) we are requesting **ten (10) applications per year**. EPA's final proposed value was a maximum of eight (8) applications per year.
5. For **macadamia nut** (Group 3) we are requesting more than EPA's final proposed value of two applications per year. Growers indicated that, under normal conditions, two applications per year is sufficient, but **more applications per year** could be needed if a new insect pest invades the orchards in Hawai'i. (Unfortunately, such invasions are not unlikely. Macadamia worldwide has many known insect pests, most of which are not established in Hawai'i. However, in March, 2005, the macadamia felted coccid was first collected from macadamia trees in Hawai'i and some areas suffered pockets of very heavy infestations. Extensive pesticide applications were made and apparently were effective. This insect is originally from Australia, where it can become a severe problem on macadamia nut trees. Malathion was not the pesticide used in this case.)
6. We are requesting **shorter restricted entry intervals (REIs)** for a number of **food crops and field and sweet corn grown for seed**. These crops and the requested REIs are indicated in *Table 1* submitted July 17, 2006 in cells marked in yellow with red characters. (The *Table 1* we submitted on May 25 was not marked with yellow, only the red characters were used.)

In a previous email message to you, I indicated that I would check with the **pineapple** growers about EPA's final proposed REI. The pineapple growers have indicated that a 24-hour REI will **not** be a problem for their operations.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on behalf of Hawai'i's agriculture stakeholders. If you have further questions or concerns, please don't hesitate to contact us.

Comments submitted by:



Cathy Tarutani
Educational Specialist
Voice: 808-956-2004
cathy@hpirs.stjohn.hawaii.edu



Michael Kawate
Pesticide Registration Specialist
Voice: 808-956-6008
mike@hpirs.stjohn.hawaii.edu

3050 Maile Way, Gilmore Hall 310, Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822

Telephone: (808) 956-7076, Facsimile: (808) 956-2428, E-mail: peps@ctahr.hawaii.edu, Web: www2.ctahr.hawaii.edu

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution