

message

From: HONEGGER, JOY L [AG/1000] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=NA-1000-01/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=58040]
Sent: 1/4/2016 10:59:20 AM
To: WRIGHT, JOHN P [AG/1000] [john.p.wright@monsanto.com]; JENKINS, DANIEL J [AG/1920] [daniel.j.jenkins@monsanto.com]; URBANCZYK-WOCHNIAK, EWA [AG/1000] [ewa.urbanczyk-wochniak@monsanto.com]; SALL, ERIK D [AG/1000] [erik.d.sall@monsanto.com]; ORR, THOMAS B [AG/1000] [thomas.b.orr@monsanto.com]; BHAKTA, TINA [AG/1000] [tina.bhakta@monsanto.com]
CC: SCHULER, LANCE J [AG/1000] [lance.j.schuler@monsanto.com]
Subject: RE: Field Volatility Summary for M1691

John,

The flux values from these studies have been used by Exponent to calculate air concentrations resulting from dicamba use on an 80 acre field. 24-hr air concentrations estimated using the standard EPA model, PERFUM. do not exceed the NOEC from the humidome plant effects study.

You have reviewed the GA report and the both the GA and TX reports and the summary are still open for comment. If we need to discuss further, let's schedule a meeting to do so.

Joy

From: WRIGHT, JOHN P [AG/1000]
Sent: Monday, January 04, 2016 10:20 AM
To: HONEGGER, JOY L [AG/1000]; JENKINS, DANIEL J [AG/1920]; URBANCZYK-WOCHNIAK, EWA [AG/1000]; SALL, ERIK D [AG/1000]; ORR, THOMAS B [AG/1000]; BHAKTA, TINA [AG/1000]
Cc: SCHULER, LANCE J [AG/1000]
Subject: RE: Field Volatility Summary for M1691

A potential watch-out. The reported % of mass that was volatilized is higher than the NOEC. Depending on which value you use, it is as much as 10X higher. A worst case assumption would be that all of that mass went downwind as vapor. Do we have a comparable estimate of the mass loss via particle drift? Is this document still open for commenting/
 John

From: HONEGGER, JOY L [AG/1000]
Sent: Monday, January 04, 2016 12:14 AM
To: JENKINS, DANIEL J [AG/1920]; URBANCZYK-WOCHNIAK, EWA [AG/1000]; SALL, ERIK D [AG/1000]; ORR, THOMAS B [AG/1000]; BHAKTA, TINA [AG/1000]
Cc: SCHULER, LANCE J [AG/1000]; WRIGHT, JOHN P [AG/1000]
Subject: RE: Field Volatility Summary for M1691

Hi Everyone,

Here is an updated version of the summary of the M1691 field volatility studies that Dan requested for an EPA meeting this week.

Joy

From: JENKINS, DANIEL J [AG/1920]
Sent: Sunday, January 03, 2016 7:33 AM
To: URBANCZYK-WOCHNIAK, EWA [AG/1000]; HONEGGER, JOY L [AG/1000]; SALL, ERIK D [AG/1000]; ORR, THOMAS B

[AG/1000]; BHAKTA, TINA [AG/1000]
Subject: FW: Field Volatility Summary for M1691

CCing Tina.

Dan Jenkins
U.S. Agency Lead
Regulatory Affairs
Monsanto Company
1300 I St., NW
Suite 450 East
Washington, DC 20005
Office: 202-383-2851
Cell: 571-732-6575

From: URBANCZYK-WOCHNIAK, EWA [AG/1000]
Sent: Saturday, January 02, 2016 7:51 PM
To: HONEGGER, JOY L [AG/1000]; SALL, ERIK D [AG/1000]; JENKINS, DANIEL J [AG/1920]; ORR, THOMAS B [AG/1000]
Subject: RE: Field Volatility Summary for M1691

Joy,

I added my comments to your summary document (attached). Comments for "GA" part are also applicable for "TX".

Thanks!

Ewa

From: HONEGGER, JOY L [AG/1000]
Sent: Saturday, January 02, 2016 2:07 AM
To: URBANCZYK-WOCHNIAK, EWA [AG/1000]; SALL, ERIK D [AG/1000]; JENKINS, DANIEL J [AG/1920]; ORR, THOMAS B [AG/1000]
Subject: Field Volatility Summary for M1691
Importance: High

Happy New Year, Everyone,

I have attached to this message a summary of the M1691 volatility studies for review.

I tried to put a high level summary in the introduction, but then provide enough information in a study summary for each study so that EFED could assess the quality of the study.

Dan,

For your information Ewa provided combined comments from Eric, Ewa, and me back to Waterborne on Wednesday, December 30 for the post-emergence application study conducted in TX.

Joy