PREDICTING CHEMICAL MOVEMENT IN SOILS

bу

George A. O'Connor
Principal Investigator
Department of Agronomy and Horticulture

and

Farhad Khorsandi Graduate Research Assistant Department of Agronomy and Horticulture

TECHNICAL COMPLETION REPORT

Project No. 1345639

August 1986

New Mexico Water Resources Research Institute

in cooperation with the

Department of Agronomy and Horticulture New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico

The research on which this report is based was financed in part by the United States Department of the Interior, Geological Survey, through the New Mexico Water Resources Research Institute.

Disclaimer

The purpose of Water Resources Research Institute technical reports is to provide a timely outlet for research results obtained on projects supported in whole or in part by the institute. Through these reports, we are promoting the free exchange of information and ideas and hope to stimulate thoughtful discussion and action that may lead to resolution of water problems. The WRRI, through peer review of draft reports, attempts to substantiate the accuracy of information contained in its reports, but the views expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the WRRI or its reviewers.

Contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the United States Department of the Interior, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute their endorsement by the United State Government.

The computer program on which this report is based is copyrighted by the University of Florida. The New Mexico Water Resources Research Institute has a copy of the program for demonstration purposes only. For copies of the program, write to Publications Distribution Center, IFAS Building 664, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u> </u>	Page
Disclaimer	ii
Abstract	1
Introduction	2
Methods	3
Results	4
Data Base Expansion	8
Climatic data	8
Chemical characteristics	8
Soils data	9
Summary and Conclusions	13
Literature Cited	16
Annandiy	17

ABSTRACT

Chemical Movement In Soil (CMIS) is a management/educational computer model that provides qualitative predictions of pesticide fate as a function of key soil, chemical, and climatic variables. Model assumptions limit it to nonpolar pesticides (and other xenobiotics) moving in sandy soils.

The purpose of this work was to test and modify the model for chemicals and soils pertinent to New Mexico.

Laboratory column studies with a sandy New Mexico soil matched reasonably well with model predictions. The data suggest that the model could be used as first approximations of pesticide behavior in New Mexico soils. It is primarily useful as an educational instrument for students and extension personnel examing implications of various management practices in worst-case scenarios.

Key Words: computer model, model testing, solute transport, pesticides.

INTRODUCTION

Accurate predictions of chemical movement in soils are of prime importance in the environmental management of xenobiotics, including pesticides. Knowing how a chemical behaves—how fast and to what depth it moves—and how long a compound persists in soil would increase chemical use efficiency and decrease environmental hazard. Chemical behavior in soils, however, is a complex phenomenon and predictions of that behavior usually necessitate extremely sophisticated computer models. Such models can be useful to researchers, but the model's complexity often exceeds our ability to supply needed input data and the "first approximation" needs of regulatory, monitoring or educational personnel.

Scientists and extension personnel at the University of Florida (Nofziger and Hornsby 1985) have developed a computer program useful for management and educational purposes. The model, named CMIS (Chemical Movement in Soils), provides qualitative predictions of pesticide fate as a function of key soil, chemical, and climatic variables. Model assumptions are relatively severe and restrict the model's usefulness in strict regulatory situations, but the speed and simplicity of the program have attracted considerable interest. The model has been partially verified for selected chemicals with field data in Florida (A. G. Hornsby 1985, personal communication) and in Maryland (C. Helling 1986, personal communication). The purpose of the work reported here was to test and modify the model for chemicals, soils and climatic conditions pertinent to New Mexico.

The project's objectives were to:

 Verify model predictions of selected chemical movement in laboratory column studies; and Expand the model data base to include soil, chemical and climatic data important to New Mexico;

METHODS

Laboratory column studies were conducted with the Berino fine sand. The Berino soil was chosen to represent calcareous sandy soils of New Mexico, which is low organic matter. The model was originally designed for sandy soils of Florida that satisfied model assumptions of rapid redistribution of applied water. A herbicide, 4-amino-3,5,6-trichloropicolinic acid (Picloram), was selected as the chemical of interest. Picloram has a relatively long half-life (138 days) and a small partition (adsorption) coefficient (26 mL/g OC), which makes it a highly mobile chemical. This combination of soil and chemical constituted a relatively simple, but important, test of the model predictions.

Plexiglass columns 28.5 cm long with an inside diameter of 5 cm were assembled in sections of about 2 cm each. Berino soil was packed in the columns to a bulk density of 1.54 gr/cm³. The soil columns were initially saturated from the bottom with 0.005 M CaCl₂ and then allowed to drain to "field capacity" for at least 2 days. Except for the short irrigation periods columns were covered to minimize evaporation. A small volume of ¹⁴C-picloram (.08 C) was applied to the soil surface, followed by "irrigation" with the equivalent of 1 cm of 0.005 M CaCl₂ daily. The solution infiltrated rapidly and was assumed to result in an irrigation or rainfall rate of 1 cm/d. Irrigation was continued for times predicted by the model to be sufficient to distribute the chemical throughout the top 18 cm of the column.

Columns were capped with cheese cloth at the bottom and drainage occurred when soil at the bottom of the columns reached near saturation. Because the

model assumes uniform soil moisture, soil below about 18 cm did not meet model requirements and was not intended to be used in model verification.

Each soil segment was subjected to vacuum (0.3 bar) filtration to obtain a sample of the soil solution. One mL subsample of the extract was mixed with scintillation cocktail for assay by liquid scintillation counting. Corrections for quench were made by external standards ("H" number).

In addition to the control column of Berino sand, columns of Berino soil amended with sufficient sewage sludge to increase the soil's organic carbon content to 1% were prepared. Adsorption to organic matter is the primary mechanism assumed to retard chemical movement in the model. Sludge-amended soil columns thus allowed verification of the model's ability to predict chemical movement in soils with variable organic carbon contents.

RESULTS

A preliminary study was conducted to determine the moisture content distribution with depth in a Berino soil column allowed to drain for 5 days following saturation with 0.005 M CaCl₂. The results are given in table 1 and show that soil held significantly more water at all depths than expected if the soil had reached "field capacity" ($\Theta_{\rm v}=10\%$ at 0.1 bar). Apparently, the column design allowed the soil to hold almost twice as much water as predicted. Although the moisture content varied with depth, a uniform $\Theta_{\rm v}$ value of 20% was assumed for modeling purposes. A more recent version of CMIS allows for variation of soil properties with depth (CMIS layered), but was not available at the time of this work. Soil chemical properties in our study were uniform with depth and an assumed uniform moisture content of 20% was regarded as appropriate for our purposes.

Table 1. Moisture content distribution with depth--Berino soil.

Section #	Soil thickness	⊗ _v .
	(cm)	(%)
1	0-1	12.2
2	1-3	18.6
3	3-5	19.7
4	5 - 7	20.2
5	7-9	22.0
6	9-11	22.3
7	11-13	22.7
8	13-15	23.8
9	15-17	25.4
		Ave. 20.8

Two columns of Berino soil were irrigated for 2 days at 1 cm/d following application of ¹⁴C-picloram. Columns were sectioned and each section vacuum extracted to obtain a sample of the soil solution. Distribution of ¹⁴C-picloram with depth for both columns is given in table 2. Data for both columns suggest a peak concentration in section #4 representing the 5-7 cm soil depth.

Computer simulations using an assumed uniform $\Theta_{_{\rm V}}=20\%$ predicted the "leading edge" of chemical to be at 6.3 cm after 2 days. (Simulation using $\Theta_{_{\rm V}}=10\%$ predicted the peak to be at 9.2 cm). The model assumes piston type flow and no physical or chemical dispersion (spreading) of the chemical as it flows through the soil. Thus, the "leading edge", "trailing edge" and "peak concentrations are all the same as far as the simulation is concerned. That dispersion occurs in reality is shown by the "bell-shaped" distributions in table 2. Verification of model predictions is thus arbitrary in that one could select the depth of deepest penetration depth of maximum concentration, or any point in between as representative of the "leading edge". Most

scientists, however, use the depth of maximum concentration as was done herein. Results of the first column studies tend to verify the model's usefulness.

Table 2. Distribution of ¹⁴C-picloram with depth-Berino soil (0.3% OC).

	Section #	Soil thickness	¹⁴ C-picloram
		(cm)	(d pm)
Column 1	1	0-1	297
	2	1-3	8,341
	3	3-5	31,932
	4	5-7*	41,425
	5	7-9	10,518
	6	9-11	1,128
Column 2	1	0-1	1,116
	2	1-3	10,854
	3	3-5	33,772
	4	5 - 7*	41,875
	5	7-9	22,567
	6	9-11	1,642

^{*}Indicates peak concentration.

Attempts also were made to simulate picloram movement in soils with higher organic carbon content (sludge-amended soil). Experimental control in these studies was generally poor and inexperience on behalf of the experimenter resulted in data of limited value. Results of one column amended to 1% OC are nevertheless presented for discussion purposes (table 3).

Irrigation of the sludge-amended column continued for 9d, as initial model predictions suggested significant retardation of chemical movement by the increased organic carbon. The extra time involved in this experiment allowed deeper chemical movement and increased dispersion (spreading of the peak). Computer simulation predicted the leading edge to be between 15-17 cm.

Table 3. Distribution of 14 C-picloram with depth-Berino soil (1% OC).

Section #	Soil thickness	14
	CHICKNESS	¹⁴ C-picloram
***************************************	(cm)	(d pm)
1-4	0-7	
5	7-9	201
6	9-11	136
7	11-13	460
8	13-15	1439
9	15-17	3374
10	17-19*	3755
11	19-21	3364
12	21-23	3456
13	23-25	2699
14	25-26.5	1733

^{*}Indicates peak concentration.

Although the prediction was reasonably good, the model fails to account for the significant spreading of chemical that is expected in nature as chemicals move deeper in soil profiles. These data emphasize the limitations of the move deeper in soil profiles. These data emphasize the limitations of the model but do not negate its usefulness as a fast, qualitative predictor of chemical behavior in soils.

The laboratory column work reported here, although simple in design and limited in scope, nevertheless appears to verify CMIS model predictions with a representative New Mexico soil. Predictions with heavier textured soils common to, for example, the Mesilla Valley are expected to be in error because redistribution of water in such soils is much slower than in sand soils for which the model was developed. Chemical mobility would be less than predicted in slowly permeable soils. Thus, the model predictions could be interpreted as representing "worst case" scenarios. Qualitative divisions of chemicals

into mobile and immobile classes are useful predictions of chemical behavior and are readily made with the model.

DATA BASE EXPANSION

The model comes equipped with climatic data, soils information, and chemical characteristics pertinent to Florida. Attempts were made to expand the data base to climates, soils and chemicals pertinent to New Mexico.

Climatic data

The program requires daily effective rainfall (rainfall minus runoff) and evapotranspiration (ET) data. Daily climatic measurements are available for weather stations throughout New Mexico from the state climatologist via a computer linkage. For this study, four stations were chosen, each representing distinct regions of the state. The stations selected were: Las Cruces, Clovis, Farmington and Alcalde. Weather data for 1985 had been tabulated by the state climatologist. Data available include daily rainfall, soil and air temperature, wind speed, net radiation, and relative humidity, but not daily ET. The latter may be calculated from the other climatic data using empirical equations (eg. Penman equation). The calculations are straightforward, but tedious. Alternatively, ET may be calculated from monthly pan evaporation data summarized in annual reports for New Mexico. Unfortunately, the latter are often incomplete especially for the winter Calculated potential ET and pan evaporation values may be months. subsequently multiplied by "crop coefficients" if the predictions warrant such detail.

Chemical characteristics

The model data base includes information (partition coefficient and halflife) for 37 chemicals (herbicides, insecticides, nematicides) of importance in Florida. It was expected that at least some of these chemicals would also be important in New Mexico. The list was checked against the results of a 1983 survey of pesticide use in New Mexico (English 1985). A tabulation of the most commonly used pesticides and their characteristics is given in table 4. Chemicals of lower agricultural importance that are used by homeowners (eg. chlordane, diazinon) do not appear in table 4, but are included in the model data base.

The most prominent chemical in table 4 is 2,4-D, a herbicide that does not meet model requirements of hydrophobic, undissociated chemicals. Its adsorption is primarily to organic matter, however, and could be modeled with CMIS as a first approximation.

chemicals with low K_{oc} values (<100) and high t1/2 values (>30) are expected to represent the greatest hazard to ground water pollution. Nematicides are designed to be mobile, persistent, and toxic, and as a group are commonly found in ground water (Sun 1986). Nationwide, EDB (ethylene dibromide) and DBCP (1,2-dibromo-3-chloropropane), and aldicarb are the most frequently reported pesticides in ground water. Fortunately, only aldicarb is used in relatively large quantities in New Mexico (table 4).

Soils data

The model requires only limited chemical and physical properties of soils, e.g., texture, bulk density, percent organic carbon, and water contents at -0.1 and -15 bars (% by volume). We hoped to obtain the information for soil series prominent in counties that included the weather station identified above. Unfortunately, the soil survey for Rio Arriba County (Alcalde station) is not completed, and so no soils information is available. Data for soils from the other counties were limited in their usefulness. If available at

Table 4. Pesticides of agricultural importance in New Mexico and their characteristics.

Common	Chemical I	Estimated	Estimated		
name	name	total use	acres treated	Koc	t1/2
		(lbs)		(m1/g)	(d)
2,4-D	2,4-dichlorophenoxy acetic acid	204,174	204,174	20	35
Parathion	0,0-diethyl o-(p-nitrophenyl) phosphorodithioate	168,080	120,057	10,650	37
Carbofuran	2,3-dihydro-2,2-dimethyl-7 benzofuranyl methyl carbamate	142,747	118,956	29	37
Dicamba	3,6-dichloro-0-anisic acid	66,559	110,931	2	14
Atrazine	2-chloro-4(ethylamino)-6- (isopropylamino)-S-triazine	48,0004	36,926	163	48
Chloropyrifos	0,0-diethyl 0-(3,5,6-trichloro- 2-pyridyl)phosphorothioate	36,897	28,382	6,070	63
Propazine	2-chloro-4,6-bis(isopropylamino) S-triazine	- 27,173	33,966	154	
Trifluralin	∝,∝,<-trif1uro-2,6-dinitro- N-N-dipropy1-P-to1uidine	20,656	29,509	14,000	70 - 132
Aldicarb	2-methy1-2-(methy1thio)	13,998	17,497	12	28
	propionaldehyde-0-(methylcarbamy		,		20
Prometryn	2,4-bis(isopropylamine)-6- (methyl thio)-6-triazine	12,617	18,024	614	
Disulfoton	0,0-diethy1-S[2-(ethy1thio) ethy1] phosphorodithioate	11,688	10,625	1,603	5
M-Parathion	0,0-dimethyl 0-(P-nitrophenyl) phosphorodithioate	7,737	8,597	5,102	4

all, data on OC content and moisture contents at 0.1 and 15 bars were often given as unacceptably wide ranges. Considerable soil analysis would have to be completed before the model could be applied to specific New Mexico soils.

Prominent soil series in counties associated with three weather stations were identified (table 5). Sandy soils, for which the model was developed, occur in parts of San Juan and Dona Ana counties, but are largely absent in Curry County. Heavier textured loams dominate the counties chosen. Chemical mobility would be over-predicted in these soils given the current assumptions in the model. More laboratory testing would be necessary to verify model

predictions in these soils, but a more sophisticated model would likely be needed.

Table 5. Prominent soil series in counties associated wit selected weather stations.

County-station	Soil name	Soil series	% of county	Texture	% OC
San Juan-Farmington	Blancot-Natal Association	Blancot Natal	10	Loam SiCl Loam	
	Sheppard-Mayqueen Shiprock Complex	Sheppard Mayqueen Shiprock	4.5	L.f. Sand	<0.3 <0.3 <0.3
	Sheppard-Huerfano Natal Complex	Sheppard Huerfano Natal	8.4	L.f. Sand S.Cl. Loam SiCl Loam	<0.3
Curry-Clovis	Amarillo sandy loam Clovis sandy loam Amarillo loam Pullman loam		16 2 20 29	F.S. Loam S.C1. Loam S.C1. Loam Loam	0.19-0.68 0.30-0.58 0.30-0.87 0.19-0.93
Dona Ana-Las Cruces	Wink-Puntura Complex	Wink Pintura	9.5	S. Loam L.f. sand	
	Wink-Harrisburg Association	Wink Harrisburg Simona		F.S. Loam S. Loam S. Loam	
	Onite-Pujarito Association	Onite Pujarito Pintura	4.7	S.Loam F.S. Loam F. Sand	
	Bluepoint loamy sand		4.0	L. Sand	
	Berino-Buckleban Association	Berino Buckleban Dona Ana	4.1	S. Loam C. Loam S. Loam	

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

CMIS is a management/educational model that provides qualitative predictions of pesticide fate as a function of key soil, chemical and climatic variables. Model assumptions currently limit it to nonpolar pesticides (and other xenobiotics) moving in sandy soils. The program has received widespread acceptance, principally by extension personnel, because of its speed and ease of handling.

Limited verification of the model has been reported with selected field data in Florida, Georgia and Maryland. Laboratory column studies with a sandy New Mexico soil also matched reasonably well with model predictions. These data suggest that the model could be used as first approximations of pesticide behavior in sandy New Mexico soils.

Attempts to expand the model's data base to other soils, climate and chemicals important to New Mexico were only partially successful. Chemicals important to New Mexico agriculture were identified and can be modeled with CMIS. Most of the chemicals so identified are already included in the model's data base.

Climatic data for four regions (weather stations) were examined. Model inputs of daily rainfall and ET are only partially available. ET data would have to be calculated in a tedious process or could be obtained from monthly open pan records. These records are incomplete for some stations and are largely useless for modeling purposes as pan evaporation exceeds rainfall in almost every month at every station. No movement of chemical is predicted to occur under such conditions. Thus, dryland agriculture represents a "safe" environment for the application of most pesticides given "normal" rainfall

conditions, moderately deep ground water and moderately- to short-lived chemicals.

Irrigated conditions, of course, represent a very different situation. Given an irrigation efficiency of 50% and a crop with a consumptive use of about 30 in/yr., sizeable quantities of water may percolate below the root zone of sandy soils to reach the ground water. If the soil's "field capacity" were 30%, 15 inches of water could be expected to wet to a depth of 15/0.30 = 50 inches in one season.

No attempt was made to modify CMIS to handle such irrigated conditions in this short project period. Future work should concentrate on typical irrigated scenarios if pesticide contamination of ground water in New Mexico is to be simulated reasonably.

Adequate soils data for the model were largely unavailable. Serious attempts to simulate chemical movement in New Mexico will require determining soil characteristics for regions to be modeled. It is important to recall that CMIS was designed for sandy soils. Many important agricultural areas of the state are dominated by heavier textured soils. Rather than try to modify CMIS for such soils, its developers suggest slightly more sophisticated management models (Hornsby 1986, personal communication). Such models are currently under study in Florida and New York state).

CMIS may nevertheless be useful in New Mexico both as an educational instrument for students and extension personnel and as a tool examining the implications of various management practices in "worst case" scenarios. Examples of such calculations are given in Appendix A for the behavior of four chemicals in two soils with different organic carbon contents and different hydraulic properties. Chemicals include the extremely mobile, short-lived

Dicamba; the mobile, extremely short-lived 2,4-D; the mobile, moderately-lived Carbofuran; and the extremely immobile, moderately-lived Parathion. Simulations were conducted with two Florida soils using Florida climatic data (rainfall >>ET).

The simulation data are presented to demonstrate the educational value of the model, e.g. shows how chemical half-life and partition coefficient affect movement. Further interpretation is left to the reader.

Literature Cited

- 1. English, L. M. 1985. Pesticide use on New Mexico major crops in 1983.

 NMSU Coop. Ext. Serv.
- 2. Nofziger, D. L. and A. G. Hornsby. 1985. Chemical movement in soils:IBM PC User's Guide. Florida Coop. Ext. Serv. Circ. 654.
- 3. Sun, M. 1986. Ground water ills: many diagnoses, few remedies. Sci. 232:1490-1493.

APPENDIX A

Chemical Data:

Common Name : <u>DICAMBA</u>
Trade Name : BANVEL D

Partition Coefficient (ml/g OC) : 2 Half-Life (days) : 14

Soil Data:

Soil Name : ORANGEBURG FINE SANDY LOAM

Soil Identifier : S37-8-(1-6)

Percent Organic Carbon : 0.31 * Water Content at -0.1 bar (% by vol.) : 30.3 Water Content at -15 bars (% by vol.) : 15.8 Bulk Density (g/cc) : 1.61

Root Depth: 30 centimeters

Rainfall File : LOCAL83.R Evapotranspiration File: LOCAL83.ET

Starting Date : 1 - 2 - 83 Stopping Date : 3 - 29 - 83

Total Rainfall: 54.74 centimeters
Total Evapotranspiration: 25.83 centimeters
Potential Evapotranspiration: 25.83 centimeters

Month	I	Day	Yea	r-	Rainfall	Solute Depth	Relative Mass	Elapsed Time
					се	ntimeters		Days
1 -		Z	****	83	0.84	2.7	1.00	Ó
1		3	-	83	1.73	8.2	o.95	1
1 .	****	20	**	83	0.71	8.2	0.41	18.
1		\mathbb{Z} 1	_	83	3.76	18.6	0.39	19
1 .		23	••••	83	o.58	19.7	0.35	21
1, .		27	_	83	0.51	17.8	0.29	25
1 -		28		83	1.78	25.0	0.28	26
1	_	30	_	83	0.30	25.2	0.25	28
Chemi	⊏al	. Mc	veme	nt	Below Root			
2 -		2		83	5.08	39.7	0.22	31
_	_	ó		83	1.02	39.7	0.18	35
2 -		13		83	1.12	39.7	0.13	42
2 -	_	14		83	5,77	54.7	0.12	4 <u>3</u>
2 - 2 - 2 -	_	17	-	83	0.25	54.7	0.10	46
2 -	_	23		83	1.45	54.7	0.08	52
2 -		28		83	0.43	54.7	0.06	57
2 - 3 -	_	1		83	1.78	54.7	0.06	58
	_	6	_	83	5,92	62.7	0.04	63
_	_	7	-	83	7.54	86.0	0.04	64
⋾ -	_	16		83	1.09	86.0	0.03	73
उ -	-	17	***	83	4.14	90.9	0.03	74
<u>उ</u> -		18	···	83	2.11	96.7	0.02	75
	_	21		83	2.11	100.3	0.02	78
उ -		24	-	83	0.84	100.3	0.02	81
3 -	-	27	_	83	3.89	107.6	0.02	84

Chemical Data:

Common Name : DICAMBA
Trade Name : BANVEL D

Partition Coefficient (ml/g OC) : 2 Half-Life (days) : 14

Soil Data:

Soil Name : TAVARES FINE SAND

Soil Identifier : S27-8-(1-6)

Percent Organic Carbon : 0.09 *

Water Content at -0.1 bar (% by vol.): 8.2 Water Content at -15 bars (% by vol.): 0.9 Bulk Density (g/cc) : 1.55

Root Depth: 30 centimeters

Rainfall File : LOCAL83.R Evapotranspiration File: LOCAL83.ET

Starting Date : 1-2-83Stopping Date : 3-29-83

Total Rainfall: 54.74 centimeters
Total Evapotranspiration: 22.06 centimeters
Potential Evapotranspiration: 25.83 centimeters

Month)	Dav	Уε	e.ar	Rai	infall	Solute Depth	. Fel	ntivo Maes	E1	manual Titus
	•	,	, 10				entimeters		arive nass	•	sed Time
1 -	_	2	_	83				•	4 00	1	Days
1 -						0.84	9.9		1.00		0
i '				83		1.73	29.7		0.95		1
1 -		. 20		83		0.71	29.7		0.41		18
					Below						
_	_	21		83		3.76	54.2		0.39		19
1 -	_	25		83		0.58	56.2		0.35		21
	-	27		83		O.51	56.2		0.29		25
1 -		28	****	83		1.78	73.3		0.28		26
_		30		83		0.30	73.3		0.25		28
		\mathbb{Z}		83		5.08	125.4		0.22		31
-	-	6		83		1.02	125.4		0.18		35
		13	~-	83		1.12	125.4		0.13		42
2 -		14	-	83		5.77	180.9		0.12		43
****	***	17	****	83		0.25	180.9		0.10		46
		23		83		1.45	180.9		0.08		52
2 ~	_	28		83		0.43	180.9		0.06		57
ত্র -	_	1	_	83		1.78	180.9		0.06		58
_		6	-	83		5.92	224.8		0.04		63
	_	7		83		7.54	310.8		0.04		64
		16		83		1.09	310.8		0.03		73
3 -	_	17		83		4.14	342.8		0.03		74
_	_	18		83		2.11	364.1		0.03		
	_	21		83		2.11	377.2		0.02		75 70
_	_	24		83		0.84					78
<u> </u>		27					377.2		0.02		81
	_	£ /	_	83		3.89	404.2		0.02		84

Chemical Data:

Common Name : 2.4-D
Trade Name :

Partition Coefficient (ml/g OC) : 20 Half-Life (days) : 5

Soil Data:

Soil Name : ORANGEBURG FINE SANDY LOAM

Soil Identifier : S37-8-(1-6)

Percent Organic Carbon : 0.31* Water Content at -0.1 bar (% by vol.) : 30.3 Water Content at -15 bars (% by vol.) : 15.8 Bulk Density (g/cc) : 1.61

Root Depth: 30 centimeters

Rainfall File : LOCAL83.R Evapotranspiration File: LOCAL83.ET

Starting Date : 1-2-83Stopping Date : 3-29-83

Total Rainfall: 54.74 centimeters
Total Evapotranspiration: 25.83 centimeters
Potential Evapotranspiration: 25.83 centimeters

Month	Day	Year	Rainfal:	l Solute Depth entimeters	Relative Mass	Elapsed Time Days
1 -	- 5	- 9	3 0.84	2.1	1.00	0
1 -	- 3		3 1.73	6.3	0.87	1
1 -			3 0.71	6.3	0.08	18
1 -			3.76	15.0	0.07	19
1 -	~-		3 0.58	15.9		
1 -					0.05	21
.	·		3 0.51	16.3	0.03	25.
1 -			3 1.78	20.3	0.03	26
1 -			3 0.30	20.6	0.02	28
Chemic	:al M	ovemer	t Below Root	Zone		
2 -	- 2	. – E	3 5.08	32.1	0.01	31
2 -	- 6	- 8	3 1.02	32.1	0.01	35
2 -	- 13	- 8	3 1.12	32.1	0.00	42
2 -	- 14	- E	3 5. 77	43.7	0.00	43
2 -	- 17	· E	3 0.25	43.7	0.00	46
2 -	- 23	- E	3 1.45	43.7	0.00	52
2 -	- 28	E	3 0.43	43.7	0.00	57
3 -	- 1	– E	3 1.78	43.7	0.00	58
3 -	- 6		3 5.92	50.0	0.00	63
3 - 3 -				68. 1	0.00	64
3 ~	- 16	- E	3 1.09	68.1	0.00	73
3 -		-		71.9	0.00	74
3 -			3 2.11	76.4	0.00	75
<u> </u>	_		3 2.11	79.2	0.00	78
- 3 -			3 0.84	79.2	0.00	81
3 -				84.8	0.00	84

Chemical Data:

Common Name : 2,4-D

Trade Name

Partition Coefficient (ml/g OC) : 20

Half-Life (days) : 5

Soil Data:

Soil Name : TAVARES FINE SAND

Soil Identifier : S27-8-(1-6)

Percent Organic Carbon : 0.09*
Water Content at -0.1 bar (% by vol.) : 8.2
Water Content at -15 bars (% by vol.) : 0.9
Bulk Density (g/cc) : 1.55

Root Depth: 30 centimeters

Rainfall File : LOCAL83.R Evapotranspiration File: LOCAL83.ET

Starting Date : 1 - 2 - 83Stopping Date : 3 - 29 - 83

Total Rainfall: 54.74 centimeters
Total Evapotranspiration: 22.06 centimeters
Potential Evapotranspiration: 25.83 centimeters

Month		Day	Υe	ar		l Solute Depth	Relative Mass	Elapsed Time Days
1 .	-	2		83	0.84	7.6	1.00	Ó
1.	-	.3		83	1.73	23.0	0.87	1
1 -	_	20	-	83	0.71	23.0	0.08	18
Chemi	ca	I Mo	over	nent	Below Root	Zone		
1 -	-	21	-	83	3.76	46.3	0.07	19
-		23	-	83	0.58	47.9	0.05	21
-		27		83	0.51	47 . 9	0.03	25
1 -	-	28		83	1.78	61.1	0.03	26 ·
_		30		83	0.30	61.1	0.02	28
	_	2		83	5.08	101.3	0.01	31
	_	6		83	1.02	101.3	0.01	35
	_	13		83	1.12	101.3	0.00	42
	_	14		83	5.77	144.1	0.00	43
		17		83	0.25	144.1	0.00	46
***	-	23		83	1.45	144.1	0.00	52
	-	28		83	0.43	144.1	0.00	57
_	_	1		83	1.78	144.1	0.00	58
	_	6		83	5.92	178.0	0.00	63
	-	7	-	83	7.54	244.3	0.00	64
-	-	16		83	1.09	244.3	0.00	73
		17	_	83	4.14	269.0	0.00	74
	_	18	-	83	2.11	285.4	0.00	75
	_	21	-	83	2.11	295.6	0.00	78
	_	24	-	83	0.84	295.6	0.00	81
ত -	-	27	_	83	3.89	316.4	0.00	84

Chemical Data:

Common Name : CARBOFURAN
Trade Name : FURADAN

Partition Coefficient (ml/g OC) : 29 Half-Life (days) : 37

Soil Data:

Soil Name : ORANGEBURG FINE SANDY LOAM

Soil Identifier : \$37-8-(1-6)

Percent Organic Carbon : 0.31 x Water Content at -0.1 bar (% by vol.) : 30.3 Water Content at -15 bars (% by vol.) : 15.8 Bulk Density (g/cc) : 1.61

Root Depth: 30 centimeters

Rainfall File : LOCALB3.R Evapotranspiration File: LOCALB3.ET

Starting Date : 1-2-83Stopping Date : 3-29-83

Total Rainfall: 54.74 centimeters
Total Evapotranspiration: 25.83 centimeters
Potential Evapotranspiration: 25.83 centimeters

Month	Day Y	ear		Solute Depth	Relative Mass	•
	_			ntimeters		Days
1 -	2 -	83	0.84	1.9	1.00	0
1 -	·	83	1.73	5.7	O.98	1
1 -	Aug 101	83	0.71	5.8	0.71	18
1 -		83	3.76	13.7	0.70	19
1 -	23 -	83	0.58	14.6	0.67	21
1	27 -	83	0.51	14.9	0.63	25
1 -	28 -	83	1.78	18.6	0.61	26
1 -	30 -	83	0.30	18.8	0.59	28
2 -	2 -	83	5.08	29.3	0.56	31
2 -	6 -	83	1.02	29.3	0.52	35
2 -	13 -	83	1.12	29.3	0.46	42
Chemic	al Move	ment	Below Root Z			\ _
2 -	14 -	83	5.77	39.9	O.45	43
2 -	17 -	83	0.25	39 .9	0.42	46
2 -	23 -	83	1.45	39.9	0.38	52
2 -	28 -	83	0.43	39.9	0.34	57
22	1 -	83	1.78	39.9	0.34	58
उ -	6 -	83	5.92	45.5	0.31	43
3 -	7 -	83	7.54	61.8	0.30	64
3 - 3 -	16 -	83	1.09	61.8	0.25	73
3 -	17 -	83	4.14	65. 2	0.25	74
3 -	18 -	83	2.11	69.2	0.25	. ` 75
3 -	21 -	83	2.11	71.7	0.23	78
3 -	24 -	83	0.84	71.7	0.22	81
3 -	27 -	83	3.89	76.8	0.21	84

Chemical Data:

Common Name : CARBOFURAN
Trade Name : FURADAN

Partition Coefficient (m1/g OC) : 29 Half-Life (days) : 37

Soil Data:

Soil Name : TAVARES FINE SAND

Soil Identifier : S27-8-(1-6)

Percent Organic Carbon : 0.09 * Water Content at -0.1 bar (% by vol.) : 8.2 Water Content at -15 bars (% by vol.) : 0.9 Bulk Density (g/cc) : 1.55

Root Depth: 30 centimeters

Rainfall File : LOCAL83.R Evapotranspiration File: LOCAL83.ET

Starting Date : 1 - 2 - 83
Stopping Date : 3 - 29 - 83

Total Rainfall: 54.74 centimeters
Total Evapotranspiration: 22.06 centimeters
Potential Evapotranspiration: 25.83 centimeters

Month	Day	Year		l Solute Depth entimeters	Relative Mass	Elapsed Time Days
1	- 2	- 8			1.00	0
1 -	- ড	- 8	1.73		0.98	1
1 -	- 20	- 8	0.71	20.7	0.71	18
Chemic	al M	ovemen	Below Root	Zone		
1 -	- 21	- 8	3.76	43.0	0.70	19.
1 -	- 23	8	0.58	44.4	0.67	21
1 -	27	- 8	0.51	44.4	0.63	25
1 -	- 28	- 8	1.78	56.3	0.61	26
1 -		- 8:	0.30	56.3	0.59	28
2 -	- 2	- 8	5.08	92.4	0.56	31
2 -		- 8	1.02	92.4	0.52	35
2 -	13	- 83	1.12	92.4	0.46	42
2 -	14	- 8:	5.77	130.7	0.45	43
2 - 2 - 2				130.7	0.42	46
2 -				130.7	o.38	52
2 - 3 -	28			130.7	0.34	57
उ		- 83		130.7	o.34	58
₃ –		- 8:		161.2	0.31	63
3 - 3 - 3 -		- 83		220.7	0.30	64
₃				220.7	0.25	73
3 -				242.9	0.25	74
3 -				257 . 6	0.25	75
3 ∽				266.7	0.23	78
ত —				266.7	0.22	81
ত —	27	- 83	3.89	285.4	O.21	84

Chemical Data:

Common Name : <u>PARATHION</u>
Trade Name : THIOPHOS
Partition Coefficient (ml/g OC) : 10650

Half-Life (days) : 35

Soil Data:

Soil Name : TAVARES FINE SAND

Soil Identifier : S27-8-(1-6)

Percent Organic Carbon : 0.09 \star Water Content at -0.1 bar (% by vol.) : 8.2 Water Content at -15 bars (% by vol.) : 0.9 Bulk Density (g/cc) : 1.55

Root Depth: 30 centimeters

Rainfall File : LOCAL83.R Evapotranspiration File: LOCAL83.ET

Starting Date : 1 - 2 - 83 Stopping Date : 3 - 29 - 83

Total Rainfall: 54.74 centimeters
Total Evapotranspiration: 22.06 centimeters
Potential Evapotranspiration: 25.83 centimeters

Month	1	Day	Υe	ear		Solute Depth timeters	Relative Mass	Elapsed Time Days
1 -	_	2 -		83	0.84	0.1	1.00	Ó
1 -	-			83	1.73	0.2	0.98	1
1 -		20 -		83	0.71	0.2	0.70	18
			_	83	3.76	0.5	0.69	19
1 -		23	_	83	0.58	0.5	0.66	21
1 -	_	27		83	0.51	0.5	0.61	25
1 -		28	_	83	1.78	0.7	0.60	26
1 -	_	30		83	0.30	0.7	o.57	28
2 -	_	2		83	5.08	1.0	o.54	31
2 -	_	6		83	1.02	1.1	0.50	35
ست		13	-	83	1.12	1.2	0.44	42
2 -	-	14	_	83	5.77	1.5	0.43	43
2 -	_	17		83	0.25	1.6	0.40	46
2 -		23		83	1.45	1.6	○.36	52
2 -		28 -	_	83	0.43	1.7	0.32	57
ਤ -		1		83	1.78	1.8	0.32	58
ত -	-	6	_	83	5.92	2.2	0.29	63
3 -	-	7		83	7.54	2.7	0.28	64
3 -	-	16		83	1.09	2.7	0.24	73
3 -	_	17	_	83	4.14	3.0	0.23	74
ত -	_	18	_	83	2.11	3.i	0.23	75
ত -	-	21	_	83	2.11	3.3	0.21	78
· - -	-	24	-	83	0.84	3.3	0.20	81
	-	27		83	3.89	3.6	0.19	84

Chemical Data:

Common Name : <u>FARATHION</u>
Trade Name : THIOPHOS
Partition Coefficient (ml/g OC) : 10650
Half-Life (days) : 35

Soil Data:

Soil Name : ORANGEBURG FINE SANDY LOAM

Soil Identifier : 537-8-(1-6)

Percent Organic Carbon : 0.31 *
Water Content at -0.1 bar (% by vol.) : 30.3
Water Content at -15 bars (% by vol.) : 15.8
Bulk Density (g/cc) : 1.61

Root Depth: 30 centimeters

Rainfall File : LOCAL83.R Evapotranspiration File: LOCAL83.ET

Starting Date : 1-2-83Stopping Date : 3-29-83

Total Rainfall: 54.74 centimeters
Total Evapotranspiration: 25.83 centimeters
Potential Evapotranspiration: 25.83 centimeters

Month	Day	Year		Solute Depth	Relative Mass	Elapsed Time Days
1 -	2	- 83		0.0	1.00	0
- 1 -	3	- 83		0.0	0.98	- 1
_ 1 -		- 83		0.1	0.70	18
1	21	- 83		0.1	0.69	19
1 -	23			0.1	0.66	21
1 -	27	- 83		0.2	0.61	25
1 -	28	- 83		0.2	0.60	26
1 -	30	- 83		0.2	0.57	28
2 -	2	- 83		0.3	0.54	31:
2 -	6	- 83		0.3	0.50	35
2222	13	- 83		0.3	0.44	42
2 -	14	- 83	5.77	0.4	0.43	43
2 -	17	- 83		0.4	0.40	46
2 -	23	- 83	1.45	0.5	0.36	52
2 -	28	- 83	0.43	0.5	0.32	57
3 -	1	- 83	1.78	0.5	0.32	58
3 -	6	- 83	5.92	0.6	0.29	63
3 -	7	- 83	7.54	0.8	0.28	64
3 -	16	- 83	1.09	0.8	0.24	73
3 -	17	- 83	4.14	0.8	0.23	74
3 -	18	- 83	2.11	0.9	0.23	. 75
3 -	21	- 83	2.11	0.9	0.21	78
3 -	24	- 83	0.84	0.9	0.20	81
उ -	27	- 83	3.89	1.0	0.19	84