

EFFICACY REVIEW

DATE: IN 4-25-95 OUT 7-11-95

FILE OR REG. NO. 1624-39

PETITION OR EXP. PERMIT NO. \_\_\_\_\_

DATE DIV. RECEIVED January 5, 1995

DATE OF SUBMISSION December 29, 1994

DATE SUBMISSION ACCEPTED \_\_\_\_\_

TYPE PRODUCT(S): (I,) D, H, F, N, R, S \_\_\_\_\_

DATA ACCESSION NO(S) . 401965-01, -02, -07, -22 & 423818-01; D214616;  
S482313; Case# 053312; AC:674

PRODUCT MGR. NO. 25-Taylor/Daughtry

PRODUCT NAME(S) TIM-BOR® Insecticide/TIM-BOR® DPT®

COMPANY NAME U. S. Borax, Incorporated

SUBMISSION PURPOSE 8 months response to Reregistration Eligibility  
Decision with respect to boric acid and sodium  
salts for §§ 95-2.3; 95-10; 95-11; 95-12 and 95-13.

CHEMICAL & FORMULATION Disodium octaborate tetrahydrate 98.00%  
(25-35 lbs./cubic foot bulk density, powder)

CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS The data presented in EPA Accession  
(MRID) Number 401965-01, having been obtained from a standard test  
meeting requirements of § 95-12(a)(1), (4) and (5)(i) on pp.271-2  
and the standard of § 95-12(b)(1)(ii)(A) but not (C) on p. 273 of  
the Product Performance Guidelines, are partially adequate to sup-  
port control of Formosan and Eastern subterranean termites when a  
borate loading of 0.30% boric acid equivalent is achieved in wood  
treated with the subject product. Together with MRID No. 401965-02  
which was similarly conducted and met the same standard; and MRID  
No. 401965-07 which was conducted as a laboratory test and demon-  
strated borax and boric acid solutions of 5% each produced a total  
mortality of subterranean termites fed on paper soaked in them; and  
MRID No. 401965-22 which was conducted as a laboratory test meeting  
the requirements of § 95-12(a)(4) and (5) on pp. 271-2 and the  
standard of § 95-12(b)(1)(ii)(A) but not (C) on p. 273 of the Prod-  
uct Performance Guidelines and which is adequate to demonstrate the  
feasibility of achieving a boric acid equivalent of 0.20% within a  
week at the core of cut lumber double-brushed with a 10% solution  
prepared with the subject product; and especially MRID No. 423818-  
01, having been obtained from standard laboratory and (continued)

field testing meeting the requirements of § 95-12(a)(1), (2), (3), (4) and (5)(i) and (iv) on pp. 271-2 and the standard of § 95-12(b)(1) subparts (ii)(A) and (C) on p. 273 of the Product Performance Guidelines, are adequate to support control of subterranean termites of the genera Coptotermes and Reticulitermes when the subject product is applied as a soil treatment and/or a wood impregnation or wood penetration treatment according to the directions on the label. MRID No. 423818-01 also contains data meeting requirements of § 95-12(a)(5)(ii) on p. 272 and the standard of § 95-12(b)(3) on p. 274 of the Guidelines with respect to wood-boring beetles; and requirements of § 95-12(a)(5)(vi) on p. 272 and the standard of § 95-12(b)(2) on pp. 273-4 of the Guidelines with respect to drywood termites. In summary, the data submitted for the subject product are sufficient to fulfill the requirements for both the laboratory efficacy evaluation and comparative field test portions of the product specific data requirements for Wood Structure Protection Treatments under Guideline requirement number 95-12 on p. 3 of 3 and to satisfy the requirement of footnote number 54 on p. 2 of 2 of the table entitled "REQUIREMENTS STATUS AND REGISTRANT'S RESPONSE" in the Registration Eligibility Decision (RED) for boric acid and its sodium salts issued February 16, 1994. As stated in our review of October 6, 1994, requirements under §§ 95-2, 95-3, 95-10, 95-11 and 95-13 have been waived as not being required. We note the presence of a section entitled "General Insect Control" on both the master label and the label for Tim-Bor® Insecticide, but not on the label for Tim-Bor® DPT®. While the uses included in this section are covered by both the boric acid and boron-containing salts registration standard of 1986 and the present RED for boron and its sodium salts, and by the fact of the concentration of active ingredient, nevertheless the presence of these uses is not reflected in REFS. This led us to conclude in our earlier review that § 95-11 requirements did not apply to this product by reason of absence of claims covered by these sections, while the registrant was correctly stating in their response that the product did not contain any of the specific claims covered by footnotes 51, 52, 53 and 55, which was and is true. We just wanted to clear up this minor misunderstanding on our part, which is of little consequence in determining the registrant's fulfillment of the requirements of the RED.

RL Vern L. McFarland, IRB