

~~SECRET~~

Shaugh. No. 098301

EAB Log Out Date: SEP 26 1986

Init.: SMC

To: L. Schnaubelt  
Product Manager I2  
Registration Division (TS-767)

From: Carolyn K. Offutt *Carolyn Offutt*  
Chief, Environmental Processes and Guidelines Section  
Exposure Assessment Branch, HED (TS-769)

Attached, please find the environmental fate review of:

Reg./File No.: 264-330 and -331

Chemical: Aldicarb

Type Product: I/N

Product Name: Temik

Company Name: Union Carbide

Submission Purposes: Resubmission by RD requesting an  
opinion from EAB on whether volatility studies are required  
for aldicarb as specified in aldicarb registration standard

Action Code: 616

Date In: 1/24/86

EFB#: 6198 & 6199

Date Completed: 9/20/86

TAIS (Level II) Days

101                      2

Deferrals To:

Ecological Effects Branch

Residue Chemistry Branch

Toxicology Branch

REQUIREMENT FOR LAB VOLATILITY STUDIES


1. CHEMICAL:

Chemical name: 2-Methyl-2(methylthio)propionaldehyde O-(methylcarbamoyl)oxime

Common name: Aldicarb

Trade name: Temik

Structure:



2. TEST MATERIAL:

not applicable

3. STUDY/ACTION TYPE:

Resubmission of inquiry from PM regarding necessity of volatility studies for aldicarb as required in the aldicarb registration standard.

4. STUDY IDENTIFICATION:

Title: not applicable

Author: not applicable

Submitted by: Product Manager for aldicarb

Issue Date: 1/24/86

Identifying No: 264-330 and 264-331

5. REVIEWED BY:

Matthew N. Lorber, Agricultural Engineer Matthew Lorber Date 9/26/86  
Environmental Processes and Guidelines Section/EAB/HED

6. APPROVED BY:

Carolyn K. Offutt, Chief

Carolyn K. Offutt Date 9/26/86  
Environmental Processes and Guidelines Section/EAB/HED

7. CONCLUSIONS:

The conclusion for the initial submission of this request was that volatilization does not represent a significant loss

mechanism for aldicarb, and hence not a significant route of worker exposure.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS:

Waive the volatility requirements for aldicarb as put forth in the registration standard.

9. BACKGROUND:

Data was submitted by Union Carbide in response to the requirement in the registration standard for volatilization studies. Union Carbide believed that the volatilization requirement was unnecessary. The Registration Division requested EAB's opinion in an earlier data review. This current review is a resubmission to EAB since the earlier review was never completed. This earlier review is filed under EAB# 6053 and 6054 and dated 9/26/86.

10. DISCUSSION

See EAB files for EFB# 6053 and 6054 for the appropriate "Discussion" of the three studies which Union Carbide submitted in support of their position.