**Chapter 1 – Methomyl Problem Formulation**
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# Introduction

This problem formulation provides the foundation for the methomyl Biological Evaluation (BE) for all federally listed endangered and threatened species, as well as those that are proposed and candidates for listing and experimental populations (in sum referred to as “listed species”). This BE also includes an analysis of designated critical habitats. The methods employed in this BE follow the Revised Method for National Level Listed Species Biological Evaluations of Conventional Pesticides (referred to as the “Revised Method”)[[1]](#footnote-2). The assessment for methomyl represents EPA’s Biological Evaluation (BE) for all federally listed species and designated critical habitats.

Included in this chapter is a description of the federal action; the mode and mechanism of action of methomyl; summaries of its uses (based on registered product labels), usage, and fate; definition of the residue of concern; an analysis plan for how the risk assessment will be conducted and a brief summary of previous FIFRA risk conclusions as well as listed species assessments. As part of the FIFRA registration review process, a detailed Problem Formulation for the FIFRA ecological risk assessment of methomyl was finalized in July 2016[[2]](#footnote-3).

# Description of the Federal Action

In 2006, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) initiated Registration Review to reevaluate all pesticides on a regular cycle. EPA is required to review each pesticide active ingredient at least every 15 years to make sure that it has the ability to assess risks to human health and the environment as science evolves and policies and practices may change, and that all pesticide products in the marketplace continue to meet the standard of registration. Registration review includes labels registered under Sections 3, 24(c), and 18 of the Federal Insecticide Fungicide Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). The federal action of registration review for methomyl encompasses the review of all the registered uses, and the approved product labels for all pesticide products containing methomyl.

# Mode and Mechanism of Action

Methomyl is an N-methylcarbamate insecticide. N-methylcarbamate insecticides act by inhibiting acetylcholinesterase, thereby reducing the degradation of the cholinergic neurotransmitter acetylcholine. As a result, inter-synaptic concentrations of acetylcholine increase as the neurotransmitter accumulates, leading to increased firing of the postsynaptic neurons. This may ultimately lead to convulsions, paralysis, and death of an organism exposed to the chemical. Acetylcholinesterase inhibition is rapidly reversed in many taxa once exposure to an N-methylcarbamate insecticide has ended.

# Use and Usage Characterization

Use data are based on registered product labels and include pesticide application information relevant to a treatment site *(e.g.,* an orchard). EPA determines the uses based on registered labels and define crop or non-crop sites to which a pesticide may be applied. Use data also describe the maximum application rates, method (*e.g.,* aerial or ground spray), re-treatment intervals and number of applications that may occur according to registered product labels.

Usage data describe how the pesticide has been applied to multiple use sites within a state, region or the US. EPA also reviews actual usage data that documents the actual applications of a pesticide, including information such as actual application rates and timing, and spatial distribution of applications across multiple sites (usually based on survey data). The key difference between use and usage is potential applications vs. actual applications.

## Use Data (as Defined on Registered Product Labels)

The label on a pesticide package or container is legally enforceable. The label provides information about how to handle and safely use the pesticide product and avoid harm to human health and the environment. Using a pesticide in a manner that is inconsistent with the use directions on the label is a violation of FIFRA and can result in enforcement actions to correct the violations. This BE assesses the legal uses of methomyl that are described on registered pesticide labels.

Methomyl is used on a wide variety of terrestrial food and feed crops, terrestrial non-food crops, and non-agricultural indoor and outdoor sites. There are currently 3 active technical registrants of methomyl with 34 active product registrations (16 Section 3s and 18 Special Local Needs), which include formulated products and technical grade methomyl (**APPENDIX 1-1**). All of the formulated methomyl products, with the exception of the fly bait products, are Restricted Use Pesticides (RUPs) – meaning that they can only be applied by, or under the supervision of, a certified applicator. Methomyl can be applied in a liquid, granular (corn only), scatter bait, bait station, or as a brush-on paste. Aerial and ground application methods (including broadcast, soil incorporation, orchard airblast, and chemigation) are allowed. Pesticide product labels for granular products contain a 25-foot (ground) buffer zone adjacent to waterbodies. Additionally, labels for foliar (flowable) applications also contain a 25 or 100-foot buffer zone for ground and aerial applications, respectively.

Current methomyl labels are reflective of the attached Master Use Summary (**APPENDIX 1-2**). In general, current single maximum methomyl application rates do not exceed 0.9 lb a.i./A nationwide for flowable formulations; however, a single application rate of 1.5 lb a.i./A is currently permitted for corn and sweet corn use patterns for granular formulation. The maximum annual rate of methomyl that may be applied to a crop site is 21.6 lb a.i./A for broccoli in Arizona and cauliflower as well as cabbage in California.

Methomyl is currently registered on a variety of agricultural use sites (**APPENDIX 1-2**), including: alfalfa, anise (fennel), apple, asparagus, avocado, bean (dry and succulent), beet, bermudagrass pasture, blueberry, broccoli, brussels sprouts, cabbage, carrot, cauliflower, celery, chicory, chinese cabbage, collards, corn (field, pop-corn, seed and sweet corn), cotton, cucumber, eggplant, endive (escarole), garlic, grapefruit, horseradish, leafy green vegetables, lemon, lentils, lettuce (head and leaf), melon, mint (peppermint and spearmint), nectarine, onion (green and dry bulb), orange, peach, peanut, pear, pea, pecan, pepper, pomegranate, potato, sorghum, soybean, spinach, sugar beet, summer squash, tangelo (tangerine), tobacco, tomato, tomatillo and wheat. In addition, there are several special local need (SLN) use sites, including broccoli raab, chinese broccoli, bean and soybean inter-planted with non-bearing fruit and nut trees, pumpkin, and sweet potato for California and radish for California and Florida. Methomyl is also registered for applications to sod farms (turf).

Non-agricultural outdoor uses for methomyl are limited to fly baits that can be used around livestock animal and poultry premises, commercial structures, and enclosed commercial dumpsters. The fly baits can be used as a perimeter scatter bait, placed in bait stations (hung at least 4 feet high), or mixed with water to form a paste which can be brushed onto walls, window sills, and support beams of outdoor livestock houses.

## Usage Data

Based on usage data compiled by EPA’s Office of Pesticide Program’s Biological and Economic Analysis Division (BEAD), approximately 565,000 pounds of methomyl are applied on average for agricultural purposes in the United States (based on data from 2013 to 2017) (see **APPENDIX 1-4** for details). Approximately 30% and 24% of the total lbs of methomyl used in the United States each year for agriculture is applied to sweet corn (200,000 lbs) and onions (100,000 lbs), respectively. A maximum of 59% of sweet corn, 29% of potatoes, and 25% of lettuce are treated with methomyl in the US. Other crops with relatively high usage of methomyl (at least 20,000 lb/year) include blueberries lettuce, tomatoes, and potatoes. For the period 2013 to 2017, pounds of methomyl applied has decreased by 26% while total acres treated has decreased by 33%. Overall, there has been a decreasing trend in agricultural usage of methomyl since 2009 (**APPENDIX 1-4)**.

# Overview of Environmental Fate

Based on the available information for methomyl, the major transport routes for methomyl include runoff and spray drift. Information on leaching and adsorption/desorption indicate that methomyl is considered mobile according to Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) mobility classification system[[3]](#footnote-4). Based on physical chemical properties as well as empirical data, volatilization from soil and water surfaces is not expected to occur and most likely not a concern for long-range transport. Low octanol/water partition coefficient (log Kow 0.12) suggests that the chemical will have a low tendency to accumulate in aquatic and terrestrial organisms.

The major route of degradation of methomyl appears to be aerobic and anaerobic biodegradation. Photodegradation, and volatilization do not seem to play a significant role in the degradation and dissipation processes. It is stable to hydrolysis at lower pHs (neutral to acidic), but it degrades slowly in alkaline conditions. Hydrolysis half-lives indicate that methomyl is classified as persistent in aquatic and terrestrial environments where microbial activity is not present; however, microbial activity is expected in most natural environments.

Based on methomyl’s aerobic soil metabolism and aerobic and anaerobic aquatic metabolism data, methomyl is not considered persistent in the environment, with half-lives on the order of days to weeks (representative half-life values range from 2.5 to 52 days). Under anaerobic conditions methomyl degradation is likely to be faster than under aerobic conditions, particularly in the presence of reduced iron. Available field data indicate that methomyl dissipation half-lives ranged from 4 to 6 days in Mississippi to 54 days in California, with little or no leaching observed. Additional details on the fate of methomyl are provided in **Chapter 3** of the BE.

# Residue of Concern

Four major degradates (*i.e.*, methomyl oxime, acetonitrile, acetamide and CO2) were detected in various environmental fate studies. These degradates are not considered to be of toxicological concern because they do not contain a N-methylcarbamate functional group. Therefore, methomyl alone is the residue of concern for the ecological risk assessment (see **Chapter 3**).

# Analysis Plan

For the draft BE, effects determinations were made for listed species and designated critical habitats that were listed as of January 30, 2019, but excluded 50 species and 16 critical habitats and 12 newly listed species (since January 30, 2019). For the final BEs, the list was updated to include these excluded species, and compared against the species list as of November 17, 2020 specifically for removal of any species that had been delisted. New species were not included from the 2020 list as there was insufficient time to include those species in the analysis. One species population for the fisher, entity ID 4648 had been delisted under this entity ID in the November 2020 list, but a new species population was still included in the new list under two new entity IDs, that still partially share the area of the range of the former entity ID. For this reason, the fisher, under the entity ID 4648, was retained in the analysis. Effects determinations were made for 1805 listed species and 791 designated critical habitats (see **APPENDIX 4-1** for complete species lists).

As described in the Revised Method, listed species risk assessments for pesticides include three steps. Steps 1 and 2 are represented by the BE, which evaluates whether an individual of a listed species is reasonably expected to be exposed to a pesticide, and, if so, distinguishes effects that are likely to adversely affect an individual of a species from those that are not likely to adversely affect an individual. This process is also applied to the designated critical habitat of listed species (when available). In Step 1, for every listed species and designated critical habitat, EPA determines whether methomyl will have No Effect (NE) or May Affect (MA) (separate determinations made for each species and critical habitat). For those species and critical habitats with MA determinations in Step 1, EPA will determine if methomyl is Not Likely to Adversely Affect (NLAA) or Likely to Adversely Affect (LAA) each individual species or critical habitat.

Details on the method, models and tools used for making NE, NLAA and LAA determinations are provided in the Revised Method. This analysis plan identifies methomyl specific information that is used in the Revised Method to complete this BE.

Step 1 begins with an analysis of the potential overlap of the action area and individual species ranges or critical habitat. For species or critical habitats with no overlap (*i.e.,* species found outside of the action area), NE determinations are made. The currently registered uses (summarized in **Section 4, APPENDIX 1-2** and **APPENDIX 1-3**) include agricultural and non-agricultural uses. The methomyl overlap analysis is conducted using ArcGIS version 10.8. The action area is derived using potential use sites and the off-site transport zone. All labeled uses for methomyl are represented by one or more of the agricultural or non-agricultural Use Data Layers (UDL) created from a variety of landcover, land use and supplemental data sources (see **APPENDIX 1-6** for details**)**. Agricultural and non-agricultural use sites are combined to derive the action area (along with the associated off-site transport zone). Due to the overlapping extents of the individual UDLs, the action area only includes direct overlap. For this reason, the spatial extent of drift from use sites was considered by creating a separate drift layer represented by the minimum distance from a use site across all UDLs for a location.

A number of spatial data sources were used to generate Use Data Layers (UDLs), which map the potential use sites for methomyl. In the contiguous United States (ConUS), agricultural use pattern UDLs are represented by using the US Department of Agriculture’s (USDA) Crop Data Layer (CDL)[[4]](#footnote-5). This analysis utilizes data from 2013-2017. **APPENDIX 1-5** includes a crosswalk between crops found in the CDL and the resulting UDL while **APPENDIX 1-6** includes a crosswalk between methomyl’s registered agricultural crops and those UDLs. **APPENDIX 1-5** also defines how individual CDL layers are grouped into UDL categories[[5]](#footnote-6) and temporally combined to reach the accuracy criteria set by EPA of 85%. USDA’s 2012 Census of Agriculture (CoA) is also used to improve accuracy of the individual UDLs by expanding the agricultural UDLs to meet or exceed the reported acres in the CoA as needed (**ATTACHMENT 1-3**). The CDL is only available for ConUS, so other data sources are used to represent agricultural areas in states and US territories outside of ConUS (referred to as NL48[[6]](#footnote-7)). In Alaska and Puerto Rico, the US Geological Survey’s 2011 National Land Cover Dataset (NLCD)[[7]](#footnote-8) is used. In Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, Virgin Islands and Northern Mariana Islands, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s Costal Change Analysis Program (C-CAP)[[8]](#footnote-9) data from 2010-2012 are used. For non-agricultural use patterns in ConUS additional UDLs were created to represent methomyl’s registered uses. The data sources used for these UDLs included but are not limited to the NLCD 2011, GAP Protected Areas Database, LandFire and NAVTEQ; for additional details see **APPENDIX 1-6** which summarizes all spatial data used to generate the agricultural and non-agricultural UDLs used for methomyl’s potential use site footprints. Due to the limited availability of GIS data in some of the NL48 regions, the Nurseries UDL could not be created in Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Island, Guam, and America Samoa and the Forest Trees UDL could not be created in America Samoa. A separate UDL specific to fallow area was not created in the NL48 regions because it would be identical to the agricultural UDL. **APPENDIX 1-6** summarizes all spatial data used to generate the agricultural and non-agricultural UDLs used for methomyl’s potential use site footprints in the ConUS and NL48.

The Step 2 overlap analysis incorporates methomyl usage data, which are provided in the SUUM (SIAB Use and Usage Matrix), combining it with information from the CoA (**APPENDIX 1-4, ATTACHMENT 1-4**). **APPENDICES 1-7 and 1-8** describe how the usage data for methomyl, the CoA, and the potential use sites are combined to estimate the number of treated acres relevant to a given species located in ConUS or NL48 (respectively). These appendices also explain how the off-site transport zone (specifically spray drift) is adjusted based on available usage data.

The Revised Method document stated “Over time, EPA expects to update the MAGtool and other models and tools described in this document. When a pesticide BE is conducted, it will incorporate the most current versions of models and tools intended for use in the BEs.” This BE is consistent with the Revised Method and includes several method updates that are intended to improve the methods for assessing exposure and effects to plants. These updates include: a refined exposure model for plants inhabiting terrestrial, wetland and aquatic habitats; consideration of new methodology for surrogate endpoints for plants when No Observed Adverse Effects Concentrations (NOAEC) values are not available, updates to the MAGtool to improve accuracy, efficiency and transparency, revision of the spatial footprint for alfalfa and other agricultural grasses (non-grazing areas), pasture/rangeland (grazing areas) and revisions to the aquatic modeling for residential uses. These approaches are discussed below. Changes to the aquatic modeling for residential uses are discussed further in **Chapter 3**.

To estimate exposures to plants in aquatic, wetland, and terrestrial habitats, this BE uses the Plant Assessment Tool (PAT), a new tool designed to refine screening-level exposure estimates to plants typically generated using TerrPlant. PAT employs mechanistic representations of fate (*e.g.,* degradation) and transport (*e.g.,* runoff), using data that are typically available for pesticides, to model runoff and spray drift exposure to terrestrial and wetland environments. For terrestrial plants, runoff and erosion are modeled using the Pesticide Root Zone Model (PRZM; which is part of PWC) and spray drift is modeled using AgDRIFT deposition values (also incorporated into the MAGtool).  The model uses a mixing cell approach to represent water within the active root zone area of soil, and accounts for flow through the terrestrial plant exposure zone (T-PEZ) caused by both treated field runoff and direct precipitation onto the T-PEZ.  Pesticide losses from the T-PEZ occur from transport (*i.e.,* washout and infiltration below the active root zone) and degradation. Wetlands are modeled using PRZM and the Variable Volume Water Model (VVWM) and are then processed in PAT to estimate aquatic (mass per volume of water) and terrestrial (mass per area) concentrations. Aquatic plant exposure is modeled using the PRZM/VVWM models and the standard pond. The results from PAT are summarized for use in the MAGtool in the same way as the results from PWC.

For listed terrestrial and wetland plant species, NOAECs from seedling emergence and vegetative vigor studies are used to represent toxicity endpoints. There are often cases where NOAECs are not available (*e.g*., statistically significant effects occurred at all test concentrations) or are considered unreliable. Consistent with OPP’s longstanding practice, in cases where NOAECs are not available or reliable, an ICx value is used as a surrogate. Based on an analysis of the variability in the dry weight and height data of the controls of commonly tested species in vegetative vigor and seedling emergence studies, x values were assigned based on test type and endpoint (**Table 1-1**; supporting details in **ATTACHMENT 1-5**). This analysis does not consider the biological significance of the percent effect but rather identifies an ICx value at which we have confidence the measured effect is discernible.Table 1-1presents the ICx values that can be used as the Step 1 and 2 thresholds when a reliable NOAEC value is not available. However, this method was not necessary to use for methomyl because a reliable NOAEC was available.

**Table 1-****1. Alternate Step 1 and 2 thresholds.1**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Test Type** | **Dry Weight** | **Shoot Height** |
| Vegetative Vigor | IC15 | IC10 |
| Seedling Emergence | IC20 | IC10 |

1 ICx values can be used as the Step 1 and 2 thresholds when a reliable NOAEC value is not available. However, this method was not necessary to use for methomyl because a reliable NOAEC was available.

Based on public comments and continued work to improve the tools, modifications were made to the MAGtool and an updated version was used in the final analysis. Updates to the tool incorporated continued efforts to improve the efficiency, accuracy, and refinement of the tool. These updates are outlined more fully in the MAGtool documentation included on the models website9 and included incorporation of a new batch function analysis, improvements to spray drift analysis methods and input options, as well as the ability to make effects determinations either deterministically or probabilistically. The model allows the user to make deterministic calculations using the upper and lower bounds of the exposure assumptions, or using a probabilistic analysis, to determine impacts to a species based on mortality effects, sublethal effect or effects to prey, pollination, habitat, and dispersal vectors (PPHD). This was done to provide more transparency to the results calculations and to streamline the calculations for shorter run times. For a subset of species, selected based on the potential to refine the effects analysis, probabilistic analysis was used in making effects determinations. For the majority of species, as impacts are predicted even at the minimum or lower bound of exposure assumptions, the probabilistic analysis does not change the effects determination and was not conducted.

In an update to the spatial analysis used for the BE, the final BEs include updates to the pasture and rangeland UDLs and include a new Alfalfa UDL. Cultivated grasses and grass crops, as identified in USDA Cultivated Layers are included in the new Alfalfa UDL. These crops included alfalfa, switchgrass, and vetch. This new layer represents alfalfa and other agricultural grasses/non-grazing areas. Non-cultivated pasture/grass areas typically used for grazing are included in the new Pasture/Rangeland UDL. This Pasture/Rangeland UDL (referred to in previous assessments just as Rangeland) includes CDL land cover categories, Other Hay/Non-Alfalfa, Pasture/Grass, Pasture/Hay, Pasture from the NLCD, in addition to other grazing/rangeland sources outlined in **Appendix 1-6**. The Bermuda grass UDL has been updated to reflect areas where cultivated grasses grow as defined in USDA’s Cropland Data Layer (CDL) and limited to latitudes where warm season grasses occur. Additional information on these updates are available in **Appendices 1-5** and **1-6**.

**Chapter 2** of this BE includes methomyl’s toxicity endpoints and **Chapter 3** includes the exposure analysis. These toxicity endpoints and exposure estimates are used in Steps 1 and 2. **Chapter 2** also summarizes incident reports that are associated with applications of methomyl (incident reports associated with illegal uses or misuses are not included in the assessment). **Chapter 3** summarizes available monitoring data. **Chapter 4** includes the species and critical habitat-specific determinations for methomyl. For exposure in terrestrial habitats, the MAGtool[[9]](#footnote-10) (version 2.2) is used (additional details in **ATTACHMENT 1-1** and tool documentation). For aquatic habitats, exposure is estimated using the Pesticide in Water Calculator (PWC; version 1.52[[10]](#footnote-11)) and, where appropriate, the Pesticide in Flooded Applications Model (PFAM, version 2[[11]](#footnote-12)). Aquatic scenarios (referred to as “bins”) used to estimate exposures for each listed species with aquatic habitats are provided in **ATTACHMENT 1-2**. For plants, exposure is estimated using PAT. The MAGtool is used to integrate exposure, effects, and listed species life history information in order to make NE, NLAA and LAA determinations.
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