To: L. Schnaubelt  
Product Manager 12  
Registration Division (TS-767)

From: Carolyn K. 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
1. **CHEMICAL:**

   Chemical name: 2-Methyl-2(methylthio)propionaldehyde O-(methylcarbamoyl)oxime
   Common name: Aldicarb
   Trade name: Temik
   Structure:
   \[
   \begin{array}{c}
   \text{CH}_3 \\
   \text{O} \\
   \text{H} \\
   \text{CH}_3 \text{SCCH}=\text{NOCN} \text{CH}_3 \\
   \end{array}
   \]

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
   Environmental Processes and Guidelines Section/EAB/HED
   Date: 7/26/86

6. **APPROVED BY:**

   Carolyn K. Offutt, Chief
   Environmental Processes and Guidelines Section/EAB/HED
   Date: 7/26/86

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.