

**METHYL BROMIDE CRITICAL USE NOMINATION FOR PREPLANT SOIL USE FOR PEPPERS
GROWN IN OPEN FIELDS ON PLASTIC TARPAULINS**

FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY: DATE RECEIVED BY OZONE SECRETARIAT: YEAR: _____ CUN: _____

NOMINATING PARTY:	The United States of America
BRIEF DESCRIPTIVE TITLE OF NOMINATION:	Methyl Bromide Critical Use Nomination for Preplant Soil Use for Peppers Grown in Open Fields on Plastic Tarpaulins (Submitted in 2006 for 2008 Use Season)

NOMINATING PARTY CONTACT DETAILS

Contact Person: John E. Thompson, Ph. D.
 Title: International Affairs Officer
 Address: Office of Environmental Policy
 U.S. Department of State
 2201 C Street N.W. Room 4325
 Washington, DC 20520
 U.S.A.
 Telephone: (202) 647-9799
 Fax: (202) 647-5947
 E-mail: ThompsonJE2@state.gov

Following the requirements of Decision IX/6 paragraph (a)(1), the United States of America has determined that the specific use detailed in this Critical Use Nomination is critical because the lack of availability of methyl bromide for this use would result in a significant market disruption. <p align="center"> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No </p>
--

Signature _____ Name _____ Date _____

Title: _____

CONTACT OR EXPERT(S) FOR FURTHER TECHNICAL DETAILS

Contact/Expert Person: Richard Keigwin
 Title: Acting Division Director
 Address: Biological and Economic Analysis Division
 Office of Pesticide Programs
 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
 Mail Code 7503C
 Washington, DC 20460
 U.S.A.
 Telephone: (703) 308-8200
 Fax: (703) 308-8090
 E-mail: Richard.kegwin@epa.gov

LIST OF DOCUMENTS SENT TO THE OZONE SECRETARIAT IN OFFICIAL NOMINATION PACKAGE

List all paper and electronic documents submitted by the Nominating Party to the Ozone Secretariat

1. PAPER DOCUMENTS: Title of Paper Documents and Appendices	Number of Pages	Date Sent to Ozone Secretariat

2. ELECTRONIC COPIES OF ALL PAPER DOCUMENTS: Title of Electronic Files	Size of File (kb)	Date Sent to Ozone Secretariat

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART A: SUMMARY	8
1. Nominating Party	8
2. Descriptive Title of Nomination	8
3. Crop and Summary of Crop System	8
4. Methyl Bromide Nominated	8
5. Brief Summary of the Need for Methyl Bromide as a Critical Use	8
6. Summarize Why Key Alternatives Are Not Feasible	11
7. Proportion of Crops Grown Using Methyl Bromide	12
8. Amount of Methyl Bromide Requested for Critical Use	13
9. Summarize Assumptions Used to Calculate Methyl Bromide Quantity Nominated for Each Region	13
MICHIGAN - PART B: CROP CHARACTERISTICS AND METHYL BROMIDE USE	14
Michigan - 10. Key Diseases and Weeds for which Methyl Bromide Is Requested and Specific Reasons for this Request	14
Michigan - 11. Characteristics of Cropping System and Climate	14
Michigan - 12. Historic Pattern of Use of Methyl Bromide, and/or Mixtures Containing Methyl Bromide, for which an Exemption Is Requested	15
MICHIGAN - PART C: TECHNICAL VALIDATION	17
Michigan - 13. Reason for Alternatives Not Being Feasible	17
Michigan - 14. List and Discuss Why Registered (<i>and Potential</i>) Pesticides and Herbicides Are Considered Not Effective as Technical Alternatives to Methyl Bromide:	20
Michigan - 15. List Present (<i>and Possible Future</i>) Registration Status of Any Current and Potential Alternatives	21
Michigan - 16. State Relative Effectiveness of Relevant Alternatives Compared to Methyl Bromide for the Specific Key Target Pests and Weeds for which It Is Being Requested	21
Michigan - 17. Are There Any Other Potential Alternatives Under Development which Are Being Considered to Replace Methyl Bromide?	22
Michigan - 18. Are There Technologies Being Used to Produce the Crop which Avoid the Need for Methyl Bromide?	23
Michigan - Summary of Technical Feasibility	23
SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA - PART B: CROP CHARACTERISTICS AND METHYL BROMIDE USE	24
Southeast U.S. Peppers Consortium excluding Florida and Georgia - 10. Key Diseases and Weeds for which Methyl Bromide Is Requested and Specific Reasons for this Request	24
Southeast U.S. Peppers Consortium excluding Florida and Georgia - 11. Characteristics of Cropping System and Climate	25
Southeast U.S. Peppers Consortium excluding Florida and Georgia - 12. Historic Pattern of Use of Methyl Bromide, and/or Mixtures Containing Methyl Bromide, for which an Exemption Is Requested	27
SOUTHEAST PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA - PART C: TECHNICAL VALIDATION	28

Southeast U.S. Peppers Consortium excluding Florida and Georgia - 13. Reason for Alternatives Not Being Feasible _____	28
Southeast U.S. Peppers Consortium excluding Florida and Georgia - 14. List and Discuss Why Registered (<i>and Potential</i>) Pesticides and Herbicides Are Considered Not Effective as Technical Alternatives to Methyl Bromide: _____	32
Southeast U.S. Peppers Consortium excluding Florida and Georgia - 15. List Present (<i>and Possible Future</i>) Registration Status of Any Current and Potential Alternatives _____	33
Southeast U.S. Peppers Consortium excluding Florida and Georgia - 16. State Relative Effectiveness of Relevant Alternatives Compared to Methyl Bromide for the Specific Key Target Pests and Weeds for which It Is Being Requested _____	33
SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA –17. ARE THERE ANY OTHER POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVES UNDER DEVELOPMENT WHICH ARE BEING CONSIDERED TO REPLACE METHYL BROMIDE? _____	35
Southeast U.S. Peppers Consortium excluding Florida and Georgia - 18. Are There Technologies Being Used to Produce the Crop which Avoid the Need for Methyl Bromide? _____	36
Southeast U.S. Peppers Consortium excluding Florida and Georgia – Summary of Technical Feasibility _____	36
GEORGIA - PART B: CROP CHARACTERISTICS AND METHYL BROMIDE USE _____	37
Georgia - 10. Key Diseases and Weeds for which Methyl Bromide Is Requested and Specific Reasons for this Request _____	37
Georgia - 11. Characteristics of Cropping System and Climate _____	38
Georgia - 12. Historic Pattern of Use of Methyl Bromide, and/or Mixtures Containing Methyl Bromide, for which an Exemption Is Requested _____	40
GEORGIA - PART C: TECHNICAL VALIDATION _____	41
Georgia - 13. Reason for Alternatives Not Being Feasible _____	41
Georgia - 14. List and Discuss Why Registered (<i>and Potential</i>) Pesticides and Herbicides Are Considered Not Effective as Technical Alternatives to Methyl Bromide: _____	45
Georgia - 15. List Present (<i>and Possible Future</i>) Registration Status of Any Current and Potential Alternatives _____	46
Georgia - 16. State Relative Effectiveness of Relevant Alternatives Compared to Methyl Bromide for the Specific Key Target Pests and Weeds for which It Is Being Requested _____	46
Georgia - 17. Are There Any Other Potential Alternatives Under Development which Are Being Considered to Replace Methyl Bromide? _____	47
Georgia - 18. Are There Technologies Being Used to Produce the Crop which Avoid the Need for Methyl Bromide? _____	48
Georgia - Summary of Technical Feasibility _____	48
FLORIDA - PART B: CROP CHARACTERISTICS AND METHYL BROMIDE USE _____	49
Florida - 10. Key Diseases and Weeds for which Methyl Bromide Is Requested and Specific Reasons for this Request _____	49
Florida - 11. Characteristics of Cropping System and Climate _____	50
Florida - 12. Historic Pattern of Use of Methyl Bromide, and/or Mixtures Containing Methyl Bromide, for which an Exemption Is Requested _____	51
FLORIDA - PART C: TECHNICAL VALIDATION _____	52
Florida - 13. Reason for Alternatives Not Being Feasible _____	52

Florida - 14. List and Discuss Why Registered (<i>and Potential</i>) Pesticides and Herbicides Are Considered Not Effective as Technical Alternatives to Methyl Bromide: _____	57
Florida - 15. List Present (<i>and Possible Future</i>) Registration Status of Any Current and Potential Alternatives _____	58
Florida - 16. State Relative Effectiveness of Relevant Alternatives Compared to Methyl Bromide for the Specific Key Target Pests and Weeds for which It Is Being Requested ____	58
Florida - 17. Are There Any Other Potential Alternatives Under Development which Are Being Considered to Replace Methyl Bromide? _____	59
Florida - 18. Are There Technologies Being Used to Produce the Crop which Avoid the Need for Methyl Bromide? _____	60
Georgia - Summary of Technical Feasibility _____	60
PART D: EMISSION CONTROL _____	62
19. Techniques That Have and Will Be Used to Minimize Methyl Bromide Use and Emissions in the Particular Use _____	62
20. If Methyl Bromide Emission Reduction Techniques Are Not Being Used, or Are Not Planned for the Circumstances of the Nomination, State Reasons _____	63
PART E: ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT _____	63
21. Operating Costs of Alternatives Compared to Methyl Bromide Over 3-Year Period ____	64
22. Gross and Net Revenue _____	65
Measures of Economic Impacts of Methyl Bromide Alternatives _____	65
Summary of Economic Feasibility _____	67
PART F. FUTURE PLANS _____	69
23. What Actions Will Be Taken to Rapidly Develop and Deploy Alternatives for This Crop? _____	69
24. How Do You Plan to Minimize the Use of Methyl Bromide for the Critical Use in the Future? _____	70
25. Additional Comments on the Nomination _____	70
26. Citations _____	72

LIST OF TABLES

PART A: SUMMARY _____	8
Table 4.1: Methyl Bromide Nominated _____	8
Table A.1: Executive Summary _____	11
Table 7.1: Proportion of Crops Grown Using Methyl Bromide _____	12
Table 8.1: Amount of Methyl Bromide Requested for Critical Use _____	13
MICHIGAN - PART B: CROP CHARACTERISTICS AND METHYL BROMIDE USE _____	14
Michigan - Table 10.1: Key Diseases and Weeds and Reason for Methyl Bromide Request ____	14
Michigan - Table 11.1: Characteristics of Cropping System _____	14
Michigan - Table 11.2 Characteristics of Climate and Crop Schedule _____	14
Michigan - Table 12.1 Historic Pattern of Use of Methyl Bromide _____	16
MICHIGAN - PART C: TECHNICAL VALIDATION _____	17
Michigan – Table 13.1: Reason for Alternatives Not Being Feasible _____	17
Michigan – Table 15.1: Present Registration Status of Alternatives _____	21
Michigan – Table C.1: Alternatives Yield Loss Data Summary _____	22

<i>SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA - PART B: CROP CHARACTERISTICS AND METHYL BROMIDE USE</i>	24
Southeast U.S. Peppers Consortium excluding Florida and Georgia - Table 10.1: Key Diseases and Weeds and Reason for Methyl Bromide Request	24
Southeast U.S. Peppers Consortium excluding Florida and Georgia - Table 11.1: Characteristics of Cropping System	25
Southeast U.S. Peppers Consortium excluding Florida and Georgia - Table 11.2 Characteristics of Climate and Crop Schedule – January Fumigation (Spring, Early Summer Harvest)	25
Southeast U.S. Peppers Consortium excluding Florida and Georgia - Table 11.3 Characteristics of Climate and Crop Schedule – Spring Fumigation (Fall Harvest)	25
Southeast U.S. Peppers Consortium excluding Florida and Georgia - Table 12.1 Historic Pattern of Use of Methyl Bromide	27
<i>SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA - PART C: TECHNICAL VALIDATION</i>	28
Southeast U.S. Peppers Consortium excluding Florida and Georgia –Table 13.1: Reason for Alternatives Not Being Feasible	28
Southeast U.S. Peppers Consortium excluding Florida and Georgia – Table 14.1: Technically Infeasible Alternatives Discussion	32
Southeast U.S. Peppers Consortium excluding Florida and Georgia – Table 15.1: Present Registration Status of Alternatives for Peppers	33
Southeast U.S. Peppers Consortium excluding Florida and Georgia Table 16.1. Fumigant Alternatives to Methyl Bromide for Polyethylene-Mulched Tomato	33
Southeast U.S. Pepper Consortium – Table C.1: Alternatives Yield Loss Data Summary	34
<i>GEORGIA - PART B: CROP CHARACTERISTICS AND METHYL BROMIDE USE</i>	37
Georgia - Table 10.1: Key Diseases and Weeds and Reason for Methyl Bromide Request	37
Georgia - Table 11.1: Characteristics of Cropping System	38
Georgia - Table 11.2 Characteristics of Climate and Crop Schedule – July Fumigation Event, Pepper Crop is Harvested in Fall	38
Georgia - Table 11.3 Characteristics of Climate and Crop Schedule – Spring (Late February – March) Fumigation Event, Pepper Crop is Harvested in Early Summer	39
Georgia - Table 12.1 Historic Pattern of Use of Methyl Bromide	40
<i>GEORGIA - PART C: TECHNICAL VALIDATION</i>	41
Georgia – Table 13.1: Reason for Alternatives Not Being Feasible	41
Georgia – Table 14.1: Technically Infeasible Alternatives Discussion	45
Georgia – Table 15.1: Present Registration Status of Alternatives for Peppers	46
Georgia Table 16.1. Fumigant Alternatives to Methyl Bromide for Polyethylene-Mulched Tomato	46
Georgia – Table C.1: Alternatives Yield Loss Data Summary	47
<i>FLORIDA - PART B: CROP CHARACTERISTICS AND METHYL BROMIDE USE</i>	49
Florida - Table 10.1: Key Diseases and Weeds and Reason for Methyl Bromide Request	49
Florida - Table 11.1: Characteristics of Cropping System	50
Florida - Table 11.2 Characteristics of Climate and Crop Schedule	50
Florida - Table 11.3 Characteristics of Climate and Crop Schedule – Peppers Double Cropped with another Vegetable Crop (usually Cucurbits)	51
Florida - Table 12.1 Historic Pattern of Use of Methyl Bromide	52
<i>FLORIDA - PART C: TECHNICAL VALIDATION</i>	52

Florida – Table 13.1: Reason for Alternatives Not Being Feasible _____	52
Florida – Table 14.1: Technically Infeasible Alternatives Discussion _____	57
Florida – Table 15.1: Present Registration Status of Alternatives _____	58
Florida - Table 16.1. Fumigant Alternatives to Methyl Bromide for Polyethylene-Mulched Tomato _____	58
Florida – Table C.1: Alternatives Yield Loss Data Summary _____	59
<i>PART D: EMISSION CONTROL</i> _____	62
Table 19.1: Techniques to Minimize Methyl Bromide Use and Emissions _____	62
<i>PART E: ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT</i> _____	63
Table 21.1: Peppers – Operating Costs of Alternatives Compared to Methyl Bromide Over 3- Year Period _____	64
Table 22.1: Peppers - Year 1, 2, and 3 Gross and Net Revenues _____	65
Florida Pepper - Table E.1: Economic Impacts of Methyl Bromide Alternatives _____	65
Georgia Pepper – Table E.2: Economic Impacts of Methyl Bromide Alternatives _____	66
Michigan Pepper - Table E.3: Economic Impacts of Methyl Bromide Alternatives _____	66
Southeastern USA (except Georgia) Pepper - Table E.4: Economic Impacts of Methyl Bromide Alternatives _____	67
<i>PART F. FUTURE PLANS</i> _____	69
<i>APPENDIX A. 2008 Methyl Bromide Usage Newer Numerical Index (BUNNI).</i> _____	77

PART A: SUMMARY

1. NOMINATING PARTY:

The United States of America (U.S.)

2. DESCRIPTIVE TITLE OF NOMINATION

Methyl Bromide Critical Use Nomination for Preplant Soil Use for Peppers Grown in Open Fields on Plastic Tarpaulins (Submitted in 2006 for 2008 Use Season)

3. CROP AND SUMMARY OF CROP SYSTEM

Peppers grown in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia. These crops are grown in open fields on plastic tarps, often followed by various other crops. Harvest is destined for the fresh market.

4. METHYL BROMIDE NOMINATED

TABLE 4.1: METHYL BROMIDE NOMINATED

YEAR	NOMINATION AMOUNT (KG)	NOMINATION AREA (HA)
2008	919,006	7,057

- This amount includes 2,844 kg for research.

5. BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE NEED FOR METHYL BROMIDE AS A CRITICAL USE:

The U.S. nomination is only for those areas where the alternatives are not suitable. In U.S. pepper production there are several factors that make the potential alternatives to methyl bromide unsuitable. These include:

- Pest control efficacy of alternatives: the efficacy of alternatives may not be comparable to methyl bromide in some areas, making these alternatives technically and/or economically infeasible for use in pepper production.
- Geographic distribution of key target pests: i.e., some alternatives may be comparable to methyl bromide as long as key pests occur at low pressure, and in such cases the U.S. is only nominating a CUE for peppers where the key pest pressure is moderate to high such as nutsedge in the Southeastern U.S..
- Regulatory constraints: e.g., 1,3 D use is limited in Georgia and Florida due to the presence of karst geology.
- Potential delay in planting and harvesting: e.g., the plant-back interval for 1,3 D + Chloropicrin may be up to two weeks longer than methyl bromide + chloropicrin. In Michigan an additional delay would occur because soil temperature must be higher to fumigate with alternatives. Delays in planting and harvesting may result in users missing key market windows, and adversely affect revenues through lower prices.

Michigan, Florida, Georgia, and the Southeastern U.S. (except Georgia and Florida) are each presented as separate regions in this nomination to reflect the separate applications from growers in these areas. A brief description of their need for MB follows, also presented on a regional basis.

Michigan

The key pest of peppers in Michigan is the soil fungi *Phytophthora capsici*, which can easily destroy the entire harvest from affected areas if left uncontrolled. While 1,3-D + chloropicrin provided some control in small plot trials with peppers and other vegetable crops in Michigan (Hausbeck and Cortright 2003), the level of control was lower than that afforded by MB. *P. capsici* has recently been shown to also occur in irrigation water in Michigan (Gevens and Hausbeck 2003). This will increase the likelihood of spread of this pathogen. It is also not yet clear whether these small-scale research results accurately reflect efficacy of MB alternatives in pepper production. Furthermore, regulatory restrictions due to concerns over human exposure and ground water contamination, along with technical limitations, result in potential economic infeasibility of this formulation as a MB alternative. Among the more important ones are a potential delay in planting as long as 28 days, (which could lead to missing a key market window) due to label restrictions and low soil temperatures, and a mandatory 30 meter buffer for treated fields near inhabited structures.

Based on the small-plot trial conducted on Michigan peppers (cited above), the best-case yield loss estimate for Michigan using the best available MB alternative (1,3-D + chloropicrin) was estimated to be 6 %, based on plant loss. In a second trial undertaken by Hausbeck and Cortright (2004), yields from pepper plots treated with metam potassium, alone or in combination with chloropicrin, and from plots treated with 1,3-D + chloropicrin were comparable to yields from plots treated with MB + chloropicrin and yields from untreated (control plots). These results Likely indicate a very low pest pressure in all treated and control plots. It is also unfortunate that these trials occurred later in the growing season (June) that is not the early season (April) that this nomination pertains to.

Michigan pepper farmers requesting MB must plant by the first week of May to capture an early market window. Soil fumigation must therefore be completed by mid April to allow 14-21 days for aeration. However, 1,3-D and metam labels recommend that applications be made when soil temperatures (at application depth) are above 4.4°C. Furthermore, optimum soil temperatures for 1,3-D are in the 10°C - 25°C range (University of California, Davis, undated). Since soil temperatures in Michigan do not climb over 10°C until after mid to late May (Schaetzl and Tomczak, 2001), neither 1,3-D nor metam products can be used effectively for early pepper planting in Michigan. Metam products have the additional disadvantage that when the soil is wet and cold (below 15°C), the minimum recommended plant back period is 30 days, which would push the crop beyond the early market window.

Southeastern United States (Including Florida and Georgia)

In the Southeastern United States, including Florida and Georgia, MB is requested primarily for control of moderate to severe infestations of nutsedge weeds. *P. capsici* is also an important pest

targeted currently with MB in these regions. Many growers also use MB against root-knot nematodes. Left uncontrolled, any of these pests could completely destroy the harvests from affected areas.

Of currently available MB alternatives, metam-sodium offers inconsistent control of nutsedges and nematodes, while 1,3-D + chloropicrin provides adequate control of nematodes and disease (Locascio et al. 1997, Eger 2000, Noling et al. 2000). However, metam-sodium has yield losses of up to 44 % compared to MB where weed infestations are moderate to severe (Locascio et al. 1997). Metam-sodium also creates a planting delay as long as 30 days to avoid risk of phytotoxic injury to crops compared to a 14-day delay for MB. Furthermore, due to regulatory restrictions resulting from groundwater contamination concerns, 1,3-D + chloropicrin cannot be used in large portions of the southeastern United States due to the presence of karst geology, and anywhere in Dade County, Florida, where the majority of that region's peppers are grown. There is also a 28 day planting delay due to regulatory restrictions for 1,3-D + chloropicrin. In Florida particularly, growers are on a tight production schedule and must place pepper transplants in fields at a certain time of the year (see Table 11.2 in the Florida section for details). Relying only on metam sodium for preplant treatment would force growers to fumigate earlier in their season, which in turn would extend the fumigation schedule into rainy periods. Growers would have to fumigate earlier to avoid rain and lose a portion of the crop (Aerts, 2004).

Furthermore, trials of metam-sodium and 1,3 D + chloropicrin (and various combinations thereof) are based on small plot research trials conducted in the Southeastern United States on crops other than peppers. For fungi and nutsedge, no on-farm, large-scale trials have yet been done. Some researchers have also reported that these MB alternatives degrade more rapidly in areas where they are applied repeatedly due to enhanced metabolism by soil microbes (Dungan and Yates 2003, Gamliel et al. 2003). This may compromise long-term efficacy of these compounds and appears to need further scientific scrutiny.

In a recent field study conducted in Tifton, Georgia by Culpepper and Langston (2004), 1,3-D + chloropicrin, followed by more chloropicrin, was more effective than MB against yellow nutsedge, but less effective against purple nutsedge. Although this treatment performed as well as MB in terms of spring pepper yield, its fall yield performance was inferior to that of MB.

In a second treatment, 1,3-D by itself, followed by chloropicrin, was significantly less effective than methyl bromide for the control of both purple and yellow nutsedge, but as effective as MB for the control soil nematodes. In terms of spring and fall pepper yield, however, this treatment performed as well as MB.

In a third treatment, 1,3-D + chloropicrin, followed by metam sodium, was as effective as MB against yellow nutsedge, 36% less effective than MB against purple nutsedge, and as effective as MB for the control of soil nematodes. This treatment also performed as well as MB in terms of both spring and fall pepper yield.

Although these combinations are showing promise, they will require further testing and validation.

In sum, although promising, these MB alternatives require further testing and validation at the commercial level before being available for adoption by pepper growers. Therefore, MB remains a critical use for peppers in the United States.

TABLE A.1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.

Region	<i>Michigan</i>	<i>Southeastern U.S. except Georgia and Florida</i>	<i>Georgia</i>	<i>Florida</i>
Requested Amount				
2008 Kilograms	15,195	270,477	347,183	1,377,786
Nominated Amount				
2008 Kilograms	14,208	95,237	174,128	632,587

*See Appendix A for a complete description of how the nominated amount was calculated.

6. SUMMARIZE WHY KEY ALTERNATIVES ARE NOT FEASIBLE:

For Michigan pests 1,3 D + chloropicrin is the only key alternative with efficacy comparable to MB. Regulatory restrictions due to human exposure concerns, combined with technical limitations, reduce its use. Key among these factors are a potential delay in planting as long as 28 days, due both to label restrictions and low soil temperatures, and mandatory 30 to 100 meter buffers for treated fields near inhabited structures.

For the Southeastern United States, including Florida and Georgia, an application of 1,3-D + chloropicrin (Telone C35), along with a herbicide mix (e.g. clomazone + metolachlor) applied at bed formation, or Telone C35 followed by a chloropicrin or a metam application, may be the best available BM alternatives outside karst geology areas. In karst geology areas, including 31 counties in Florida, where Telone use is highly restricted, metam sodium or metam potassium remain at present the best alternatives. Although promising, these alternatives will require further testing and validation on commercial fields.

There is evidence that the efficacy of metam-sodium declines in areas where it is repeatedly applied due to enhanced degradation of methyl isothiocyanate, the active ingredient, by soil microbes (Ashley et al. 1963, Ou et al. 1995, Verhagen et al. 1996, Gamliel et al. 2003).

All other available MB alternatives are currently technically infeasible for U.S. peppers.

7. (i) PROPORTION OF CROPS GROWN USING METHYL BROMIDE

TABLE 7.1: PROPORTION OF CROPS GROWN USING METHYL BROMIDE

REGION WHERE METHYL BROMIDE USE IS REQUESTED	TOTAL CROP AREA IN 2003 (HA)	PROPORTION OF REQUEST FOR METHYL BROMIDE (%)
Michigan	816	16
Southeastern U.S. except Georgia and Florida	5,806	31
Georgia	2,899	80
Florida	7,893	104
NATIONAL TOTAL*	17,414	71

* Includes States not requesting MB.

7. (ii) IF ONLY PART OF THE CROP AREA IS TREATED WITH METHYL BROMIDE INDICATE THE REASON WHY METHYL BROMIDE IS NOT USED IN THE OTHER AREA AND IDENTIFY WHAT ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES ARE USED TO CONTROL THE TARGET PATHOGENS AND WEEDS WITHOUT METHYL BROMIDE THERE.

In Michigan, areas not treated apparently do not have any infestation (i.e., zero oospores per unit soil) of the key fungal pests. Applicant states that soil infestation is spreading in the region annually. In southeastern U.S., Florida, and Georgia, areas not treated do not have nutsedges or nematodes naturally present in pepper fields. Simple absence of all pests is the only reason these areas are not presently treated with MB.

7. (iii) WOULD IT BE FEASIBLE TO EXPAND THE USE OF THESE METHODS TO COVER AT LEAST PART OF THE CROP THAT HAS REQUESTED USE OF METHYL BROMIDE? WHAT CHANGES WOULD BE NECESSARY TO ENABLE THIS?

No. For further discussion of limitations please see Part 5 (above), and the region-specific discussions below.

8. AMOUNT OF METHYL BROMIDE REQUESTED FOR CRITICAL USE

TABLE 8.1: AMOUNT OF METHYL BROMIDE REQUESTED FOR CRITICAL USE

REGION:	Michigan	Southeastern U.S. except Georgia and Florida	Georgia	Florida
YEAR OF EXEMPTION REQUEST	2008	2008	2008	2008
KILOGRAMS OF METHYL BROMIDE	15,195	270,477	347,183	1,377,786
USE: FLAT FUMIGATION OR STRIP/BED TREATMENT	Strip/Bed	Strip/Bed	Strip/Bed	Strip/Bed
FORMULATION TO BE USED FOR THE CUE (<i>methyl bromide/chloropicrin</i>)	67:33 or 50:50	67:33	67:33	Mostly 67:33
TOTAL AREA TO BE TREATED WITH THE METHYL BROMIDE OR METHYL BROMIDE/CHLOROPICRIN FORMULATION (<i>ha</i>)	127	1,801	2,312	8,195
DOSAGE RATE* (<i>g/m²</i>) OF ACTIVE INGREDIENT USED TO CALCULATE REQUESTED KILOGRAMS OF METHYL BROMIDE	12.0	15.0	15.0	16.8

9. SUMMARIZE ASSUMPTIONS USED TO CALCULATE METHYL BROMIDE QUANTITY NOMINATED FOR EACH REGION:

The amount of methyl bromide nominated by the U.S. was calculated as follows:

- The percent of regional hectares in the applicant’s request was divided by the total area planted in that crop in the region covered by the request. Values greater than 100 percent are due to the inclusion of additional varieties in the applicant’s request that were not included in the USDA. National Agricultural Statistics Service surveys of the crop.
- Hectares counted in more than one application or rotated within one year of an application to a crop that also uses methyl bromide were subtracted. There was no double counting in this sector.
- Growth or increasing production (the amount of area requested by the applicant that is greater than that historically treated) was subtracted. The three applicants that included growth in their request had the growth amount removed.
- Quarantine and pre-shipment (QPS) hectares is the area in the applicant’s request subject to QPS treatments. Not applicable in this sector.
- Only the acreage experiencing one or more of the following impacts were included in the nominated amount: moderate to heavy key pest pressure, regulatory impacts, karst geology, buffer zones, unsuitable terrain, and cold soil temperatures.

MICHIGAN - PART B: CROP CHARACTERISTICS AND METHYL BROMIDE USE

MICHIGAN - 10. KEY DISEASES AND WEEDS FOR WHICH METHYL BROMIDE IS REQUESTED AND SPECIFIC REASONS FOR THIS REQUEST

MICHIGAN - TABLE 10.1: KEY DISEASES AND WEEDS AND REASON FOR METHYL BROMIDE REQUEST

REGION WHERE METHYL BROMIDE USE IS REQUESTED	KEY DISEASE(S) AND WEED(S) TO GENUS AND, IF KNOWN, TO SPECIES LEVEL	SPECIFIC REASONS WHY METHYL BROMIDE IS NEEDED
Michigan	Crown and root rots caused by soil-borne fungus <i>Phytophthora capsici</i> .	Fumigation operations need to be completed by the first week of May to allow growers to plant early and capture the early market for premium prices, as well as ensuring demand for their crop during the entire growing season (especially during the mid and late season).

MICHIGAN - 11. (i) CHARACTERISTICS OF CROPPING SYSTEM AND CLIMATE

MICHIGAN - TABLE 11.1: CHARACTERISTICS OF CROPPING SYSTEM

CHARACTERISTICS	MICHIGAN
CROP TYPE:	Pepper transplants for fruit production
ANNUAL OR PERENNIAL CROP:	Annual; generally 1 year
TYPICAL CROP ROTATION AND USE OF METHYL BROMIDE FOR OTHER CROPS IN THE ROTATION:	Pepper – usually followed by an eggplant or pepper crop
SOIL TYPES:	Sandy loam; clay loam
FREQUENCY OF METHYL BROMIDE FUMIGATION:	1 time every 2 years
OTHER RELEVANT FACTORS:	Key marketing opportunities have been established with Michigan’s vegetable crop diversification and aims toward stable demands in the late spring and through the summer for Midwestern markets.

MICHIGAN - TABLE 11.2 CHARACTERISTICS OF CLIMATE AND CROP SCHEDULE FOR PEPPERS

	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB
CLIMATIC ZONE	USDA Plant Hardiness zone 5b											
SOIL TEMP. (°C)	<10	10 - 15	15- 20	20-25	20- 25	20- 25	20	10- 15	<10	<10	<10	<10
RAINFALL (mm)	40	72	101	48	47	32	17	31	36	20	6	8
OUTSIDE TEMP. (°C)	0.2	7.4	12.1	17.5	20.6	20.9	18.1	8	2.4	-2.9	-8	-7
FUMIGATION SCHEDULE		X										
PLANTING SCHEDULE			X									
KEY MARKET WINDOW					X	X	X	X				

MICHIGAN– 11. (ii) INDICATE IF ANY OF THE ABOVE CHARACTERISTICS IN 11. (i) PREVENT THE UPTAKE OF ANY RELEVANT ALTERNATIVES?

Michigan experiences heavy rainfall events across the entire state at any given moment of the growing season. Heavy rain events (over 25 mm) can trigger rapid root and crown rot development, and promote dissemination of *P. capsici* via irrigation sources (Gevens and Hausbeck 2003). Generally, there is no difference in the amount of infection depending on soil type. The pathogen is widespread and indigenous on almost all soil types in Michigan (Cortright 2003, Gevens and Hausbeck 2003).

Significant rainfall events (>25 mm) or cold soil temperatures (<4.4 °C) delay fumigation and planting with the MB alternatives 1, 3 D + chloropicrin and metam-sodium. Also, all fumigation practices need to be completed by the first week of May to allow growers to plant early and capture the early market (July-September).

MICHIGAN - 12. HISTORIC PATTERN OF USE OF METHYL BROMIDE, AND/OR MIXTURES CONTAINING METHYL BROMIDE, FOR WHICH AN EXEMPTION IS REQUESTED

Growers are using anti-drip valves to eliminate loss of MB at the end of rows when the machinery is removed from the ground. Michigan's use of MB for vegetable production has declined steadily since the mid-1990s, when growers switched to different application methods (i.e. from Flat Fumigation to tarped beds) and formulations (from 98 % MB to 67 % MB). Currently, all MB is applied to tarped beds, with 100% of low-density polyethylene sheeting and 95% of the acreage was treated with the 67:33 formulation. Since 2000, about 5% of the acreage has been treated with the 50:50 formulation of methyl bromide and chloropicrin.

Please see Table 12.1 for further information.

MICHIGAN - TABLE 12.1 HISTORIC PATTERN OF USE OF METHYL BROMIDE ON PEPPERS

FOR AS MANY YEARS AS POSSIBLE AS SHOWN SPECIFY:	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
AREA TREATED (<i>hectares</i>)	98	117	130	135	128	139
RATIO OF FLAT FUMIGATION METHYL BROMIDE USE TO STRIP/BED USE IF STRIP TREATMENT IS USED	No pepper area in Michigan uses flat fumigation application.					
AMOUNT OF METHYL BROMIDE ACTIVE INGREDIENT USED (<i>total kilograms</i>)	11,747	14,001	15,618	16,230	15,391	16,715
FORMULATIONS OF METHYL BROMIDE (<i>methyl bromide /chloropicrin</i>) [^]	67:33	67:33	67:33 or 50:50	67:33 or 50:50	67:33 or 50:50	67:33 or 50:50
METHODS BY WHICH METHYL BROMIDE APPLIED	Injected 20-25 cm	Injected 20-25 cm	Injected 20-25 cm	Injected 20-25 cm	Injected 20-25 cm	Injected 20-25 cm
DOSAGE RATE* (g/m^2) FOR THE ACTIVE INGREDIENT	12.0	12.0	12.0 or 8.9	12.0 or 8.9	12.0 or 8.9	12.0 or 8.9

[^] Growers have just started switching to the 50/50 formulation of MB/Chloropicrin since 2000 (about 5% of production acreage) to reduce cost per acre.

MICHIGAN – PART C: TECHNICAL VALIDATION -PEPPERS

MICHIGAN - 13. REASON FOR ALTERNATIVES NOT BEING FEASIBLE

MICHIGAN – TABLE 13.1: REASON FOR ALTERNATIVES NOT BEING FEASIBLE

NAME OF ALTERNATIVE	TECHNICAL AND REGULATORY* REASONS FOR THE ALTERNATIVE NOT BEING FEASIBLE OR AVAILABLE	IS THE ALTERNATIVE CONSIDERED COST EFFECTIVE
CHEMICAL ALTERNATIVES		
Metam-sodium or Metam-potassium	<p>Pepper farmers requesting MB must plant by the first week of May to capture an early market window. Soil fumigation must therefore be completed by mid April to allow 14-21 days for aeration. However, metam labels recommend that applications be made when soil temperatures (at application depth) are above 4.4°C. Since soil temperatures in Michigan do not climb over 10°C until after mid to late May (Schaetzl and Tomczak, 2001), metam products cannot be used effectively for early pepper planting in Michigan. Metam products have the additional disadvantage that when the soil is wet and cold (below 15°C), the minimum recommended plant back period is 30 days, which would further move the crop beyond the early market window.</p> <p>In addition, control of the key pest is inconsistent (Locascio et al. 1997, Martin 2003). Gilreath et al. (1994) found that metam-sodium treatments did not match MB in terms of plant vigor at the end of the season; <i>P. capsici</i> was, however, not present. In the cool conditions of Michigan, metam-sodium is likely to be slow to transform into the active ingredient (methyl isothiocyanate), which also suggests that pest control will not be as effective as with MB (Ashley et al. 1963). In a recent study conducted in Oceana County, Michigan by Hausbeck and Cortright (2004), yields from pepper plots treated with metam potassium (K-Pam) were comparable to yields from control plots and plots treated with MB + chloropicrin, indicating a very low pest (<i>P. capsici</i>) pressure at the test site.</p>	No
NON CHEMICAL ALTERNATIVES		
Soil solarization	<p>Michigan’s climate is typically cool (often less than 11 °C through May) and cloudy, particularly early in the growing season when control of the key pests is especially important. In Michigan, the growing season is short (May to September), and the time needed to utilize solarization is likely to render the subsequent growing of crops impossible, even if it did somehow eliminate all fungal pathogens. Since solarization has shown promise in other crops and regions (e.g., tomatoes in Florida), the potential for adoption exists (Schneider et al. 2003). However, because of climate, solarization is not feasible in Michigan.</p>	No

NAME OF ALTERNATIVE	TECHNICAL AND REGULATORY* REASONS FOR THE ALTERNATIVE NOT BEING FEASIBLE OR AVAILABLE	IS THE ALTERNATIVE CONSIDERED COST EFFECTIVE
Steam	While steam has been used effectively against fungal pests in protected production systems, such as greenhouses, there is no evidence that it would be effective in open field pepper crops in Michigan. Any such system would also require large amounts of energy and water to provide sufficient steam necessary to sterilize soil down to the rooting depth of field crops (at least 20-50 cm).	No
Biological Control	Biological control agents are not technically feasible alternatives to MB because they alone cannot control the soil pathogens that afflict peppers in Michigan. The bacterium <i>Burkholderia cepacia</i> and the fungus <i>Gliocladium virens</i> have shown some potential in controlling some fungal plant pathogens (Larkin and Fravel 1998). However, in a test conducted by the Michigan applicants, <i>P. capsici</i> was not controlled adequately in summer squash by either of these beneficial microorganisms.	No
Cover crops and mulching	There is no evidence these practices effectively substitute for the control MB provides against <i>P. capsici</i> . Control of <i>P. capsici</i> is imperative for pepper production in Michigan. Plastic mulch is already in widespread use in Michigan vegetables, and regional crop experts state that it is not an adequate protectant when used without MB. The longevity and resistance of <i>P. capsici</i> oospores renders cover crops ineffective as a management alternative to MB.	No
Crop rotation and fallow land	The crop rotations available to growers in Michigan region are also susceptible to these fungi, particularly to <i>P. capsici</i> . Fallow land can still harbor <i>P. capsici</i> oospores (Lamour and Hausbeck 2003). Thus fungi would persist and attack peppers if crop rotation/fallow land was the main management regime.	No
Endophytes	Though these organisms (bacteria and fungi that grow symbiotically or as parasites within plants) have been shown to suppress some plant pathogens in cucumber, there is no such information for the other pepper crops grown in Michigan. Furthermore, the pathogens involved did not include <i>Phytophthora</i> species, which are arguably the greatest single threat to Michigan peppers.	No
Flooding/Water management	Flooding is not technically feasible as an alternative because it does not have any suppressive effect on <i>P. capsici</i> (Allen et al. 1999), and is likely to be impractical for Michigan pepper growers. It is unclear whether irrigation methods in this region could be adapted to incorporate flooding or alter water management for pepper fields. In any case, there appears to be no supporting evidence for its use against the hardy oospores of <i>P. capsici</i> .	No

NAME OF ALTERNATIVE	TECHNICAL AND REGULATORY* REASONS FOR THE ALTERNATIVE NOT BEING FEASIBLE OR AVAILABLE	IS THE ALTERNATIVE CONSIDERED COST EFFECTIVE
Grafting/resistant rootstock/plant breeding/soilless culture/organic production/substrates/plug plants.	Due to the paucity of scientific information on the utility of these alternatives as MB replacements in peppers, they have been grouped together for discussion in this document. There are no studies documenting the commercial availability of resistant rootstock immune to the fungal pathogens listed as major pepper pests. Grafting and plant breeding are thus also rendered technically infeasible as MB alternatives for control of <i>Phytophthora</i> fungi. Soilless culture, organic production, and substrates/plug plants are also not technically viable alternatives to MB for fungi. One of the fungal pests listed by Michigan can spread through water (Gevens and Hausbeck 2003), making it difficult to keep any sort of area (with or without soil) disease free. Various aspects of organic production - e.g., cover crops, fallow land, and steam sterilization - have already been addressed in this document and assessed to be technically infeasible methyl bromide alternatives.	No
COMBINATIONS OF ALTERNATIVES		
Metam sodium or metam potassium + Chloropicrin	<p>Pepper farmers requesting MB must plant by the first week of May to capture an early market window. Soil fumigation must therefore be completed by mid April to allow 14-21 days for aeration. However, metam labels recommend that applications be made when soil temperatures (at application depth) are above 4.4°C. Since soil temperatures in Michigan do not climb over 10°C until after mid to late May (Schaetzl and Tomczak, 2001), metam products cannot be used effectively for early pepper planting in Michigan. Metam products have the additional disadvantage that when the soil is wet and cold (below 15°C), the minimum recommended plant back period is 30 days, which would further move the crop beyond the early market window.</p> <p>In addition, trials in tomato have shown inconsistent efficacy of this formulation against fungal pests, though it is generally better than metam-sodium alone (Locascio and Dickson 1998, Csinos et al. 1999). These studies apparently did not measure yield impacts, and did not involve peppers. Hausbeck and Cortright (2004) evaluated several soil fumigants for control of <i>P. capsici</i> on several vegetable crops, including peppers, in Michigan. Results show that yields from pepper plots treated with metam potassium + chloropicrin were comparable to yields from control plots and from plots treated with MB + chloropicrin. These results point to a very low pest pressure in the study area. Further studies are necessary to clearly identify MB alternatives.</p>	No

NAME OF ALTERNATIVE	TECHNICAL AND REGULATORY* REASONS FOR THE ALTERNATIVE NOT BEING FEASIBLE OR AVAILABLE	IS THE ALTERNATIVE CONSIDERED COST EFFECTIVE
1,3 dichloropropene + chloropicrin	Regulatory restrictions and Michigan's cool and wet soils may result in a delay of up to 28 days in planting after treatment with this combination. This delay could result in growers missing key market windows, with consequent negative economic impacts (detailed in other sections below). In a small plot study conducted in Michigan by Hausbeck and Cortright (2004) pepper yields from plots treated with 1,3-D + chloropicrin were comparable to yields from control plots and plots treated with MB + chloropicrin. These results seem to indicate a very low pest (<i>P. capsici</i>) pressure at the test site. Further studies are necessary to clearly identify MB alternatives.	No
1,3 dichloropropene + Metam-sodium	Trials in tomato have shown inconsistent efficacy of this combination against fungal pests, though it is generally better than metam-sodium alone (Csinos et al. 1999). Low efficacy in even small-plot trials indicates that this is not a technically feasible alternative for commercially produced peppers in Michigan at this time. These studies apparently did not measure yield impacts, and did not involve peppers.	No

* Regulatory reasons include local restrictions (e.g. occupational health and safety, local environmental regulations) and lack of registration.

MICHIGAN - 14. LIST AND DISCUSS WHY REGISTERED (and Potential) PESTICIDES AND HERBICIDES ARE CONSIDERED NOT EFFECTIVE AS TECHNICAL ALTERNATIVES TO METHYL BROMIDE:

Table 14.1 Technically Infeasible Alternatives Discussion.

NAME OF ALTERNATIVE	DISCUSSION
None	Other than those options discussed elsewhere, no alternatives exist for the control of the key pests when they are present in the soil and/or afflict the belowground portions of pepper plants. A number of effective fungicides are available for treatment of these fungi when they infect aerial portions of crops. However, these infections are not the focus of MB use, which is meant to keep newly planted transplants free of these fungi.

Michigan 15. LIST PRESENT (and Possible Future) REGISTRATION STATUS OF ANY CURRENT AND POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVES:

MICHIGAN – TABLE 15.1: PRESENT REGISTRATION STATUS OF ALTERNATIVES

NAME OF ALTERNATIVE	PRESENT REGISTRATION STATUS	REGISTRATION BEING CONSIDERED BY NATIONAL AUTHORITIES? (Y/N)	DATE OF POSSIBLE FUTURE REGISTRATION:
Methyl iodide	Not registered in the U.S. for peppers, although registration is being pursued for tomatoes, strawberries, peppers, and ornamental crops.	Yes	Unknown
Furfural	Not registered in the U.S. for peppers. Registration is currently being pursued only for non-food greenhouse uses.	No (for peppers)	Unknown
Sodium azide	Not registered. No registration requests submitted to U.S.	No (for any crop/commodity)	Unknown
Propargyl bromide	Not registered. No registration requests submitted to U.S.	No (for any crop/commodity)	Unknown
Muscador albus Strain QST 20799	Registration package has been received.	Yes	Registered but not yet for sale in the U.S.

MICHIGAN - 16. STATE RELATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF RELEVANT ALTERNATIVES COMPARED TO METHYL BROMIDE FOR THE SPECIFIC KEY TARGET PESTS AND WEEDS FOR WHICH IT IS BEING REQUESTED:

Michigan pepper farmers requesting MB must plant by the first week of May to capture an early market window. Soil fumigation must therefore be completed by mid April to allow 14-21 days for aeration. However, 1,3-D and metam labels recommend that applications be made when soil temperatures (at application depth) are above 4.4°C. Furthermore, optimum soil temperatures for 1,3-D are in the 10°C - 25°C range (University of California, Davis, undated). Since soil temperatures in Michigan do not climb over 10°C until after mid to late May (Schaeztl and Tomczak, 2001), neither 1,3-D nor metam products can be used effectively for early pepper planting in Michigan. Metam products have the additional disadvantage that when the soil is wet and cold (below 15°C), the minimum recommended plant back period is 30 days, which would push the crop beyond the early market window.

Few studies have focused on peppers in Michigan’s growing conditions. A recent study, conducted in Oceana County, Michigan by Hausbeck and Cortright (2004), was undertaken to evaluate soil fumigants for managing *P. capsici* on several solanaceous and cruciferous crops. Results, however, show that yields from pepper plots treated with metam potassium (K-Pam), alone or in combination with chloropicrin, and from plots treated with 1,3-D + chloropicrin (Telone C35) were comparable to yields from plots treated with MB + chloropicrin and to yields from control plots. These results seem to indicate a very low pest pressure in treated and control plots. However, with the best available MB alternative, revenue losses would be possible from planting delays and missing of key market windows.

In studies with other vegetable crops, 1,3 D + chloropicrin has generally shown better control of fungi than metam-sodium formulations, although still not as good as control with MB. For example, in a study using a bell pepper/squash rotation in small plots - conducted in the much warmer conditions of Georgia and without *P. capsici* as a component of the pest complex - Webster et al. (2001) found significantly lower fungal populations with 1,3 D + 35 % chloropicrin (drip irrigated or chisel injected, 146 kg/ha of 1,3 D), as compared to the untreated control. However, MB (440 kg/ha, shank-injected) lowered fungal populations even more. Methyl iodide had no significant suppressive effect, as compared to the untreated control. In another study, conducted on tomatoes in Florida, Gilreath et al. (1994) found that metam-sodium treatments did not match MB in terms of plant vigor at the end of the season. *P. capsici* was not present.

MICHIGAN – TABLE C.1: ALTERNATIVES YIELD LOSS DATA SUMMARY

ALTERNATIVE	LIST TYPE OF PEST	RANGE OF YIELD LOSS	BEST ESTIMATE OF YIELD LOSS
1,3 dichloropropene + Chloropicrin	<i>P. capsici</i>	0 – 6 % PLUS loss of revenue due to planting delays	6 % loss of revenue due to planting delays
OVERALL LOSS ESTIMATE FOR ALL ALTERNATIVES TO PESTS			6 % likely with the best alternative (1,3 D + chloropicrin)

MICHIGAN - 17. ARE THERE ANY OTHER POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVES UNDER DEVELOPMENT WHICH ARE BEING CONSIDERED TO REPLACE METHYL BROMIDE?

The critical use exemption applicant states that 1,3 D + chloropicrin, metam-sodium, methyl iodide, chloropicrin, and chloropicrin/metam sodium will continue to be subjects of field studies of utilization and efficacy enhancement where *P. capsici* fungi are the target pests. Most of these alternatives are not currently registered for peppers, and there are presently no commercial entities pursuing registration in the United States. The regulatory restrictions on 1,3-D discussed elsewhere will adversely influence the economics of this MB alternative. The timeline for developing the above-mentioned MB alternatives in Michigan is as follows:

2003 – 2005: Test for efficacy of identified alternatives.

2005 – 2007: Establish on-farm demonstration plots for effective MB alternatives.

2008 – 2010: Work with growers to implement widespread commercial use of effective alternatives.

Research is also under way to optimize the use of a 50 % MB: 50 % chloropicrin formulation to replace the currently used 67:33 formulation. In addition, field research is being conducted to optimize a combination of crop rotation, raised crop beds, black plastic, and foliar fungicides. Use of virtually impermeable film (VIF) will also be investigated as a replacement for the currently used low-density polyethylene (LDPE).

MICHIGAN - 18. ARE THERE TECHNOLOGIES BEING USED TO PRODUCE THE CROP WHICH AVOID THE NEED FOR METHYL BROMIDE?

No. Soilless systems and greenhouse production are not in use for peppers in this region, and quick adoption is probably economically infeasible. Growers apply MB on fields with a history of fungal contamination, but it appears that most growing acreage in this region has moderate to severe infestations of *P. capsici* and other soil borne fungi, which thrive in cool and moist climates.

MICHIGAN - SUMMARY OF TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY

Based on the new trials conducted in vegetable crops in Michigan in 2003 (described above in Section 16), EPA has determined that only 1,3 D + chloropicrin has some technical feasibility against the key pest of peppers in this region.

Available studies in vegetable crops in the U.S. indicate that 1,3 D + chloropicrin has some technical feasibility against the key pest of peppers in this region. However, no large-plot studies have yet been performed to show commercial feasibility. Demonstration studies are planned (see Section 17 above). Important regulatory constraints on 1,3 D must also be kept in mind: a 7- 28 day planting delay, mandatory 30 m buffers near inhabited structures – both of which will cause negative economic impacts that make the use of these MB alternatives infeasible. There is also potentially lower dissipation (and thus efficacy) of these compounds in the cool, wet soils of this region. These planting restrictions may thus be important factors inhibiting widespread grower adoption of this MB alternative. Potential yield losses associated with plant restrictions could be exacerbated because fumigation practices need to be completed by the first week of May to allow growers to plant early and capture the early market (July – September) and have their product available for premium prices, as well as ensuring demand for their crop during the entire growing season (especially during the mid and late season). Key marketing opportunities have been established with Michigan’s vegetable crop diversification and aims toward stable demands in the late spring and through the summer for Midwestern markets.

Currently unregistered alternatives, such as furfural and sodium azide, have shown good efficacy against the key pests involved (Cortright, personal communication). However, even if registration is pursued soon, these options would require additional research focusing on their adaptation to commercial pepper production in Michigan.

There are also no non-chemical alternatives that are currently viable for MB replacement for commercial pepper growers. In sum, while the potential exists for a combination of chemical and non-chemical alternatives to replace MB use in Michigan pepper, this goal appears to be at least a few years away.

**SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA - PART B:
CROP CHARACTERISTICS AND METHYL BROMIDE USE ON PEPPERS**

SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA [U.S. States of Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky*, Louisiana*, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee and Virginia; *States added in 2005 for use in 2008] - 10. KEY DISEASES AND WEEDS FOR WHICH METHYL BROMIDE IS REQUESTED AND SPECIFIC REASONS FOR THIS REQUEST

SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA - TABLE 10.1: KEY DISEASES AND WEEDS AND REASON FOR METHYL BROMIDE REQUEST FOR PEPPERS

REGION WHERE METHYL BROMIDE USE IS REQUESTED	TARGET PESTS (WEED & PLANT-PARASITIC NEMATODES) PATHOGENS, AND [% DEGREE OF INFESTATION, IF REPORTED]	SPECIFIC REASONS WHY METHYL BROMIDE IS NEEDED
Southeast U.S. Peppers Consortium excluding Florida and Georgia	Yellow and purple nutsedge (<i>Cyperus esculentus</i> , <i>C. rotundus</i>), [30%]; plant-parasitic nematodes (<i>Meloidogyne incognita</i> ; <i>Pratylenchus sp.</i>); pythium root and collar rots (<i>P.irregularare</i> , <i>P. myriotylum</i> , <i>P. ultimum</i> , <i>P. aphanidermatum</i>); crown and root rot (<i>Phytophthora capsici</i>)	Only MB can effectively control the target pests found in the southeastern United States where pest pressures commonly exist at moderate to severe levels. Most, if not all of these states, are limited in the use of the alternative 1,3-D because of underlying karst topography throughout the region. Halosulfuron, while effective against nutsedge, is only registered for use on row middles in peppers. Metam-sodium has limited pest control capabilities and should never be used as a stand-alone fumigant (Noling, 2003).

**SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA - 11. (i)
CHARACTERISTICS OF CROPPING SYSTEM AND CLIMATE FOR PEPPERS**

SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA - TABLE 11.1: CHARACTERISTICS OF CROPPING SYSTEM

CHARACTERISTICS	SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA
CROP TYPE:	Pepper transplants for fruit production
ANNUAL OR PERENNIAL CROP:	Annual; generally 1 year
TYPICAL CROP ROTATION AND USE OF METHYL BROMIDE FOR OTHER CROPS IN THE ROTATION:	Pepper – usually double-cropped with a high-value cucurbit crop (muskmelon, cucumber, or squash).
SOIL TYPES:	Sandy loam; clay loam
FREQUENCY OF METHYL BROMIDE FUMIGATION:	1 time per year; (either in spring or fall)
OTHER RELEVANT FACTORS:	There are two distinct pepper-growing systems: 1) a spring crop (fumigation cycle begins in January) and a fall crop (fumigation cycle begins in May). Methyl bromide is applied 1 time per year on an individual field. Pepper does not follow pepper in this rotation; peppers are rotated with another crop, often a high-value cucurbit, which also depends on MB fumigation.

SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA - TABLE 11.2 CHARACTERISTICS OF CLIMATE AND CROP SCHEDULE – JANUARY FUMIGATION (SPRING, EARLY SUMMER HARVEST)

	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC
CLIMATIC ZONE	U.S. Plant Hardiness Zones 6b, 7a, 7b, 8a, 8b											
FUMIGATION SCHEDULE	X	X	X									
PLANTING SCHEDULE		X	X	X								
KEY HARVEST WINDOW				X	X	X	X					

SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA - TABLE 11.3 CHARACTERISTICS OF CLIMATE AND CROP SCHEDULE – SPRING FUMIGATION (FALL HARVEST)

	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC
CLIMATIC ZONE	U.S. Plant Hardiness Zones 6b, 7a, 7b, 8a, 8b											
FUMIGATION SCHEDULE					X	X						
PLANTING SCHEDULE						X	X					
KEY HARVEST WINDOW								X	X	X	X	

SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA – 11. (ii)
INDICATE IF ANY OF THE ABOVE CHARACTERISTICS IN 11. (i) PREVENT THE UPTAKE OF ANY
RELEVANT ALTERNATIVES?

Peppers are generally produced using mechanized practices that involve deep soil injection (20 – 25 cm) of methyl bromide. Weeds, especially nutsedge, are the most serious concern precipitating MB use in both transplant beds and the field. Nutsedge species grow even under adverse conditions, resist traditional and modern methods of weed control, and are endemic to large tracts of pepper producing area in the Southeastern United States. Although herbicides are applied to the row middles between raised production beds to manage grass and broadleaf weeds, there are no registered herbicides that can be used to control nutsedges on the beds. In addition to weeds, soil-borne fungal pathogens and plant-parasitic nematodes are endemic to the region, and nearly all production areas have severe infestations, thereby necessitating annual treatment with a broad-spectrum soil fumigant.

Alternatives like 1,3-dichloropropene and metam sodium require, respectively, a 7-28 day interval and a 14-30 day interval before planting, compared to 14 days for MB. This interval may cause delays and adjustments in production schedules that could lead to missing specific market windows, thus reducing profits for pepper growers (Kelley, 2003).

SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA - 12. HISTORIC PATTERN OF USE OF METHYL BROMIDE ON PEPPERS, AND/OR MIXTURES CONTAINING METHYL BROMIDE, FOR WHICH AN EXEMPTION IS REQUESTED

SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA - TABLE 12.1 HISTORIC PATTERN OF USE OF METHYL BROMIDE ON PEPPERS

FOR AS MANY YEARS AS POSSIBLE AS SHOWN SPECIFY:	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
AREA TREATED (hectares) ^A	880	809	809	991	1,153	1,329
RATIO OF FLAT FUMIGATION METHYL BROMIDE USE TO STRIP/BED	Not available					
AMOUNT OF METHYL BROMIDE ACTIVE INGREDIENT USED ^A (total kilograms)	132,199	121,563	121,563	148,914	173,227	199,667
FORMULATIONS OF METHYL BROMIDE (methyl bromide /chloropicrin)	No definitive/substantiated information available			67:33	67:33	67:33
METHODS BY WHICH METHYL BROMIDE APPLIED	No information available			Injected 15 to 25 cm deep	Injected 15 to 25 cm deep	Injected 15 to 25 cm deep
DOSAGE RATE* (G/HA) FOR THE ACTIVE INGREDIENT	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0

^A An increase in the acreage of peppers produced in the Southeastern U.S. (relative to the initial nomination) is due to the addition of two new states (added since 2001): Kentucky and Louisiana.

^B Based on estimated area: 2,023 to 2,415 m² (Lewis, 2003, personal communication).

**SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA - PART C:
TECHNICAL VALIDATION FOR PEPPERS**

**SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA - 13. REASON
FOR ALTERNATIVES NOT BEING FEASIBLE**

**SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA – TABLE 13.1: REASON FOR
ALTERNATIVES NOT BEING FEASIBLE**

NAME OF ALTERNATIVE	TECHNICAL AND REGULATORY* REASONS FOR THE ALTERNATIVE NOT BEING FEASIBLE OR AVAILABLE	IS THE ALTERNATIVE CONSIDERED COST EFFECTIVE?
CHEMICAL ALTERNATIVES		
Metam Sodium	Metam sodium provides limited and erratic performance at suppressing all major pepper pathogens and pests. In addition, there is a 14-30 day waiting period at the time of application until planting, compared to 14 days for MB. Such a delay could cause the higher-end market windows to be missed, particularly for the spring plantings (i.e., fall harvests). Beginning the application cycle earlier is not an option since crops from the previous fumigation cycle must be cleaned up prior to metam application. (Georgia CUE # 03-0049; Kelley, 2003). Repeated applications of MITC (the breakdown product of metam sodium) are known to enhance its biodegradation and reduce efficacy as a result of increased populations of adapted microorganisms (Dungan and Yates, 2003).	No
NON CHEMICAL ALTERNATIVES		
Soil solarization	For nutsedge control in the southeastern United States, solarization is not technically feasible as a methyl bromide alternative. Response of <i>Cyperus</i> species to solarization is sporadic and not well understood; data show solarization to provide, at best, suppression of nutsedge populations (Chase et al. 1999). Research indicates that the lethal temperature for nutsedge tubers is 50°C or higher. Trials conducted in mid-summer in Georgia resulted in maximum soil temperatures of 43 °C at 5 cm depth (Chase et al. 1999). Thus, solarization, even in the warmer months in southern states, did not result in temperatures high enough to destroy nutsedge tubers. Also, tubers lodged deeper in the soil would be completely unaffected. In addition, solarization would take fields out of production since it would be needed during the spring and into the summer months, which are optimal for pepper production.	No
Steam	Steam is not a technically feasible alternative for open field pepper production because it requires sustained heat over a required period of time (UNEP 1998). While steam has been used effectively against fungal pests in protected production systems, such as greenhouses, there is no evidence that it would be effective in open field pepper crops. Any such system would also require large amounts of energy and water to provide sufficient steam necessary to sterilize soil down to the rooting depth of field crops (at least 20-50 cm).	No

NAME OF ALTERNATIVE	TECHNICAL AND REGULATORY* REASONS FOR THE ALTERNATIVE NOT BEING FEASIBLE OR AVAILABLE	IS THE ALTERNATIVE CONSIDERED COST EFFECTIVE?
Biological Control	Biological control agents alone cannot control nutsedge and/or the soil pathogens that afflict peppers. The bacterium <i>Burkholderia cepacia</i> and the fungus <i>Gliocladium virens</i> have shown some potential in controlling some fungal plant pathogens (Larkin and Fravel 1998). However, no biological control agent has been identified to effectively control nutsedge or <i>Phytophthora</i> . Therefore, biological control is not a stand-alone replacement for methyl bromide in pepper crops. Only a limited number of biological organisms are effectively used to manage soil borne diseases and pests. Biocontrol agents are usually very specific regarding the organisms they control and their successful establishment is highly dependent on environmental conditions.	No
Cover crops and mulching	Cover crops and mulches have been integrated into solanaceous crop production systems. However there is no evidence these practices effectively substitute for the control methyl bromide provides against nutsedges (Burgos and Talbert 1996). Some cover crops that have been shown to reduce weed populations also reduced or delayed crop maturity and/or emergence, as well as yields (Burgos and Talbert 1996, Galloway and Weston 1996). Mulching has also been shown to be ineffective in controlling nutsedges, which are able to penetrate through both organic and plastic mulches (Munn 1992, Patterson 1998).	No
Crop rotation and fallow land	Crop rotation/fallow is not a technically feasible alternative to methyl bromide because it does not provide adequate control of nutsedges or fungal pathogens. The crop rotations available to growers are also susceptible to fungi; fallow land can still harbor fungal oospores (Lamour and Hausbeck 2003). Tubers of the perennial nutsedges provide new plants with larger energy reserves than annual weeds that can be more easily controlled by crop rotations and fallow. (Thullen and Keeley 1975). Furthermore, nutsedge plants can produce tubers within 2 weeks after emergence (Wilén et al. 2003). This enhances their survival across different cropping regimes that can disrupt other plants that rely on a longer undisturbed growing period to produce seeds to propagate the next generation.	No
Flooding/Water management	Flooding has been used effectively to manage various soil borne pest and diseases, especially nematodes and some weeds. However, nutsedges have shown tolerance to this treatment. Submerging nutsedge tubers for 8 days to 4 weeks showed no effect on the sprouting capabilities of the tubers (Horowitz, 1972). Studies in Florida showed ineffective nematode, disease, and nutsedge control after flooding (Allen, 1999). Regulatory issues concerning water management, as well as economic feasibility, also preclude its viability as an alternative to methyl bromide. Land structure, frequent and severe droughts, and the economics of developing and managing flood capabilities prevent flooding from being a viable, cost effective alternative in the Southeastern United States.	No

NAME OF ALTERNATIVE	TECHNICAL AND REGULATORY* REASONS FOR THE ALTERNATIVE NOT BEING FEASIBLE OR AVAILABLE	IS THE ALTERNATIVE CONSIDERED COST EFFECTIVE?
Grafting/resistant rootstock/plant breeding/soilless culture/organic production/substrates/plug plants.	<p>Due to the paucity of scientific information on the utility of these alternatives as methyl bromide replacements in peppers, they have been grouped together for discussion in this document. The U.S. EPA was unable to locate any studies showing any potential for grafting, resistant rootstock or plant breeding as technically feasible alternatives to methyl bromide control of nutsedges. Plug plants are extensively used on high value vegetable crops like pepper but they do not control competition from nutsedges. There are no studies documenting the commercial availability of resistant rootstock immune to the fungal pathogens listed as major pepper pests. Grafting and plant breeding are thus also rendered technically infeasible as methyl bromide alternatives for control of <i>Phytophthora</i> and <i>Fusarium</i> fungi. Soilless culture, organic production, and substrates/plug plants are also not technically viable alternatives to methyl bromide for fungi. Various aspects of organic production – e.g., cover crops, fallow land, and steam sterilization - have already been addressed in this document and assessed to be technically infeasible methyl bromide alternatives.</p>	No
COMBINATIONS OF ALTERNATIVES		
Metam sodium + Chloropicrin	Although this combination would likely be more effective than metam-sodium alone where fungal pests are the only concern, it may not prevent yield losses due to nutsedges, particularly where weed pressure is high. In a study with vegetables it provided control of yellow nutsedge, but weed pressure in that small plot test was low, according to the authors (Csinos et al. 1999).	No
1,3 dichloropropene (Telone II) + metam-sodium	This combination controls nematodes but not nutsedges. In a study with vegetables, it provided control of yellow nutsedge, but weed pressure in that small plot test was low, according to the authors (Csinos et al. 1999). It is inconsistently effective against fungal pests (see Michigan sections for more discussion). 1,3-D is also subject to regulatory prohibition of use on Karst geology.	No
1,3 dichloropropene (Telone II) followed by chloropicrin	Culpepper and Langston (2004) tested the effectiveness of several soil fumigant combinations for the management of nutsedges and nematodes affecting peppers in Tifton, Georgia. Results show that 1,3-D, followed by chloropicrin, was significantly less effective than MB for the control of both purple and yellow nutsedge, but as effective as MB for the control soil nematodes. In terms of spring and fall crop yield, however, this combination performed as well as MB. This treatment is promising and will require further testing and validation in commercial fields.	No, but shows promise

NAME OF ALTERNATIVE	TECHNICAL AND REGULATORY* REASONS FOR THE ALTERNATIVE NOT BEING FEASIBLE OR AVAILABLE	IS THE ALTERNATIVE CONSIDERED COST EFFECTIVE?
1,3 dichloropropene + chloropicrin	This combination does not adequately control nutsedge. Because of ground water contamination concerns, 1,3-D cannot be used in pepper growing areas of the U.S. where karst topography exists. Where 1,3-D use is allowed, set back restrictions (~ 100 meters from occupied structures; ~ 30 meters for emulsified formulations applied via chemigation) may limit the portion of a field that can be treated. In addition, because of a 28-day waiting period between application and planting (compared to 14 days for MB), growers could lose half of the harvest season and miss higher-end market windows, mainly for spring fumigations (i.e., fall harvests).	No
1,3 dichloropropene + chloropicrin (Telone C35) followed by chloropicrin	Culpepper and Langston (2004) have tested the effectiveness of several soil fumigant combinations for the management of nutsedges and nematodes affecting peppers in Tifton, Georgia. In this study, 1,3-D + chloropicrin, followed by more chloropicrin, was more effective than MB for the control of yellow nutsedge, but less effective against purple nutsedge. This treatment performed as well as MB in terms of spring crop yield, but poorly in terms of fall yield. This combination does not appear to show promise as a MB alternative.	No
1,3 dichloropropene + chloropicrin (Telone C35) followed by metam sodium	Culpepper and Langston (2004) have tested the effectiveness of several soil fumigant combinations for the management of nutsedges and nematodes affecting peppers in Tifton, Georgia. In this study, 1,3-D + chloropicrin, followed by metam sodium was 36% less effective than MB for the control of purple nutsedge, but as effective as MB for the control of yellow nutsedge and soil nematodes. In terms of spring and fall crop yield, this treatment performed as well as MB. This combination is promising and will require further testing and validation in commercial fields.	No, but shows promise
Fumigant combination + herbicide partners	Current research suggests that in areas of low pest pressure this combination may be suitable for some growers as an alternative for methyl bromide. In these situations growers may employ a marginal strategy without major economic dislocation if given a reasonable time frame for the transition.	Yes

* Regulatory reasons include local restrictions (e.g. occupational health and safety, local environmental regulations) and lack of registration.

SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA- 14. LIST AND DISCUSS WHY REGISTERED (and Potential) PESTICIDES AND HERBICIDES ARE CONSIDERED NOT EFFECTIVE AS TECHNICAL ALTERNATIVES TO METHYL BROMIDE:

SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA – TABLE 14.1: TECHNICALLY INFEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES DISCUSSION

NAME OF ALTERNATIVE	DISCUSSION
Halosulfuron-methyl	Is a non-selective herbicide. Causes potential crop injury; has plant back restrictions. Efficacy is lowered in rainy conditions (common during the period of initial planting of these crops). Also, a 24-month plant back restriction may cause significant economic disruption if growers must rely on this option. Since halosulfuron can only be applied to the row middles, nutsedges would survive on the pepper beds, close to crop plants. Thus this herbicide is not technically feasible as a stand-alone replacement for MB, and its use in conjunction with other pest management methods has not yet been investigated.
Glyphosate	Is a non-selective herbicide. As halosulfuron, it will not control nutsedge within the plant rows and does not provide residual control. Thus this herbicide is not technically feasible as a stand-alone replacement for MB, and its use in conjunction with other pest management methods has not yet been studied.
Paraquat	Is a non-selective herbicide that will not control nutsedge in the plant rows. It does not provide residual control. Thus this herbicide is not technically feasible as a stand-alone replacement for MB, and its use in conjunction with other pest management methods has not yet been investigated.

Other than those options discussed elsewhere, no alternative exists for the control of the key weeds, nematodes, and pathogens affecting pepper production. Non-chemical alternatives and chemical alternatives to methyl bromide have been or are being investigated and when suitable, are incorporated into current pepper production practices.

Nutsedge management has proven to be difficult due to the perennial growth habit of nutsedge and tubers as primary means of propagation. There are no herbicides which control nutsedge in the crop row. Paraquat and glyphosate will suppress emerged nutsedge, but cannot be used in the crop row because of potential crop injury (SE Pepper Consortium CUE 02-0041.) Research suggests that metam sodium can, in some situations, provide effective pest management for certain diseases and weeds. However, even though there have been nearly 50 years experience with metam sodium, (which breaks down to methyl isothiocyanate) nutsedge control results have been unpredictable.

Since methyl bromide has been used effectively to manage minor crop production, there are limited pesticide alternatives due primarily to the small market share and the high cost associated with pesticide registration. Labeling of these products in minor crops could be more expensive than returns from potential sales, and therefore pesticide manufacturers have been reluctant to register pesticides for minor crop uses. Methyl bromide will be needed until a cost-effective alternative regimen is in place.

SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA 15. LIST PRESENT (and Possible Future) REGISTRATION STATUS OF ANY CURRENT AND POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVES:

SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA – TABLE 15.1: PRESENT REGISTRATION STATUS OF ALTERNATIVES FOR PEPPERS

NAME OF ALTERNATIVE	PRESENT REGISTRATION STATUS	REGISTRATION BEING CONSIDERED BY NATIONAL AUTHORITIES? (Y/N)	DATE OF POSSIBLE FUTURE REGISTRATION:
Methyl iodide	Not registered	Yes	Unknown
Furfural	Not registered.	No	Unknown
Sodium azide	Not registered. No registration application received.	No	Unknown
Propargyl bromide	Not registered. No registration application received.	No	Unknown
Muscador albus Strain QST 20799	Registration package has been received.	Yes	Registered but not yet for sale in the U.S.

SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA – 16. STATE RELATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF RELEVANT ALTERNATIVES COMPARED TO METHYL BROMIDE FOR THE SPECIFIC KEY TARGET PESTS AND WEEDS FOR WHICH IT IS BEING REQUESTED:

SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA - TABLE 16.1. FUMIGANT ALTERNATIVES TO METHYL BROMIDE FOR POLYETHYLENE-MULCHED TOMATO (LOCASCIO ET AL. 1997)

Chemicals	Rate (kg/ha)	Average Nutsedge Density (#/m ²)	Average Marketable Yield (ton/ha)	% Yield Loss (compared to MB)
Untreated (control)	-	300 ^{ab}	20.1 ^a	59.1
MB + Pic (67-33), chisel-injected	390 kg	90 ^c	49.1 ^b	---
1,3 D + Pic (83-17), chisel-injected	327 l	340 ^a	34.6 ^c	29.5
Metam Na, Flat Fumigation	300 l	320 ^a	22.6 ^a	54.0
Metam Na, drip irrigated	300 l	220 ^b	32.3 ^c	34.2

- Notes:** (1) Numbers followed by the same letter (within a column) are not significantly different at the 0.05 level of probability, using Duncan's multiple range test.
(2) Data shown are from the Gainesville/Horticultural Unit site, 1994 season (this was one of three sites included in this study). This site had relatively high nutsedge pressure, and data for both pest pressure and marketable yields for all treatments shown.

Locascio et al. (1997) studied MB alternatives on tomatoes grown in small plots at two Florida locations with high nutsedge infestation. The data from this tomato study are being cited

because comparable pepper data are not available. Various treatments were tested on plots that had multiple pests. At the Bradenton site there was moderate to heavy *Fusarium* infestation; heavy purple nutsedge infestation and light root-knot nematode pressure. At Gainesville there was heavy infestation of yellow and purple nutsedge and moderate infestation of root-knot nematode. The treatments at both locations included MB (67%) + chloropicrin (33%) chisel-injected at 390 kg/ha; metam-sodium (chisel-injected) at 300L/ha; metam-sodium drip-irrigated at 300L/ha; and 1,3-D + 17% chloropicrin chisel-injected at 327L/ha. In pairwise statistical comparisons, the yield was significantly lower in metam-sodium treatments compared to MB at both sites. At Bradenton, the average yield from both metam-sodium treatments was 33% of the MB yields, suggesting a 67% yield loss from not using MB. At Gainesville the average yield of the two metam-sodium treatments was 56% of the MB yield, suggesting a 44% yield loss from not using MB. The yield of the 1,3-D treatment at Gainesville was 71% of the MB standard suggesting a 29% loss by not using MB (yield data for 1,3-D were not reported for Bradenton). In considering 1,3 D results, one must keep in mind that this MB alternative cannot be used in areas where karst geology exists which is approximately 40% of the Florida pepper production area.

For **root knot nematodes**, both metam-sodium and 1,3 D + 35 % chloropicrin have shown good efficacy in trials with tomato and pepper. For example, Locascio and Dickson (1998) reported that metam-sodium + 35 % chloropicrin (295 l/ha of metam-sodium, shank-injected) reduced nematode galls significantly over untreated control plots, though not as much as did MB + 35 % chloropicrin treatments (500kg MB/ha, shank-injected), in Florida tomatoes. Analysis of 35 tomato and 5 pepper trials conducted from 1993 – 1995 indicated that 1,3 D (with either 17 % or 35 % chloropicrin) provided control of nematodes that was equal or superior to that seen with MB, in 95 % of the tomato and 100 % of pepper trials (Eger 2000). However, it is not clear whether yields were also comparable to those obtained with MB. Noling et al (2000) also studied the effects of metam-sodium (115 l/ha, syringe-injected), 1,3 D + 17 % chloropicrin (53.6 l/ha, soil-injected), and 1,3 D + 35 % chloropicrin (39.8 l/ha), among other treatments, in tomato plots. Galls inflicted by root knot nematodes were reduced significantly by all these MB alternatives, as compared to untreated control plots. Yields were also significantly higher as compared to the control plots; all MB alternatives resulted in similar high yields. However, the effects of MB formulations were not reported in this study. Further, it is the opinion of some U.S. crop experts that metam sodium, in particular, is inconsistent as a nematode control agent (Dr. S. Culpeper, University of Georgia, personal communication).

SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPER CONSORTIUM - TABLE C.1: ALTERNATIVES YIELD LOSS DATA SUMMARY

ALTERNATIVE	LIST TYPE OF PEST	RANGE OF YIELD LOSS	BEST ESTIMATE OF YIELD LOSS
1,3 dichloropropene + chloropicrin	Nutsedges, fungal pathogens	20 - 100	29%
Metam-sodium (with or without chloropicrin)	Nutsedges, fungal pathogens	30 - 55	44%
OVERALL LOSS ESTIMATE FOR ALL ALTERNATIVES TO PESTS			29 % if 1,3 D + pic is used; 44 % if metam-sodium is used

SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA –17. ARE THERE ANY OTHER POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVES UNDER DEVELOPMENT WHICH ARE BEING CONSIDERED TO REPLACE METHYL BROMIDE?

Future plans to minimize MB use include:

- 1) Optimizing use of plastic (VIF) tarps and drip irrigation equipment for applying at-plant herbicides.
- 2) Conducting studies on tomato, pepper, and cucurbit crops with combinations of fumigants and herbicides including halosulfuron, metolachlor, rimsulfuron, and dimethenamid. Telone C-35 will be used as a fumigant because of nematode and disease problems.
- 3) Changing MB:chloropicrin formulations from 98:2 to 67:33

Trials using the alternative fumigants Telone C-35, iodomethane, metam sodium, chloropicrin, and at least two reduced-risk products (Propozone, PlantPro45, DiTera, Deny) are also planned. These trials will incorporate screening of pepper varieties for tolerance/resistance to *Phytophthora capsici*. The applicant noted that a program to evaluate host resistance to Phytophthora root and crown rot has been implemented. Growers are starting to deploy lines identified with genetic resistance and acceptable horticultural qualities.

In addition, the following new long-term studies have been initiated at the Coastal Plain Experiment Station in Tifton, Georgia, with funding provided by USDA-CSREES, Methyl Bromide Transitions Grant:

- Evaluation of the effects of soil conditions, particularly soil temperature and moisture, on nutsedge species efficacy from several fumigants.
- Investigation of the impact of multiple-season adoption of methyl bromide alternatives in terms of pest species composition, including weeds, diseases, and nematodes.
- Integration of multiple tactics as alternatives to methyl bromide for management of weeds, diseases, and nematodes in pepper and eggplant.
- Evaluation of vegetable crop response to herbicides applied under plastic prior to crop transplants and characterize herbicide fate when applied in a plasticulture system between summer and fall crops.

SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA - 18. ARE THERE TECHNOLOGIES BEING USED TO PRODUCE THE CROP WHICH AVOID THE NEED FOR METHYL BROMIDE?

No. soilless systems and greenhouse production are not in use for peppers and quick adoption is probably economically infeasible. Grafting has not been evaluated for vegetable production due to the high cost and the large number of plants that would be needed. In addition this alternative is primarily used for nematode and disease management, but there is no evidence that it applies to competition from weeds. Plug plants are extensively used on high value vegetable crops like pepper but they do not control competition from nutsedges.

SOUTHEAST U.S. PEPPERS CONSORTIUM EXCLUDING FLORIDA AND GEORGIA – SUMMARY OF TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY

There has been extensive research on alternatives for solanaceous crops, and methyl bromide minimizing practices have been incorporated into pepper production systems where possible. However, the effectiveness of chemical and non-chemical alternatives designed to fully replace methyl bromide must still be characterized as preliminary. These alternatives have not been shown to be stand-alone replacements for methyl bromide, and no combination has been shown to provide effective, economical pest control. Methyl bromide is believed to be the only treatment currently available that consistently provides reliable control of nutsedge species and the disease complex affecting pepper production. (Locascio et al., 1997) Nutsedges resist traditional and modern methods of weed control and are endemic to large tracts of pepper producing area in the Southeastern United States. Herbicides are applied to the row middles between raised production beds to manage grass and broadleaf weeds, but there are no currently registered herbicides to address sedge weed pests. Nematodes, especially root knot nematodes (*Meloidogyne* spp.), and fungal diseases (such as *Phytophthora* blight) are also of concern. Fungal pests are expected to become serious problems for pepper production if MB were not available for pre-plant fumigation.

The 1,3-dichloropropene and chloropicrin combination does not effectively control nutsedges. Lack of an effective registered herbicide for control of nutsedge impairs adoption of methyl bromide alternatives in pepper (Banks, 2002). In addition, labeling of 1,3-dichloropropene products restricts its use in key pepper growing areas of the United States where karst topography exists due to ground-water contamination concerns. In areas where 1,3-dichloropropene use is allowed, set back restrictions and 7-28 day waiting periods between application and planting cause delays/adjustments in production schedules that could lead to missing specific market windows, thus reducing profits on pepper crops. For example, peppers produced during the winter return a higher price than peppers produced during warmer months, and many growers rely on this price premium to maintain profitability.

Metam sodium provides limited and erratic performance at suppressing all major solanaceous pathogens and pests. Data indicate that metam sodium is not an effective alternative to methyl

bromide for nutsedge control in bell pepper fields Webster et al., (2002). A 14-30 day planting delay is also recommended for this chemical. In addition there is evidence that both 1,3-dichloropropene and methyl isothiocyanate (the breakdown product of metam sodium) levels decline more rapidly, thus further compromising efficacy, in areas where these are repeatedly applied (Smelt et al. 1989, Ou et al. 1995, Gamliel et al. 2003). This is due to enhanced degradation of these chemicals by soil microbes (Dungan and Yates 2003).

Culpepper and Langston (2004) recently compared the effectiveness of several soil fumigants in managing soil pests affecting peppers in Tifton, Georgia. Results show that 1,3-D followed by chloropicrin was significantly less effective than methyl bromide for the control of both purple and yellow nutsedge, but as effective as MB for the control soil nematodes. In terms of spring and fall crop yield, this treatment performed as well as MB. 1,3-D + chloropicrin, followed by more chloropicrin was more effective than MB for the control of yellow nutsedge, but less effective against purple nutsedge. This treatment performed as well as MB in terms of spring crop yield, but poorly in terms of fall yield. 1,3-D + chloropicrin, followed by metam sodium was 36% less effective than methyl bromide for the control of purple nutsedge, but as effective as MB for the control of yellow nutsedge. This combination was as effective as MB against soil nematodes. In terms of spring and fall crop yield, this treatment performed as well as MB. These treatments are showing promise and will require further testing and validation in commercial fields.

Research on the effectiveness of non-chemical alternatives to methyl bromide is still in a preliminary stage, particularly for high value, minor-use crops such as peppers.

GEORGIA - PART B: CROP CHARACTERISTICS AND METHYL BROMIDE USE ON PEPPERS

GEORGIA - 10. KEY DISEASES AND WEEDS FOR WHICH METHYL BROMIDE IS REQUESTED AND SPECIFIC REASONS FOR THIS REQUEST

GEORGIA - TABLE 10.1: KEY DISEASES AND WEEDS AND REASON FOR METHYL BROMIDE REQUEST FOR PEPPERS

REGION WHERE METHYL BROMIDE USE IS REQUESTED	TARGET PESTS (WEED & PLANT-PARASITIC NEMATODES) PATHOGENS, AND [% DEGREE OF INFESTATION, IF REPORTED]	SPECIFIC REASONS WHY METHYL BROMIDE IS NEEDED
Georgia	Yellow and purple nutsedge (<i>Cyperus esculentus</i> , <i>C. rotundus</i>) [100%]; crown and Root rot (<i>Phytophthora capsici</i>) [40%]; plant-parasitic nematodes (<i>Meloidogyne incognita</i> ; <i>Pratylenchus</i> sp) [70%]; southern blight (<i>Sclerotium rolfsii</i>) [70%]; Pythium root and collar rots (<i>P.irregularare</i> , <i>P. myriotylum</i> , <i>P. ultimum</i> , <i>P. aphanidermatum</i>) [100%]	Only MB can effectively control the target pests found in the southeast U.S. where pest pressures commonly exist at moderate to severe levels. Most, if not all of these states are limited in the use of the alternative 1,3-D because of underlying karst geology throughout the region. Halosulfuron, which is registered only for middle-of-row use, does not control nutsedge near pepper plants where most competition occurs. Metam-sodium has limited pest control capabilities and should never be used as a stand-alone fumigant (Noling, 2003). Refer to Item 13 for additional detail.

GEORGIA - 11. (i) CHARACTERISTICS OF CROPPING SYSTEM AND CLIMATE FOR PEPPERS

GEORGIA - TABLE 11.1: CHARACTERISTICS OF CROPPING SYSTEM

CHARACTERISTICS	GEORGIA
CROP TYPE:	Pepper transplants for fruit production
ANNUAL OR PERENNIAL CROP:	Annual; generally 1 year
TYPICAL CROP ROTATION AND USE OF METHYL BROMIDE FOR OTHER CROPS IN THE ROTATION:	Pepper – usually followed by a cucurbit crop (cucumbers or squash). Occasionally eggplants follow pepper crops.
SOIL TYPES:	Sandy loam; clay loam
FREQUENCY OF METHYL BROMIDE FUMIGATION:	1 time per year; (either in spring or fall)
OTHER RELEVANT FACTORS:	Actual frequency may be between 12 and 15 months depending on the number of crops grown per fumigation cycle.

GEORGIA - TABLE 11.2 CHARACTERISTICS OF CLIMATE AND CROP SCHEDULE – JULY FUMIGATION EVENT, PEPPER CROP IS HARVESTED IN FALL.

	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB
CLIMATIC ZONE	U.S. Plant Hardiness Zones 7a, 7b, 8a, 8b											
SOIL TEMP. (° F)	64.1	72.5	80.8	85.9	87.8	86.8	82.2	73.9	34.0	54.0	51.1	55.5
RAINFALL (inches)	5.0	3.8	3.5	4.5	5.6	4.8	3.4	2.3	2.3	4.5	4.5	4.2
AVERAGE AIR TEMP. (° C)	69.8	77.7	84.7	89.4	90.7	90.5	87.3	79.3	69.8	63.1	61.5	64.0
FUMIGATION SCHEDULE					X							
PLANTING SCHEDULE	2C				P							
KEY HARVEST WINDOWS			2C	2C	2C		P	P	P			

Methyl bromide applied in July allows the grower to economically produce at least two crops from one annual fumigation event. **P** = planting or harvest of pepper crop; **2C** = planting and/or harvest of 2nd crop.

GEORGIA - TABLE 11.3. CHARACTERISTICS OF CLIMATE AND CROP SCHEDULE – SPRING (LATE FEBRUARY - MARCH) FUMIGATION EVENT, PEPPER CROP IS HARVESTED IN EARLY SUMMER

	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN
CLIMATIC ZONE	U.S. Plant Hardiness Zones 7a, 7b, 8a, 8b											
SOIL TEMP. (°C)	Same as above- Table 11.2											
RAINFALL (mm)	Same as above- Table 11.2											
AIR TEMP. (°C)	Same as above- Table 11.2											
FUMIGATION SCHEDULE ^A	X											
PLANTING SCHEDULE ^A		P				2C						
KEY HARVEST WINDOW ^A				P	P	P		2C	2C	2C		

^AFumigation is an early spring event. Two crops are shown as being produced from one fumigation event.

P = planting and/or harvest of pepper crop; **2C** = planting and/or harvest of second crop.

GEORGIA – 11. (ii) INDICATE IF ANY OF THE ABOVE CHARACTERISTICS IN 11. (i) PREVENT THE UPTAKE OF ANY RELEVANT ALTERNATIVES?

Peppers are generally produced using mechanized practices that involve deep injection of methyl bromide. Methyl bromide is being requested only for moderate to severe pest infestations. Approximately 81% of the Georgia pepper area is considered to have moderate to severe infestations of nutsedge (Culpepper, 2004).

Weeds, especially nutsedge, are the most serious concern precipitating methyl bromide use in both transplant beds and in the field. Nutsedge species grow even under adverse conditions, resist traditional and modern methods of weed control, and are endemic to large tracts of pepper producing area in the Southeastern United States. Herbicides are applied to the row middles between raised production beds to manage grass and broadleaf weeds - but there are no currently registered herbicides that control nutsedges near pepper plants. Weeds, when present in crops such as pepper, tomato, and cucurbits for 40 to 60 days may reduce yields by 10 to 50%. In addition to weeds, soil-borne fungal pathogens and plant-parasitic nematodes are endemic to the region and nearly all production areas have severe infestations, thus necessitating annual treatment with a broad-spectrum soil fumigant.

Alternatives like 1,3-dichloropropene and metam sodium require, respectively, a 14-28 day interval and a 14-30 day interval before planting, compared to 14 days for MB. This interval can cause delays/adjustments in production schedules that could lead to missing specific market windows, thus reducing profits on pepper crops (Kelley, 2003).

GEORGIA - 12. HISTORIC PATTERN OF USE OF METHYL BROMIDE ON PEPPERS, AND/OR MIXTURES CONTAINING METHYL BROMIDE, FOR WHICH AN EXEMPTION IS REQUESTED

GEORGIA - TABLE 12.1 HISTORIC PATTERN OF USE OF METHYL BROMIDE ON PEPPERS

FOR AS MANY YEARS AS POSSIBLE AS SHOWN SPECIFY:	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
AREA TREATED (<i>hectares</i>)	1,767	2,263	2,252	2,312	2,117	2,432
RATIO OF FLAT FUMIGATION METHYL BROMIDE USE TO STRIP/BED USE IF STRIP TREATMENT IS USED	All production acreage is strip/bed fumigation and tarped with LDPE films. Approximately 58% of the field is treated with MB and covered with plastic mulch.					
AMOUNT OF METHYL BROMIDE ACTIVE INGREDIENT USED (<i>total kilograms</i>)	337,163	347,944	338,248	347,183	317,886	365,235
FORMULATIONS OF METHYL BROMIDE (<i>methyl bromide /chloropicrin</i>)	98:2	98:2 (15% acreage) 67:33 (85% Of acreage)	67:33	67:33	67:33	67:33
METHODS BY WHICH METHYL BROMIDE APPLIED	Injected, 20.3 to 30.5 cm, under tarp	Injected, 20.3 to 30.5 cm, under tarp	Injected, 20.3 to 30.5 cm, under tarp	Injected, 20.3 to 30.5 cm, under tarp	Injected, 20.3 to 30.5 cm, under tarp	Injected, 20.3 to 30.5 cm, under tarp
DOSAGE RATE*(G/M ²) OF ACTIVE INGREDIENT	19.1	15.4	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0

GEORGIA - PART C: TECHNICAL VALIDATION FOR PEPPERS

GEORGIA - 13. REASON FOR ALTERNATIVES NOT BEING FEASIBLE

GEORGIA – TABLE 13.1: REASON FOR ALTERNATIVES NOT BEING FEASIBLE

NAME OF ALTERNATIVE	TECHNICAL AND REGULATORY* REASONS FOR THE ALTERNATIVE NOT BEING FEASIBLE OR AVAILABLE	IS THE ALTERNATIVE CONSIDERED COST EFFECTIVE?
CHEMICAL ALTERNATIVES		
Metam Sodium	Metam sodium provides limited and erratic performance at suppressing all nutsedge weed species and pepper pathogens. Also, there is a 14-30 day waiting period at the time of application until planting compared to 14 days for MB. Such a delay may cause the higher-end market windows to be missed—particularly for the spring plantings (i.e., fall harvests). Beginning the application cycle earlier is not an option since crops from the previous fumigation cycle must be cleaned up prior to metam application. (Georgia CUE # 03-0049; Kelley, 2003). Repeated applications of MITC (the breakdown product of metam sodium) are known to enhance its biodegradation (and reduce efficacy) as a result of increased populations of adapted microorganisms (Dungan and Yates, 2003).	No
NON CHEMICAL ALTERNATIVES		
Soil solarization	For nutsedge control in the southeastern United States, solarization is not technically feasible as a methyl bromide alternative. Response of <i>Cyperus</i> species to solarization is sporadic and not well understood; data show solarization to provide, at best, suppression of nutsedge populations (Chase et al. 1999). Research indicates that the lethal temperature for nutsedge tubers is 50 °C or higher (Chase et al. 1999). Trials conducted in mid-summer in Georgia resulted in maximum soil temperatures of 43 °C at 5 cm depth. Thus, solarization, even in the warmer months in southern states, did not result in temperatures high enough to destroy nutsedge tubers. Also, tubers lodged deeper in the soil would be completely unaffected. In addition, solarization would take fields out of production since it would be needed during the spring and into the summer months, which are optimal for pepper production.	No
Steam	Steam is not a technically feasible alternative for open field pepper production because it requires sustained heat over a required period of time (UNEP 1998). While steam has been used effectively against fungal pests in protected production systems, such as greenhouses, there is no evidence that it would be effective in open field pepper crops. Any such system would also require large amounts of energy and water to provide sufficient steam necessary to sterilize soil down to the rooting depth of field crops (at least 20-50 cm).	No

NAME OF ALTERNATIVE	TECHNICAL AND REGULATORY* REASONS FOR THE ALTERNATIVE NOT BEING FEASIBLE OR AVAILABLE	IS THE ALTERNATIVE CONSIDERED COST EFFECTIVE?
Biological Control	Biological control agents alone cannot control nutsedge and/or the soil pathogens that afflict peppers. The bacterium <i>Burkholderia cepacia</i> and the fungus <i>Gliocladium virens</i> have shown some potential in controlling some fungal plant pathogens (Larkin and Fravel 1998). However, no biological control agent has been identified to effectively control nutsedge or <i>Phytophthora</i> . Therefore, biological control is not a stand-alone replacement for methyl bromide in pepper crops. Only a limited number of biological organisms are effectively used to manage soil borne plant pathogens and pests. Biocontrol agents are usually very specific regarding the organisms they control and their successful establishment is highly dependent on environmental conditions.	No
Cover crops and mulching	Cover crops and mulches have been integrated into solanaceous crop production systems. However there is no evidence these practices effectively substitute for the control methyl bromide provides against nutsedges (Burgos and Talbert 1996). Some cover crops that have been shown to reduce weed populations also reduced or delayed crop maturity and/or emergence, as well as yields (Burgos and Talbert 1996, Galloway and Weston 1996). Mulching has also been shown to be ineffective in controlling nutsedges, which are able to penetrate through both organic and plastic mulches (Munn 1992, Patterson 1998).	No
Crop rotation and fallow land	Crop rotation/fallow is not a technically feasible alternative to methyl bromide because it does not provide adequate control of nutsedges or fungal pathogens. The crop rotations available to growers are also susceptible to fungi; fallow land can still harbor fungal oospores (Lamour and Hausbeck 2003). Tubers of the perennial nutsedges provide new plants with larger energy reserves than annual weeds that can be more easily controlled by crop rotations and fallow. (Thullen and Keeley 1975). Furthermore, nutsedge plants can produce tubers within 2 weeks after emergence (Wilen et al. 2003). This enhances their survival across different cropping regimes that can disrupt other plants that rely on a longer undisturbed growing period to produce seeds to propagate the next generation.	No
Flooding/Water management	Flooding has been used effectively to manage various soil borne pest and plant pathogens, especially nematodes and some weeds. However, nutsedges have shown tolerance to this treatment. Submerging nutsedge tubers for 8 days to 4 weeks showed no effect on the sprouting capabilities of the tubers (Horowitz, 1972). Studies in Florida showed ineffective nematode, plant pathogen, and nutsedge control after flooding (Allen, 1999). Regulatory issues concerning water management, as well as economic feasibility, also preclude its viability as an alternative to methyl bromide. Land structure, frequent and severe droughts, and the economics of developing and managing flood capabilities prevent flooding from being a viable, cost effective alternative in the Southeastern United States.	No

NAME OF ALTERNATIVE	TECHNICAL AND REGULATORY* REASONS FOR THE ALTERNATIVE NOT BEING FEASIBLE OR AVAILABLE	IS THE ALTERNATIVE CONSIDERED COST EFFECTIVE?
Grafting/resistant rootstock/plant breeding/soilless culture/organic production/substrates /plug plants.	Due to the paucity of scientific information on the utility of these alternatives as methyl bromide replacements in peppers, they have been grouped together for discussion in this document. The United States was unable to locate any studies showing any potential for grafting, resistant rootstock or plant breeding as technically feasible alternatives to methyl bromide control of nutsedges. Plug plants are extensively used on high value vegetable crops like pepper but they do not control competition from nutsedges. There are no studies documenting the commercial availability of resistant rootstock immune to the fungal pathogens listed as major pepper pests. Grafting and plant breeding are thus also rendered technically infeasible as methyl bromide alternatives for control of <i>Phytophthora</i> and <i>Fusarium</i> fungi. Soilless culture, organic production, and substrates/plug plants are also not technically viable alternatives to methyl bromide for fungi. Various aspects of organic production – e.g., cover crops, fallow land, and steam sterilization - have already been addressed in this document and assessed to be technically infeasible methyl bromide alternatives.	No
COMBINATIONS OF ALTERNATIVES		
Metam sodium + Chloropicrin	Would possibly be more effective than metam-sodium alone where fungal pests are the only concern (see Michigan sections for more discussion), but this combination may not prevent yield losses due to nutsedges, particularly where the weed pressure is high. U.S. EPA is aware of one vegetable study that showed control of yellow nutsedge with this chemical combination, but weed pressure in that small plot test was low, according to the authors (Csinos et al. 1999).	No
1,3 dichloropropene + Metam-sodium	Controls nematodes but not nutsedges. U.S. EPA is aware of one vegetable study that showed control of yellow nutsedge with this chemical combination, but weed pressure in that small plot test was low, according to the authors (Csinos et al. 1999). Inconsistently effective against fungal pests (see Michigan sections for more discussion). 1,3-D also subject to regulatory prohibition of use on Karst geology.	No
1,3 dichloropropene (Telone II) followed by chloropicrin	Culpepper and Langston (2004) have tested the effectiveness of several soil fumigant combinations for the management of nutsedges and nematodes affecting peppers in Tifton, Georgia. Results show that 1,3-D followed by chloropicrin was significantly less effective than MB for the control of both purple and yellow nutsedge, but as effective as MB for the control soil nematodes. In terms of spring and fall crop yield, however, this combination performed as well as MB. This treatment is promising and will require further testing and validation in commercial fields.	No, but shows some promise

NAME OF ALTERNATIVE	TECHNICAL AND REGULATORY* REASONS FOR THE ALTERNATIVE NOT BEING FEASIBLE OR AVAILABLE	IS THE ALTERNATIVE CONSIDERED COST EFFECTIVE?
1,3 dichloropropene + chloropicrin	This combination does not adequately control nutsedge. Due to ground-water contamination concerns, 1,3-D cannot be used in pepper growing areas of the U.S. where karst topography exists. Where 1,3-dichloropropene use is allowed, set back restrictions (~ 100 meters from occupied structures; ~ 30 meters for emulsified formulations applied via chemigation) may limit the proportion of the field that can be treated. In addition, because of a 28-day waiting period between application and planting (compared to 14 days for MB), growers could lose half of the harvest season and miss higher-end market windows, mainly for spring fumigations (i.e., fall harvests). (SE Pepper Consortium, CUE # 03-0041).	No
1,3 dichloropropene + chloropicrin (Telone C35) followed by chloropicrin	Culpepper and Langston (2004) have tested the effectiveness of several soil fumigant combinations for the management of nutsedges and nematodes affecting peppers in Tifton, Georgia. In this study, 1,3-D + chloropicrin, followed by more chloropicrin was more effective than MB for the control of yellow nutsedge, but less effective against purple nutsedge. This treatment performed as well as MB in terms of spring crop yield, but poorly in terms of fall yield. This combination does not appear to show promise as a MB alternative.	No
1,3 dichloropropene + chloropicrin (Telone C35) followed by metam sodium	Culpepper and Langston (2004) have tested the effectiveness of several soil fumigant combinations for the management of nutsedges and nematodes affecting peppers in Tifton, Georgia. In this study, 1,3-D + chloropicrin, followed by metam sodium was 36% less effective than MB for the control of purple nutsedge, but as effective as MB for the control of yellow nutsedge and soil nematodes. In terms of spring and fall crop yield, this treatment performed as well as MB. This combination is promising and will require further testing and validation in commercial fields.	No, but shows promise
Fumigant combination + herbicide partners	Current research suggests that in areas of low pest pressure this combination may be suitable for some growers as an alternative for methyl bromide. In these situations growers may employ a marginal strategy without major economic dislocation if given a reasonable time frame for the transition.	Yes

* Regulatory reasons include local restrictions (e.g. occupational health and safety, local environmental regulations) and lack of registration.

GEORGIA- 14. LIST AND DISCUSS WHY REGISTERED (and Potential) PESTICIDES AND HERBICIDES ARE CONSIDERED NOT EFFECTIVE AS TECHNICAL ALTERNATIVES TO METHYL BROMIDE:

GEORGIA – TABLE 14.1: TECHNICALLY INFEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES DISCUSSION

NAME OF ALTERNATIVE	DISCUSSION
Halosulfuron-methyl	For nutsedges: potential crop injury; plant back restrictions. Efficacy is lowered in rainy conditions (which are common in this region). Also, a 24 month plant back restriction may cause significant economic disruption if growers must rely on this control option.
Glyphosate	For nutsedges: Non-selective; will not control nutsedge in the plant rows; does not provide residual control. Repeated applications are required for control even in row middles.
Paraquat	For nutsedges: Non-selective; will not control nutsedge in the plant rows; does not provide residual control

Other than those options discussed in Table 13.1 and elsewhere in this document, no alternative exists for the control of the key pests and fungi affecting pepper production. Non-chemical alternatives and chemical alternatives to methyl bromide have been or are being investigated and when suitable, are incorporated into current pepper production practices.

Nutsedge management has proven to be difficult due to the perennial growth habit of nutsedge and tubers as primary means of propagation. There are no herbicides which control nutsedge in the crop row. Paraquat and glyphosate will suppress emerged nutsedge, but cannot be used in the crop row because of potential crop injury (SE Pepper Consortium CUE 02-0041). Research suggests that metam sodium can, in some situations, provide effective pest management for certain plant pathogens and weeds. However, even though there have been nearly 50 years experience with metam sodium, (which breaks down to methyl isothiocyanate) nutsedge control results have been unpredictable.

Since methyl bromide has been used effectively to manage minor crop production, there are limited pesticide alternatives due primarily to the small market share and the high cost associated with pesticide registration. Labeling of these products in minor crops could be more expensive than returns from potential sales, and therefore pesticide manufacturers have been reluctant to register pesticides for minor crop uses. Methyl bromide will be needed until a cost-effective alternative regimen is in place.

The applicant supplied information indicating pepper yield in fields treated with 1,3-D was 43% below MB-treated fields, though these results are as yet unpublished.

GEORGIA 15. LIST PRESENT (and Possible Future) REGISTRATION STATUS OF ANY CURRENT AND POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVES:

GEORGIA – TABLE 15.1: PRESENT REGISTRATION STATUS OF ALTERNATIVES FOR PEPPERS

NAME OF ALTERNATIVE	PRESENT REGISTRATION STATUS	REGISTRATION BEING CONSIDERED BY NATIONAL AUTHORITIES? (Y/N)	DATE OF POSSIBLE FUTURE REGISTRATION:
Iodomethane	Not registered	Yes	Unknown
Furfural (Multigard™)	Not registered	No	Unknown
Sodium azide	Not registered. No registration application received.	No	Unknown
Propargyl bromide	Not registered. No registration application received.	No	Unknown
Muscador albus Strain QST 20799	Registration package has been received.	Yes	Registered but not yet for sale in the U.S.

GEORGIA - 16. STATE RELATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF RELEVANT ALTERNATIVES COMPARED TO METHYL BROMIDE FOR THE SPECIFIC KEY TARGET PESTS AND WEEDS FOR WHICH IT IS BEING REQUESTED:

GEORGIA - TABLE 16.1. FUMIGANT ALTERNATIVES TO METHYL BROMIDE FOR POLYETHYLENE-MULCHED TOMATO (LOCASCIO ET AL. 1997)

Chemicals	Rate (kg/ha)	Average Nutsedge Density (#/m ²)	Average Marketable Yield (ton/ha)	% Yield Loss (compared to MB)
<i>UNTREATED (CONTROL)</i>	-	300 ^{ab}	20.1 ^a	59.1
MB + Pic (67-33), chisel-injected	390 kg	90 ^c	49.1 ^b	---
1,3 D + Pic (83-17), chisel-injected	327 l	340 ^a	34.6 ^c	29.5
Metam Na, Flat Fumigation	300 l	320 ^a	22.6 ^a	54.0
Metam Na, drip irrigated	300 l	220 ^b	32.3 ^c	34.2

Notes: (1) Numbers followed by the same letter (within a column) are not significantly different at the 0.05 level of probability, using Duncan's multiple range test.
 (2) Data shown are from the Gainesville/Horticultural Unit site, 1994 season (this was one of three sites included in this study). This site had relatively high nutsedge pressure, and data for both pest pressure and marketable yields for all treatments shown.

Locascio et al. (1997) studied MB alternatives on tomatoes grown in small plots at two Florida locations with high nutsedge infestation. The data from the tomato study are being cited because pepper data are not available.

Various treatments were tested on plots that had multiple pests. At the Bradenton site there was moderate to heavy *Fusarium* infestation; heavy purple nutsedge infestation and light root-knot nematode pressure. At Gainesville there was heavy infestation of yellow and purple nutsedge and moderate infestation of root-knot nematode. The treatments at both locations included MB (67%) + chloropicrin (33%) chisel-injected at 390 kg/ha; metam-sodium (chisel-injected) at 300L/ha; metam-sodium drip-irrigated at 300L/ha; and 1,3-D + 17% chloropicrin chisel-injected at 327L/ha. In pairwise statistical comparisons, the yield was significantly lower in metam-sodium treatments compared to MB at both sites. At Bradenton, the average yield from both metam-sodium treatments was 33% of the MB yields, suggesting a 67% yield loss from not using MB. At Gainesville, the average yield of the two metam-sodium treatments was 56% of the MB yield, suggesting a 44% yield loss from not using MB. The yield of the 1,3-D treatment at Gainesville was 71% of the MB standard suggesting a 29% loss by not using MB (yield data for 1,3-D were not reported for Bradenton). { In considering 1,3 D results, one must keep in mind that this MB alternative cannot be used in areas where karst geology exists. }

GEORGIA – TABLE C.1: ALTERNATIVES YIELD LOSS DATA SUMMARY

ALTERNATIVE	LIST TYPE OF PEST	RANGE OF YIELD LOSS	BEST ESTIMATE OF YIELD LOSS
1,3 D + chloropicrin	Nutsedges, fungal pathogens	20 – 100	29
Metam-sodium (with or without chloropicrin)	Nutsedges, fungal pathogens	30 – 55	44
OVERALL LOSS ESTIMATE FOR ALL ALTERNATIVES TO PESTS			29 % if 1,3 D + pic is used; 44 % if metam-sodium is used

GEORGIA - 17. ARE THERE ANY OTHER POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVES UNDER DEVELOPMENT WHICH ARE BEING CONSIDERED TO REPLACE METHYL BROMIDE?

There are plans to conduct studies on tomato, pepper, and cucurbit crops with combinations of fumigants and herbicides including halosulfuron, metolachlor, rimsulfuron, and dimethenamid. Telone C-35 will be used as a fumigant because of nematode and plant pathogen problems.

Trials using the alternative fumigants Telone C-35, iodomethane, metam sodium, chloropicrin, and at least two low risk products (Propozone, PlantPro45, DiTera, Deny) are also planned. These trials will incorporate screening of pepper varieties for tolerance/resistance to *P. capsici*. The applicant noted that a program to evaluate host resistance to *Phytophthora* root and crown rot has been implemented. Growers are starting to deploy lines identified with genetic resistance and acceptable horticultural qualities.

In addition, the following new long-term studies have been initiated at the Coastal Plain Experiment Station in Tifton, Georgia, with funding provided by USDA-CSREES, Methyl Bromide Transitions Grant:

- Evaluation of the effects of soil conditions, particularly soil temperature and moisture, on nutsedge species efficacy from several fumigants.

- Investigation of the impact of multiple-season adoption of methyl bromide alternatives in terms of pest species composition, including weeds, diseases, and nematodes.

- Integration of multiple tactics as alternatives to methyl bromide for management of weeds, diseases, and nematodes in pepper and eggplant.

Evaluation of vegetable crop response to herbicides applied under plastic prior to crop transplants and characterize herbicide fate when applied in a plasticulture system between summer and fall crops.

GEORGIA - 18. ARE THERE TECHNOLOGIES BEING USED TO PRODUCE THE CROP WHICH AVOID THE NEED FOR METHYL BROMIDE?

No. soilless systems and greenhouse production are not in use for peppers and quick adoption is probably economically infeasible. Grafting has not been evaluated for vegetable production due to the high cost and the large number of plants that would be needed. In addition this alternative is primarily used for nematode and plant pathogen management, but there is no evidence that it applies to competition from weeds. Plug plants are extensively used on high value vegetable crops like pepper but they do not control competition from nutsedges.

GEORGIA - SUMMARY OF TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY

There has been extensive research on alternatives for solanaceous crops, and methyl bromide minimizing practices have been incorporated into pepper production systems where possible. However, the effectiveness of chemical and non-chemical alternatives designed to fully replace methyl bromide must still be characterized as preliminary. These alternatives have not been shown to be stand-alone replacements for methyl bromide, and no combination has been shown to provide effective, economical pest control. Methyl bromide is believed to be the only treatment currently available that consistently provides reliable control of nutsedge species and the plant pathogen complex affecting pepper production. Nutsedges resist traditional and modern methods of weed control and are endemic to large tracts of pepper producing area in the Southeastern United States. Herbicides are applied to the row middles between raised production beds to manage grass and broadleaf weeds, but there are no currently registered herbicides to address nutsedges in the row. Nematodes, especially root knot nematodes (*Meloidogyne* spp.), and fungal diseases (such as *Phytophthora* blight) are also of concern. These pests are expected to become serious problems for pepper production if methyl bromide were not available for pre-plant fumigation.

The 1,3-dichloropropene and chloropicrin combination does not effectively control nutsedges. Lack of an effective registered herbicide for control of nutsedge impairs adoption of methyl bromide alternatives in pepper (Banks, 2002). In addition, labeling of 1,3-dichloropropene products restricts its use in key pepper growing areas of the U.S. where karst topography exists, due to ground-water contamination concerns. In areas where 1,3-dichloropropene use is allowed, set back restrictions, and 7-28 day waiting periods between application and planting cause delays/adjustments in production schedules that could lead to missing specific market windows, thus reducing profits on pepper crops. For example,

peppers produced during the winter fetch a higher price than peppers produced during warmer months, and many growers rely on this price premium to maintain profitability.

Metam sodium provides limited and erratic performance at suppressing all major solanaceous pathogens and pests. Data indicate that metam sodium is not an effective alternative to methyl bromide for nutsedge control in bell pepper fields Webster et al., (2002 a). A 14-30 day planting delay is also recommended for this chemical. In addition there is evidence that both 1,3-dichloropropene and methyl isothiocyanate (the breakdown product of metam sodium) levels decline more rapidly, thus further compromising efficacy, in areas where these are repeatedly applied (Smelt et al. 1989, Ou et al. 1995, Gamliel et al. 2003). This is due to enhanced degradation of these chemicals by soil microbes (Dungan and Yates 2003).

Culpepper and Langston (2004) recently compared the effectiveness of several soil fumigants in managing soil pests affecting peppers in Tifton, Georgia. Results show that 1,3-D followed by chloropicrin was significantly less effective than methyl bromide for the control of both purple and yellow nutsedge, but as effective as MB for the control soil nematodes. In terms of spring and fall crop yield, this treatment performed as well as MB. 1,3-D + chloropicrin, followed by more chloropicrin was more effective than MB for the control of yellow nutsedge, but less effective against purple nutsedge. This treatment performed as well as MB in terms of spring crop yield, but poorly in terms of fall yield. 1,3-D + chloropicrin, followed by metam sodium was 36% less effective than methyl bromide for the control of purple nutsedge, but as effective as MB for the control of yellow nutsedge. This combination was as effective as MB against soil nematodes. In terms of spring and fall crop yield, this treatment performed as well as MB. These treatments are showing promise and will require further testing and validation in commercial fields.

Research on the effectiveness of non-chemical alternatives to methyl bromide is still in a preliminary stage, particularly for high value, minor-use crops.

PART B: FLORIDA -CROP CHARACTERISTICS AND METHYL BROMIDE USE ON PEPPERS

FLORIDA - 10. KEY DISEASES AND WEEDS FOR WHICH METHYL BROMIDE IS REQUESTED AND SPECIFIC REASONS FOR THIS REQUEST

FLORIDA- TABLE 10.1: KEY DISEASES AND WEEDS AND REASON FOR METHYL BROMIDE REQUEST

REGION WHERE METHYL BROMIDE USE IS REQUESTED	TARGET PATHOGENS, NEMATODES AND/OR WEED(S) TO GENUS AND, IF KNOWN, TO SPECIES LEVEL	SPECIFIC REASONS WHY METHYL BROMIDE IS NEEDED
--	---	---

Florida	<p>Weeds: yellow & purple nutsedges (<i>Cyperus rotundus</i> & <i>C. esculentus</i>), nightshade (<i>Solanum</i> spp.), white clover (<i>Trifolium repens</i>), ragweed (<i>Ambrosia artemisiifolia</i>)</p> <p>Plant diseases: phytophthora blight (<i>Phytophthora</i> spp.), damping-off (<i>Rhizoctonia solani</i>, <i>Pythium</i> spp.), white mold (<i>Sclerotinia sclerotiorum</i>)</p> <p>Nematodes: root-knot nematodes (<i>Meloidogyne</i> spp.),</p>	<p>Only MB can effectively control the target pests found in Florida, where pest pressures commonly exist at moderate to severe levels. Use of 1,3-D is restricted in key pepper growing areas of Florida underlain by karst geology and sandy (porous) sub-soils, geological features that could lead to ground-water contamination. Approximately 40% of Florida's pepper production land has these soil constraints. For instance, 1,3-D is prohibited in Dade County, where 100% of the pepper growing area is affected (U.S. EPA, 2002, Noling, 2003). Metam-sodium has limited pest control capabilities and is not useful as a stand-alone fumigant (Noling, 2003). Halosulfuron, which is effective against nutsedge, is only registered for use in row middles in peppers.</p>
---------	---	---

FLORIDA - 11. (i) CHARACTERISTICS OF CROPPING SYSTEM AND CLIMATE

FLORIDA - TABLE 11.1: CHARACTERISTICS OF CROPPING SYSTEM

CHARACTERISTICS	FLORIDA
CROP TYPE:	Pepper transplants for fruit production
ANNUAL OR PERENNIAL CROP:	Annual (usually 1 yr)
TYPICAL CROP ROTATION) AND USE OF METHYL BROMIDE FOR OTHER CROPS IN THE ROTATION:	Eggplants or cucurbits
SOIL TYPES:	Sandy and sandy-loam soils
FREQUENCY OF METHYL BROMIDE FUMIGATION:	1 time per year
OTHER RELEVANT FACTORS:	Double-cropped with cucurbits

FLORIDA - TABLE 11.2 CHARACTERISTICS OF CLIMATE AND CROP SCHEDULE

	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	Sept	Oct	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB
CLIMATIC ZONES	Plant Hardiness Zones 9a; 9b; 10a, 10.											
RAINFALL (mm), TAMPA, FL	65.5	50.0	72.5	134.1	175.8	193.3	152.7	65.0	42.7	158.8	62.0	66.8,
OUTSIDE TEMP. (°C); TAMPA, FL	19.4	22.1	25.3	27.6	28.2	28.2	27.3	24.1	19.2	17.3	16.0	16.9
FUMIGATION SCHEDULE^A						X	X	X	X	X	X	
TRANSPLANTING SCHEDULE; *NON DOUBLE-CROPPED^B	X						X	X	X	X	X	X
KEY HARVEST WINDOW; NON DOUBLE-CROPPED^C	X	X	X	X					X	X	X	X

^A Non-double cropped: earliest start date: August 15; cells marked with an "x" represent variation in fumigation initiation amongst pepper growers.

^B For Non-Double cropped pepper production, transplanting peppers is usually initiated around September 1; cells marked with an "x" represent variation in transplanting dates amongst pepper growers.

^C For Non-Double Cropped Peppers: Harvest Period usually begins as early as Nov. 15, and may continue until June 15, depending on when planted and weather conditions.

FLORIDA - TABLE 11.3 CHARACTERISTICS OF CLIMATE AND CROP SCHEDULE – PEPPERS DOUBLE CROPPED WITH ANOTHER VEGETABLE (USUALLY CUCURBITS)

	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	Oct	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB
CLIMATIC ZONES	Plant Hardiness Zones 9a; 9b; 10a, 10.											
RAINFALL (mm), TAMPA, FL	65.5	50.0	72.5	134.1	175.8	193.3	152.7	65.0	42.7	158.8	62.0	66.8,
OUTSIDE TEMP. (°C); TAMPA, FL	19.4	22.1	25.3	27.6	28.2	28.2	27.3	24.1	19.2	17.3	16.0	16.9
FUMIGATION SCHEDULE; DOUBLE-CROPPED^A						X	X					
TRANSPLANTING SCHEDULE; DOUBLE-CROPPED^B	2C	2C					P	P				2C
KEY HARVEST WINDOW; DOUBLE-CROPPED^C	P	P	2C	2C	2C				P	P	P	P

^ADouble-cropped; assumed to be with cucurbits; earliest start date is August 15; shaded cells represent variation in fumigation initiation among pepper growers who double-crop.

^BFor Double-Cropped pepper production, transplanting (**P**) is typically initiated on September 1; variance can be until October 31. The second crop of cucurbits (usually) transplants (indicated by “**2C**”) would typically be initiated around Feb 15, and may vary until April 30

^CFor Double Cropped peppers, Harvest Period usually begins as early as Nov. 15, (**P**), may continue until April 15, depending on when planted and weather conditions; Harvesting of second crop (**2C**) may start around May and continue until mid-July.

Climate Zone designation (<http://www.usna.usda.gov/Hardzone>)

FLORIDA – 11. (ii) INDICATE IF ANY OF THE ABOVE CHARACTERISTICS IN 11. (i) PREVENT THE UPTAKE OF ANY RELEVANT ALTERNATIVES?

The sandy soils of Florida are a contributing factor to the erratic performance suppressing weeds, nematodes, and plant pathogens of the metam sodium + chloropicrin combination, the most promising alternative to methyl bromide currently available for use in Dade County (because of label restrictions for 1,3-D). Methyl bromide has higher vapor pressure than metam sodium, therefore can penetrate and diffuse throughout the soil more effectively than metam sodium.

Several climatic factors appeared to contribute to increases in plant pathogens, e.g., Southern stem blight, caused by the soil-borne fungus (*Sclerotium rolfsii*) across the production area, even with methyl bromide. Variations in rainfall and soil and air temperatures may predispose developing plants to diseases caused by plant-pathogenic fungi. Furthermore, in the fall, temperature and rainfall patterns favor high levels of nematode infestation.

FLORIDA - 12. HISTORIC PATTERN OF USE OF METHYL BROMIDE, AND/OR MIXTURES CONTAINING METHYL BROMIDE, FOR WHICH AN EXEMPTION IS REQUESTED

FLORIDA - TABLE 12.1 HISTORIC PATTERN OF USE OF METHYL BROMIDE

FOR AS MANY YEARS AS POSSIBLE AS SHOWN SPECIFY:	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
AREA TREATED (<i>hectares</i>)	8,903	8,741	8,741	8,195	8,417	8,701
RATIO OF FLAT FUMIGATION METHYL BROMIDE USE TO STRIP/BED USE	100% strip treatments are used in this region					
AMOUNT OF METHYL BROMIDE ACTIVE INGREDIENT USED (<i>total kilograms</i>)	1,644,501	1,431,639	1,406,135	1,285,199	1,320,860	1,338,006
FORMULATIONS OF METHYL BROMIDE (<i>methyl bromide /chloropicrin</i>) ^A	98:2 & 67:33	98:2 & 67:33	67:33	67:33	67:33	67:33
METHOD BY WHICH METHYL BROMIDE APPLIED ^A	Sweptback chisel-shank, 25-30.5 cm.deep	Sweptback chisel-shank, 25-30.5 cm.deep	Sweptback chisel-shank, 25-30.5 cm.deep	Sweptback chisel-shank, 25-30.5 cm.deep	Sweptback chisel-shank, 25-30.5 cm.deep	Sweptback chisel-shank, 25-30.5 cm.deep
DOSAGE RATE OF STRIP/ BED, G MB/M ²	18.5	16.4	16.1	15.7	15.7	15.4

^A Sources: personal communication, Professor J.W. Noling, November 25, 2003; M. Aerts, December 2, 2003.

Florida - PART C: TECHNICAL VALIDATION

FLORIDA - 13. REASON FOR ALTERNATIVES NOT BEING FEASIBLE

FLORIDA – TABLE 13.1: REASON FOR ALTERNATIVES NOT BEING FEASIBLE

NAME OF ALTERNATIVE	TECHNICAL AND REGULATORY* REASONS FOR THE ALTERNATIVE NOT BEING FEASIBLE OR AVAILABLE	IS THE ALTERNATIVE CONSIDERED COST EFFECTIVE?
CHEMICAL ALTERNATIVES		

NAME OF ALTERNATIVE	TECHNICAL AND REGULATORY* REASONS FOR THE ALTERNATIVE NOT BEING FEASIBLE OR AVAILABLE	IS THE ALTERNATIVE CONSIDERED COST EFFECTIVE?
1,3 dichloropropene	<p>1,3-D provides control of nematode populations, but poor control of plant pathogens and weeds. Control of nematodes is erratic, due to poor distribution of the fumigant in the sandy soils of Florida. 1,3-D's use is prohibited due to groundwater contamination in key pepper growing areas with karst geology, which is estimated to be about 40% in of FL pepper area in 2002. In Dade County, a major pepper production area, 100% of pepper acreage is affected by a label prohibition that addresses groundwater contamination concerns. In areas where 1,3-D use is allowed, set back restrictions (~ 100 meters from occupied structures; ~ 30 meters for emulsified formulations applied via chemigation) may limit the portion of a field that can be treated. In addition, the 28-day waiting period between application and planting can cause delays/adjustments in production schedules that could lead to missing specific higher-end market windows.</p>	No
Metam-sodium/potassium	<p>Provides limited and erratic performance for suppressing major pepper pathogens and pests. Does not work under high pest pressure. This soil fumigant is considered the best available alternative for Dade County only, where 1,3 D use is prohibited (Aerts, 2003). This is at best a treatment that complements other fumigants and herbicides, and is not a stand-alone option (Noling, 2003). Metam sodium has a lower vapor pressure than methyl bromide, and therefore cannot penetrate and diffuse throughout the soil as effectively as MB. In addition, the effectiveness of metam sodium is dependent on the organic matter and moisture content of the soil. Metam sodium tends to degrade rapidly in warm soils where it has been previously used.</p>	No

NAME OF ALTERNATIVE	TECHNICAL AND REGULATORY* REASONS FOR THE ALTERNATIVE NOT BEING FEASIBLE OR AVAILABLE	IS THE ALTERNATIVE CONSIDERED COST EFFECTIVE?
NON CHEMICAL ALTERNATIVES		
Solarization	Solarization is not technically feasible as a methyl bromide alternative for control of nutsedges. Research indicates that the lethal temperature for nutsedge tubers is 50 °C or higher (Chase et al. 1999. Trials conducted in mid-summer in Georgia resulted in maximal soil temperatures of 43 °C at 5 cm depth. Thus, solarization, even in the warmer months in southern states, did not result in temperatures reliably high enough to destroy nutsedge tubers, and tubers lodged deeper in the soil would be completely unaffected. Response of <i>Cyperus</i> species to solarization is sporadic and not well understood and data show solarization to provide, at best, suppression of nutsedge populations (Chase et al. 1999). In addition, solarization will take fields out of production since it would be needed during the spring and into the summer months, which are optimal for pepper production.	No
Steam	Steam is not a technically feasible alternative for open field pepper production because it requires sustained heat over a required period of time (UNEP 1998). While steam has been used effectively against fungal pests in protected production systems, such as greenhouses, there is no evidence that it would be effective in open field pepper crops. Any such system would also require large amounts of energy and water to provide sufficient steam necessary to sterilize soil down to the rooting depth of field crops (at least 20-50 cm).	No
Biological Control	Biological control agents alone cannot control nutsedge and/or the soil pathogens that afflict peppers. The bacterium <i>Burkholderia cepacia</i> and the fungus <i>Gliocladium virens</i> have shown some potential in controlling some fungal plant pathogens (Larkin and Fravel 1998). However, no biological control agent has been identified to effectively control nutsedge or <i>Phytophthora</i> . Therefore, biological control is not a stand-alone replacement for methyl bromide in pepper crops. Only a limited number of biological organisms are effectively used to manage soil borne plant pathogens and pests.	No
Cover crops and mulching	Cover crops and mulches have been integrated to solanaceous crop production management. However there is no evidence these practices effectively substitute for the control methyl bromide provides against nutsedges (Burgos and Talbert 1996). Some cover crops that have been shown to reduce weed populations also reduced or delayed crop maturity and/or emergence, as well as yields (Burgos and Talbert 1996, Galloway and Weston 1996). Mulching has also been shown to be ineffective in controlling nutsedges, since these plants are able to penetrate through both organic and plastic mulches (Munn 1992, Patterson 1998).	No

NAME OF ALTERNATIVE	TECHNICAL AND REGULATORY* REASONS FOR THE ALTERNATIVE NOT BEING FEASIBLE OR AVAILABLE	IS THE ALTERNATIVE CONSIDERED COST EFFECTIVE?
Crop rotation and fallow land	Crop rotation/fallow is not a technically feasible alternative to methyl bromide because it does not provide adequate control of nutsedges or fungal pathogens. The crop rotations available to growers are also susceptible to fungi; fallow land can still harbor fungal oospores (Lamour and Hausbeck 2003). As regards to nutsedges, tubers of these perennial species provide new plants with larger energy reserves than the annual weeds that can be frequently controlled by crop rotations and fallow land (Thullen and Keeley 1975). Furthermore, nutsedge plants can produce tubers within 2 weeks after emergence (Wilén et al. 2003). This enhances their survival across different cropping regimes that can disrupt other plants that rely on a longer undisturbed growing period to produce seeds to propagate the next generation.	No
Flooding/Water management	South Florida is generally subject to natural flooding during summer months, but other areas cannot be flooded because of lack of a shallow, impermeable layer. Although flooding is a pest management tool that has been used effectively to manage various soil borne pest and plant pathogens, nutsedges have shown tolerance to this treatment. Submergence of nutsedge tubers for periods of 8 days to 4 weeks showed no effect on the sprouting capabilities of the tubers (Horowitz, 1972). Studies in Florida (Allen, 1999) showed ineffective nematode, plant pathogen, and nutsedge control. Regulatory issues concerning water management, as well as economic feasibility, also preclude its viability as an alternative to methyl bromide. Land structure, frequent and severe droughts, and the economics of developing and managing flood capabilities will prevent flooding from being a viable, cost effective alternative in the Southeastern states.	No
Grafting/resistant rootstock/plant breeding/soilless culture/organic production/substrates/plug plants.	Due to the paucity of scientific information on the utility of these alternatives as methyl bromide replacements in peppers, they have been grouped together for discussion in this document. The U.S. was unable to locate any studies showing any potential for grafting, resistant rootstock or plant breeding as technically feasible alternatives to methyl bromide control of nutsedges. Plug plants are extensively used on high value vegetable crops like pepper but they do not control competition from nutsedges. There are no studies documenting the commercial availability of resistant rootstock immune to the fungal pathogens listed as major pepper pests. Grafting and plant breeding are thus also rendered technically infeasible as methyl bromide alternatives for control of <i>Phytophthora</i> and <i>Fusarium</i> fungi. Soilless culture, organic production, and substrates/plug plants are also not technically viable alternatives to methyl bromide for fungi. Various aspects of organic production – e.g., cover crops, fallow land, and steam sterilization - have already been addressed in this document and assessed to be technically infeasible methyl bromide alternatives.	No
COMBINATIONS OF ALTERNATIVES		

NAME OF ALTERNATIVE	TECHNICAL AND REGULATORY* REASONS FOR THE ALTERNATIVE NOT BEING FEASIBLE OR AVAILABLE	IS THE ALTERNATIVE CONSIDERED COST EFFECTIVE?
Metam sodium + Chloropicrin	This combination has been used in Florida since the 1970s. It is being tested as a leading alternative to MB in Dade County because of label restrictions for 1,3-D, which do not allow its use in that county. However, it has shown erratic performance suppressing weeds, nematodes, and plant pathogens in the sandy soils of Florida. MB has higher vapor pressure than metam sodium and can penetrate and diffuse throughout the soil more effectively. Trials in tomato have shown inconsistent efficacy of this combination against soil pathogens, though it is generally better than metam-sodium alone (Locascio and Dickson 1998, Csinos et al. 1999). This alternative will require further testing and validation on commercial fields.	No, but shows promise
1,3 dichloropropene + chloropicrin (Telone C35)	Although this combination, by itself, is not effective in areas with moderate to high nutsedge pressure, it can provide season long control when coupled with herbicides (Chellemi et al. 2001; Gilreath and Santos, 2003). Trials comparing Flat Fumigation applications with standard in-row applications indicated the need to increase the amount of chloropicrin to compensate for the potential decrease in efficacy of 1,3-D applied via Flat Fumigation. Applications via micro-irrigation systems have yielded mixed results, probably due to poor lateral distribution of the chemical in the soil (Martin 2003; Dungan and Yates, 2003). In addition, 1,3-D's use is prohibited due to groundwater contamination in areas with karst geology, estimated to be about 40% in of FL pepper area in 2002. In Dade County this combination is not allowed at all. A Telone C35 application, along with a herbicide mix (e.g. clomazone + metolachlor) applied at bed formation, has been identified by the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association as the recommended best MB alternative outside karst geology areas. Although promising, this alternative will require further testing and validation on commercial fields.	No, but shows promise for non-karst geology areas.
1,3 dichloropropene + Metam-sodium	Trials in tomato have shown inconsistent efficacy of this formulation against fungal pests, though it is generally better than metam-sodium alone (Csinos et al. 1999). Low efficacy in even small-plot trials indicates that this is not a technically feasible alternative for commercially produced peppers at this time. In addition, 1,3-D's use is prohibited due to groundwater contamination in all pepper growing areas with karst geology, estimated to be about 40% in of FL pepper area in 2002. In Dade County 100% of pepper acreage is affected by this limitation.	No
Fumigant combination + herbicide partners	Current research suggests that in areas of low pest pressure this combination may be suitable for some growers as an alternative for methyl bromide. In these situations growers may employ a marginal strategy without major economic dislocation if given a reasonable time frame for the transition	Yes

* Regulatory reasons include local restrictions (e.g. occupational health and safety, local environmental regulations) and lack of registration.

FLORIDA - 14. LIST AND DISCUSS WHY REGISTERED (and Potential) PESTICIDES AND HERBICIDES ARE CONSIDERED NOT EFFECTIVE AS TECHNICAL ALTERNATIVES TO METHYL BROMIDE:

FLORIDA – TABLE 14.1: TECHNICALLY INFEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES DISCUSSION

NAME OF ALTERNATIVE	DISCUSSION
Halosulfuron-methyl	For nutsedges: potential crop injury; plant back restrictions. Efficacy is lowered in rainy conditions (which are common in this region). Also, a 24-month plant back restriction may cause significant economic disruption if growers must rely on this control option. Halosulfuron is registered for use in row middles only.
Glyphosate	For nutsedges: Non-selective; will not control nutsedge in the plant rows; does not provide residual control
Paraquat	For nutsedges: Non-selective; will not control nutsedge in the plant rows; does not provide residual control. Another weed, nightshade, has shown resistance to paraquat, a dangerous development since this plant serves as a reservoir for many insects (e.g., whiteflies), that are vectors of pepper diseases (Aerts, 2004)

Other than those options discussed in Table 13.1 and elsewhere in this document, no alternative exists for the control of the key pests and fungi affecting pepper production. Non-chemical alternatives and chemical alternatives to methyl bromide have been or are being investigated and when suitable, incorporated into current pepper production practices.

Nutsedge management has proven to be difficult due to the perennial growth habit of nutsedge and tubers as primary means of propagation. There are no herbicides which control nutsedge in the crop row. Paraquat and glyphosate will suppress emerged nutsedge, but cannot be used in the crop row because of potential crop injury (SE Pepper Consortium CUE 02-0041). Research suggests that metam sodium can, in some situations, provide effective pest management for certain plant pathogens and weeds. However, even though there have been nearly 50 years experience with metam sodium, (which breaks down to methyl isothiocyanate) nutsedge control results have been unpredictable.

Since methyl bromide has been used effectively to manage minor crop production, there are limited pesticide alternatives due primarily to the small market share and the high cost associated with pesticide registration. Labeling of these products in minor crops could be more expensive than returns from potential sales, and therefore pesticide manufactures have been reluctant to register pesticides for minor crop uses. Methyl bromide will be needed until a cost-effective alternative regimen is in place.

FLORIDA - 15. LIST PRESENT (and Possible Future) REGISTRATION STATUS OF ANY CURRENT AND POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVES:

FLORIDA – TABLE 15.1: PRESENT REGISTRATION STATUS OF ALTERNATIVES

NAME OF ALTERNATIVE	PRESENT REGISTRATION STATUS	REGISTRATION BEING CONSIDERED BY NATIONAL AUTHORITIES? (Y/N)	DATE OF POSSIBLE FUTURE REGISTRATION:
Iodomethane	Pre-plant soil fumigant. Not registered yet	Yes	Unknown
Trifloxysulfuron sodium	Herbicide - recently registered for tomato in FL only. Crop injury potential exist	No	Unknown
Fosthiazate	Not registered on peppers	No	Unknown
Furfural (Multigard™)	Not registered	No	Unknown
Sodium azide	Not registered. No registration application received.	No	Unknown
Propargyl bromide	Not registered. No registration application received.	No	Unknown
<i>Paecilomyces lilacinus</i>	Biological nematicide; not registered	Yes	Unknown
Muscador albus Strain QST 20799	Registration package has been received.	Yes	Registered but not yet for sale in the U.S.

FLORIDA - 16. STATE RELATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF RELEVANT ALTERNATIVES COMPARED TO METHYL BROMIDE FOR THE SPECIFIC KEY TARGET PESTS AND WEEDS FOR WHICH IT IS BEING REQUESTED:

FLORIDA - TABLE 16.1. FUMIGANT ALTERNATIVES TO METHYL BROMIDE FOR POLYETHYLENE-MULCHED TOMATO (LOCASCIO ET AL. 1997)-)

Chemicals	Rate (kg/ha)	Average Nutsedge Density (#/m ²)	Average Marketable Yield (ton/ha)	% Yield Loss (compared to MB)
Untreated (control)	-	300 ^{ab}	20.1 ^a	59.1
MB + Pic (67-33), chisel-injected	390 kg	90 ^c	49.1 ^b	---
1,3 D + Pic (83-17), chisel-injected	327 l	340 ^a	34.6 ^c	29.5
Metam Na, Flat Fumigation	300 l	320 ^a	22.6 ^a	54.0
Metam Na, drip irrigated	300 l	220 ^b	32.3 ^c	34.2

Notes: (1) Numbers followed by the same letter (within a column) are not significantly different at the 0.05 level of probability, using Duncan’s multiple range test.

(2) Data shown are from the Gainesville/Horticultural Unit site, 1994 season (this was one of three sites included in this study). This site had relatively high nutsedge pressure, and data for both pest pressure and marketable yields for all treatments shown.

All fumigants were injected 15-20 cm deep, with three chisels per bed, 30 cm apart

Locascio et al. (1997) studied MB alternatives on tomatoes grown in small plots at two Florida locations with high nutsedge infestation. The data from the tomato study are being cited because pepper data are not available.

Various treatments were tested on plots that had multiple pests. At the Bradenton site there was moderate to heavy *Fusarium* infestation; heavy purple nutsedge infestation and light root-knot nematode pressure. At Gainesville there was heavy infestation of yellow and purple nutsedge and moderate infestation of root-knot nematode. The treatments at both locations included MB (67%) + chloropicrin (33%) chisel-injected at 390 kg/ha; metam-sodium (chisel-injected) at 300L/ha; metam-sodium drip-irrigated at 300L/ha; and 1,3-D + 17% chloropicrin chisel-injected at 327L/ha. In pairwise statistical comparisons, the yield was significantly lower in metam-sodium treatments compared to MB at both sites. At Bradenton, the average yield from both metam-sodium treatments was 33% of the MB yields, suggesting a 67% yield loss from not using MB. At Gainesville, the average yield of the two metam-sodium treatments was 56% of the MB yield, suggesting a 44% yield loss from not using MB. The yield of the 1,3-D treatment at Gainesville was 71% of the MB standard suggesting a 29% loss by not using MB (yield data for 1,3-D were not reported for Bradenton). In considering 1,3 D results, one must keep in mind that this MB alternative cannot be used in areas where karst geology exists, or anywhere in Dade county, a major production area.

FLORIDA – TABLE C.1: ALTERNATIVES YIELD LOSS DATA SUMMARY

ALTERNATIVE	LIST TYPE OF PEST	RANGE OF YIELD LOSS	BEST ESTIMATE OF YIELD LOSS
1,3 dichloropropene + chloropicrin	Nutsedges, fungal pathogens	20 - 100	29
Metam-sodium (with or without chloropicrin)	Nutsedges, fungal pathogens	30 - 55	44
OVERALL LOSS ESTIMATE FOR ALL ALTERNATIVES TO PESTS			29 % if 1,3 D + pic is used; 44 % if metam-sodium is used

FLORIDA - 17. ARE THERE ANY OTHER POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVES UNDER DEVELOPMENT WHICH ARE BEING CONSIDERED TO REPLACE METHYL BROMIDE?

Iodomethane is being considered for registration as a methyl bromide replacement. Its registration date is not known. Please refer to Table 15.1 for details.

FLORIDA- 18. ARE THERE TECHNOLOGIES BEING USED TO PRODUCE THE CROP WHICH AVOID THE NEED FOR METHYL BROMIDE?

The U.S. EPA is unaware of large- scale, commercial greenhouse operations for peppers or other technologies that could reduce methyl bromide use. There may be local or small community organic or hothouse pepper production that targets fresh market and/or temporal (seasonal) sectors.

Grafting has not been evaluated for vegetable production due to the high cost and the large number of plants that would be needed. In addition this alternative is primarily used for nematode and plant pathogen management, but there is no evidence that it applies to competition from weeds. Plug plants are extensively used on high value vegetable crops like pepper but they do not control competition from nutsedges.

FLORIDA - SUMMARY OF TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY

There has been extensive research on alternatives for solanaceous crops, and methyl bromide minimizing practices have been incorporated into pepper production systems where possible. However, the effectiveness of chemical and non-chemical alternatives designed to fully replace methyl bromide must still be characterized as preliminary. Weeds, particularly nutsedge, are the major pests of Florida peppers that drive the need for methyl bromide. There are no registered herbicides compatible with pepper production. Although s-metolachlor (Dual Magnum) and napropamide (Devrinol) were cited as herbicides with some potential to control nutsedges, their efficacy in sub-tropical Florida is inconsistent (Noling, 2003). Furthermore, s-metolachlor's effectiveness is restricted to yellow nutsedge. When nutsedge pressure is moderate to severe, 1,3-D + chloropicrin is not technically feasible because it needs to be coupled with an effective herbicide to provide control for the entire growing season (U.S. EPA, 2002). Frank et al (1992) reported that weeds in pepper for 40 to 60 days could reduce yields by 10 to 50 percent. Stall and Morales-Payan reported that tomato must be nutsedge-free for 2 to 10 weeks to keep yield reductions below 5 percent. There are no herbicides which control purple nutsedge in the crop row. Paraquat and glyphosate will suppress emerged nutsedge, but cannot be used in the crop row because of potential crop injury (SE Pepper Consortium CUE 02-0041).

In addition, labeling of 1,3-dichloropropene products restricts its use in key pepper growing areas of the U.S. where karst geology exists due to ground-water contamination concerns. In areas where 1,3-dichloropropene use is allowed, set back restrictions and a 28 day waiting periods, at the maximum label rate, between application and planting cause delays/adjustments in production schedules that could lead to missing specific market windows, thus reducing profits on pepper crops. For example, peppers produced during the winter fetch a higher price than peppers produced during warmer months, and many growers rely on this price premium to maintain profitability.

Metam sodium provides limited and erratic performance at suppressing all major solanaceous pathogens and pests. Data indicate that metam sodium is not an effective alternative to methyl bromide for nutsedge control in bell pepper fields (Webster et al. (2002). A 14-30 day planting delay is also recommended for this chemical. In addition there is evidence that both 1,3-dichloropropene and methyl isothiocyanate (the breakdown product of metam sodium) levels decline more rapidly, thus further compromising efficacy, in areas where these are repeatedly applied (Smelt et al. 1989, Ou et al. 1995, Gamliel et al. 2003). This is due to enhanced degradation of these chemicals by soil microbes (Dungan and Yates 2003).

Diseases caused by soil-borne plant pathogenic fungi, (e.g., *Sclerotinia*, *Phytophthora* spp., *Verticillium* spp., *Pythium* spp. and *Rhizoctonia solani*) commonly reside in many production areas, since many pepper production areas are old tomato production fields. Fungicides such as chlorothalonil, and azoxystrobin are considered to be only prophylactic, and may not offer sufficient pest management. Resistance of *Phytophthora* spp to metalaxyl and mefenoxem (Ridomil and Ridomil Gold, respectively) has been reported in tomato crop areas, and most recently pepper (Lamour and Hausbeck 2003).

Nematodes, such as the root knot nematode species of *Meloidogyne* were third, following weeds and fungal pathogens, in order of causing yield and economic losses in Florida peppers. Pre-plant control of nematodes is very important because root feeding and damage may predispose the plant tissues to fungal pathogens or bacterial wilt which can lead to significant yield loss. Fumigant alternatives such as metam-sodium (Vapam, K-pam) have proven inconsistent. (Noling, 2003; CUE #03-0017).

Research on the effectiveness of non-chemical alternatives to methyl bromide is still in a preliminary stage, particularly for high value, minor-use crops.

PART D: EMISSION CONTROL

19. TECHNIQUES THAT HAVE AND WILL BE USED TO MINIMIZE METHYL BROMIDE USE AND EMISSIONS IN THE PARTICULAR USE:

TABLE 19.1: TECHNIQUES TO MINIMIZE METHYL BROMIDE USE AND EMISSIONS

TECHNIQUE OR STEP TAKEN	VIF OR HIGH BARRIER FILMS	METHYL BROMIDE DOSAGE REDUCTION	INCREASED % CHLOROPICRIN IN METHYL BROMIDE FORMULATION	LESS FREQUENT APPLICATION
WHAT USE/EMISSION REDUCTION METHODS ARE PRESENTLY ADOPTED?	Currently some growers use HDPE tarps.	Growers have switched from a 98% MB formulation to a 67 % formulation. Between 1997 and 2001, the U.S. has achieved a 36 % reduction in use rates.	From 2 % to 33 %	No
WHAT FURTHER USE/EMISSION REDUCTION STEPS WILL BE TAKEN FOR THE METHYL BROMIDE USED FOR CRITICAL USES?	Research is underway to develop use in commercial production systems	A 50 % MB formulation is being tested in Michigan pepper fields. A similar formulation was tested in Florida and found to be ineffective.	A 50 % MB formulation is being tested in Michigan pepper fields. A similar formulation was tested in Florida and found to be ineffective.	The U.S. anticipates that the decreasing supply of methyl bromide will motivate growers to try less frequent applications.
OTHER MEASURES <i>(please describe)</i>	Examination of promising but presently unregistered alternative fumigants and herbicides, alone or in combination with non-chemical methods, is planned in all regions (Please see Section 17 for each region for details)	Measures adopted in Michigan will likely be used in the other regions when fungi are the only key pests involved	Measures adopted in Michigan will likely be used in the other regions when fungi are the only key pests involved	Unknown

20. IF METHYL BROMIDE EMISSION REDUCTION TECHNIQUES ARE NOT BEING USED, OR ARE NOT PLANNED FOR THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE NOMINATION, STATE REASONS

In accordance with the criteria of the critical use exemption, each party is required to describe ways in which it strives to minimize use and emissions of MB. The use of MB in the growing of peppers in the United States is minimized in several ways. First, because of its toxicity, MB has, for the last 40 years, been regulated as a restricted use pesticide in the United States. As a consequence, MB can only be used by certified applicators who are trained at handling these hazardous pesticides. In practice, this means that MB is applied by a limited number of very experienced applicators with the knowledge and expertise to minimize dosage to the lowest level possible to achieve the needed results. In keeping with both local requirements to avoid “drift” of methyl bromide into inhabited areas, as well as to preserve MB and keep related emissions to the lowest level possible, MB application for cucurbits is most often machine injected into soil to specific depths.

As MB has become scarce, users in the United States have, where possible, experimented with different mixes of MB and chloropicrin. Specifically, in the early 1990s, MB was typically sold and used in MB mixtures made up of 92% MB and 2% chloropicrin, with the chloropicrin being included solely to give the chemical a smell enabling those in the area to be alerted if there was a risk. However, with the outset of very significant controls on MB, users have been experimenting with significant increases in the level of chloropicrin and reductions in the level of MB. While these new mixtures have generally been effective at controlling target pests, at low to moderate levels of infestation, it must be stressed that the long-term efficacy of these mixtures is unknown.

Tarpaulin (high density polyethylene) is also used to minimize use and emissions of MB. In addition, pepper growers utilize cultural practices.

Reduced MB concentrations in mixtures, cultural practices, and the extensive use of tarpaulins to cover land treated with MB has resulted in reduced emissions and an application rate that we believe is among the lowest in the world for the uses described in this nomination.

PART E: ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT

Economic data from the 2004 submission for all applicants were not substantially different from those in 2003 (greater or less than a 10% change in costs and revenue). Given these insignificant differences, the economic analyses were not updated for any applicants other than Michigan, which was updated to reflect a change in the requested pounds of MeBr.

The following economic assessment is organized by MeBr critical use application. Cost of MeBr and alternatives are given first in table 21.1. This is followed in table 22.1 by a listing of net and gross revenues by applicant. Expected losses when using MeBr alternatives are then further decomposed in tables E1 through E5.

Reader, please note that in this study net revenue is calculated as gross revenue minus operating costs. This is a good measure as to the direct losses of income that may be suffered by the users. It should be noted that net revenue does not represent net income to the users. Net income, which indicates profitability of an operation of an enterprise, is gross revenue minus the sum of operating and fixed costs. Net income should be smaller than the net revenue measured in this study. We did not include fixed costs because it is often difficult to measure and verify.

21. OPERATING COSTS OF ALTERNATIVES COMPARED TO METHYL BROMIDE OVER 3-YEAR PERIOD:

TABLE 21.1: PEPPERS – OPERATING COSTS OF ALTERNATIVES COMPARED TO METHYL BROMIDE OVER 3-YEAR PERIOD

ALTERNATIVE	YIELD*	COST IN YEAR 1 (US\$/ha)	COST IN YEAR 2 (US\$/ha)	COST IN YEAR 3 (US\$/ha)
Florida				
Methyl Bromide	100%	\$20,341	\$20,341	\$20,341
1,3-D + Chloropicrin	71%	\$18,510	\$18,510	\$18,510
Metam-Sodium	56%	\$16,999	\$16,999	\$16,999
Georgia				
Methyl Bromide	100%	\$28,623	\$28,623	\$28,623
1,3-D + Chloropicrin	71%	\$25,790	\$25,790	\$25,790
Metam-Sodium	56%	\$23,598	\$23,598	\$23,598
Michigan				
Methyl Bromide	100%	\$23,938	\$23,938	\$23,938
1,3-D + Chloropicrin	94%	\$25,607	\$25,607	\$25,607
Southeast USA				
Methyl Bromide	100%	\$18,758	\$18,758	\$18,758
1,3-D + Chloropicrin	71%	\$18,844	\$18,844	\$18,844
Metam-Sodium	56%	\$16,731	\$16,731	\$16,731

* As percentage of typical or 3-year average yield, compared to methyl bromide e.g. 10% more yield, write 110.

22. GROSS AND NET REVENUE:

TABLE 22.1: PEPPERS – YEAR 1, 2, AND 3 GROSS AND NET REVENUES

ALTERNATIVES <i>(as shown in question 21)</i>	YEAR 1, 2, AND 3	
	GROSS REVENUE FOR LAST REPORTED YEAR <i>(US\$/ha)</i>	NET REVENUE FOR LAST REPORTED YEAR <i>(US\$/ha)</i>
Florida		
Methyl Bromide	\$29,498	\$9,158
1,3-D + Chloropicrin	\$20,944	\$2,433
Metam-Sodium	\$16,519	\$(479)
Georgia		
Methyl Bromide	\$35,176	\$6,553
1,3-D + Chloropicrin	\$24,975	\$(816)
Metam-Sodium	\$19,698	\$(3,900)
Michigan		
Methyl Bromide	\$24,056	\$118
1,3-D + Chloropicrin	\$20,916	\$(2,994)
Southeastern USA		
Methyl Bromide	\$30,579	\$11,822
1,3-D + Chloropicrin	\$21,711	\$2,867
Metam-Sodium	\$17,124	\$393

NOTE: Year 1 equals year 2 and 3.

MEASURES OF ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF METHYL BROMIDE ALTERNATIVES

FLORIDA PEPPER - TABLE E.1: ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF METHYL BROMIDE ALTERNATIVES

FLORIDA PEPPER	METHYL BROMIDE	1, 3-D + CHLOROPICRIN	METAM-SODIUM
YIELD LOSS (%)	0%	29%	44%
YIELD PER HECTARE	2,922	2,074	1,636
* PRICE PER UNIT (US\$)	\$10	\$10	\$10
= GROSS REVENUE PER HECTARE (US\$)	\$29,498	\$20,944	\$16,519
- OPERATING COSTS PER HECTARE (US\$)	\$20,341	\$18,510	\$16,999
= NET REVENUE PER HECTARE (US\$)	\$9,158	\$2,433	\$(479)
FIVE LOSS MEASURES *			
1. LOSS PER HECTARE (US\$)	\$0	\$6,724	\$9,637
2. LOSS PER KILOGRAM OF METHYL BROMIDE (US\$)	\$0	\$45	\$64
3. LOSS AS A PERCENTAGE OF GROSS REVENUE (%)	0%	23%	33%
4. LOSS AS A PERCENTAGE OF NET REVENUE (%)	0%	73%	105%
5. PROFIT MARGIN (%)	31%	12%	-3%

GEORGIA PEPPER - TABLE E.2: ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF METHYL BROMIDE ALTERNATIVES

GEORGIA PEPPER	METHYL BROMIDE	1, 3-D + CHLOROPICRIN	METAM-SODIUM
YIELD LOSS (%)	0%	29%	44%
YIELD PER HECTARE	4,440	3,152	2,486
* PRICE PER UNIT (US\$)	\$8	\$8	\$8
= GROSS REVENUE PER HECTARE (US\$)	\$35,176	\$24,975	\$19,698
- OPERATING COSTS PER HECTARE (US\$)	\$28,623	\$25,790	\$23,598
= NET REVENUE PER HECTARE (US\$)	\$6,553	\$(816)	\$(3,900)
FIVE LOSS MEASURES *			
1. LOSS PER HECTARE (US\$)	\$0	\$7,368	\$10,453
2. LOSS PER KILOGRAM OF METHYL BROMIDE (US\$)	\$0	\$49	\$70
3. LOSS AS A PERCENTAGE OF GROSS REVENUE (%)	0%	21%	30%
4. LOSS AS A PERCENTAGE OF NET REVENUE (%)	0%	112%	160%
5. PROFIT MARGIN (%)	19%	-3%	-20%

MICHIGAN PEPPER- TABLE E.3: ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF METHYL BROMIDE ALTERNATIVES

MICHIGAN PEPPER	METHYL BROMIDE	1, 3-D + CHLOROPICRIN
YIELD LOSS (%)	0%	6%
YIELD PER HECTARE	4,530	4,258
* PRICE PER UNIT (US\$)	\$5	\$5
= GROSS REVENUE PER HECTARE (US\$)	\$24,056	\$20,916
- OPERATING COSTS PER HECTARE (US\$)	\$23,938	\$25,607
= NET REVENUE PER HECTARE (US\$)	\$118	\$(4,690)
FIVE LOSS MEASURES *		
1. LOSS PER HECTARE (US\$)	\$0	\$4,808
2. LOSS PER KILOGRAM OF METHYL BROMIDE (US\$)	\$0	\$40
3. LOSS AS A PERCENTAGE OF GROSS REVENUE (%)	0%	20%
4. LOSS AS A PERCENTAGE OF NET REVENUE (%)	0%	100%
5. PROFIT MARGIN (%)	0%	-22%

SOUTHEASTERN USA (EXCEPT GEORGIA) PEPPER - TABLE E.4: ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF METHYL BROMIDE ALTERNATIVES

SOUTHEASTERN USA (EXCEPT GEORGIA) PEPPER	METHYL BROMIDE	1, 3-D + CHLOROPICRIN	METAM- SODIUM
YIELD LOSS (%)	0%	29%	44%
YIELD PER HECTARE	3,707	2,632	2,076
* PRICE PER UNIT (US\$)	\$8	\$8	\$8
= GROSS REVENUE PER HECTARE (US\$)	\$30,579	\$21,711	\$17,124
- OPERATING COSTS PER HECTARE (US\$)	\$18,758	\$18,844	\$16,731
= NET REVENUE PER HECTARE (US\$)	\$11,822	\$2,867	\$393
FIVE LOSS MEASURES *			
1. LOSS PER HECTARE (US\$)	\$0	\$8,954	\$11,429
2. LOSS PER KILOGRAM OF METHYL BROMIDE (US\$)	\$0	\$60	\$76
3. LOSS AS A PERCENTAGE OF GROSS REVENUE (%)	0%	29%	37%
4. LOSS AS A PERCENTAGE OF NET REVENUE (%)	0%	76%	97%
5. PROFIT MARGIN (%)	39%	13%	2%

SUMMARY OF ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY

There are currently few alternatives to methyl bromide for use in peppers. Furthermore, there are factors that limit existing alternatives' usability and efficacy from place to place. These include pest complex, climate, and regulatory restrictions. As described above, the two most promising alternatives to methyl bromide in Florida, Georgia, and the Southeastern USA for control of nut-sedge in peppers (1,3-D + chloropicrin and metam-sodium) are considered not technically feasible. This derives from regulatory restrictions and the magnitude of expected yield losses when they are used. Economic data representing the Florida, Georgia, and Southeastern USA pepper growing conditions are included in this section as a supplement to the biological review to illustrate the impacts of using MeBr alternatives, not to gauge them with respect to economic feasibility. However, in Michigan 1,3-D + chloropicrin is considered technically feasible.

Michigan

The US concludes that, at present, no economically feasible alternatives to MeBr exist for use in Michigan pepper production. Two factors have proven most important in this conclusion. These are yield loss and missed market windows, which are discussed individually below.

1. Yield Loss

Expected yield losses of 6% are anticipated throughout Michigan pepper production.

2. Missed Market Windows

The US agrees with Michigan's assertion that growers will likely receive significantly lower prices for their produce if they switch to 1,3-D + chloropicrin. This is due to changes in the harvest schedule caused by the above described soil temperature complications and extended plant back intervals when using 1,3-D + chloropicrin.

The analysis of this effect is based on the fact that prices farmers receive for their peppers vary widely over the course of the growing season. Driving these fluctuations are the forces of supply and demand. Early in the growing season, when relatively few peppers are harvested, the supply is at its lowest and the market price is at its highest. As harvested quantities increase, the price declines. In order to maximize their revenues, pepper growers manage their production systems with the goal of harvesting the largest possible quantity of peppers when the prices are at their highs. The ability to sell produce at these higher prices makes a significant contribution toward the profitability of pepper operations.

To describe these conditions in Michigan pepper production, weekly pepper sales data from the US Department of Agriculture for the previous three years was used to gauge the impact of early season price fluctuations on gross revenues. Though data availability is limiting, it is assumed that if pepper growers adjust the timing of their production system, as required when using 1,3-D + Chloropicrin, that they will, over the course of the growing season, receive gross revenues reduced by approximately 7.5%. The season average price was reduced by 7.5% in the analysis of the alternatives to reflect this. Based on currently available information, the US believes this reduction in gross revenues serves as a reasonable indicator of the typical effect of planting delays resulting when MeBr alternatives are used in Michigan pepper production.

Florida

No technically (and thus economically) feasible alternatives to MeBr are presently available to the effected pepper growers. As such, the US concludes that use of MeBr is critical in Florida pepper production.

Georgia

No technically (and thus economically) feasible alternatives to MeBr are presently available to the effected pepper growers. As such, the US concludes that use of MeBr is critical in Georgia pepper production.

Southeastern USA Except Georgia

No technically (and thus economically) feasible alternatives to MeBr are presently available to the effected pepper growers. As such, the US concludes that use of MeBr is critical in Southeastern USA pepper production.

PART F. FUTURE PLANS

23. WHAT ACTIONS WILL BE TAKEN TO RAPIDLY DEVELOP AND DEPLOY ALTERNATIVES FOR THIS CROP?

Since 1997, the United States EPA has made the registration of alternatives to methyl bromide a high registration priority. Because the EPA currently has more applications pending in its registration review queue than the resources to evaluate them, EPA prioritizes the applications. By virtue of being a top registration priority, methyl bromide alternatives enter the science review process as soon as U.S. EPA receives the application and supporting data rather than waiting in turn for the EPA to initiate its review.

As one incentive for the pesticide industry to develop alternatives to methyl bromide, the Agency has worked to reduce the burdens on data generation, to the extent feasible while still ensuring that the Agency's registration decisions meet the Federal statutory safety standards. Where appropriate from a scientific standpoint, the Agency has refined the data requirements for a given pesticide application, allowing a shortening of the research and development process for the methyl bromide alternative. Furthermore, Agency scientists routinely meet with prospective methyl bromide alternative applicants, counseling them through the preregistration process to increase the probability that the data is done right the first time and rework delays are minimized.

The U.S. EPA has also co-chaired the USDA/EPA Methyl Bromide Alternatives Work Group since 1993 to help coordinate research, development and the registration of viable alternatives. This coordination has resulted in key registration issues (such as worker and bystander exposure through volatilization, township caps and drinking water concerns) being directly addressed through USDA's Agricultural Research Service's U.S.\$15 million per year research program conducted at more than 20 field evaluation facilities across the country. Also EPA's participation in the evaluation of research grant proposals each year for USDA's U.S. \$2.5 million per year methyl bromide alternatives research has further ensured close coordination between the U.S. government and the research community.

The amount of methyl bromide requested for research purposes is considered critical for the development of effective alternatives. Without methyl bromide for use as a standard treatment, the research studies can never address the comparative performance of alternatives. This would be a serious impediment to the development of alternative strategies. The U.S. government estimates that peppers research will require 2844 kg per year of methyl bromide for 2005 and 2006. This amount of methyl bromide is necessary to conduct research on alternatives and is in addition to the amounts requested in the submitted CUE applications. One example of the research is a field study testing the comparative performance of methyl bromide, host resistance, cultural practices, pest management approaches for control of root-knot nematodes. Another example is a five year field study comparing methyl bromide to 1,3-D combined with biologically based materials including transplant treatments for control of weeds, root-knot nematodes and soil borne fungal pathogens.

24. HOW DO YOU PLAN TO MINIMIZE THE USE OF METHYL BROMIDE FOR THE CRITICAL USE IN THE FUTURE?

See Section 23 above.

For further details regarding the transition plans for this sector please consult the national management strategy.

25. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON THE NOMINATION?

New data used in this CUN

1. Southeastern states, including Georgia

New data on potential MB alternatives for use on peppers were submitted by the Georgia and Southeast U.S. Peppers Consortium. Results of a small plot field study conducted in Tifton, Georgia by Culpepper and Langston (2004) show that 1,3-D + chloropicrin, followed by more chloropicrin, was more effective than MB against yellow nutsedge, but less effective against purple nutsedge. Although this treatment performed as well as MB in terms of spring crop yield, its fall yield performance was inferior to that of MB. In a second treatment, 1,3-D by itself, followed by chloropicrin, was significantly less effective than methyl bromide for the control of both purple and yellow nutsedge, but as effective as MB for the control soil nematodes. In terms of spring and fall pepper yield, however, this treatment performed as well as MB. In a third treatment, 1,3-D + chloropicrin, followed by metam sodium, was as effective as MB against yellow nutsedge, 36% less effective than MB against purple nutsedge, and as effective as MB for the control of soil nematodes. This treatment also performed as well as MB in terms of both spring and fall pepper yield. Although these combinations are showing promise, they will require further testing and validation.

Ongoing research at University of Florida includes various techniques with existing chemical alternatives as well as the development of new chemistries, such as propargyl bromide, a compound with reduced risk. The efficacy of pre plant herbicides and soil-applied fumigants depends on the physical, chemical and biological properties of the soil. The depth of the incorporation could play a critical role in the efficacy of a given chemical alternative, because of the changes in soil humidity, microbial activity, and temperature. These changes could alter the chemistry of the applied chemicals.

In addition, the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association has been screening, as stand-alone MB replacements, 1,3-D, chloropicrin, metam sodium, and dazomet evaluated against 98:2 and 67:33 MB + chloropicrin formulations at the maximum allowable label rate at multiple locations. Results indicate that the best alternatives will likely include a pre-plant application of 1,3-D + chloropicrin, followed by an application of chloropicrin injected into the raised bed and a herbicide mix applied to the raised bed at plastic laying.

26. CITATIONS

- Aerts, M. 2003. Asst. Director, Environmental and Pest Management Division, FFVA (Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association). Personal Communication with G. Tomimatsu, U.S. EPA, December 2, 2003.
- Aerts, M. 2004. Asst. Director, Environmental and Pest Management Division, FFVA (Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association). Personal Communication with A. Jones and N. Mallampalli, U.S. EPA, February 13, 2004.
- Allen, L.H., S.J. Locascio, D.W. Dickson, D.J. Mitchell, and S.D. Nelson. 1999. Flooding (soil anoxia) for control of pests of vegetables. Research Summary, U.S.DA Specific Cooperative Agreement 58-6617-6-013.
- Ashley, M.G., B.L. Leigh, and L.S. Lloyd. 1963. The action of metham-sodium in soil II. Factors affecting removal of methyl isothiocyanate residues. J. Sci. Food Agric. 14: 153-161.
- Banks, H. J. 2002. 2002 Report of the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee, 2002 Assessment. P. 46.
- Burgos, N. R. and R. E. Talbert. 1996. Weed control and sweet corn (*Zea mays* var. *rugosa*) response in a no-till system with cover crops. Weed Sci. 44 (2): 355 – 361.
- Chase, C.A., T.R. Sinclair, D.G. Shilling, J.P. Gilreath, and S.J. Locascio. 1998. Light effects on rhizome morphogenesis in nutsedges (*Cyperus* spp): Implications for control by soil solarization. Weed Sci. 46:575-580.
- Chellemi, D.O., R. C. Hochmuth, T. Winsberg, W. Guetler, K. D. Shuler, L. E. Datnoff, D. T. Kaplan, R. McSorley, R. A. Dunn, and S. M. Olson. 1997. Application of soil solarization to fall production of cucurbits and pepper. Proc. Fla. State Hort. Soc. 110:333-336.
- Chellemi, D.O., J. Mirusso, J. Nance, and K. Shuler. 2001. Results from field scale demonstrations/validation studies of Telone® products on the Florida east coast. Proceedings, Florida Tomato Institute, University of Florida, Pp 51-58.
- Cortright, B. 2003. Field Research Associate University of Michigan. Personal Communication with G. Tomimatsu, November 24, 2003.
- Culpepper, A.S. 2004. Survey of infestations of nutsedges in Georgia vegetable crops. (Unpublished).
- Culpepper A.S. and D.B. Langston. 2004. Fumigant/herbicide combinations. Unpublished report. University of Georgia, Tifton.

- Csinos, A.S., D.R. Sumner, R.M. McPherson, C. Dowler, C.W. Johnson, and A.W. Johnson. 1999. Alternatives for methyl bromide fumigation of tobacco seed beds, pepper, and tomato seedlings. Proc. Georgia Veg. Conf. Available on the Web at <http://www.tifton.uga.edu/veg/Publications/Gfvga99.pdf>
- Dowler, C. C. 1999. Herbicide activity of metham, methyl iodide, and methyl bromide applied through irrigation systems. Proc. Southern Weed Sci. Soc. 52: 77 – 78.
- Dungan, R. S. and S. R. Yates. 2003. Degradation of fumigant pesticides: 1,3-Dichloropropene, methyl isothiocyanate, chloropicrin, and methyl bromide. *Vodose Zone Journal* 2:279-286.
- Eger, J. E. 2000. Efficacy of Telone products in Florida crops: a seven year summary. Proc. Annual Int. Res. Conf. on Methyl Bromide Alternatives and Emissions Reductions. Available on the web at <http://www.mbao.org/mbrpro00.html>.
- FFVA. 2002. Application for the Methyl Bromide Critical Use Exemption, Florida Solanaceous Crops (other than tomato). September 9, 2002.
- Frank, J.R., P. H. Schwartz and W.E. Potts. 1992. Modeling the effects of weed interference periods and insects on bell peppers (*Capsicum annuum*). *Weed Sci.* 40:308-312.
- Galloway, B. A. and L. A. Weston. 1996. Influence of cover crop and herbicide treatment on weed control and yield in no-till sweet corn (*Zea mays* L.) and pumpkin (*Cucurbita maxima* Duch.). *Weed Technol.* 10 (2): 341 – 346.
- Gamliel, A., S. Triki, M. Austerweil, P. DiPrimo, I. Peretz-Alon, O. Heiman, M. Beniches, B. Steiner, and J. Katan. 2003. Accelerated degradation of metam sodium in the field and its management. Proc. Annual Int. Res. Conf. on Methyl Bromide Alternatives and Emissions Reductions. Available on the web at <http://www.mbao.org/mbrpro03.html>.
- Gevens, A., and M. K. Hausbeck. 2003. *Phytophthora capsici* in irrigation water and isolation of *P. capsici* from snap beans in Michigan. Michigan State Univ. Vegetable Crop Advisory Team Alert Vol. 18 (19). Available on the Web at www.ipm.msu.edu/CAT03_veg/V09-24-03.htm.
- Gilreath, J.P. and B.M. Santos. 2003. Herbicide dose and incorporation in combinations with 1,3dichloropropene plus chloropicrin for *Ceperus rotundus* control in tomato and pepper. *Crop Protection* 23(3):205-210.
- Hausbeck, M.K. and B.D. Cortright. 2003. Evaluation of fumigants for managing *Phytophthora* crown and fruit rot of solanaceous and cucurbit crops, plot two, 2003. Unpublished study (MI CUE # 03-0061).

- Horowitz, M. 1972. Effects of desiccation and submergence on the viability of rhizome fragments of bermudagrass, johnsongrass, and tubers of nutsedge. *Israel J. Agric. Res.* 22(4):215-220.
- Kadir, J. B., R. Charudattan, W. M. Stall, and B. J. Brecke. 2000. Field efficacy of *Dactylaria higginsii* as a bioherbicide for the control of purple nutsedge (*Cyperus rotundus*). *Weed Technol.* 14 (1): 1 – 6.
- Kelley, W. T. 2003, Professor, University of Georgia. Personal communication with G. Tomimatsu, November 24, 2003.
- Lamour, K. H. and M. Hausbeck, 2003. Effect of Crop Rotation on the survival of *Phytophthora capsici* in Michigan. *Plant Dis.* 87:841-845.
- Larkin, R. P., and Fravel, D. R. 1998. Efficacy of various fungal and bacterial biocontrol organisms for control of *Fusarium* wilt of tomato. *Plant Dis.* 82:1022 -1028.
- Lewis, C. 2003 (President, Hy-Yield Bromine). Personal communication through S.A. Toth (steve_toth@ncsu.edu), Extension Entomologist & Pest Management Information Specialist, North Carolina State University; message forwarded electronically to G. Tomimatsu, December 29, 2003.
- Locascio, S. J., and D. W. Dickson. 1998. Metam sodium combined with chloropicrin as an alternative to methyl bromide. *Proc. Annual Int. Res. Conf. on Methyl Bromide Alternatives and Emissions Reductions.* Available on the web at <http://www.mbao.org/mbrpro98.html>.
- Locascio, S.J., J.P. Gilreath, D.W. Dickson, T.A. Kucharek, J.P. Jones, and J.W. Noling. 1997. Fumigant alternatives to methyl bromide for polyethylene mulched tomato. *HortSci.* 32: 1208-1211.
- Martin, F. N. 2003. Development of alternative strategies for management of soilborne pathogens currently controlled with methyl bromide. *Ann. Rev. Phytopathol.* 41: 325 - 350.
- MBTOC (1994): 1994 Report of the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee for the 1995 Assessment of the UNEP Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. Nairobi.
- Melban, K. 2003. California Pepper Commission. Personal Communication with G. Tomimatsu. Kenny@tabcomp.com. 11/26/2003.
- Munn, D.A. 1992. "Comparison of shredded newspaper and wheat straw as crop mulches." *Hort technol.* 2: 361 - 366.
- Noling, J. W. 2003. University of Florida-Lake Alfred. Personal Communication with G. Tomimatsu. Jwn@lal.ufl.edu. 11/25/2003.

- Noling, J.W., E. Roskopf, and D.L. Chellemi. 2000. Impacts of alternative fumigants on soil pest control and tomato yield. Proc. Annual Int. Res. Conf. on Methyl Bromide Alternatives and Emissions Reductions. Available on the web at <http://www.mbao.org/mbrpro00.html>.
- Ou, L.-T., K.Y.Chung, J.E. Thomas, T.A. Obreza, and D.W. Dickson. 1995. Degradation of 1,3-dichloropropene (1,3-D) in soils with different histories of field applications of 1,3-D. *J. Nematol.* 25: 249–257.
- Phatak, S. C., D. R. Sumner, H. D. Wells, D. K. Bell, and N. C. Glaze. 1983. Biological control of yellow nutsedge, *Cyperus esculentus*, with the indigenous rust fungus *Puccinia canaliculata*. *Science*. 219: 1446 – 1448.
- Patterson, D.T. 1998. Suppression of purple nutsedge (*Cyperus rotundus*) with polyethylene film mulch. *Weed Technology*, 12:275-280.
- Schneider S. M., E.N. Roskopf, J.G. Leesch, D.O. Chellemi, C. T. Bull, and M. Mazzola. 2003. United States Department of Agriculture – Agricultural Research Service research on alternatives to methyl bromide: pre-plant and post-harvest. *Pest Manag Sci.* 59: 814-826.
- Thullen, R.J. and P.E. Keeley. 1975. Yellow nutsedge sprouting and resprouting potential. *Weed Sci.* 23:333-337.
- Schaetzl, R.J. and D.M. Tomczak. 2001. Wintertime temperatures in the fine-textured soils of the Saginaw Valley, Michigan. *The Great Lake Geographer*, 8(2):87-99. http://geography.ssc.uwo.ca/great_lakes_geographer/GLG_volume8/Schaetzl_Tomczak.pdf
- Smelt, J.H., S.J.H. Crum, and W. Teinissen. 1989. Accelerated transformation of the fumigant methyl isocyanate in soil after repeated application of metam sodium. *J. Environ. Sci. Health B24*: 437-455.
- Stall, W.M. and J. Morales-Payan. 2000. The critical period of nutsedge interference in tomato. S.W. Florida Research & Education Center. Available on the web at www.imok.ufl.edu/liv/groups/IPM/weed_con/nutsedge.htm
- UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). 1998. Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee (MBTOC) 1998 assessment of alternatives to methyl bromide. p.49.
- University of California, Davis. Undated. Management of plant parasitic nematodes, Chemical management techniques, Factors affecting the effectiveness of Telone II. <http://ucdnema.ucdavis.edu/imagemap/nemmap/ent156html/204NEM/204INDEX>,
<http://ucdnema.ucdavis.edu/imagemap/nemmap/ent156html/204NEM/CHEM/XTELCHRT>
- U.S. EPA. 2002. Peppers-Field. Peppers Grown Outdoors on Plastic Mulch. CUN2003/058

- Verhagen, C., G. Lebbink, and J. Bloem. 1996. Enhanced biodegradation of the nematicides 1,3-dichloropropene and methyl isothiocyanate in a variety of soils. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 28:1753–1756.
- Webster, T.M. 2002. Nutsedge eradication: impossible dream? *National Nursery Proc.* RMRS-P-000. U.S.DA Forest Service, Rocky Mtn Res. Station, Ogden, Utah.
- Webster, T. M., A.S. Csinos, A.W. Johnson, C. C. Dowler, D. R. Sumner, R. L. Fery. 2001. Methyl bromide alternatives in a bell pepper-squash rotation. *Crop Protection* 20:605-614.
- Wilén, C. A., M. E. McGiffen, and C. L. Elmore. 2003. Nutsedge: Integrated Pest Management for Home Gardeners and Landscape Professionals. University of California IPM Publication # 4732. Available on the Web at www.ipm.ucdavis.edu.

APPENDIX A. 2008 Methyl Bromide Usage Newer Numerical Index (BUNNI).

2008 Methyl Bromide Usage Newer Numerical Index - BUNNI						Peppers	Notes
January 24, 2006	Region	Southeast Pepper	Georgia Pepper	Florida Pepper	Michigan Pepper	Sector Total or Average	
Dichotomous Variables	Strip or Bed Treatment?	Strip	Strip	Strip	Strip		
	Currently Use Alternatives?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
	Tarps / Deep Injection Used?	Tarp	Tarp	Tarp	Tarp		
Most Likely Combined Impacts (%)	Karst -1,3-D Limitation (%)	0%	8%	40%	0%		
	100 ft Buffer Zones (%)	0%	0%	1%	0%		
	Key Pest Distribution (%)	68%	68%	68%	75%		
	Regulatory Issues (%)	0%	0%	0%	0%		
	Unsuitable Terrain (%)	0%	0%	0%	0%		
	Cold Soil Temperature (%)	0%	0%	0%	75%		
	Total Combined Impacts (%)	68%	71%	81%	94%		
Most Likely Baseline Transition	(%) Able to Transition	32%	32%	32%	0%		
	Minimum # of Years Required	7	7	7	0		
	(%) Able to Transition / Year	5%	5%	5%	0%		
EPA Adjusted Use Rate (kg/ha)		130	130	130	120		
EPA Adjusted Strip Dosage Rate (g/m2)		20	20	20	18		
2008 Applicant Requested Usage	<i>Amount - Pounds</i>	<i>596,300</i>	<i>765,408</i>	<i>3,037,500</i>	<i>33,500</i>	<i>4,432,708</i>	
	<i>Area - Acres</i>	<i>4,450</i>	<i>5,712</i>	<i>20,250</i>	<i>313</i>	<i>30,725</i>	
	<i>Rate (lb/A)</i>	<i>134.00</i>	<i>134.00</i>	<i>150.00</i>	<i>107.03</i>	<i>144</i>	
	Amount - Kilograms	270,477	347,183	1,377,786	15,195	2,010,641	
	Treated Area - Hectares	1,801	2,312	8,195	127	12,434	
Rate (kg/ha)	150	150	168	120	162		
EPA Preliminary Value kgs		210,911	347,183	1,230,822	15,195	1,804,111	
EPA Baseline Adjusted Value has been adjusted for:		MBTOC Adjustments, Double Counting, Growth, Use Rate/Strip Treatment, LPF Transition, and Combined Impacts					
EPA Baseline Adjusted Value		kgs	109,565	208,163	767,781	14,208	1,099,717
EPA Transition Amount		kgs	(14,326)	(34,035)	(135,194)	-	(183,555)
Most Likely Impact Value (kgs)		kgs	95,239	174,128	632,587	14,208	916,162
		ha	733	1,339	4,866	118	7,057
		Rate	130	130	130	120	130
Sector Research Amount (kgs)			2,844	2008 Total US Sector Nomination		919,006	

1 Pound = 0.453592 kgs 1 Acre = 0.404686 ha

* ALL OF THE APPLICANTS HAVE BEEN ADJUSTED FOR STRIP TREATMENTS EXCEPT MICHIGAN WHO ADJUSTED ON THEIR OWN

Footnotes for Appendix A:

Values may not sum exactly due to rounding.

- Dichotomous Variables** – dichotomous variables are those which take one of two values, for example, 0 or 1, yes or no. These variables were used to categorize the uses during the preparation of the nomination.
- Strip Bed Treatment** – Strip bed treatment is ‘yes’ if the applicant uses such treatment, no otherwise.
- Currently Use Alternatives** – Currently use alternatives is ‘yes’ if the applicant uses alternatives for some portion of pesticide use on the crop for which an application to use methyl bromide is made.
- Tarps/ Deep Injection Used** – Because all pre-plant methyl bromide use in the US is either with tarps or by deep injection, this variable takes on the value ‘tarp’ when tarps are used and ‘deep’ when deep injection is used.
- Pest-free cert. Required** - This variable is a ‘yes’ when the product must be certified as ‘pest-free’ in order to be sold
- Other Issues**.- Other issues is a short reminder of other elements of an application that were checked

7. **Frequency of Treatment** – This indicates how often methyl bromide is applied in the sector. Frequency varies from multiple times per year to once in several decades.
8. **Quarantine and Pre-Shipment Removed?** – This indicates whether the Quarantine and pre-shipment (QPS) hectares subject to QPS treatments were removed from the nomination.
9. **Most Likely Combined Impacts (%)** – Adjustments to requested amounts were factors that reduced to total amount of methyl bromide requested by factoring in the specific situations were the applicant could use alternatives to methyl bromide. These are calculated as proportions of the total request. We have tried to make the adjustment to the requested amounts in the most appropriate category when the adjustment could fall into more than one category.
10. **(%) Karst geology** – Percent karst geology is the proportion of the land area in a nomination that is characterized by karst formations. In these areas, the groundwater can easily become contaminated by pesticides or their residues. Regulations are often in place to control the use of pesticide of concern. Dade County, Florida, has a ban on the use of 1,3D due to its karst geology.
11. **(%) 100 ft Buffer Zones** – Percentage of the acreage of a field where certain alternatives to methyl bromide cannot be used due the requirement that a 100 foot buffer be maintained between the application site and any inhabited structure.
12. **(%) Key Pest Impacts** - Percent (%) of the requested area with moderate to severe pest problems. Key pests are those that are not adequately controlled by MB alternatives. For example, the key pest in Michigan peppers, *Phytophthora* spp. infests approximately 30% of the vegetable growing area. In southern states the key pest in peppers is nutsedge.
13. **Regulatory Issues (%)** - Regulatory issues (%) is the percent (%) of the requested area where alternatives cannot be legally used (e.g., township caps) pursuant to state and local limits on their use.
14. **Unsuitable Terrain (%)** – Unsuitable terrain (%) is the percent (%) of the requested area where alternatives cannot be used due to soil type (e.g., heavy clay soils may not show adequate performance) or terrain configuration, such as hilly terrain. Where the use of alternatives poses application and coverage problems.
15. **Cold Soil Temperatures** – Cold soil temperatures is the proportion of the requested acreage where soil temperatures remain too low to enable the use of methyl bromide alternatives and still have sufficient time to produce the normal (one or two) number of crops per season or to allow harvest sufficiently early to obtain the high prices prevailing in the local market at the beginning of the season.
16. **Total Combined Impacts (%)** - Total combined impacts are the percent (%) of the requested area where alternatives cannot be used due to key pest, regulatory, soil impacts, temperature, etc. In each case the total area impacted is the conjoined area that is impacted by any individual impact. The effects were assumed to be independently distributed unless contrary evidence was available (e.g., affects are known to be mutually exclusive). For example, if 50% of the requested area had moderate to severe key pest pressure and 50% of the requested area had karst geology, then 75% of the area was assumed to require methyl bromide rather than the alternative. This was calculated as follows: 50% affected by key pests and an additional 25% (50% of 50%) affected by karst geology.
17. **Most Likely Baseline Transition** – Most Likely Baseline Transition amount was determined by the DELPHI process and was calculated by determining the maximum share of industry that can transition to existing alternatives.
18. **(%) Able to Transition** – Maximum share of industry that can transition
19. **Minimum # of Years Required** – The minimum number of years required to achieve maximum transition.
20. **(%) Able to Transition per Year** – The Percent Able to Transition per Year is the percent able to transition divided by the number of years to achieve maximum transition.
21. **EPA Adjusted Use Rate** - Use rate is the lower of requested use rate for 2008 or the historic average use rate or is determined by MBTOC recommended use rate reductions.
22. **EPA Adjusted Strip Dosage Rate** – The dosage rate is the use rate within the strips for strip / bed fumigation.
23. **2008 Amount of Request** – The 2008 amount of request is the actual amount requested by applicants given in total pounds active ingredient of methyl bromide, total acres of methyl bromide use, and application rate in pounds active ingredient of methyl bromide per acre. U.S. units of measure were used to describe the initial request and then were converted to metric units to calculate the amount of the US nomination.
24. **EPA Preliminary Value** – The EPA Preliminary Value is the lowest of the requested amount from 2005 through 2008 with MBTOC accepted adjustments (where necessary) included in the preliminary value.
25. **EPA Baseline Adjusted Value** – The EPA Baseline Adjusted Value has been adjusted for MBTOC adjustments, QPS, Double Counting, Growth, Use Rate/ Strip Treatment, Miscellaneous adjustments, MBTOC recommended Low Permeability Film Transition adjustment, and Combined Impacts.

26. **EPA Transition Amount** – The EPA Transition Amount is calculated by removing previous transition amounts since transition was introduced in 2007 and removing the amount of the percent (%) Able to Transition per Year multiplied by the EPA Baseline Adjusted Value.
27. **Most Likely Impact Value** – The qualified amount of the initial request after all adjustments have been made given in total kilograms of nomination, total hectares of nomination, and final use rate of nomination.
28. **Sector Research Amount** – The total U.S. amount of methyl bromide needed for research purposes in each sector.
29. **Total US Sector Nomination** - Total U.S. sector nomination is the most likely estimate of the amount needed in that sector.