

**APPENDIX 1 – SUMMARY OF APPLICATION METHOD ADJUSTMENT  
FACTORS AND METHOD USE FRACTIONS**

**Table A1 - 1. Application Method Adjustment Factors for 2004 - 2207.**

Fumigation Method <sup>1</sup>	AMAF					
	1,3-D	Chloropicrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio carbonate
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast	61*	64*	74*	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast	not applicable	44	48	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-bed	not applicable	64*	100*	77*	not applicable	not applicable
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-bed	not applicable	64*	100*	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable
Shallow injection w/ water treatments	41	20	not applicable	21	not applicable	not applicable
Shallow injection w/ soil cap	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	14	not applicable	not applicable
Deep injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast	41	64*	74*	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable
Deep injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast	not applicable	44	48	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable
Deep injection w/ water treatments	27	20	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable
Rotovate/rototill	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	14	17	not applicable
Sprinkler	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	77*	not applicable	10
Sprinkler w/ water treatments	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	21	not applicable	not applicable
Flood	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	77*	not applicable	10
Drip w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp	29	not applicable	not applicable	9	not applicable	10
Drip w/ low permeability tarp	not applicable	15	not applicable	9	not applicable	not applicable
Non-field soil (structural/post-harvest)	not applicable	100	100	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable

\* These are considered “high-emission” fumigation methods and are prohibited within the San Joaquin Valley, Southeast Desert, and Ventura NAAs during May-October.

**Table A1 - 2. 1990 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the Sacramento Metro nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method <sup>1</sup>	% of Amount Applied					
	1,3-D <sup>2</sup>	Chloropicrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam <sup>3</sup>	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio carbonate <sup>4</sup>
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast		42	37			
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast						
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-bed		42	36	3		
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-bed						
Shallow injection w/ water treatments						
Shallow injection w/ soil cap				15		
Deep injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast		16	14			
Deep injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast						
Deep injection w/ water treatments						
Rotovate/rototill				2	100	
Sprinkler				55		33
Sprinkler w/ water treatments						
Flood				10		33
Drip w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp				10		34
Drip w/ low permeability tarp				5		
Non-field soil (structural/post-harvest)			13			

<sup>1</sup> Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup> Use of 1,3-D was suspended in early 1990.

<sup>3</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied.

<sup>4</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathio carbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

**Table A1 - 3. 1990 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the San Joaquin Valley nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method <sup>1</sup>	% of Amount Applied					
	1,3-D <sup>2</sup>	Chloropicrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam <sup>3</sup>	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio carbonate <sup>4</sup>
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast		29	29			
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast						
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-bed		29	29	8		
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-bed						
Shallow injection w/ water treatments						
Shallow injection w/ soil cap				25		
Deep injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast		42	42			
Deep injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast						
Deep injection w/ water treatments						
Rotovate/rototill				3	100	
Sprinkler				60		33
Sprinkler w/ water treatments						
Flood						33
Drip w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp				2		34
Drip w/ low permeability tarp				2		
Non-field soil (structural/post-harvest)						

<sup>1</sup> Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup> Use of 1,3-D was suspended in early 1990.

<sup>3</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied.

<sup>4</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

**Table A1 - 4. 1990 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the Southeast Desert nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method <sup>1</sup>	% of Amount Applied					
	1,3-D <sup>2</sup>	Chloropicrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam <sup>3</sup>	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio carbonate <sup>4</sup>
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast		50	35			
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast						
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-bed		50	34	10		
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-bed						
Shallow injection w/ water treatments						
Shallow injection w/ soil cap						
Deep injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast						
Deep injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast						
Deep injection w/ water treatments						
Rotovate/rototill					100	
Sprinkler				30		33
Sprinkler w/ water treatments						
Flood				50		33
Drip w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp				5		34
Drip w/ low permeability tarp				5		
Non-field soil (structural/post-harvest)			31			

<sup>1</sup> Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup> Use of 1,3-D was suspended in early 1990.

<sup>3</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied

<sup>4</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathio carbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

**Table A1 - 5. 1990 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the Ventura nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method <sup>1</sup>	% of Amount Applied					
	1,3-D <sup>2</sup>	Chloropicrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam <sup>3</sup>	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio carbonate <sup>4</sup>
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast		50	49			
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast						
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-bed		50	49	20		
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-bed						
Shallow injection w/ water treatments						
Shallow injection w/ soil cap						
Deep injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast						
Deep injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast						
Deep injection w/ water treatments						
Rotovate/rototill					100	
Sprinkler				50		33
Sprinkler w/ water treatments						
Flood						33
Drip w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp				15		34
Drip w/ low permeability tarp				15		
Non-field soil (structural/post-harvest)			3			

<sup>1</sup> Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup> Use of 1,3-D was suspended in early 1990.

<sup>3</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied

<sup>4</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

**Table A1 - 6. 1990 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the South Coast nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method <sup>1</sup>	% of Amount Applied					
	1,3-D <sup>2</sup>	Chloropicrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam <sup>3</sup>	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio carbonate <sup>4</sup>
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast		50	3			
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast						
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-bed		50	3	20		
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-bed						
Shallow injection w/ water treatments						
Shallow injection w/ soil cap						
Deep injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast						
Deep injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast						
Deep injection w/ water treatments						
Rotovate/rototill					100	
Sprinkler				50		33
Sprinkler w/ water treatments						
Flood						33
Drip w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp				15		34
Drip w/ low permeability tarp				15		
Non-field soil (structural/post-harvest)			95			

<sup>1</sup> Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup> Use of 1,3-D was suspended in early 1990.

<sup>3</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied

<sup>4</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

**Table A1 - 7. 2005 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the Sacramento Metro nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method <sup>1</sup>	% of Amount Applied					
	1,3-D	Chloropicrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam <sup>2</sup>	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio-carbonate <sup>3</sup>
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast						
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast		56.0	11.3			
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-bed				21		
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-bed		33.0	6.3			
Shallow injection w/ water treatments						
Shallow injection w/ soil cap				15		
Deep injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast	99					
Deep injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast			11.4			
Deep injection w/ water treatments						
Rotovate/rototill					100	
Sprinkler				45		33
Sprinkler w/ water treatments						
Flood						33
Drip w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp	1			9		34
Drip w/ low permeability tarp		11.0		10		
Non-field soil (structural/post-harvest)			70.9			

<sup>1</sup>Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup>DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied.

<sup>3</sup>DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

**Table A1 - 8. 2005 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the San Joaquin Valley nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method <sup>1</sup>	% of Amount Applied					
	1,3-D	Chloropicrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam <sup>2</sup>	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio-carbonate <sup>3</sup>
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast	2					
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast		97.0	79.5			
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-bed				21		
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-bed			0.6			
Shallow injection w/ water treatments						
Shallow injection w/ soil cap				20		
Deep injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast	97	1.0				
Deep injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast		1.0	16.3			
Deep injection w/ water treatments						
Rotovate/rototill					100	
Sprinkler				35		33
Sprinkler w/ water treatments						
Flood						33
Drip w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp	1			14		34
Drip w/ low permeability tarp				10		
Non-field soil (structural/post-harvest)		1.0	3.7			

<sup>1</sup> Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied.

<sup>3</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

**Table A1 - 9. 2005 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the Southeast Desert nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method <sup>1</sup>	% of Amount Applied					
	1,3-D	Chloropicrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam <sup>2</sup>	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio-carbonate <sup>3</sup>
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast						
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast		88	77.1			
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-bed				6		
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-bed			18.9			
Shallow injection w/ water treatments						
Shallow injection w/ soil cap						
Deep injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast	10					
Deep injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast			1.1			
Deep injection w/ water treatments						
Rotovate/rototill					100	
Sprinkler				75		33
Sprinkler w/ water treatments						
Flood						33
Drip w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp	90	5		7		34
Drip w/ low permeability tarp		5		12		
Non-field soil (structural/post-harvest)		2	2.9			

<sup>1</sup> Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied

<sup>3</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

**Table A1 - 10. 2005 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the Ventura nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method <sup>1</sup>	% of Amount Applied					
	1,3-D	Chloropicrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam <sup>2</sup>	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio-carbonate <sup>3</sup>
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast	1					
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast		67	100.0			
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-bed						
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-bed						
Shallow injection w/ water treatments				25		
Shallow injection w/ soil cap						
Deep injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast	4					
Deep injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast						
Deep injection w/ water treatments						
Rotovate/rototill					100	
Sprinkler						33
Sprinkler w/ water treatments				20		
Flood						33
Drip w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp	95			5		34
Drip w/ low permeability tarp		33		50		
Non-field soil (structural/post-harvest)						

<sup>1</sup>Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup>DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied

<sup>3</sup>DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

**Table A1 - 11. 2005 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the South Coast nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method <sup>1</sup>	% of Amount Applied					
	1,3-D	Chloropicrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam <sup>2</sup>	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio-carbonate <sup>3</sup>
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast						
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast		40	60.9			
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-bed				25		
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-bed		36	30.8			
Shallow injection w/ water treatments						
Shallow injection w/ soil cap						
Deep injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast	2					
Deep injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast			0.5			
Deep injection w/ water treatments						
Rotovate/rototill					100	
Sprinkler				20		33
Sprinkler w/ water treatments						
Flood						33
Drip w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp	98			5		34
Drip w/ low permeability tarp		24		50		
Non-field soil (structural/post-harvest)			7.8			

<sup>1</sup> Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied

<sup>3</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

**Table A1 - 12. 2006 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the Sacramento Metro nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method <sup>1</sup>	% of Amount Applied					
	1,3-D	Chloropicrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam <sup>2</sup>	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio-carbonate <sup>3</sup>
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast	3					
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast		56.0	11.3			
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-bed				21		
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-bed		33.0	6.3			
Shallow injection w/ water treatments						
Shallow injection w/ soil cap				15		
Deep injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast	95					
Deep injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast			11.4			
Deep injection w/ water treatments						
Rotovate/rototill					100	
Sprinkler				45		33
Sprinkler w/ water treatments						
Flood						33
Drip w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp	2			9		34
Drip w/ low permeability tarp		11.0		10		
Non-field soil (structural/post-harvest)			70.9			

<sup>1</sup>Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup>DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied

<sup>3</sup>DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

**Table A1 - 13. 2006 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the San Joaquin Valley nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method <sup>1</sup>	% of Amount Applied					
	1,3-D	Chloropicrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam <sup>2</sup>	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio-carbonate <sup>3</sup>
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast	2					
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast		97.0	79.5			
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-bed				21		
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-bed			0.6			
Shallow injection w/ water treatments						
Shallow injection w/ soil cap				20		
Deep injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast	97	1.0				
Deep injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast		1.0	16.3			
Deep injection w/ water treatments						
Rotovate/rototill					100	
Sprinkler				35		33
Sprinkler w/ water treatments						
Flood						33
Drip w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp	1			14		34
Drip w/ low permeability tarp				10		
Non-field soil (structural/post-harvest)		1.0	3.7			

<sup>1</sup>Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup>DPR DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied

<sup>3</sup>DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

**Table A1 - 14. 2006 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the Southeast Desert nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method <sup>1</sup>	% of Amount Applied					
	1,3-D	Chloropicrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam <sup>2</sup>	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio-carbonate <sup>3</sup>
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast						
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast		88.0	77.1			
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-bed				6		
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-bed			18.9			
Shallow injection w/ water treatments						
Shallow injection w/ soil cap						
Deep injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast	16					
Deep injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast		0.2	1.1			
Deep injection w/ water treatments						
Rotovate/rototill					100	
Sprinkler				75		33
Sprinkler w/ water treatments						
Flood						33
Drip w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp	84	5.0		7		34
Drip w/ low permeability tarp		5.0		12		
Non-field soil (structural/post-harvest)		2.0	2.9			

<sup>1</sup> Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup> DPR DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied

<sup>3</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

**Table A1 - 15. 2006 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the Ventura nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method <sup>1</sup>	% of Amount Applied					
	1,3-D	Chloropicrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam <sup>2</sup>	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio-carbonate <sup>3</sup>
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast						
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast		67.0	100.0			
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-bed						
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-bed						
Shallow injection w/ water treatments				25		
Shallow injection w/ soil cap						
Deep injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast	7					
Deep injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast						
Deep injection w/ water treatments						
Rotovate/rototill					100	
Sprinkler						33
Sprinkler w/ water treatments				20		
Flood						33
Drip w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp	93			5		34
Drip w/ low permeability tarp		33.0		50		
Non-field soil (structural/post-harvest)						

<sup>1</sup> Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied

<sup>3</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

**Table A1 - 16. 2006 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the South Coast nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method <sup>1</sup>	% of Amount Applied					
	1,3-D	Chloropicrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam <sup>2</sup>	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio-carbonate <sup>3</sup>
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast						
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast		40.0	60.9			
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-bed				25		
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-bed		36.0	30.8			
Shallow injection w/ water treatments						
Shallow injection w/ soil cap						
Deep injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast						
Deep injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast			0.5			
Deep injection w/ water treatments						
Rotovate/rototill					100	
Sprinkler				20		33
Sprinkler w/ water treatments						
Flood						33
Drip w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp	100			5		34
Drip w/ low permeability tarp		24.0		50		
Non-field soil (structural/post-harvest)			7.8			

<sup>1</sup> Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup> DPR DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied

<sup>3</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

**Table A1 - 17. 2007 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the Sacramento Metro nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method <sup>1</sup>	% of Amount Applied					
	1,3-D	Chloropicrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam <sup>2</sup>	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio-carbonate <sup>3</sup>
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast	0.0					
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast		56.0	11.3			
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-bed				21		
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-bed		33.0	6.3			
Shallow injection w/ water treatments						
Shallow injection w/ soil cap				15		
Deep injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast	99.9					
Deep injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast			11.4			
Deep injection w/ water treatments						
Rotovate/rototill					100	
Sprinkler				45		33
Sprinkler w/ water treatments						
Flood						33
Drip w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp	0.1			9		34
Drip w/ low permeability tarp		11.0		10		
Non-field soil (structural/post-harvest)			70.9			

<sup>1</sup>Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup>DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied

<sup>3</sup>DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

**Table A1 - 18. 2007 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the San Joaquin Valley nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method <sup>1</sup>	% of Amount Applied					
	1,3-D	Chloropicrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam <sup>2</sup>	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio-carbonate <sup>3</sup>
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast	0.3					
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast		97.0	79.5			
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-bed				21		
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-bed			0.6			
Shallow injection w/ water treatments						
Shallow injection w/ soil cap				20		
Deep injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast	99.3	1.0				
Deep injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast		1.0	16.3			
Deep injection w/ water treatments						
Rotovate/rototill					100	
Sprinkler				35		33
Sprinkler w/ water treatments						
Flood						33
Drip w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp	0.4			14		34
Drip w/ low permeability tarp				10		
Non-field soil (structural/post-harvest)		1.0	3.7			

<sup>1</sup>Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup>DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied

<sup>3</sup>DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

**Table A1 - 19. 2007 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the Southeast Desert nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method <sup>1</sup>	% of Amount Applied					
	1,3-D	Chloropicrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam <sup>2</sup>	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio-carbonate <sup>3</sup>
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast	0.4					
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast		88.0	77.1			
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-bed				6		
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-bed			18.9			
Shallow injection w/ water treatments						
Shallow injection w/ soil cap						
Deep injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast	0.0					
Deep injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast		0.2	1.1			
Deep injection w/ water treatments						
Rotovate/rototill					100	
Sprinkler				75		33
Sprinkler w/ water treatments						
Flood						33
Drip w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp	99.6	5.0		7		34
Drip w/ low permeability tarp		5.0		12		
Non-field soil (structural/post-harvest)		2.0	2.9			

<sup>1</sup> Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup> DPR DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied

<sup>3</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

**Table A1 - 20. 2007 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the Ventura nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method <sup>1</sup>	% of Amount Applied					
	1,3-D	Chloropicrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam <sup>2</sup>	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio-carbonate <sup>3</sup>
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast						
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast		67.0	100.0			
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-bed						
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-bed						
Shallow injection w/ water treatments				25		
Shallow injection w/ soil cap						
Deep injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast	5.0					
Deep injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast						
Deep injection w/ water treatments						
Rotovate/rototill					100	
Sprinkler						33
Sprinkler w/ water treatments				20		
Flood						33
Drip w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp	94.9			5		34
Drip w/ low permeability tarp		33.0		50		
Non-field soil (structural/post-harvest)						

<sup>1</sup> Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied

<sup>3</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

**Table A1 - 21. 2007 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the South Coast nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method <sup>1</sup>	% of Amount Applied					
	1,3-D	Chloropicrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam <sup>2</sup>	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio-carbonate <sup>3</sup>
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast						
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast		40.0	60.9			
Shallow injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-bed				25		
Shallow injection w/ low permeability tarp-bed		36.0	30.8			
Shallow injection w/ water treatments						
Shallow injection w/ soil cap						
Deep injection w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp-broadcast						
Deep injection w/ low permeability tarp-broadcast			0.5			
Deep injection w/ water treatments						
Rotovate/rototill					100	
Sprinkler				20		33
Sprinkler w/ water treatments						
Flood						33
Drip w/ high permeability tarp or no tarp	100.0			5		34
Drip w/ low permeability tarp		24.0		50		
Non-field soil (structural/post-harvest)			7.8			

<sup>1</sup> Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied

<sup>3</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

**Table A1 - 22. Application Method Adjustment Factors for 2008.**

Fumigation Method	Code	AMAF						
		1,3-D	Chloro-picrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam Na	Metam K	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio-carbonate
Chemigation (Drip System)/Tarpaulin	1209	19	12					
Chemigation (Drip)	1601							10
Chemigation (mini-sprinkler)	1602							10
Day Chemigation (Drip System) Nontarpaulin	1408				9	9		
Day Chemigation (Drip System) Tarpaulin	1407				9	9		
Day Drench	1413				100	100		
Day Nontarpaulin/Shallow/Broadcast or Bed /Two Water Treatments	1405				28			
Day Nontarpaulin/Shallow/Broadcast or Bed/Three Water Treatments	1406				21	21		
Day Power Mulcher	1410				14	14		
Day Rotary Tiller	1409					14		
Day Soil Capping	1411				14	14		
Day Sprinkler/Broadcast or Bed/One Water Treatment	1401				77	77		
Day Sprinkler/Broadcast or Bed/Three Water Treatments	1403				21	21		
Day Sprinkler/Broadcast or Bed/Two Water Treatments	1402				28	28		
Day or Night Flood	1412				77			
Night 4 A.M. Start/Sprinkler/Broadcast or Bed/Two Water treatments	1472				35			
Night Nontarpaulin/Shallow/	1455				13	13		

Broadcast or Bed/Two Water Treatments								
Night Sprinkler/Broadcast or Bed/Two Water Treatments	1452				77			
Nontarpaulin/Deep/Broadcast or Bed	1206	26	64					
Other label method - Methyl Bromide	1190		100	100				
Tarpaulin/Deep/Bed	1208	26						
Tarpaulin/Deep/Broadcast	1207	26						
Tarpaulin/Shallow/Bed	1106							10
Tarpaulin/Deep/Broadcast	1107			48				
Tarpaulin/Shallow/Broadcast – Nobel Plow	1103		44	48				

<sup>1</sup> Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied.

<sup>3</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

**Table A1 - 23. 2008 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the Sacramento Metro nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method	Code	% of Amount Applied						
		1,3-D	Chloro-picrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam Na	Metam K	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio-carbonate
Chemigation (Drip System)/Tarpaulin	1209	3.0	9.6					
Day Chemigation (Drip System) Nontarpaulin	1408					16.5		
Day Chemigation (Drip System) Tarpaulin	1407				83.2			
Day Rotary Tiller	1409				16.8	83.5		
Nontarpaulin/Deep/Broadcast or Bed	1206	97.0	55.7					
Tarpaulin/Deep/Broadcast	1107			74.8				
Tarpaulin/Shallow/Broadcast – Nobel Plow	1103		34.8	25.2				
Chemigation (Drip System)/Tarpaulin	1209	3.0	9.6					

<sup>1</sup> Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied.

<sup>3</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

**Table A1 - 24. 2008 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the San Joaquin Valley nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method	Code	% of Amount Applied						
		1,3-D	Chloro-picrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam Na	Metam K	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio-carbonate
Chemigation (Drip)	1601							97.1
Chemigation (mini-sprinkler)	1602							2.9
Day Chemigation (Drip System) Nontarpaulin	1408				1.3	10.5		
Day Chemigation (Drip System) Tarpaulin	1407				0.1	0.2		
Day Drench	1413					5.1		
Day Nontarpaulin/Shallow/Broadcast or Bed /Two Water Treatments	1405				0.2			
Day Nontarpaulin/Shallow/Broadcast or Bed/Three Water Treatments	1406				9.4	2.4		
Day Power Mulcher	1410				3.5	42.5		
Day Rotary Tiller	1409					5.2		
Day Soil Capping	1411				3.0	1.3		
Day Sprinkler/Broadcast or Bed/One Water Treatment	1401				1.4	7.6		
Day Sprinkler/Broadcast or Bed/Three Water Treatments	1403				14.3	0.7		
Day Sprinkler/Broadcast or Bed/Two Water Treatments	1402				7.7	7.1		
Day or Night Flood	1412							
Night 4 A.M. Start/Sprinkler/Broadcast or Bed/Two Water treatments	1472							
Night Nontarpaulin/Shallow/	1455				58.7	17.4		

Broadcast or Bed/Two Water Treatments								
Night Sprinkler/Broadcast or Bed/Two Water Treatments	1452				0.3			
Nontarpaulin/Deep/Broadcast or Bed	1206	98.0	19.5					
Other label method - Methyl Bromide	1190		0.4	0.3				
Tarpaulin/Deep/Bed	1208	1.2						
Tarpaulin/Deep/Broadcast	1207	0.9						
Tarpaulin/Shallow/Broadcast – Nobel Plow	1103		80.1	99.7				

<sup>1</sup>Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup>DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied.

<sup>3</sup>DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

**Table A1 - 25. 2008 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the Southeast Desert nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method	Code	% of Amount Applied						
		1,3-D	Chloro-picrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam Na	Metam K	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio-carbonate
Chemigation (Drip System)/Tarpaulin	1209	88.3	100.0					
Day Chemigation (Drip System) Nontarpaulin	1408				57.1			
Day Sprinkler/Broadcast or Bed/Three Water Treatments	1403				34.2			
Day Sprinkler/Broadcast or Bed/Two Water Treatments	1402				1.3			
Night 4 A.M. Start/Sprinkler/Broadcast or Bed/Two Water treatments	1472				7.4			
Nontarpaulin/Deep/Broadcast or Bed	1206	11.7						
Tarpaulin/Deep/Broadcast	1107			37.4				
Tarpaulin/Shallow/Bed	1106							100.0

<sup>1</sup>Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup>DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied.

<sup>3</sup>DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

**Table A1 - 26. 2008 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the Ventura nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method	Code	% of Amount Applied						
		1,3-D	Chloro-picrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam Na	Metam K	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio-carbonate
Chemigation (Drip System)/Tarpaulin	1209	99.5	89.1					
Chemigation (mini-sprinkler)	1602							100.0
Day Chemigation (Drip System) Nontarpaulin	1408				0.2			
Day Chemigation (Drip System) Tarpaulin	1407				99.8	100.0		
Nontarpaulin/Deep/Broadcast or Bed	1206	0.5	0.1					
Tarpaulin/Shallow/Broadcast – Nobel Plow	1103		10.8	100.0				

<sup>1</sup> Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied.

<sup>3</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

**Table A1 - 27. 2008 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the South Coast nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method	Code	% of Amount Applied						
		1,3-D	Chloro-picrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam Na	Metam K	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio-carbonate
Chemigation (Drip System)/Tarpaulin	1209	100.0	63.4					
Other label method - Methyl Bromide	1190		0.9	2.3				
Tarpaulin/Deep/Broadcast	1107		0.5	4.8				
Tarpaulin/Shallow/Broadcast – Nobel Plow	1103		35.2	92.9				

<sup>1</sup> Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied.

<sup>3</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

**Table A1 - 28. 2009 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the Sacramento Valley nonattainment area.**

Fumigation	% of Amount Applied					
	1,3-D	Chloropicrin	Methyl	Metam <sup>2</sup>	Dazomet	Na

Method <sup>1</sup>			Bromide			Tetrathio-carbonate <sup>3</sup>
Default <sup>4</sup>	14.6	86.7	43.4	22.8		100.0
Tarpaulin/Shallow/ Broadcast - Closing shoe and compaction roller				1.4		
Nontarpaulin/Deep/ Broadcast or Bed	85.4	13.3				
Sprinkler/Broadcast or Bed/Three Water Treatments				22.6		
Chemigation (Drip System) Tarpaulin			56.6	16.6		
Chemigation (Drip System) Nontarpaulin				21.2		
Rotary Tiller				11.4		
Soil Capping				4.0		
Soil incorporation					100	

<sup>1</sup>Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup>DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied.

<sup>3</sup>DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

<sup>4</sup>DEFAULTS: Default application methods are used for those applications where the reported fumigant application code is missing or incorrect. For each fumigant, the default application method is chosen as the method with the highest application method adjustment factor (AMAF) among the fumigant's low emission application methods as defined in section 6452. In 2009 these defaults are: methyl bromide and chloropicrin, tarpaulin/shallow/broadcast – nobel plow; 1,3-D, nontarpaulin/shallow/broadcast /three water treatments; metam, sprinkler/broadcast or bed/two water treatments; dazomet, soil incorporation; sodium tetrathiocarbonate, chemigation.

**Table A1 - 29. 2009 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the San Joaquin Valley nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method <sup>1</sup>	% of Amount Applied					
	1,3-D	Chloropicrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam <sup>2</sup>	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio-carbonate <sup>3</sup>
Default <sup>4</sup>	14.5	14.3	14.6	17.3	100.0	22.1
Nontarpaulin/Deep/Broadcast			0.1			
Tarpaulin/Shallow/Broadcast – Nobel Plow		67.2	80.5			
Tarpaulin/Deep/Broadcast			0.3			
Drip System - Hot Gas		4.5				
Other label method		0.2	0.9			
Nontarpaulin/Deep/Broadcast or Bed	83.1	7.5		0.4		
Tarpaulin/Deep/Broadcast	1.1					
Tarpaulin/Deep/Bed	0.8					
Sprinkler/Broadcast or Bed/One Water Treatment				2.4		
Sprinkler/Broadcast or Bed/Two Water Treatments				2.5		
Sprinkler/Broadcast or Bed/Three Water Treatments				0.8		
Nontarpaulin/Shallow/Broadcast or Bed /Two Water Treatments				3.3		
Nontarpaulin/Shallow/Broadcast or Bed/Three Water Treatments				2.8		
Chemigation (Drip System) Tarpaulin				0.8		
Chemigation (Drip System) Nontarpaulin		6.4	3.7	1.4		1.5
Rotary Tiller	0.5			2.6		
Power Mulcher				2.9		
Flood				0.2		
Soil Drench				1.7		
Night Nontarpaulin/Shallow/Broadcast or Bed/Two Water Treatments				60.9		
Chemigation (Drip)						76.4

<sup>1</sup> Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam and dazomet to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied.

<sup>3</sup> DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

<sup>4</sup> DEFAULTS: Default application methods are used for those applications where the reported fumigant application code is missing or incorrect. For each fumigant, the default application method is chosen as the method with the highest application method adjustment factor (AMAF) among the fumigant's low emission application methods as defined in section 6452. In 2009 these defaults are: methyl bromide and chloropicrin, tarpaulin/shallow/broadcast – nobel plow; 1,3-D, nontarpaulin/shallow/broadcast /three water treatments; metam, sprinkler/broadcast or bed/two water treatments; dazomet, soil incorporation; sodium tetrathiocarbonate, chemigation.

**Table A1 - 30. 2009 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the Southeast Desert nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method <sup>1</sup>	% of Amount Applied					
	1,3-D	Chloropicrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam <sup>2</sup>	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio-carbonate <sup>3</sup>
Default <sup>4</sup>				55.5		
Chemigation (Drip System)/Tarpaulin	100.0	100.0				
Chemigation (Drip System) Tarpaulin				36.5		
Chemigation (Drip System) Nontarpaulin				8.0		
Shallow injection w/ water treatments						

<sup>1</sup>Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup>DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam and dazomet to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied.

<sup>3</sup>DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

<sup>4</sup>DEFAULTS: Default application methods are used for those applications where the reported fumigant application code is missing or incorrect. For each fumigant, the default application method is chosen as the method with the highest application method adjustment factor (AMAF) among the fumigant's low emission application methods as defined in section 6452. In 2009 these defaults are: methyl bromide and chloropicrin, tarpaulin/shallow/broadcast – nobel plow; 1,3-D, nontarpaulin/shallow/broadcast /three water treatments; metam, sprinkler/broadcast or bed/two water treatments; dazomet, soil incorporation; sodium tetrathiocarbonate, chemigation.

**Table A1 - 31. 2009 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the Ventura County nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method <sup>1</sup>	% of Amount Applied					
	1,3-D	Chloropicrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam <sup>2</sup>	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio-carbonate <sup>3</sup>
Default <sup>4</sup>			0.9		100.0	
Tarpaulin/Shallow/Broad cast – Nobel Plow		13.8	99.1			
Nontarpaulin/Deep/Broad cast or Bed	2.7	0.4				
Chemigation (Drip System)/Tarpaulin	97.3	85.8				
Chemigation (Drip System) Tarpaulin				100.0		

<sup>1</sup>Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup>DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam and dazomet to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied.

<sup>3</sup>DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

<sup>4</sup>DEFAULTS: Default application methods are used for those applications where the reported fumigant application code is missing or incorrect. For each fumigant, the default application method is chosen as the method with the highest application method adjustment factor (AMAF) among the fumigant's low emission application methods as defined in section 6452. In 2009 these defaults are: methyl bromide and chloropicrin, tarpaulin/shallow/broadcast – nobel plow; 1,3-D, nontarpaulin/shallow/broadcast /three water treatments; metam, sprinkler/broadcast or bed/two water treatments; dazomet, soil incorporation; sodium tetrathiocarbonate, chemigation.

**Table A1 - 32. 2009 frequency of fumigation methods used (method use fractions) in the South Coast nonattainment area.**

Fumigation Method <sup>1</sup>	% of Amount Applied					
	1,3-D	Chloropicrin	Methyl Bromide	Metam <sup>2</sup>	Dazomet	Na Tetrathio-carbonate <sup>3</sup>
Default <sup>4</sup>		0.8	3.0	100.0		
Tarpaulin/Shallow/Broad cast – Nobel Plow		29.5	97.0			
Chemigation (Drip System)/Tarpaulin	100.0	69.7				

<sup>1</sup>Fumigation methods are described in detail in the memo Bary et al., 2007.

<sup>2</sup>DPR assumes 100% conversion of metam and dazomet to MITC and percentages are relative to the amount of MITC applied.

<sup>3</sup>DPR assumes 100% conversion of sodium (Na) tetrathiocarbonate to carbon disulfide and percentages are relative to the amount of carbon disulfide applied.

<sup>4</sup>DEFAULTS: Default application methods are used for those applications where the reported fumigant application code is missing or incorrect. For each fumigant, the default application method is chosen as the method with the highest application method adjustment factor (AMAF) among the fumigant's low emission application methods as defined in section 6452. In 2009 these defaults are: methyl bromide and chloropicrin, tarpaulin/shallow/broadcast – nobel plow; 1,3-D, nontarpaulin/shallow/broadcast /three water treatments; metam, sprinkler/broadcast or bed/two water treatments; dazomet, soil incorporation; sodium tetrathiocarbonate, chemigation.