

# MCFA

---

## Minor Crop Farmer Alliance

---

August 18, 2014

OPP Docket

Environmental Protection Agency Docket Center (EPA/DC)

Mail Code: 28221T

1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20460

Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs

Office of Management and Budget

ATTN: Desk Officer for EPA

725 17<sup>th</sup> Street, NW

Washington, DC 20503

Ms. Kathy Davis

Field and External Affairs Division

Office of Pesticide Programs

Mail Code: 7506P

Environmental Protection Agency

1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20406-0001

**Re: Docket ID No. Docket # EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0184. Pesticides; Agricultural Worker Protection Standard Revisions. 79 FR No. 53, Wednesday, March 19, 2014, pp 15444 - 15531.**

Dear Ms. Davis:

These comments are submitted by the Minor Crop Farmer Alliance (“MCFA”) on the subject notice published in the Federal Register on March 19, 2014, 79 FR No. 53, pp 15444 – 15531 (the “Notice”). MCFA is an alliance of national and regional organizations and individuals representing growers, shippers, packers, handlers, and processors of various agricultural commodities, including food, fiber, turf grass, nursery and landscape crops, and organizations involved with public health pesticides. Our members are extremely interested in the development and safe use of pest management tools including crop protection chemicals that are environmentally sound, safe for applicators and safe for workers in the field. As a collection of

# MCFA

---

## Minor Crop Farmer Alliance

---

producers that are highly dependent on skilled labor to manage and harvest our crops we are especially sensitive to the needs of the workers we depend upon to successfully and economically competitive produce the crops we grow. While our commodities are often called “minor crops” or “specialty crops,” they are vitally important components in our diets. They also contribute to safe and aesthetic surroundings for our homes, schools, and places of business. U.S. farmers grow more than 500 types of fruit, vegetable, tree nut, flower, ornamental nursery, and turf grass crops in addition to the major bulk (row) commodity crops. Specialty crop production accounts for more than \$60 billion, or approximately 40% of total U.S. crop receipts.

For many of our operations the labor costs involved in production and harvesting represents a large portion of the total annual capital inputs necessary for specialty crop production. A significant cost embedded in this overall expense is the ongoing training updates, records management and provision of safety equipment for workers covered by these regulations and the revisions thereof. Our membership has been engaged over the past decade as the Agency has reviewed and developed many of the proposed changes that are suggested in the Federal Register Notice. We were surprised at the tone and direction of the Preamble and the information used to describe the current state of our industry’s efforts to provide protections for one of our most critical assets –the skilled workers that return year after to year to work at our side in producing and harvesting the agricultural products that we produce. While we recognize that there may be areas that need to be adjusted to fine tune the mechanisms to ensure complete coverage of the non-handler farm work force; the basic structure and requirements of the existing WPS when followed have repeatedly demonstrated to be wholly adequate in providing the safety information and farm level infrastructure necessary to ensure the well-being of the agricultural workforce.

We are surprised by the proposed rule’s apparent lack of consideration to the many enhancements and changes that have taken place in pest management options available currently. Many of the highly toxic and more risky compounds that led to the development and implementation of the Worker Protection Standards 20 years ago have been replaced with compounds that are much safer in terms of human health and the environment, especially in light of the enhanced risk assessment and risk mitigation components of EPA’s registration and registration review process. Many of the research studies included in the risk/benefit and cost analysis were done during the period either prior to or during the transition to the newer, safer compounds that dominate the pest management options available to and used by our membership.

# MCFA

---

## Minor Crop Farmer Alliance

---

These comments were developed to represent the collective experiences of our diverse coalition membership. It is anticipated that individual, site specific comments will be submitted across our membership. We support and endorse the diversity and specificity of those comments. The unique situations that need to be addressed across the spectrum of specialty crop production to deliver the level of education and site specific requirements demanded by the crop-specific and site-specific nature of this production leads to the need for flexibility in the regulations while meeting the goals to ensure an educated and protected work force. We recognize the need for information derived from each unique crop production system to develop the education and training requirements. We appreciate that the applicator and the person responsible for causing an application to be made has the primary responsibility in assuring that it is conducted in a manner to minimize the exposure of individuals, either during the application or subsequent to the application. We also feel very strongly that the agricultural work force once educated and trained, has the responsibility to ensure their actions also provide the protections required under the Worker Protection Standards. We are concerned that in the Agency's attempt to capture the complexity of the workplace; it has created a condition that creates multiple independent points of communication to implement the various regulatory requirements. This complexity is not functionally conducive to the efficient management and effective programs that have been implemented by the majority of the impacted growers under existing and required programs.

In light of the above comments, we have carefully looked at the 12 sections of proposed changes that were identified by the Agency. Our general comments on those specific areas of requested comments track the issues as identified on the EPA website and are in the following order:

- 1) **Training for Workers and Handlers**
- 2) **Notifications to Workers and Handlers**
- 3) **Hazard Communications**
- 4) **Information Exchange Between Handlers and Agricultural Employers**
- 5) **Handler Restrictions and Minimum Age for Handlers**
- 6) **Restriction for Worker Entry into Treated Areas**
- 7) **Display of Basic Pesticide Safety Information**
- 8) **Decontamination and Emergency Assistance**
- 9) **Personal Protective Equipment**
- 10) **Monitoring Handler Exposure to Cholinesterase Inhibiting Pesticides**
- 11) **Exemptions and Exceptions**
- 12) **General Revisions and Implementation**

# MCFA

---

## Minor Crop Farmer Alliance

---

Each of these individual sections of comments is attached as listed above to the end of this letter to preserve the formatting of the comments.

The Minor Crop Farmer Alliance also endorses the regionally developed crop specific comments of our member organizations which address the diversity of management styles and production practices associated with the spectrum of crops our members grow. As noted in the opening paragraphs of our comments we take the responsibility of protection of our workers very seriously and are more than willing to work to ensure that the necessary training and protective measures are in place. We are prepared to work with the Agency as they review the comments submitted to develop the appropriate regulatory mechanisms to ensure efficient and effective protection in the work place.

Sincerely yours,



Daniel A. Botts, Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association  
Chairman, MCFA Technical Committee

Attachments:

- 1) Training for Workers and Handlers**
- 2) Notifications to Workers and Handlers**
- 3) Hazard Communications**
- 4) Information Exchange Between Handlers and Agricultural Employers**
- 5) Handler Restrictions and Minimum Age for Handlers**
- 6) Restriction for Worker Entry into Treated Areas**
- 7) Display of Basic Pesticide Safety Information**
- 8) Decontamination and Emergency Assistance**
- 9) Personal Protective Equipment**
- 10) Monitoring Handler Exposure to Cholinesterase Inhibiting Pesticides**
- 11) Exemptions and Exceptions**
- 12) General Revisions and Implementation**

EPA Requested Comment Areas					
Section 1: Training for Workers and Handlers:					
Issue Area	FR Notice	EPA Questions	Sections of Proposed Rule	Sections Existing Rule	Comments
A. Shorten Retraining Interval for Workers and Handlers	PP 15459 – 15461	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should EPA consider different pesticide safety training timing? If so, what timeframe and why?</li> <li>• Do you have information concerning the relationship between the frequency of training of workers and handlers and the frequency of incidents of pesticide exposure or illness? If so, please provide.</li> <li>• Are there other ways EPA could ensure that workers and handlers retain the information presented in pesticide safety training so the retraining interval can be longer than one year?</li> <li>• Are there other burdens or benefits associated with a 2-year retraining interval that EPA has not considered?</li> <li>• What would be the impact of a 1- or 2-year retraining interval on states and tribes?</li> <li>• Should EPA consider retaining the current 5 year retraining interval for workers and handlers and adding a requirement for annual refresher training?</li> </ul>	101 201 309(c)	130(a) 230(a)	<p><b>Specialty crop agriculture is covered under Food safety programs that include intensive education on personal hygiene. In many cases this is done on an on-going and regular basis and includes information on pesticides. The record keeping associated with this activity needs to be coordinated to preclude duplicative requirements across programs. The movement of workers across employers and regions of the country suggests that a core training process that is transportable across employers would be helpful. Crop and site specific information are currently required to comply with existing programs and should be considered as this rulemaking proceeds</b></p> <p><b>The current training interval is adequate. The additional information to be included in the training concerning off-site exposure through contact with work clothes and the need for personal hygiene should clearly indicate that it is the personal responsibility of the worker, as the employers ability to control or manage this aspect of exposure prevention is impossible.</b></p>

EPA Requested Comment Areas					
Section 1: Training for Workers and Handlers:					
Issue Area	FR Notice	EPA Questions	Sections of Proposed Rule	Sections Existing Rule	Comments
B. Establish Recordkeeping Requirements to Verify Training for Workers and Handlers	PP 15461 – 15463	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would a requirement for employers to report worker and handler training information to the state or federal government for compilation in a central repository have benefits? If so, please detail the potential benefits and cost.</li> <li>• Should the Agency reconsider any of the alternate options presented in developing a final rule? If so, why? Please provide data to support your position.</li> <li>• Are there changes that would make the training verification card program more effective and less prone to falsified cards? If so, please provide detailed suggestions for improving the system.</li> <li>• Should EPA consider a performance standard to evaluate worker and handler training (asking questions based on the training content) rather than recordkeeping? Are there benefits or drawbacks to this approach that the Agency has not considered?</li> <li>• Would employers rely on training records provided by the worker or handler as verification that the worker or handler had received pesticide safety training?</li> </ul>	<b>103</b> <b>203(b)</b> <b>101(b)</b> <b>201(d)</b>  <b>Training</b> <b>101 (c) (4)</b> <b>201(c)(4)</b>	<b>135 (e)</b> <b>235 (e)</b>	<b>The concept of a national registry for training records would be very difficult to implement. History has indicated that this type of verification system is extremely difficult to maintain and ensure accuracy of the information collected.</b>

<b>EPA Requested Comment Areas</b>					
<b>Section 1: Training for Workers and Handlers:</b>					
<b>Issue Area</b>	<b>FR Notice</b>	<b>EPA Questions</b>	<b>Sections of Proposed Rule</b>	<b>Sections Existing Rule</b>	<b>Comments</b>
C. Require Employers to Provide Establishment-Specific Information for Workers and Handlers	PP 15463 – 15464	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent do employers already provide this information to all workers and handlers when they first arrive at the establishment, for example, during the hiring process?</li> <li>The current rule requires employers to ensure that the workers and handlers receive information in a manner they understand. Are there any issues with the current requirement for employers? If so, please describe and provide data to support this position.</li> </ul>	<b>103</b> <b>203(b)</b>	<b>135(e)</b> <b>235(e)</b>	<b>Most specialty crop producers provide significant information during the hiring and initial training process. For many growers this training is required for maintenance of their accreditation under various marketplace programs outside of the official government regulatory mandates. The Agency should consider how the records and information required under these programs could be incorporated in to the site specific needs related to pesticide exposures.</b>
E. Expand the Content of Worker and Handler Pesticide Safety Training	PP 15566 - - 15570	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there any training points listed above that EPA should consider not including in the final proposal? If so, which points and why?</li> <li>Are there points that EPA should consider adding to the training content? If so, what points should be added? Please provide a rationale for why the additional content would benefit workers and/or handlers.</li> </ul>	<b>Worker</b> <b>101(c)(2) -- (c) (3)</b> <b>Handler</b> <b>201(c)(2) – (c)(3)</b> <b>Violations</b> <b>170.101(c)(2)(viii) –(ix)</b> <b>120.102(c)(3)(v)</b> <b>Hazard</b> <b>Communication</b> <b>101(c)(3)(i)</b> <b>201(c)(3)(v)</b> <b>Early Re-entry</b> <b>101(c)(3)(iii)</b> <b>101(c)(3)(v)</b> <b>Respirator Fit Test</b> <b>201(c)(3) (ii)</b>	<b>130(d)(4)</b> <b>130 (3)(b)</b>	<b>The proposed expanded content covers areas that are included in most food safety related training programs. The complexity and level of detail indicated in the proposed regulation would take much more than just an additional 15 minutes as suggested in the rule.</b>
F. Retain Audiovisual Presentations as Permissible Methods for Pesticide Safety Training	PP 15470 – 15471	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please provide any additional information on the efficacy of different methods used to conduct worker and handler training.</li> </ul>	<b>101(c)1</b> <b>201(c)1</b>	<b>130(d)(1)</b> <b>230(d)(1)</b>	<b>Regarding the current WPS provisions of for handlers and field workers, the specialty crop industry takes these responsibilities seriously and have developed site specific and crop specific training that apply to their individual situations. The materials used and methods of training need to be flexible to capture the core requirements but not be overly prescriptive if alternative training methods are applied.</b>

EPA Requested Comment Areas					
Section 1: Training for Workers and Handlers:					
Issue Area	FR Notice	EPA Questions	Sections of Proposed Rule	Sections Existing Rule	Comments
G. Eliminate Exception to Handler Training requirements	PP 15471 – 15472	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should the proposed training under 40 CFR part 171 include a requirement for expanded training on the WPS?</li> <li>• How would the benefits to employers from giving a single training that would apply to both WPS handlers and applicators using RUPs under the direct supervision of a certified applicator compare to the costs of requiring agricultural applicator training for all applicators using RUPs under the direct supervision of a certified applicator?</li> </ul>	<b>Not in Proposed Rule</b>	<b>230(b)(2)</b>	<b>As a practical matter, the training requirements for pesticide handlers and applicators under the WPS are not dissimilar from the requirements for applicators working under the direct supervision of a certified applicator. The WPS aspects of the training that are not already covered in the applicator training should be included in that training requirement.</b>



<b>EPA Requested Comment Areas</b>					
<b>Section 2: Notifications to Workers and Handlers:</b>					
<b>Issue Area</b>	<b>FR Notice</b>	<b>EPA Questions</b>	<b>Sections of Proposed Rule</b>	<b>Sections Existing Rule</b>	<b>Comments</b>
A. Posted Notification Timing & Oral Notification – Recordkeeping of Oral Notifications	PP 15472 -- 15474	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For outdoor production, EPA proposes to allow the option of oral warning or posted notification for products with an REI of 48 hours or less. Is there a different time period that would better balance the costs of compliance with the expected risk reduction?</li> <li>• Will the proposed requirements for posting instead of oral warnings provide sufficient benefit for workers to warrant the additional burden placed on agricultural employers?</li> <li>• Should EPA require recordkeeping for oral notification? If so, why?</li> </ul>	<b>109(a)((1)(i)</b> <b>109(a)(1)(ii)</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>Most specialty crop growers have a highly coordinated and regulated workforce on their farms. Information is given on a daily basis to the personnel responsible for overseeing the activities of individual workers. The individual treatment areas and re-entry intervals associated with those treatments are communicated and locations identified to preclude reentry or exposure to treatments in adjacent fields. The requirement for posting where these types of notifications and oversight are current practice would be redundant and unnecessary.</b>
B. Locations of Warning Sign	PP 15474 - - 15475	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there preferable alternatives to the proposed option for posting locations that EPA has not considered? If so, please describe and provide data to support the alternative.</li> </ul>	<b>109(b)(2)(ii)</b>	<b>120(c)</b>	<b>It is our experience that current central posting requirements have been adequate. In many cases additional information is provided on employer or crew leader provided transportation as workers move from field to field during the day.</b>
C. Warning Sign Content	PP 15475 - - 15476	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should EPA consider replacing the current or proposed general field posting sign with risk-based reentry signs? What would be the costs and benefits of using risk-based signs?</li> </ul>	<b>109(b)(2)</b>	<b>120(c)(1)</b>	<b>No, the current system is adequate.</b>

<b>EPA Requested Comment Areas Section 3: Hazard Communication</b>					
<b>Issue Area</b>	<b>FR Notice</b>	<b>EPA Questions</b>	<b>Sections of Proposed Rule</b>	<b>Sections Existing Rule</b>	<b>Comments</b>
A. Pesticide-Specific Hazard Communication Materials — General	PP 15476 -- 15479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What would be the burden on employers to maintain the SDS and pesticide label for 2 vs. 5 years?</li> <li>• Do agricultural employers already collect SDSs? If so, how do they obtain them and what burden is associated with retrieving the SDS for one or more products?</li> <li>• What are the benefits and drawbacks of requiring employers to maintain and provide access to employees and others the proposed pesticide-specific hazard information?</li> <li>• Are there other approaches for providing workers and handlers with understandable, readily accessible, and relevant information on the symptoms, short-term health effects, and long-term health effects of exposure (including prenatal exposure) to specific pesticides? If so, please describe these approaches, their implementation, and the advantages they provide in comparison to the proposed approach.</li> <li>• Are there other data on the benefit pesticide-specific information before every entry into a pesticide treated area?</li> <li>• Does opening access to pesticide specific information to authorized representatives raise any problems? If so, please describe the potential issues with particularity and provide supporting information where available</li> </ul>	<b>11(b)</b>	<b>130 230 124 224 232(a) 122 222</b>	<p><b>Current practice dictates the collection and retention of labelling and MSDS information utilized for pesticide applications. All of this information is accessible upon request and is readily available in the event of emergency access is needed. The primary responsibility of persons responsible for managing the non-handler workforce is the avoidance of exposures, either directly or through contact with treated surfaces until the label mandated reentry interval has expired.</b></p> <p><b>Providing information on the potential impacts of exposures to pesticides is important but needs to be in a context that recognizes the major efforts taken through labeling and use conditions tailored to prevent or minimize any potential effect from those exposures. In the absence of that context, the information would be unduly alarmist. This information is best provided as part the general WPS training that is currently required.</b></p> <p><b>A general statement that pesticides are used and efforts should be taken to minimize contact with treated surfaces coupled with reminders about hand washing prior to eating or other hand to mouth contact should be adequate without detailed discussion about specific pesticides on a daily basis.</b></p> <p><b>The pesticide specific information discussed in the proposed rule are all contained on the information (labels and MSDS sheets) that is required to be available should an exposure event occur.</b></p> <p><b>The current proposed definition of “authorized representative” is overly broad and would be very difficult to manage to ensure information that is worker specific is protected. The information necessary to provide support for workers who seek treatment for potential health related impacts is already provided in the current WPS regulations.</b></p>
B. Pesticide Application Information — Content and Timing	PP 15479 - - 15480	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would the additional pesticide application information proposed by EPA impose undue burden on the applicator or the employer?</li> <li>• Are there benefits or drawbacks to requiring this additional information that EPA has not considered? If so,</li> </ul>	<b>11(b)</b>	<b>122 222</b>	<p><b>As a general process this information is scheduled and resulting treatment schedules are documented to the employer as pesticide applications are accomplished. This information is collected and maintained and would be readily accessible if needed. In many cases this information is provided at the central posting stations on many farms.</b></p>

EPA Requested Comment Areas Section 3: Hazard Communication					
Issue Area	FR Notice	EPA Questions	Sections of Proposed Rule	Sections Existing Rule	Comments
		please describe.			
C. Pesticide Application Information — Location and Accessibility	PP 15480 - - 15481	No Specific Questions	<b>11(b)</b>	<b>122</b> <b>222</b>	<b>The current system works and does not need to be changed.</b>
D. Pesticide Application Information and Pesticide-Specific Hazard Communication Materials— Retention of Records	PP 15481 - - 1548	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should EPA consider a different timeframe for recordkeeping for this requirement? If so, what period and why?</li> <li>• What burdens would be imposed on agricultural employers as a consequence of the proposed two-year record retention requirement?</li> <li>• How would the burden of the proposal to maintain application records compare with the current requirement to maintain a central display?</li> </ul>	<b>11(b)(2)</b>	<b>122(b)</b> <b>222(b)</b>	<b>The two year time frame for record retention is consistent with other information that the employer is currently maintaining. Most growers who have central posting are already holding these records in duplicate. The only additional burden would be maintaining the timely updates at both locations.</b>

EPA Requested Comment Areas					
Section 4: Information Exchange between Handlers and Agricultural Employers:					
Issue Area	FR Notice	EPA Questions	Sections of Proposed Rule	Sections Existing Rule	Comments
	PP 154822 -- 15483	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it reasonable to require the handler employer to notify the agricultural employer of changes to scheduled pesticide applications within 2 hours of the end of the application?</li> <li>• What are the benefits to expanding the information to be exchanged between handler and agricultural employers? Are there any drawbacks?</li> <li>• Would this impose additional burden on employers? If so, what burden and how could it be reduced?</li> </ul>	<b>9(k)</b> <b>13(i) – (j)</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>The current requirements aimed at ensuring no entry into treated areas requires close coordination between supervisory personnel responsible for both activities on specialty crops farms. In most cases the application schedule is adjusted to ensure no potential exposure to non-application workers. No additional regulatory language is necessary.</b>

<b>EPA Requested Comment Areas</b>					
<b>Section 5: Handler Restrictions and Minimum Age for Handlers:</b>					
<b>Issue Area</b>	<b>FR Notice</b>	<b>EPA Questions</b>	<b>Sections of Proposed Rule</b>	<b>Sections Existing Rule</b>	<b>Comments</b>
A. Suspend Application	PP 15483 -- 15483	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will this proposal, in combination with the entry-restricted area requirements proposed in Unit XIV., effectively reduce worker exposure to spray drift? Please provide rationale and data to substantiate your response.</li> <li>• Are there alternatives to this proposal that would better protect workers and others from spray drift, while reserving the flexibility to use pesticides in agriculture? Please provide rationale and data to support your response.</li> </ul>	<b>205 (a) and (b)</b>	<b>No Direct Language</b>	<p><b>This proposed language puts a huge burden on the applicator, especially in orchard situations when using air-blast sprayers. Given restricted sight lines and the noise of the sprayer, applicators may not see or hear someone enter the treated area. In cases of persons entering an area being treated by an air-blast sprayer, the person entering the area should be aware that spraying is occurring and that the sprayer may not be visible.</b></p> <p><b>Current label language on Agricultural products direct applicators to not make applications in a manner that would allow drift or direct exposure to field workers.</b></p>
B. Establish Minimum Age of 16 for Handling Pesticides	PP 15483 - 15484	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there alternatives that have not been considered that would improve protections for adolescent handlers, either those under 16 or 18 years old, while allowing flexibility for pesticide use for agriculture?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What would be the impact on state programs of establishing a minimum age of either 16 or 18 for handlers?</li> <li>• Would establishing a minimum age of 16 for handlers have an impact on state requirements for certified applicators to be a minimum age? If so, please provide data to support this position.</li> <li>• Would establishing a minimum age of 18 for handlers have an impact on state requirements for certified applicators to be a minimum age? If so, please provide data to support this position.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Are there additional benefits or burdens with establishing a minimum age of 16 or 18 for handlers? If so, please provide data to support either position.</li> </ul>	<b>9(c) 13(c) 301(a)(1)(i)</b>	<b>No Direct Language</b>	<p><b>While we have no major reservations concerning this provision; we are not aware of any information that has been generated that would indicate that the protections specified on pesticide labels established to allow use of the products would not be sufficient to protect workers.</b></p>

<b>EPA Requested Comment Areas</b>					
<b>Section 6: Restriction for Worker Entry into Treated Areas:</b>					
<b>Issue Area</b>	<b>FR Notice</b>	<b>EPA Questions</b>	<b>Sections of Proposed Rule</b>	<b>Sections Existing Rule</b>	<b>Comments</b>
A. Establish Minimum Age of 16 for Workers Entering a Treated Area under an REI	PP 15484 – 15485	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there other ways EPA could protect children less than 16 years old from pesticide risks associated with entry into a treated area during an REI? If so, please describe.</li> <li>• What would be the impact on state programs of establishing a minimum age for early entry workers?</li> <li>• Would establishing a minimum age of 16 or 18 for early entry workers have an adverse impact on state requirements for certified applicators to be a minimum age, generally 16 or 18?</li> <li>• Are there additional benefits or burdens with establishing a minimum age of 16? If so, please provide data to support this position.</li> <li>• Are there additional benefits or burdens associated with establishing a minimum age of 18? If so, please provide data to support this position.</li> </ul>	<b>303</b> <b>301(a)(1)(i)</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>Many states currently have regulations in place that are more restrictive than those proposed in this regulation. As a result we have no major reservations as to the burden if the proposal is implemented as proposed.</b>
B. Requirements for Entry During an REI	PP 15485 – 15487	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there other information related to entry into a treated area under an REI that EPA should require employers to document? If so, what information and why?</li> <li>• Are there other ways EPA could verify that workers received notification and the proper equipment to work in a treated area under an REI without the proposed recordkeeping?</li> </ul>	<b>305</b>	<b>112(a)</b> <b>(Limited Contact &amp; Irrigation)</b>	<b>It is not clear from the information cited in the proposed rule if the early re-entry issues were the result of employer directed events. We believe that the current systems in place to provide communication between applicators and the field supervisory personnel responsible for oversight of non-application related workers is adequate to prevent routine early reentry from occurring.</b>

EPA Requested Comment Areas					
Section 6: Restriction for Worker Entry into Treated Areas:					
Issue Area	FR Notice	EPA Questions	Sections of Proposed Rule	Sections Existing Rule	Comments
C. Clarify Requirement for Decontamination Supplies for Workers Entering a Treated Area Under an REI	PP 15487 – 15487	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is 3 gallons for decontamination a reasonable amount of water for an early entry worker who has been exposed to a pesticide? If not, why?</li> <li>• What amount of water would be reasonable, or what other alternative is there?</li> </ul>	<b>305(j)</b>	<b>112(d)</b>	<b>Under current OSHA field sanitation Standards and Food Safety Mandated programs, adequate water for the purposes of field decontamination is already required. If additional WPS mandates are required, coordination with the other field hygiene related programs needs to take place.</b>

<b>EPA Requested Comment Areas</b>					
<b>Section 6: Restriction for Worker Entry into Treated Areas:</b>					
<b>Issue Area</b>	<b>FR Notice</b>	<b>EPA Questions</b>	<b>Sections of Proposed Rule</b>	<b>Sections Existing Rule</b>	<b>Comments</b>
D. Exception to the General Prohibition Against Sending Workers Into a Treated Area Under an REI	PP 15487 – 15489	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there reasons EPA should consider eliminating the agricultural emergency exception?</li> </ul>		<b>112(a)</b> <b>112(b)</b>	<p><b>It is our opinion that an emergency exemption process needs to be considered, defined and allowed under the WPS guidelines. It needs to clearly be a non-routine process and all protections necessary to prevent contact exposure to treated surfaces applied.</b></p>
ii. Limit "agricultural emergency" exception.	PP 15488 – 15489	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What benefits and drawbacks are associated with limiting the agencies that can declare an agricultural emergency?</li> <li>• Please share any data on the use of the agricultural emergency exception, establishing a time limit, or other restrictions associated with exceptions.</li> <li>• Should EPA develop guidance on the criteria for declaring an agricultural emergency and/or how a person or organization could request an eligible agency to declare an agricultural emergency?</li> <li>• Do you have factual information about the current frequency of use of any of the exceptions? If so, please provide it to the Agency.</li> </ul>	<b>303(a) (no Contact)</b> <b>303(c)</b>	<b>303(d)</b> <b>112</b>	<p><b>Emergency exemptions by their very nature cannot be predicted or anticipated, as a result any criteria developed to define the circumstances that require reentry should be transparent and clearly defined. Pre-approval to initiate re-entry under the exemption would be cumbersome and unnecessary if the criteria is clearly defined and the steps are taken to ensure documentation of the criteria being met, the workers involved, and the protective measures taken to minimize contact to treated surfaces.</b></p>
iv. Eliminate provision for exceptions requiring Agency approval.	PP 15489 - 15489	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the benefits and challenges of the proposed amendments to each of the exceptions?</li> <li>• Are there other reasonable alternatives that EPA did not consider? If so, please describe and provide a rationale for their consideration.</li> <li>• Should EPA consider a different time limit for the agricultural emergency exception? For other exceptions?</li> <li>• Are there any drawbacks to adding the irrigation and limited contact exceptions into the rule?</li> <li>• For all comments, please provide factual information in support of your assertions.</li> </ul>	<b>No Language</b>	<b>112(e)</b>	<p><b>Common sense would support the ability to provide adequate protection during limited duration events that required workers to enter treated areas to perform tasks with limited potential for contact with treated surfaces.</b></p>



EPA Requested Comment Areas					
Section 6: Restriction for Worker Entry into Treated Areas:					
Issue Area	FR Notice	EPA Questions	Sections of Proposed Rule	Sections Existing Rule	Comments
E. Expansion of Entry-Restricted Areas	PP 15489 – 15490	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it reasonable for EPA to assume that workers can be reassigned for the duration of the pesticide application?</li> <li>• Are there any burdens to applying an entry-restricted area on farms and in forests?</li> </ul> Are there any other benefits?	<b>105(a)</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>This provision as described in the FR Notice would represent a scheduling challenge, it would be fairly easily managed on large acreage holdings but would become more problematic as the production area is limited.</b>

<b>EPA Requested Comment Areas</b>					
<b>Section 7: Display of Basic Pesticide Safety Information:</b>					
<b>Issue Area</b>	<b>FR Notice</b>	<b>EPA Questions</b>	<b>Sections of Proposed Rule</b>	<b>Sections Existing Rule</b>	<b>Comments</b>
A. Location of Basic Pesticide Safety Information Display	PP 15490 -- 15491	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What additional burden would employers face if the proposed option to require pesticide safety information to be displayed at decontamination sites is implemented? Would there be benefits to employers?</li> <li>• Do data exist that show that access to information such as that on the pesticide safety poster at the same location as decontamination supplies leads to more workers adopting hygiene practices, thereby reducing the number of workplace illnesses?</li> </ul>	<b>110(a)(2)</b>	<b>135(d)</b> <b>235(d)</b>	<b>The concern is that the decontamination equipment could be mobile, making display and updating more difficult. We are not aware of data that shows that the addition of passive display makes a difference beyond the training provided to workers. Suggest deleting the requirement to display safety information at site where decontamination supplies are provided, as it is unclear why this is required.</b>
B. Content of Basic Pesticide Safety Information Display	PP 15491 - 15492	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What additional burden would employers face if the proposed option to require pesticide safety information to be displayed at decontamination sites is implemented? Would there be benefits to employers?</li> <li>• Should EPA consider other changes to content of the pesticide safety information display? If so, what changes and why?</li> </ul>	<b>11(a)(1)</b> <b>11(a)(2)</b>	<b>135(b)(1)</b> <b>and (2)</b> <b>235(b)(1)</b> <b>and (2)</b>	<p><b>Requiring additional posting at each decontamination site (i.,e., field sanitation stations or food safety mandated facilities) is a significant burden</b></p> <p><b>The most important information to display is general hygiene information that can lead to reduced potential exposure if practiced.</b></p>

EPA Requested Comment Areas					
Section 8: Decontamination and Emergency Assistance:					
Issue Area	FR Notice	EPA Questions	Sections of Proposed Rule	Sections Existing Rule	Comments
A. Clarify the Quantity of Water Required for Decontamination	PP 15492 – 15492	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is 1 gallon for routine washing for workers and 3 gallons for handler emergency decontamination, reasonable amounts of water for workers or handlers who have been exposed to pesticides? If not, why?</li> <li>• What amount of water would be reasonable, or what other alternative is there?</li> <li>• Would waterless cleansing agents used in lieu of soap, water, and towels effectively remove pesticide residues from workers' and handlers' hands? Should EPA consider allowing the employer to substitute waterless cleansing agents for the currently required decontamination supplies? If so, why? Please provide data on the efficacy of waterless cleansing agents for removing pesticide residues.</li> </ul>	<b>11(b)</b> <b>209(b)</b>	<b>150</b> <b>250</b>	<b>This amount of water at decontamination facilities appears to be appropriate. As in earlier comments we would suggest coordination across other worker hygiene related regulations from other agencies to ensure consistency.</b>

EPA Requested Comment Areas					
Section 8: Decontamination and Emergency Assistance:					
Issue Area	FR Notice	EPA Questions	Sections of Proposed Rule	Sections Existing Rule	Comments
B. Eliminate the Substitution of Natural Waters for Decontamination Supplies	PP 15492 – 15493	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please provide information on situations, if any, in which the proposed change would significantly increase the burden on agricultural employers and offer alternative proposals.</li> <li>• Please provide any information on the cost associated with the current situation and proposed change.</li> <li>• Would using natural waters for decontamination worsen a worker's or handler's situation after pesticide exposure?</li> <li>• Would it be beneficial to use any water in the event of a pesticide emergency or when decontamination supplies cannot be located within one quarter mile because of limited vehicular access?</li> </ul>	<b>Not in Proposed Rule Language</b>	<b>150 250</b>	<b>The appropriate level of water quality should be utilized to minimize potential for cross exposures. For employer supplied decontamination (hygiene) facilities this is typically potable water or equivalent quality. In true emergency decontamination situations the employee should be directed to use whatever water is available for immediate decontamination.</b>

EPA Requested Comment Areas					
Section 8: Decontamination and Emergency Assistance:					
Issue Area	FR Notice	EPA Questions	Sections of Proposed Rule	Sections Existing Rule	Comments
C. Requirements for Ocular Decontamination in Case of Exposed Pesticide Handlers	PP 15493 – 15494	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it reasonable to require that clean, running water be present and flowing at a minimum of 1.5 liter (0.4 gallons) per minute for 15 minutes at permanent mixing and loading stations? If not, why?</li> <li>• Should EPA consider other ways to provide ocular decontamination for handlers? If so, please provide specific details, including rationale and cost.</li> <li>• Do data exist on the relative number of mixing and loading activities that occur at permanent sites and away from permanent sites?</li> <li>• Are there other ways in which ocular decontamination might reasonably be improved at temporary mixing and loading sites?</li> </ul>	209(b)	250	<b>Permanent mixing and loading stations at the field level draw water from wells or surface water that is clean but not necessarily potable. The requirement for flowing water for a fifteen minute period may not be achievable for many locations. If the concern is emergency eye wash for handlers the provision of the three gallons of clean water for decontamination would allow for a first flus to allow time to get to a location with continuously flowing clean water.</b>

EPA Requested Comment Areas					
Section 8: Decontamination and Emergency Assistance:					
Issue Area	FR Notice	EPA Questions	Sections of Proposed Rule	Sections Existing Rule	Comments
D. Showers for Handler Decontamination	PP 15494 - - 15594	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it reasonable to assume a significant percentage of handlers would not use a permanent shower facility at a worksite?</li> <li>• Would increased handler training, clarified amounts of water for routine decontamination, and/or the use of additional PPE for handlers be sufficient to protect handlers and their families from occupational and take-home pesticide exposure? If not, why?</li> <li>• Are there other preventative measures that would provide comparable protection to handlers and their family is without incurring the same cost as requiring installation of shower facilities? If so, please describe the preventative measures, estimated cost, and implementation.</li> <li>• What other alternatives exist?</li> </ul>	<b>Not in Proposed Rule language</b>	<b>Not in Rule</b>	<b>We concur with the agency's decision to not require permanent shower facilities for handlers on site for the same reasons given in the federal register notice.</b>

<b>EPA Requested Comment Areas</b>					
<b>Section 8: Decontamination and Emergency Assistance:</b>					
<b>Issue Area</b>	<b>FR Notice</b>	<b>EPA Questions</b>	<b>Sections of Proposed Rule</b>	<b>Sections Existing Rule</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Emergency Assistance</b>	PP 15494 – 15496	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is 30 minutes a reasonable timeframe for an agricultural employer or commercial handler employer to make transportation available to a worker or handler who has been exposed to pesticides to a medical treatment facility? If the timeframe is too long or short, please explain why. What would be a reasonable alternative?</li> <li>• Do medical personnel treating a worker or handler for occupational pesticide exposure need more information than what is proposed to evaluate, diagnose, and treat the patient? If so, what additional information would be necessary?</li> <li>• If time is of the essence in determining the proper course of treatment, should EPA consider requiring the agricultural employer to report the estimated time of the incident in addition to the information proposed above?</li> </ul>	<b>9(f)</b> <b>13(k)</b>	<b>160</b> <b>260</b>	<p><b>The specific parameters surrounding the exposure incident determines the adequate response time for providing transportation to a medical facility.</b></p> <p><b>The question of exposure is unclear: who makes that determination? Assessing if a handler is exposed and to what chemical(s) is relatively simple, but worker exposure may be more complex, as it includes determining what the worker may have been exposed to. A medical emergency resulting from pesticide exposure to a non-handler, non-applicator field worker is highly unlikely, if the training and notification requirements currently required are followed.</b></p> <p><b>In the cases where exposures resulting in health impacts are alleged, the information already collected and available upon request by a worker or his attending physicians is more than adequate to facilitate diagnosis and subsequent treatment options. Any information surrounding the exposure concerns of the 4r medical professional should be provided upon request.</b></p>

EPA Requested Comment Areas Section 9: Personal Protective Equipment:					
Issue Area	FR Notice	EPA Questions	Sections of Proposed Rule	Sections Existing Rule	Comments
A. Chemical-Resistant PPE	PP 15496 -- 15496	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there alternatives to this proposal for determining chemical resistance of a garment that are both cost-effective and protective? Please provide details and any data that may apply.</li> </ul>	<b>207(b)(1)</b>	<b>240(c)(1)</b>	<b>No suggestions or recommendations.</b>



EPA Requested Comment Areas Section 9: Personal Protective Equipment:					
Issue Area	FR Notice	EPA Questions	Sections of Proposed Rule	Sections Existing Rule	Comments
B. Closed Systems	PP 15496 - - 15498	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the proposed standards for closed systems reasonable and achievable?</li> <li>• Are the proposed standards for closed systems too specific? If so, please describe what aspects are too specific, why, and how to achieve sufficient protection while reducing the specificity.</li> <li>• Do data exist on the number of establishments that use closed systems, the number that do not use closed systems because the current standard is not clear, and/or the number of establishments that use closed systems that meet the California criteria?</li> <li>• Would people who currently use closed systems that do not meet the proposed standard upgrade their closed system or opt to use the label-required PPE? What information would impact this decision?</li> <li>• What would be the cost to convert an existing system that does not meet the proposed standard to one that does?</li> <li>• Should EPA consider eliminating any of the criteria listed in the proposal? If so, which criteria and why?</li> <li>• What would be the benefits and draw backs of the requirement for the closed system to triple rinse the container? Is the technology available to provide this element at a reasonable cost?</li> <li>• Would it be possible for agricultural and handler employers, handlers, and inspectors to measure the closed system's PSI while the system is in use?</li> <li>• If it would not be possible, should EPA consider eliminating this element?</li> </ul>	<b>307 (d)</b>	<b>240(d)(4)</b>	<b>Any proposed standards for closed systems should be defined by the technical standards necessary to accomplish the specific protection goals of the system. Technology is evolving rapidly and no technology should be eliminated for consideration if the protection outcome can be achieved. The California standard can be used as an example but it should not become the default standard to the exclusion of other equally protective alternative systems.</b>

<b>EPA Requested Comment Areas Section 9: Personal Protective Equipment:</b>					
<b>Issue Area</b>	<b>FR Notice</b>	<b>EPA Questions</b>	<b>Sections of Proposed Rule</b>	<b>Sections Existing Rule</b>	<b>Comments</b>
C. Contaminated PPE	PP 15498 - - 15499	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there better ways to mitigate the risks associated with reuse of discarded PPE? Please provide rationale and data, as applicable, with your response.</li> </ul>	<b>207(d)(2)</b>	<b>240 (f)</b>	<b>No recommendations</b>
D. Eyewear Protection for Open Cockpits	PP 15499 – 15499	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the estimate of the cost reasonable? Please provide rationale and data to support your information.</li> </ul>		<b>240(d)(6)(ii)</b>	<b>No Information or recommendations</b>
E. Respirator Requirements Harmonized with OSHA					<b>The use of respirators is a highly effective means of reducing the potential for either oral or inhalation exposure routes. The training requirements associated with occupational use of respirators in life threatening situations in many cases is not absolutely necessary to achieve the protection goals of incidental exposures in a non-life threatening environment. Individual labels specify when fit testing and medically fit determinations are appropriate. The universe of pesticides that are acutely toxic are limited and a more compound specific pathway to establish appropriate training requirements would be recommended.</b>

<b>EPA Requested Comment Areas</b>					
<b>Section 10: Monitoring Handler Exposure to Cholinesterase Inhibiting Pesticides:</b>					
<b>Issue Area</b>	<b>FR Notice</b>	<b>EPA Questions</b>	<b>Sections of Proposed Rule</b>	<b>Sections Existing Rule</b>	<b>Comments</b>
	PP 14500 -- 15502	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do you believe the costs and burdens of a national ChE monitoring program would be justified by the protections to handler health? If so, please provide justification.</li> <li>• Do you agree that it is more protective to prevent handler exposure than to address it after it occurs? If so, why? If not, do you have an alternative proposal to address handler exposure?</li> <li>• Does other information exist on the benefits or challenges of ChE monitoring that the Agency has not presented in this proposal? If so, please provide.</li> </ul>	<b>Not Proposed in Current Language</b>	<b>Not Required</b>	<p><b>Measurement of cholinesterase levels as a means to establish exposure thresholds for individual workers is indicated due to the need for a base line study to provide individualized information on personal levels that are metabolically dictated. This occupation exposure measurement is not easily accomplished due to other common materials where exposure changes the levels of cholinesterase, especially in serum level measurements. The invasive nature of the testing and the limited suitability would suggest that efforts directed toward education and training to prevent contact with treated surfaces would be more efficient and effective.</b></p>

EPA Requested Comment Areas					
Section 11: Exemptions and Exceptions:					
Issue Area	FR Notice	EPA Questions	Sections of Proposed Rule	Sections Existing Rule	Comments
A. Immediate Family	PP 15502 -- 15503	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would this requirement have a different impact on small farms than on larger establishments? If so, please explain the likely impact.</li> <li>• Does exempting agricultural establishment owners from the requirements to provide certain protections to immediate family members present unreasonable risks to family members who are under 16 years old?</li> <li>• What would be the impact of limiting the immediate family exemption to family members who are at least 16 years old and who are employed by the owner?</li> <li>• How many agricultural establishments would be affected if EPA decided to limit the exemption to immediate family members at least 16 years old?</li> </ul>	<b>Not Explicit In Current Proposed Rule</b>	<b>109(a) 209(a)</b>	<b>As described in the Federal Register notice, this exemption is essentially recognition of a unique relationship for farms where family members work. While technically exempt the label dictates many of the protection requirements and would be enforceable even without strict coverage by WPS. This represents a very small portion of the farm workforce and does not undermine the intent or protections to those for whom the rule is intended to protect.</b>

EPA Requested Comment Areas					
Section 11: Exemptions and Exceptions:					
Issue Area	FR Notice	EPA Questions	Sections of Proposed Rule	Sections Existing Rule	Comments
B. Crop Advisors and Employees	PP 15503 - - 15504	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should EPA consider an alternative to this proposal? If so, what alternative and why?</li> <li>• Should EPA require specific training for the employees of crop advisors to ensure that they understand the risks of entering and working in areas treated with pesticides? If so, please provide specific information on the type of training and anticipated benefit to crop advisor employees. Also, please comment on whether a crop adviser's employees, who have received such training, should be exempt from the WPS requirements for provisions for decontamination supplies and emergency assistance and from following the labeling requirements for PPE for early entry.</li> </ul>	<b>301(b)</b>	<b>5 230(c)(4)</b>	<p><b>This is a highly trained and professional workforce that performs critically important functions for the specialty crop industry. The value of the services provided and information collected requires re-entry into treated areas prior to the end of longer re-entry intervals. Adequate training to confer an understanding of the risks is the responsibility of the Crop Advisory service that employs the exempt workers.</b></p> <p><b>Appropriate PPE and decontamination supplies to ensure protection of the crop advisor employee should be provided by the Crop Advisory Service and not the responsibility of the farm for which services are provided.</b></p>

EPA Requested Comment Areas Section 11: Exemptions and Exceptions:					
Issue Area	FR Notice	EPA Questions	Sections of Proposed Rule	Sections Existing Rule	Comments
C. Revise the Exception to the Requirement for Workers To Be Fully Trained Before Entering Pesticide- Treated Areas	PP 15504 - - 15507	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply of trainers and how quickly they can be available.</li> <li>• Frequency of hiring new workers during the year.</li> <li>• Evidence about the frequency of illness for workers who receive basic vs. full pesticide safety training.</li> <li>• Should EPA eliminate the grace period? Why or why not?</li> <li>• What would be the impact of eliminating the grace period on agricultural employers, trainers, and/or workers?</li> <li>• What would be the impact of a shorter grace period on agricultural employers and trainers?</li> <li>• Would retaining a shorter grace period as proposed negatively impact workers? If so, how?</li> <li>• Should EPA retain the current 5 day grace period or reduce the grace period to 3 or 4 days? If EPA reduces the grace period to 3 or 4 days, what would be the relative impacts on agricultural employers and workers as compared to the proposed reduced grace period of 2 days?</li> </ul>	309	<p>130 15 day – 1992 Rule 5 day – 1995 rev. Rule</p> <p>130(c)</p>	<p><b>Efforts should be made to train workers who enter treated areas as soon as possible after hiring. In many cases this is done at the point of hiring but for some farm operations weekly training sessions are more efficient and effective. We have no evidence of increased negative health impacts related to the frequency or timing of initial worker training.</b></p> <p><b>We see no justification for reduction in the timing of the grace period for ensuring the initial training of a newly hired worker.</b></p>

EPA Requested Comment Areas					
Section 12: General Revisions and Implementation:					
Issue Area	FR Notice	EPA Questions	Sections of Proposed Rule	Sections Existing Rule	Comments
A. Improved Definitions	PP 15507 – 15508	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What impact do you expect on employers, workers, handlers, or other stakeholders as a result of replacing the terms “farms,” “forests,” “nurseries,” and “greenhouses” with the terms “outdoor production” and “enclosed space production”?</li> <li>• What are the impacts of revising the definition of “immediate family”?</li> <li>• Should EPA consider including cousins in the definition of immediate family? Why or why not?</li> <li>• What are the impacts of adding a definition of “employ”?</li> <li>• What are the impacts of adding a definition of “authorized representative”?</li> <li>• Are there other terms that the Agency should consider clarifying, redefining, or eliminating from the rule? If so, please provide detail about the term(s) and rationale for change.</li> </ul>	5	3	<p><b>Most of the changes to definitions provide clarity and transparency in implementation of the proposed rule. However, we do have suggestion or comments concerning the following definitions:</b></p> <p><b><i>Agricultural Establishment:</i></b> the proposed change from Greenhouse to “enclosed space production of agricultural Plants” appears to greatly expand the locations that were clearly not considered greenhouses in the previous rule ( I,e, shade house environments with open walls, structures with walls that can be opened to allow natural airflow).</p> <p><b><i>Authorized Representative:</i></b> The proposed definition is open-ended and subject to serious abuse. The representative of a worker seeking information under the provision of the WPS should be limited to family members or medical personnel with a legitimate need for information.</p> <p><b><i>Employ:</i></b> this definition is overly broad and expands the employee/employer beyond those typically contained in other employment based regulations. The definition as stated would place responsibilities on a farm operator for persons totally out of his personal management or control.</p> <p><b><i>Labor Contractor:</i></b> The definition is appropriately framed in the context of the direct oversight and management of the workers employed by the labor contractor. In relation to this rule many of the responsibilities of the farm management structure as currently defined should reside with this individual. He/she has direct control of the location and work performed by the workers he supplies for specific job functions. He/she should legitimately be the primary point of contact for scheduling of work locations to ensure entry restrictions are followed and applications to adjacent areas are scheduled to prevent exposure of the workers under his employment.</p>

EPA Requested Comment Areas					
Section 12: General Revisions and Implementation:					
Issue Area	FR Notice	EPA Questions	Sections of Proposed Rule	Sections Existing Rule	Comments
B. Restructuring of Part 170	PP 15508 – 15508	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the restructuring clearer and easier to read and understand?</li> <li>• Are there other ways that part 170 could be simplified or made clearer? If so, please provide suggested language and rationale.</li> </ul>			<b>Restructuring of the rule increased the clarity and relationship among the components.</b>
	PP 15508 – 15509	<p>Please provide input on how to measure the efficacy of the revised WPS once implemented. Describe specific data elements and how EPA could use them to determine whether the revised regulation is effective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What data would help to evaluate the impacts (costs) and benefits of the rule after implementation? Describe specific data elements and how EPA could use them to evaluate the costs and benefits of the rule.</li> <li>• If EPA evaluates the effectiveness and/or the impacts and benefits of the rule, what timeframe should be used to conduct the evaluation, e.g., should EPA begin a review after the rule is fully implemented or a specific time period after full implementation? For how long should EPA conduct the evaluation? Please provide additional information on methodology that could be used to conduct any evaluation.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Four Subparts</b></p> <p><b>A – General Provisions</b></p> <p><b>B – Requirements for Protections of Workers</b></p> <p><b>C—Requirements for protection of Handlers</b></p> <p><b>D – Exemptions and Exceptions</b></p>	<p><b>Three Subparts</b></p> <p><b>A – General Provisions</b></p> <p><b>B—Standard for Workers</b></p> <p><b>C—Standard for Pesticide Handlers</b></p>	<b>No suggestions or recommendations on the measurement of effectiveness or the relative cost benefit determinations. We are concerned that the justification of the proposed changes are based on information that is not directly relevant to the current spectrum of pest control choices in the market place. Many of the studies relied upon to describe the exposure impacts that the rule is designed to avoid are no longer in widespread use and the replacement compounds are safer. We would encourage careful scrutiny of the health benefits claimed in the proposal.</b>