nonperishable processed food and the possible cancellation of the related uses. However, because those actions have not occurred, the Agency is proposing action at this time based on unacceptable dietary and worker risks (see warehouse discussion below).

3. Warehouses. MOEs from applying dichlorvos in warehouses and reentering treated areas are unacceptable, with the exception of impregnated resin pest strips in closed areas such as silos. EPA is, therefore, proposing cancellation of this use. Even if applicator exposure were minimized through the use of automatic application equipment, the MOEs from reentry would still be unacceptable. EPA assumes that a variety of tasks are performed in a warehouse including inventory, stocking and retrieving stored commodities, all of which would require entry into the warehouse soon after application to perform these tasks, and would result in prolonged exposure to a worker. Therefore, EPA does not believe it is feasible to mitigate the risk to workers reentering treated areas.

If dichlorvos can no longer be used in warehouses, areas where food is stored, due to worker risk, then the dietary risk from bulk stored, packaged or bagged raw and processed food would be eliminated. Therefore, the benefits for warehouses and for bulk stored, packaged or bagged food would be similar. As discussed in paragraph 2 above, there are potentially significant benefits for the use on bulk stored packaged and bagged food in warehouses. There are alternatives to dichlorvos for this use: however. cancellation of this use would result in increased costs as described in paragraph 2 above. These benefits do not justify MOEs of 38 for applicators and 2.8 for reentry workers. Based on unacceptable MOEs for applicators and reentry workers, EPA believes the risks outweigh the benefits, and therefore, products registered for the warehouse use should be canceled.

4. Commercial, institutional, and *industrial areas.* The risks posed by these uses, which include food handling establishments, are estimated to be similar to risks from warehouse uses, involving MOEs of 38 for applicators and 2.8 for persons reentering treated areas. There are a variety of registered alternatives in the absence of dichlorvos, and the benefits are not expected to be significant. EPA is, therefore, proposing to cancel these uses because the risks outweigh the benefits. Any dietary risk resulting from food handling use, although not estimated here, would be eliminated.

5. Greenhouses. The estimated dietary risk from dichlorvos use in greenhouses is  $2.0 \times 10^{-7}$ , which is negligible. However, the MOEs for workers performing most methods of application in greenhouses are less than 100, and about one-third are less than 50, since they involve the applicator remaining in the greenhouse during application. In addition, the MOE for reentry workers 24 hours after application is 21. There are a variety of registered alternatives available as a space treatment, surface treatment or direct treatment to plants. Assuming an equal number of applications to replace dichlorvos, the cancellation of dichlorvos should not result in significant economic impacts. These applicator and reentry risks are unacceptable, and thus, EPA is proposing to cancel registrations of products labeled for use in greenhouses unless the following changes are made to the label which will reduce risks to an acceptable level: Eliminate handheld application methods and require use of automatic foggers inside the greenhouse or fogging through a port on the side of a greenhouse. In either case, no one (including the applicator) would be allowed in the greenhouse during the application. In addition, because of low MOEs for workers reentering greenhouses, the Agency is proposing to limit exposure by prohibiting entry by anyone, including handlers (except in an emergency) within the first 4 hours following application. For the remainder of the first 48 hours following application, the Agency is proposing to allow one hour per day entry into dichlorvos-treated greenhouses by trained pesticide handlers who are equipped with handler personal protective equipment (including an organic-vapor-cartridge respirator) and who are performing a handling task. Handling tasks are defined by the Worker Protection Standard (40 CFR part 170) and include operating ventilation equipment and checking air concentration levels. Entry by workers to perform non-handler tasks, such as harvesting, cultivation, and irrigationrelated tasks would be prohibited for the entire 48-hour period. It is unclear what effect, if any, the reentry restrictions proposed in this action will have on the greenhouse industry, since the Agency has no information regarding the need for reentry tasks during the first 48 hours following application of dichlorvos.

If the application and reentry restrictions proposed here are not feasible to implement, EPA does not believe that the loss of dichlorvos in greenhouses would have a significant impact on the greenhouse industry; benefits from the use of dichlorvos in greenhouses are expected to be minimal due to the availability of alternatives. Therefore, EPA is proposing these restrictions because, without them, the applicator and reentry risks outweigh the benefits. Note that the entry restrictions being proposed by the Agency are based on the assumption that the treated area would not be ventilated for the entire 48-hour period following application. The Agency would consider data, if submitted, that indicate that a specified number of air exchanges or a specified number of hours of mechanical ventilation would reduce the dichlorvos air concentration level to an acceptable level for safe entry for workers (without respirators) in less than the proposed 48-hour entryrestricted period. This 48-hour reentry period exceeds the 24-hour period required in the Worker Protection Standard; however, based on the exposure data for dichlorvos, EPA believes that this longer reentry period is necessary to reduce worker risk to an acceptable level.

6. Mushroom houses. The estimated dietary risk from use of dichlorvos in mushroom houses is 2.6 x 10-9, which is negligible. However, the MOEs for most methods of applying dichlorvos in mushroom houses are less than 100, and some are less than 10, since they involve the applicator remaining in the house during application. In addition, the MOE for reentry workers following 24 hours after application is 21. These applicator and reentry risks are unacceptable, and thus, EPA is proposing to cancel registrations of products labeled for use in mushroom houses unless the following changes are made to the label which will reduce risks to an acceptable level: Eliminate hand-held application methods, and require use of automatic foggers inside the mushroom house or fogging through a port on the side of a mushroom house. In either case, no one (including the applicator) would be allowed in the mushroom house during the application. In addition, because of low MOEs from reentering mushroom houses, the Agency is proposing to limit exposure by prohibiting entry by anyone, including handlers (except in an emergency) within the first 4 hours following application. For the remainder of the first 48 hours following application, the Agency is proposing to allow one hour per day entry into dichlorvos-treated mushroom houses by trained pesticide handlers who are equipped with handler personal protective equipment (including an