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. The economic impact resulting from these restrictions is not expected to be significant since dichlorvos is only used for insect control after surface sprays and larvacides have been used, and permethrin is available as a direct alternative to dichlorvos. It is unclear what effect, if any, the reentry restrictions proposed in this action will have on the mushroom industry, since the Agency has no information showing whether reentry to perform crop cultivation tasks is necessary during the first 48 hours following application. EPA acknowledges that there may be impacts due to these restrictions; however in the absence of data, EPA is assuming no impact. 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 at all during 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 exposure data for dichlorvos, EPA believes that this longer reentry period is necessary to reduce worker risk to an acceptable level.

7. Direct treatment to domestic food and non-food animals (non-poultry). EPA is proposing cancellation of all products registered for hand-held application methods to domestic animals. The MOE for hand application is approximately 6. Other direct application methods that do not involve hand-held application are not expected to exceed the Agency's level of concern and would still be allowed. These include: face and back rubbers, and devices which automatically apply dichlorvos to the animals. The loss of

dichlorvos for hand-held treatment of animals should not have a major economic impact since there are easily available alternatives similar in cost to dichlorvos, and dichlorvos can still be used by other methods. Therefore, EPA believes that the risks outweigh the benefits for hand-held methods of application to food and non-food animals, excluding poultry.

8. Direct treatment to domestic food and non-food animals (poultry). EPA is proposing to retain the use of dichlorvos on poultry because the risks from application are not unreasonable. Dichlorvos is mainly used as a space spray to treat poultry premises, but it is also used for direct animal treatment. EPA does not have data to estimate risk from treating poultry; however, the Agency believes that both the application method and fewer number of applications will result in much lower exposure and risk than for cattle treatment. The benefits for poultry treatment cannot be separated out from the use on domestic animals and their premises. However, EPA believes there is a benefit for controlling mites on laying hens. As a result EPA is believes the benefits of dichlorvos use exceeds the risks and is proposing retention of this use.

9. Treatment of domestic animal (food and non-food) premises. EPA is proposing to retain the use of dichlorvos for treatment of domestic animal premises. The Agency estimates that MOEs for applying dichlorvos are greater than 100. Because there may be some benefits for the combined direct animal and premise treatment, and the estimated risk is very low, EPA believes that the benefits of this use outweigh the risks. Therefore, EPA is proposing retention of this use.

10. Feedlots (including around feedlots, stockyards, corrals, and holding pens). EPA proposes to retain the use of dichlorvos in feedlots. The Agency estimates that the MOEs for applying dichlorvos are greater than 100. Also application of dichlorvos in feedlots generally involves application over a short period of time in a well ventilated area, which together, further reduces the risk of exposure. There are various alternatives to dichlorvos for controlling flies in feedlots. Because there are probable regional impacts resulting from cancellation of this use, and the MOEs are greater than 100, EPA is proposing to retain this use. Therefore, the benefits outweigh the risks in this case.

11. Manure. EPA proposes retaining the use of dichlorvos on manure. The Agency estimates that the MOEs for applying dichlorvos on manure are greater than 100. In addition, manure is generally located outdoors or in well-ventilated areas, thereby reducing exposure to dichlorvos. There are various alternatives to dichlorvos for controlling flies on manure. There may be some benefits from the use of dichlorvos on manure, although not significant, and because this use is not a risk of concern, EPA is proposing to retain the use on manure.

12. Tobacco warehouse. EPA is proposing cancellation of products registered for this use because both applicator and reentry MOEs are low: 2 for application and 0.3 for reentry. Although EPA did not conduct a benefits analysis for this use site, EPA believes that little or no dichlorvos is used for tobacco warehouses, and Amvac has requested voluntary cancellation for this use site. The Agency does not anticipate a significant economic impact from cancellation; therefore, the risks of this use outweigh its benefits.

13. Residential uses. The Agency is proposing cancellation of all products registered for residential uses, including use by residents and by professional applicators, and for use on pets. EPA has determined that the MOEs are significantly less than 100 for all methods of application in the home and for post-application exposure to residents. The animal health and safety data discussed earlier also indicate an unacceptable risk for pets. Overall, the effect of cancellation of all residential uses is not expected to be significant, since there are several alternatives available. Therefore, EPA believes that the risks to residents and pets outweigh the benefits of this use.

14. Ornamental lawns, turf and plants. EPA is proposing to cancel dichlorvos products registered for these uses. The estimated risks from application of dichlorvos to ornamental lawns, turf, and plants are low (32 - similar to a greenhouse power sprayer). The economic impact resulting from the cancellation of this use is not expected to be significant since there are alternatives available which, in some cases, cost less than dichlorvos. Therefore, the risks outweigh the benefits.

15. Kennels. EPA is proposing to retain use in kennels. The Agency estimates that the MOE for applying dichlorvos in kennels is similar to that of a dairy barn or at least 225. There may be some benefits from the use of dichlorvos in kennels, although not significant, and because this use is not a risk of concern, EPA is proposing to retain this use.