16. *Insect traps.* EPA is proposing to retain the use of dichlorvos in insect traps. The risk to applicators is expected to be negligible because of the short amount of time that the applicator is in contact with the trap, and because the traps are located outside away from people. The only alternative, adhesive strips, may not be as effective as dichlorvos in cases where there are heavy insect populations. Although the overall benefits are not expected to be

problems outweigh the negligible risks. 17. Garbage dumps. EPA proposes retaining the use of dichlorvos on garbage dumps. The Agency estimates that the MOE for applying dichlorvos on a garbage dump are greater than 100. In addition, garbage is generally located outdoors or in a separate room, thereby reducing exposure. There are various alternatives to dichlorvos for controlling flies on garbage. There may be some benefits from the use of dichlorvos on garbage dumps, although not significant, and because this use is not a risk of concern, EPA is proposing to retain the use on garbage dumps.

significant, the benefits for heavy insect

18. Commercial transportation vehicles. There are unacceptable applicator and reentry risks for all commercial transportation uses. Due to a very low MOE of 14 for applicators on airplanes, EPA is proposing to cancel dichlorvos products registered for this use. EPA does not believe it is possible to reduce this risk. The benefits are not expected to be significant, since EPA estimates the use to be minimal and Amvac has requested voluntary cancellation of this use. Therefore, EPA believes the risks outweigh the benefits of continued use in airplanes. The Agency believes that risk mitigation measures are possible for use of dichlorvos in buses. For passenger buses, EPA is proposing to eliminate applicator exposure by limiting application to only foggers, and requiring a 6-hour ventilation period following treatment. With these measures required, the benefits of use of dichlorvos in buses would outweigh its risk.

EPA is proposing to cancel products registered for use in other vehicles (trucks/shipholds/railroad cars). EPA does not believe it is feasible to mitigate the risk from reentry. A 36–hour reentry period would be required to achieve an MOE above 100, which is not practical for commercial vehicles. The economic impact resulting from the cancellation of this use is not expected to be significant since there are alternatives available which would result in similar treatment costs. Therefore, the risks outweigh the benefits.

19. Restricted use. With the exception of certain uses listed below, EPA is proposing that all registered products be restricted to use by certified applicators only. This proposal is based on the acute toxicity of dichlorvos (Toxicity Category I, the most toxic classification) and the existence of poisoning incidents. This is not expected to be a major burden since most commercial use products already have a label statement limiting sale and use to pest control operators. In addition, the Registration Standard recommended classification of all products, except those labeled for household use only, as restricted use. EPA is therefore proposing to restrict the use of all products except those registered for only the following uses: impregnated

strips in enclosed spaces within a museum and insect traps.

20. PPE requirements. EPA proposes to cancel the registration of all remaining dichlorvos products unless the labels are amended to require users to wear: a long sleeved shirt, long pants, gloves, socks and shoes. EPA estimates of acceptable MOEs for some uses are based on wearing these protective clothing. The PPE proposed in this Notice are the minimum needed to eliminate unreasonable risks from use of dichlorvos. If the presence of additional active ingredients in specific end-use products result in more restrictive PPE requirements then the more restrictive requirements must be placed on the end-use label.

If the acute inhalation toxicity of the end-use product is in category I or II, and therefore, a respirator is required for pesticide handlers, the following type of respirator is appropriate to mitigate dichlorvos inhalation concerns: a respirator with either an organic-vaporremoving cartridge with a prefilter approved for pesticides (MSHA/NIOSH approval number prefix TC-23C), or a canister approved for pesticides (MSHA/NIOSH approval number prefix TC-14G).

21. *Retained uses.* EPA is proposing to retain the following uses; however, the related registrations will be canceled unless the labels conform to the above cancellations, restricted use, reentry and protective clothing requirements: mushroom houses and greenhouses (only automatic foggers or fogging through a port), kennels, feedlots, insect traps, garbage dumps, direct application to poultry, automated application to livestock, animal premises, manure, and buses.

TABLE 4.—UPPER BOUND CANCER RISK ESTIMATES FROM USE OF DICHLORVOS AND NALED

Use	Risk Before Agency Proposed Action	Risk After Agency Proposed Action
Packaged or bagged, non-perishable processed food and RACs (in- cluding bulk stored, regardless of fat content)	3.4 x 10 ⁻⁶	0
Milk	6.2 x 10 ⁻⁷	6.2 x 10 ⁻⁷
Eggs	7.1 x 10 ⁻⁸	7.1 x 10 ⁻⁸
Red Meat	1.1 x 10 ⁻⁷	1.1 x 10 ⁻⁷
Poultry	3.7 x 10 ⁻⁸	3.7 x 10 ⁻⁸
Agricultural uses Lettuce Cucumbers Tomatoes	2.1 x 10 ⁻⁷ 1.6 x 10 ⁻⁷ 2.6 x 10 ⁻⁸ 1.4 x 10 ⁻⁸	2.1 x 10 ⁻⁷ 1.6 x 10 ⁻⁷ 2.6 x 10 ⁻⁸ 1.4 x 10 ⁻⁸