1. What are the advantages and disadvantages of amending the WPS in the manner described by this proposal?

2. What are the advantages and disadvantages of proposing a minimum-size sign?

3. What is an appropriate minimumsize requirement for smaller signs? Please provide any available data on the relationship between sign size and worker recognition that entry to the treated area is prohibited.

4. Should EPA require a maximum distance requirement between signs when smaller signs are used (e.g., the Oregon Proposal discussed in Unit IV.B. of this preamble)? If so, what should the distance be?

5. Would commenters prefer a more precise and objective standard, such as permitting the use of a smaller size sign on a smaller plot, e.g., 1/2 acre or less?

6. Should the grower be permitted to handwrite in a substitute language or should a manufacturered sign or sticker be required?

V. Public Docket

A record has been established for this rulemaking under docket number "OPP-250107 " (including comments and data submitted electronically as described below). A public version of this record, including printed, paper versions of electronic comments, which does not include any information claimed as CBI, is available for inspection from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The public record is located in Rm. 1132 of the Public Response and Program Resources Branch, Field Operations Division (7506C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA.

Electronic comments can be sent directly to EPA at:

opp-docket@epamail.epa.gov

Electronic comments must be submitted as an ASCII file avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption.

The official record for the rulemaking, as well as the public version, as described above will be kept in paper form. Accordingly, EPA will transfer all comments received electronically into printed, paper form as they are received and will place the paper copies in the official rulemaking record which will also include all comments submitted directly in writing. The official rulemaking record is the paper record maintained at the address in "ADDRESSES" at the beginning of this document.

VI. Statutory Requirements

As required by FIFRA section 25(a), this proposed rule was provided to the Secretary of Agriculture; the Committee on Agriculture of the House Representatives; and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate for review. The FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel waived its review.

VII. Regulatory Assessment Requirements

A. Executive Order 12866

Pursuant to Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), it has been determined that this is not a "significant regulatory action." OMB has waived its review.

Both the proposals to modify the second language requirements on the sign and to allow smaller signs in greenhouses and nurseries are only optional changes to the requirements of the current WPS. This proposed rule, if finalized, would provide nonmandatory options and, therefore, does not increase costs. In the event that either option is chosen, the second language change would be a negligible cost, and the smaller signs change would constitute regulatory relief.

B. Regulatory Flexibility Act

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, the Agency must conduct a small business analysis to determine whether a substantial number of small entities would be significantly affected by the rule. However, this proposed rule potentially reduces burden and would not require actions which would increase costs. I therefore certify that this proposal does not require a separate analysis under the Regulatory Flexibility Act as it would not have an adverse impact on any small entity.

C. Paperwork Reduction Act

This proposed rule does not have any information collection requirements subject to the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, 44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.