American Coatings Association℠

Theodore Varns
Office of Pesticide Programs
Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW,
Washington, DC 20460-0001

July 27, 2022

Re: Diuron, EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0077
Submitted via www.regulations.gov

Dear Mr. Varns:

The American Coatings Association (ACA) appreciates the opportunity to submit comment on EPA's Proposed Interim Decision (PID) for diuron. ACA is a voluntary, non-profit trade association working to advance the needs of the paint and coatings industry and the professionals who work in it. The organization represents manufacturers of paints, coatings, sealants, adhesives, raw materials suppliers, distributors, and technical professionals. ACA's membership represents over 90 percent of the total domestic production of paints and coatings. ACA and its members are committed to bringing safe products to market with minimal environmental impacts, based on accurate assessment of risk. ACA and its members respectfully submit the following comment:

I. Introduction

ACA published its Proposed Interim Registration Review Decision for Diuron (hereinafter "PID") in March 2022, adopting and referencing EPA's *Response to Comment on the Draft Risk Assessment for Diuron*, having published the underlying Draft Risk Assessment for Diuron (hereinafter "DRA") in December 2020. EPA identifies carcinogenicity as the hazard of concern, with risk at levels of concern from occupational dermal and inhalation exposures. EPA assessed occupational handler cancer risks from open pour liquids, airless spray painting, and brush/roller painting. ACA provided comment on the DRA, noting deficiencies in data used to assess consumer and professional painter exposures during spray application of paint and worker exposure from open pouring of biocides during paint formulation.

Adopting a revised DRA, EPA proposed the following risk mitigation strategies in the PID:

- EPA proposes requiring closed loading during paint manufacturing processes.
- EPA is proposing a 50% maximum rate reduction from 6,000 ppm to 3,000 ppm for all paints and building material products, including adhesives, caulks, and sealants containing

diuron.
- EPA proposes that all diuron-containing products be labelled for outdoor use only.
- Even at levels of 3,000 ppm in paint, cancer risk from occupational airless spray application remains at levels of concern. EPA therefore proposes PPE with additional labeling on paint containers, including specification of respiratory protection and other PPE, fit-testing specifications and biocide-specific warning language.
- EPA proposes the paint industry undertake additional "stewardship" requirements so professional painters are aware of EPA-estimated risks from biocides in paint, appropriate PPE use, fit-testing requirements and the requirement for an initial medical exam.

ACA appreciates the opportunity to comment on EPA's proposed risk mitigation strategy, especially due to the direct and extreme impact this could have on labeling paint products with diuron. ACA notes several issues with EPA's risk assessment and mitigation strategy that weigh against adoption of a labeling requirement. ACA looks forward to continued engagement with EPA to develop information for painters, as necessary. Any information requirement must be based on an accurate risk assessment without redundancy with OSHA requirements. To the extent a narrowly tailored information requirement is justified by a risk assessment, ACA suggests alternatives to labeling, such as QR codes, websites and information on Safety Data Sheets.

When assessing risk, ACA remains concerned that EPA has not adopted realistic values for volumes of biocide handled by workers during formulation. ACA is also concerned that EPA has not accurately considered the vapor pressure of diuron during paint formulation and exposure to particles from airless spray application. In effect, labeling changes and closed systems may not be appropriate. To the extent EPA deems closed delivery systems necessary, ACA recommends a requirement for closed systems only for biocide delivery above the volume that would cause an unreasonable risk from open pouring. Notably, the risk at normal volumes handled is negligible using the revised vapor pressure as submitted in comments by Thor Corporation.

I. EPA must revise the underlying DRA with more accurate values.

ACA recommends that EPA delay development of a risk mitigation strategy, as proposed in the PID, due to deficiencies in the underlying DRA that must be resolved prior to determining an appropriate risk mitigation strategy. ACA had previously commented that the DRA overestimates the volumes of paint handled by professional applicators using airless sprayers. EPA also overestimates frequency of paint application. ACA similarly noted overestimates of volumes handled and frequency of application for consumer applications and volumes handled by workers during open pouring.

When developing its risk assessment, EPA relied on default values from its Residential SOPs to provide data points for volumes of paint handled and frequency of paint application. In its *Response to Comments on the Draft Risk Assessment*, EPA explains, "The Agency's policy is to use the best available data when assessing risk due to antimicrobial pesticide exposures. Current data sources informing antimicrobial pesticide handler exposure assumptions have been cited in the DRA and are considered reflective of the *best available product use data currently available* to the

Agency."[1]

EPA proceeds to invite ACA to submit its member survey data providing estimates of volumes handled and frequency, using EPA's 875.1700 Product Use Data guideline. ACA appreciates EPA's willingness to consider such information. ACA has been unable to assess the feasibility of submitting information under this guideline, since it is not readily available online. ACA also questions the necessity of using this guideline. ACA welcomes the opportunity to submit any supporting data from member surveys described in prior comments and summarized below, with any additional information. ACA looks forward to coordinating with EPA to submit any additional information.

a. Data standards for registration review.

FIFRA and related regulations do not define "best available data." Similarly, EPA does not provide a publicly available data screening protocol implementing its "best available data" considerations. EPA has broad discretion in identifying and including relevant information within the scope of a risk assessment. *EPA's Framework for Human Health Risk Assessment to Inform Decision Making*[2] provides as a general principle:

> Risk assessments should be based on exposure scenarios that are consistent with the purpose and context. As appropriate, they should include consideration of susceptible population groups and life stages.

Another general principle requires, "A risk assessment should be fit for its intended purpose." *EPA's Guidelines for Human Exposure Assessments*[3] includes similar principles as foundational to a risk assessment.

ACA recommends that EPA suspend developing risk mitigation strategies to gather addition information related to volume of biocides handled and frequency of exposure as related to spray application of paints and open pouring of biocides in the workplace. EPA should then revise the DRA accordingly.

EPA's broad discretion to identify and consider recent information stems from the statute and implementing regulations:

> Among other things, FIFRA requires that a pesticide generally will not cause unreasonable adverse effects on the environment. Registration review is intended to ensure that each pesticide's registration is based on current scientific and other knowledge regarding the pesticide, including its effects on human health and the

---

[1] EPA's *Response to Public Comments on N'(3,4-dichlorophenyl)-N,N-dimethylurea (Diuron) Draft Risk Assessment on the Antimicrobial Use* (August 26, 2021), page 2.

[2] . *EPA's Framework for Human Health Risk Assessment to Inform Decision Making* (April 2014), See p. 16 for general risk assessment principles, available at: https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2014-12/documents/hhra-framework-final-2014.pdf.

[3] *EPA's Guidelines for Human Exposure Assessments* (October 2019), available at: https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2020-01/documents/guidelines_for_human_exposure_assessment_final2019.pdf.

> environment.
> (40 CFR 155.40(a)(1))

Here, consideration of "unreasonable adverse effects on the environment," includes "taking into account the economic, social, and environmental costs and benefits of the use of any pesticide."[4]

On its registration review website, EPA further explains its need for flexibility in accepting current data:

> EPA always strives to base its decisions on the best available and sound science. However, science is constantly evolving, and new scientific information can come to light at any time and change our understanding of potential effects from pesticides. As part of registration review, EPA may identify additional data that may be useful for assessing a pesticide and require that it be submitted through a data call-in.

Here, EPA has not indicated a revised data call-in that would trigger procedures in FIFRA Section 3(c)(2), including a 90-day response period from data submitters. As such, ACA's submission of data using EPA's 875.1700 Product Use Data guideline is not necessary. ACA has not evaluated feasibility of submitting information using this guideline, but ACA welcomes the opportunity to submit additional information regarding its relevant member surveys and any additional data.

b. ACA's revised data points for EPA's risk assessment

As identified in ACA's comments on the DRA (Draft Risk Assessment), EPA should revise the following data point:

- In Table 8 of the DRA, EPA assumes that a worker pours diuron concentrate into 2,000 gallons/day of paint as a "standard assumptions used for occupational exposure assessments of AD chemicals." This value appears high, arbitrary and unfounded. Large paint manufacturing facilities generally use enclosed biocide metering/dosing systems rather than manual pouring. **Smaller facilities (or the occasional small batch at a larger facility) may involve manual pouring, but the quantity of paint dosed by an individual worker would be on the order of 200 gallons/day.** The DRA should be updated with this 10-fold lower value and the margin of exposure (MOE) re-calculated.

ACA further suggests modifications to duration of exposure of workers spray applying paint products. The open pour and paint application frequencies at Table 9 of the DRA are assumed by EPA to be:

- 250 days per year painting (no rationale provided).
- 8 hours per day painting (no rationale provided).
- 35 years out of a 78-year lifetime (no rationale provided).

As estimated with ACA members, based on member experience, the occupational paint application frequencies should be:

- 125 days per year to account for the other non-painting activities that painters do that

[4] FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. §136(bb), provides the definition of ''unreasonable adverse effects on the environment." See also f.n. 5, below, providing the detailed definition and additional explanation.

require entire days, such as drywall installation and repair.
- 4 hours per day to account for the non-painting activities that occur on the days when painting occurs, such as edge taping, furniture moving, tarp placement, equipment setup, cleanup, etc.
- 35 years seems to be a reasonable, upper-end career length.

Application frequencies of consumers are also over-estimated. Paint application frequencies (Table 7) are assumed by EPA to be:
- 1 day per year for airless spray painting (rounded up from 0.4 days per year) based on the application of two coats per house and a repainting interval of five years.
- 4 days per year for brush/roller painting based on Table 10-3 of HED's 2012 Residential SOPs.
- 50 years out of a 78-year lifetime.

As estimated with ACA members, based on members' experience, and to be consistent with EPA's stated repainting interval of five years, the paint application frequencies for consumers should be:
- 0.4 days per year for airless spray painting (no rounding is needed).
- 2 days per year for brush/roller painting because one coat is applied on the first day and another coat is applied on the second day.
- Painting your own house from age 20 to 70 (50 years) seems reasonable, but it has been misapplied in the calculations. Because a house is painted once every 5 years, only 10 years should be counted as "years when painting actually happened" (not each and every one of the 50 years).

II. EPA must consider workplace practices in the Draft Risk Assessment

As noted in ACA's comment on the DRA, ACA strongly recommends that EPA consider standard workplace practices such as engineering controls and PPE in the workplace when evaluating workplace risks, to the extent EPA has access to an industrial hygienist for an accurate assessment. In its response to comment, EPA simply notes that it considers PPE for handlers of diuron as a registered pesticide product. EPA encourages paint manufacturers to register their products with diuron as a pesticide product so EPA can fully consider PPE.

As noted above, EPA has broad discretion to identify relevant information for a DRA. Professional painters wear typically use adequate ventilation and PPE including respirators, goggles, gloves, face masks or other PPE to cover any potentially exposed skin. Adjustments to the DRA should be made to appropriately account for use of PPE and ventilation in this scenario.

Nothing in FIFRA or implementing regulations restrict EPA's consideration of PPE and ventilation when considering safety during use or formulation of a treated article. Here, EPA has assumed authority to evaluate safety related to biocide exposure from a treated article, but then argues that it is not authorized to allow a full set of considerations related to that exposure scenario. This interpretation is not supported by FIFRA. If EPA is to evaluate exposure at all, it must do so accurately, not by excluding critical elements such as workplace practices and PPE. ACA

recommends suspending risk mitigation so EPA can incorporate the related information ACA submitted in comment to the DRA and / or gather additional information.

III. EPA must consistently use vapor pressure values in the exposure assessment.

EPA has overestimated workplace exposure using an unreasonably high vapor pressure calculation, while recognizing risk is negligible for post-application inhalation exposure due low vapor pressure. As EPA notes in its PID, diuron has a low vapor pressure of 1.5×10^{-8} mmHg at 25°C, resulting in negligible post-application inhalation risk. EPA explains,

> For antimicrobial uses, EPA also did not conduct a quantitative post-application exposure assessment for products preserved with diuron. The post-application dermal and **inhalation exposures** for both adults and children are **expected to be minimal when used as an in-can preservative in paints because of diuron's low vapor pressure (1.5×10^{-8} mmHg at 25°C)** and the low potential for dermal contact with treated surfaces such as painted surfaces, adhesives, and caulks."[5]

Using this vapor pressure, the theoretical maximum concentration of diuron in air is 0.00019 mg/m^3 in an enclosed environment, as compared to EPA's calculation of 0.025 mg/m^3 Inhalation Exposure value for Open Pour Liquid, Occupational Handler Cancer Risks[6]. EPA exposure value is overestimated by about 130 fold. Additional details can be found in comment submitted by Thor Corporation. ACA requests that the DRA be corrected accordingly.

IV. EPA must reconsider degree of exposure that justify use of a closed delivery system.

Two key factors mitigate against adoption of a uniform requirement for closed biocide delivery systems:
1. Exposure is over-estimated due to overestimates for volumes of biocide being open-poured and an inaccurate vapor pressure calculation, as discussed in Section I(b) above.
2. EPA did not consider significant installation costs in its benefits analysis starting page 34 of the PID.

Both factors disproportionately impact small manufacturers, who would open-pour biocides at relatively small volumes and do not have the capacity to absorb significant costs associated with installation of a closed system. As an alternative regulatory approach, ACA suggests developing a threshold upper limit for open pouring of biocides, beyond which a paint company is required to install a closed system, to the extent EPA deems a closed system necessary. With a revised vapor pressure value, a closed system would not be necessary.

Regarding costs of installing a closed system, an ACA member recently installed closed systems at the cost of $250,000 per biocidal product. Paint manufacturers using multiple biocides can easily pay more than $1 million to ensure closed systems. This cost renders a biocide unusable by small

[5] Docket Number EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0077, Proposed Interim Registration Review Decision, Case Number 0046, page 22

[6] Docket Number EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0077, Registration Review Draft Risk Assessment for the Antimicrobial Use of Diuron, December 17, 2020, page 16, Table 9

scale manufacturers. The risk mitigation costs are not proportionate to the actual risk at issue, considering that EPA's risk estimate does not consider mitigating factors in the workplace, such as ventilation, PPE and contained delivery methods typically used in facilities without closed systems.

V. EPA must consider the benefits of diuron use in conjunction with estimated risks.

ACA is concerned that EPA has not adequately considered the niche function of diuron, while assuming replaceability by biocides that are not suitable substitutes. As part of its risk assessment, EPA must consider, "any unreasonable risk to man or the environment, taking into account the economic, social, and environmental costs and benefits of the use of any pesticide . . . "[7] As such, EPA has a broad set of considerations, including the overall economic impact of its proposed restriction on diuron, likely to result in the discontinuation of certain coatings products used to enhance the lifetime of structures. In certain instances, discontinuation of products may be justified where a risk assessment shows clear evidence of adverse risk to human health or the environment. That is not the case here.

Diuron is an algaecide used in certain outdoor specialty products, used to inhibit algal growth on dry film after application. Because diuron is not used for in-can preservation, it must be used in combination with fungicides that preserve paint prior to application. Diuron in paint products provides long-term protection, thereby lowering environmental impacts associated with having to repaint surfaces or replace structures due to age. As such, diuron serves a niche function in specialty products designed to protect outdoor surfaces. Although it is not broadly used in paint, when it is in a paint formulation, diuron cannot be easily replaced. Comments provided by manufacturers (Troy Corporation and Thor) include additional details regarding diuron's use, function and mechanism of algal inhibition that emphasize its unique function in paint formulations.

At page 37 of EPA's PID, under the section discussing benefits of diuron, EPA relies on the 2016 Kline Report, asserting:

---

[7] FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. §136(bb), provides the definition of ''unreasonable adverse effects on the environment'':

> "means (1) any unreasonable risk to man or the environment, taking into account the economic, social, and environmental costs and benefits of the use of any pesticide, or (2) a human dietary risk from residues that result from a use of a pesticide in or on any food inconsistent with the standard under section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 346a). 2–1 The Administrator shall consider the risks and benefits of public health pesticides separate from the risks and benefits of other pesticides. In weighing any regulatory action concerning a public health pesticide under this Act, the Administrator shall weigh any risks of the pesticide against the health risks such as the diseases transmitted by the vector to be controlled by the pesticide."

The relevance of this definition is through the safety standard for registration in Section 3 (7 U.S.C. §137(a)):

> "Except as provided by this Act, no person in any State may distribute or sell to any person any pesticide that is not registered under this Act. To the extent necessary to prevent *unreasonable adverse effects on the environment*, the Administrator may by regulation limit the distribution, sale, or use in any State of any pesticide that is not registered under this Act and that is not the subject of an experimental use permit under section 5 or an emergency exemption under section 18."

> According to the 2016 Kline Report alternatives to dry-film mildewcidal paint products containing diuron include 3-iodo-2-propynyl butylcarbamate (IPBC), zinc pyrithione, octhilinone (OIT), carbendazim (MBC), and chlorothalonil, among others. The Kline Report (2016) forecasts that IPBC and zinc pyrithione are projected to grow in market share of dry-film preservatives as preservatives like diuron and carbendazim are under the review of EPA due to health and safety issues. Kline predicts this may incentivize the end-user to use other alternatives, such as IPBC and OIT, that are still undergoing registration review.

Notably, the biocides identified here are typically used for in-can preservation, not as algaecides. The identified alternatives are still undergoing registration review and are likely to be restricted. It's likely that registration will be cancelled for use in paints and coatings for some of these. For this reason alone, they should not be considered as viable alternatives. Their technical viability is also a significant factor.

ACA requests that EPA explain its consideration of the 2016 Kline Report in relation to information submitted by biocide manufacturers, noted on page 37 of the PID:

> The algaecide use in paints and coatings is considered a niche use of diuron. There are a limited number of registered algaecidal active ingredients for exterior control of algae to protect the paint coating, including OIT and terbutryn. OIT is limited in its microbial control of algae in paints and coatings and is mainly used as an in-can bactericide. It is not considered as efficacious as diuron. Diuron is less costly and more efficacious than terbutryn. Formulations containing terbutryn are extremely prone to instability due to the chemical incompatibility of terbutryn with other active ingredients such as IPBC.

As noted above, due to the costs and implausibility of adding lengthy label statements and the costs associated with closed systems for small and some medium-sized manufacturers, the most viable option for paint manufacturers is to seek an alternative to diuron. Yet, alternatives are not readily available. Even those alternatives identified in the 2016 Kline Report may not be available due to regulatory restriction and in any case may not be technologically viable.

VI. EPA's proposed labeling change is not viable and information conveyed is redundant with existing information and practices.

EPA is suggesting paint label changes to mitigate EPA's estimated risk from commercial airless spray application of paint. Label changes include a new warning statement and PPE specifications (painters hat, chemically resistant gloves, coveralls and respiratory protection). Label changes include specifications of types of respirators based on volatility, organic vapors or presence of oil in formulation. Additionally, the Agency proposes OSHA requirements for fit testing and an initial medical exam be included on the paint/coating label. ACA suggests that EPA work with the paint industry to identify an alternative method of conveying information other than a label change. Information could be conveyed with QR codes, information on a website or even changes to an SDS.

a. Label software is not designed to accommodate non-GHS hazard statements and warnings.

Paint labels are currently generated through standardized software based on GHS / OSHA Hazard Communication label elements and hazard statements. Modifying a label requires extensive and costly programming changes, especially where label statements vary from standard hazard statements.

b. Paint labels do not have additional space for additional lengthy warning statements.

Paint labels contain detailed warning statements, instructions for safe use and other information, as mandated by federal and state laws, often in multiple languages. As a result of these extensive warnings and instructions, label space is at a premium. Paint manufacturers cannot accommodate the lengthy label statements EPA is proposing onto a label. EPA further proposes labels in both Spanish and English. Currently, paint manufacturers often comply with labeling requirements under both the FHSA (Federal Hazardous Substances Act) for consumer products and OSHA Haz Com (Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Hazard Communication System) for commercial and industrial products. Because of the likelihood of products going into both commercial and consumer markets, paint manufacturers often comply with both sets of requirements or some combination thereof, in addition to complying with state-mandated warnings such as California's Proposition 65[8] warnings.

Under the FHSA, formulated products marketed to consumers must include labels with identity of hazardous substances, signal words, hazard statements, precautionary statements, first aid instructions, special care and handling instructions, etc., as required at 16 CFR 1500.121. Similarly, the OSHA Hazard Communication Standard, for commercial and industrial products, requires signal words, hazard statements, precautionary statements and pictograms, as required at 29 CFR 1910.1200. Products labeled according to OSHA Hazard Communication are accompanied by Safety Data Sheets with information about chemical composition and hazardous substances. Manufacturers of formulated products often comply with both sets of requirements in two or more languages, while including discretionary warnings and label statement in compliance with state laws. Safety Data Sheets for most products are available online and provide a convenient method for conveying additional information to professional users.

c. EPA should restrict any information requirement to architectural paints in containers of one gallon or more.

ACA also suggests restricting the size of containers subject to a requirement to convey EPA-identified safety information to containers of one gallon or more, since a commercial painter would require at least one gallon to load into an airless sprayer. ACA also suggests exempting products that are not spray applied, such as outdoor protective coatings made for brush / roller application. That is, any information requirement should be limited to architectural paints.

[8] Additional information regarding Proposition 65 is available on the website of California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment at: https://oehha.ca.gov/proposition-65/about-proposition-65#

Alternatively, ACA suggests a label statement, "not for use with spray application" for exempted products.

d. Respirator specifications and fit testing

Respirator selection requires careful consideration of a variety of factors, including workplace conditions and chemical composition of the spray applied coating. ACA recommends that EPA not specify respirator by type. Instead, EPA should provide information to employers enabling them to select the appropriate respirator, while considering exposure to antimicrobials as part of a set of standard considerations. Existing OSHA requirements at 29 CFR 1910.134 provide a broad set of considerations related to respirator selection and use, designed to enable an employer to consult standard references, including an SDS, to select the appropriate respirator. Variations from standard PPE selection methods, with an EPA-mandated label statement, would inappropriately focus on crude estimates of exposure to antimicrobials in treated articles, instead of actual workplace conditions and other paint-product characteristics. EPA's novel approach could compromise PPE selection.

OSHA has developed a process for respirator selection and use. Under 29 CFR 1910.134, an employer must maintain:

- Procedures for selection of PPE.
- Medical evaluations of employees using respirators.
- Fit and tight testing procedures
- Procedures for proper respirator use.
- Procedures for regular respirator maintenance.
- Employee training in hazards and use of respirators.
- Procedures for regularly evaluating effectiveness of the program.

ACA suggests that EPA develop information to inform employers of estimated risks from antimicrobials in paint to adopt into existing procedures and training, rather than a label element specifying types of respirators.

Professional painters undergo extensive training prior to becoming a professional painter and regularly attend routine training updates, providing an existing system to convey biocide-related information. The International Union of Painters and Allied Trades standard training module covers:

- OSHA 10/30 training.
- Respirator training course and fit testing, both quantitative and qualitative requirements.
- Extensive Course in reading and understanding the Safety Data Sheet (SDS) and Product Data Sheet (PDS)
- Hazard communication
- Hazardous waste
- Proper selection and use of PPE
- Course on understanding the hierarchy of controls and why PPE needs to be the lowest in the hierarchy for protection.

VII. EPA's proposed stewardship program has redundant elements with OSHA requirements.

Considering the extensive information available to professional painters, some elements of EPA's stewardship recommendations are unnecessary and could cause confusion. EPA should narrow the scope of its stewardship requirements to incorporate information about estimated risks from biocides in paint into existing OSHA training modules. ACA notes that the following proposed stewardship requirements are duplicative and unnecessary, could conflict with OSHA requirements or could cause worker confusion:

- Infographic on PPE use. This is unnecessary and duplicative of existing training materials.
- Instructions on proper respirator fit testing and information on OSHA medical testing requirements. This is unnecessary and duplicative of existing training materials.
- Incorporation of EPA-required PPE instructions, respirator fit testing requirements, and health risk statements into industry safety and instructional literature (e.g., 29 CFR § 1910.1200). Here, ACA recommends that EPA not specify PPE, but provide enough information for an employer to select appropriate PPE.

Regarding, EPA's proposed Spanish language labeling and instructions, ACA suggests that any information supplied via a QR code or website include Spanish instructions. ACA does not support a labeling requirement.

VIII. Conclusion

Under existing OSHA requirements, an employer must consider multiple factors when developing safety practices. EPA's narrow focus on respirator and PPE selection based on crude estimates of biocide exposure can lead to PPE recommendations on a label that do not adequately protect workers against all jobsite risks when spray applying paint. ACA recommends re-orienting EPA's focus to providing employers with information about estimated risks from biocides in paints, enabling selection of appropriate PPE, and conveying that information through a viable method. To that end, ACA suggests the following:

- ACA recommends that EPA delay development of a risk mitigation strategy, as proposed in the diuron PID, due to deficiencies in the underlying risk assessment that must be resolved to determine an appropriate risk mitigation strategy.
- ACA suggests that EPA develop information to inform employers of estimated risks from antimicrobials in paint that can be easily adopted into existing procedures and training, rather than a label element specifying types of respirators.
- EPA should narrow the scope of stewardship requirements to incorporate information about estimated risks from biocides in paint into existing OSHA training modules.

Thank you for considering these comments. We look forward to working with EPA to devise a viable method of communicating risk mitigation strategies, after a more accurate assessment of risk. We hope to meet with EPA to discuss these issues further. In the meantime, please feel free to contact us if we can provide any additional information.

Sincerely,

Riaz Zaman
Sr. Counsel, Government Affairs
901 New York Ave., Ste. 300 W
Washington, D.C. 20001
rzaman@paint.org
202-719-3715