

Attachment C: Responses to Comments Received on Proposed New Information Collection Request (ICR) for the Tracking the Adoption of Bilingual Labeling of Pesticide Products

Background

On July 21, 2025, EPA published a draft information collection request (ICR) for tracking the adoption of the PRIA 5 bilingual labeling requirements in public docket EPA-HQ-OPP-2025-0049¹ (FRL-12717-01-OCSP). The 60-day public comment period ended on September 19, 2025. EPA received four comments on the draft ICR. Two comments from the public went beyond the scope of the ICR. EPA is responding to the two remaining comments, from the PRIA Coalition and from a group of nongovernmental organizations.

In addition to publishing the draft ICR in the public docket, EPA also consulted with nine entities² that represent a range of affected stakeholders (e.g., small companies, large companies, agricultural companies, antimicrobial companies, and a coalition of trade associations). OMB requires federal agencies to consult with nine or fewer potential respondents prior to submitting the ICR to OMB for review and approval. This consultation requirement is in addition to providing the public with 60 days to comment on the proposed collection activity. For consultation on the draft ICR, EPA sent a list of specific questions (e.g., availability of the required data, clarity of instructions, benefits of electronic reporting, accuracy of burden and cost estimates) and a draft example screenshot of the bilingual labeling tracking form in the agency's MyPeST application to get feedback on July 23, 2025. EPA received one completed questionnaire from Pyxis Regulatory Consulting. More information about the consultation process can be found under Question #8 of the ICR supporting statement and in Attachments A and B.

Public Comments and EPA Responses

Comment 1: The nongovernmental organizations (California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation, Environmental Protection Network, Pesticide Action and Agroecology Network, Coming Clean Network, Northwest Center for Alternatives to Pesticides, National Resources Defense Council, Farmworker Migrant Clinicians Network, Alianza Nacional de Campesinas, Toxic Free NC, Rural Coalition, Earthjustice, and Farmworker Association of Florida; hereinafter, "NGOs") expressed general support for the Agency's plan to use MyPeST to track bilingual labeling compliance on a product-by-product basis. However, NGOs suggest that EPA include additional checkboxes to

¹ Available at <https://www.regulations.gov/search/docket?filter=EPA-HQ-OPP-2025-0049>.

² Ecolab, Syngenta, the PRIA Coalition, Lallemand Plant Care, Pyxis Regulatory Consulting, Clorox, Bengal Labs, Synergy, and Albaugh LLC.

track the manner of compliance (i.e., to indicate whether bilingual labeling is being placed directly on the product container or made available via QR code or URL link). They also suggest that the Agency must include additional means of tracking whether bilingual labeling is “readily accessible” via scannable technology or other electronic methods.

NGOs ask why the Agency is able to add such limited features to MyPeST and suggest expanding tracking capabilities in MyPeST in the future. NGOs further ask for clarification as to how the Agency will determine whether registrants have complied with updates to the *Spanish Translation Guide for Pesticide Labeling* (STGPL), given that registrants indicate compliance via a checkbox that is not date stamped.

Finally, NGOs recommend that EPA publish information about whether individual product labels are compliant, rather than publish aggregate information; and suggest that labels be uploaded to EPA’s Pesticide Product and Label System (PPLS) for public viewing.

EPA Response: EPA’s obligation is to “track adoption of the bilingual labeling required under” PRIA 5, not to track the *manner* of adoption. Given its mandate, EPA has chosen to focus its tracking efforts on determining whether registrants have complied, not how.

With respect to tracking whether bilingual labeling linked via scannable technology or other electronic means is “readily accessible,” PRIA 5 does not specify how registrants must make linked labeling accessible. It is not possible to enumerate all acceptable manners of compliance, and thus the information cannot easily be captured via features such as checkboxes. Furthermore, in the certification statement in MyPeST, registrants affirm that each selected product complies with the requirements at 7 USC §136a(5), which include the accessibility requirements.

With respect to updates to the STGPL, EPA clarifies that it can run internal reports on MyPeST at any point and plans to do so regularly to track adoption of bilingual labeling. Were the STGPL to be revised, registrants would have the timeframes specified in PRIA 5 to update their labels and would be asked to report their compliance in MyPeST by a specified date thereafter. Then, EPA would run a report in MyPeST to determine the extent of compliance and compare it to previous reports.

With respect to reporting aggregate compliance data or information about individual labels, PRIA 5 does not specify how EPA must externally report the information it collects from tracking (EPA must only “develop and implement, and make publicly available, a *plan* for tracking”; emphasis added). EPA is still determining the final form that its external reporting will take. However, EPA is planning to make bilingual labeling available to the public via the Pesticide Product and Label System (PPLS), as the NGOs suggest in their comment.

The NGOs also commented on EPA's recently published Q&A document; these comments were out of scope of the ICR proposal.

Comment 2: The PRIA Coalition expresses general support for EPA's plan to track adoption of bilingual labeling via MyPeST.

The PRIA Coalition notes that not all registrants are enrolled in MyPeST and that registrants may need time beyond December 29, 2025 – the first PRIA 5 compliance deadline for bilingual labeling requirements – to learn how to use MyPeST and submit their bilingual labeling compliance information. They request that registrants subject to the first compliance deadline be given six months past the release of the MyPeST features to report compliance. In subsequent years, registrants would report by January 28 – one month past that year's compliance date. The PRIA Coalition notes that this is not a request to extend deadlines by which the bilingual labeling itself is required to be on product containers – only to extend the reporting deadline.

The PRIA Coalition suggests that EPA's burden estimate does not account for the time registrants may spend registering in the MyPeST system. It also recommends that EPA include an assessment of the number of companies registered for MyPeST in its analysis.

The PRIA Coalition recommends that, to improve the efficiency of the process, registrants not recertify compliance annually, provided there have been no changes to the STGPL and that registrants have no new products required to comply with PRIA 5 bilingual labeling requirements.

Similarly, the PRIA Coalition recommends clarifying in the MyPeST instructions that products that are not required to have bilingual labeling at the time of the certification (e.g., manufacturing use products, or products that have not yet reached their compliance dates) should not be certified, nor a box checked for the product in MyPeST. It also recommends clarifying in the instructions that registrants who have gone above the bilingual labeling requirements (for example, proactively translating labels for products not yet required to have bilingual labeling,) should report that information in MyPeST.

The PRIA Coalition asks that the instructions be clarified for products not released for shipment. They ask EPA to make clear that registrants who decide mid-year to release a product for shipment may simply update MyPeST to indicate that they have added required bilingual labeling; registrants should not delay releasing products for shipment until the next reporting deadline. The PRIA Coalition also asks whether EPA needs to track whether products will be released for shipment.

The PRIA Coalition requests that EPA add a “save” feature to MyPeST, as well as a date stamp for the certification statement.

Finally, with respect to adding the capability for registrants to share labels via MyPeST, the PRIA Coalition notes that MyPeST is designed to be a confidential portal, not a portal for the public to view labels. Moreover, they note that each product might have many different labels, and that uploading multiple per product could prove burdensome for registrants. They ask whether registrants would be expected to update the labels in MyPeST over time.

EPA Response: With respect to deadlines, EPA agrees with the PRIA Coalition that registrants may need time past December 29, 2025, to familiarize themselves with MyPeST. EPA also notes that it cannot collect tracking data until OMB approves its ICR, although registrants may log in and acquaint themselves with the platform in the meantime. For products required to include bilingual labeling by December 29, 2025, EPA will ask registrants to report compliance by June 28, 2026, provided the ICR is approved by that date. This gives registrants the six months the PRIA Coalition requests. In coming years, registrants will have one month past the PRIA compliance date to report compliance. EPA has added these dates to its form instructions.

EPA has estimated the time required for registrants to enroll in MyPeST and has internal data on the number of companies enrolled in MyPeST. The time burden for registering and logging in to MyPeST is included in the estimates in Table 2 of the ICR Supporting Statement, which describe the burden to respondents of planning activities and recording information more generally. Given that the Table 2 estimates are calculated by product – and that each registrant may have many products but only needs to register once and log in once per session – the total estimate in Table 2 should provide a conservative estimate of the registrant burden. However, EPA has updated its description in the ICR supporting statement to indicate explicitly that the enrollment burden is included.

With respect to the burden of educating registrants on the use of MyPeST in bilingual labeling tracking, EPA is currently working with unenrolled registrants to encourage their enrollment in the system. The burden of familiarizing registrants with MyPeST is captured in Table 6 of the “Agency Burden” section of the ICR supporting statement.

EPA agrees with the PRIA Coalition that recertifying responses annually is unnecessary, provided that a registrant has made no product label changes that result in a new compliance date, nor added new products required to comply with bilingual labeling requirements. EPA has clarified the MyPeST instructions accordingly.

Similarly, EPA agrees with the PRIA Coalition that products not required to have bilingual labeling at the time of the certification do not require certification, nor does a box need to be

checked in MyPeST. The Agency clarified this point in the revised instructions. It has also clarified that registrants who have gone beyond the bilingual labeling requirements should report that information in MyPeST.

MyPeST includes a separate column of checkboxes (labeled “not to be released for shipment”) and a separate certification statement for products that would be required to comply with bilingual labeling requirements, were they released for shipment, but that have not been released. EPA agrees with the PRIA Coalition that registrants should release products for shipment as soon as required bilingual labeling is added and should simply update MyPeST with that information at that time. There is no need to wait to release the products until the next reporting deadline. EPA has clarified this point in the certification statement and instructions.

EPA notes that it does need to collect data on whether certain products may be released for shipment. Only registrants know if a product will not be released for shipment – and thus, whether a product is not required to include bilingual labeling on that basis. Indicating that a product will not be shipped helps registrants avoid the appearance of non-compliance and clarifies to EPA that no enforcement action is necessary. EPA notes, however, that registrants only need to check the “not to be released for shipment” box if the product would be required to have the bilingual labeling, were it to be released for shipment. Otherwise, they can leave the box blank. This point is clarified in the instructions.

EPA will consider the additional features the PRIA Coalition suggests in future iterations of MyPeST. The checkbox information saves when the registrant clicks “yes” on the certification statement. The URLs save automatically after five minutes of inactivity, so registrants do not have to complete tracking in one sitting. EPA clarified this in the instructions. EPA notes that while a date stamp is not visible to registrants in MyPeST, the system does record the date of each submission. The Agency can run a report to determine which registrants have certified their responses by the reporting deadline. With respect to adding labels into MyPeST, EPA agrees with the PRIA Coalition that MyPeST is designed as a confidential portal. Labels will not be published in MyPeST. Registrants may provide a URL link to their translated labels in MyPeST. However, providing a URL is not required. EPA hopes that registrants will consider providing URLs so that the Agency may publish the link on the Pesticide Product and Label System (PPLS) to make bilingual labeling accessible to farmworkers and the public. The MyPeST application itself will remain confidential.

Registrants will be able to provide the location of their bilingual labels to EPA by copying URLs into a free text field in MyPeST. With respect to the Coalition’s concern about the burden of sharing labels, this field will be character-limited to 255 characters; registrants could not link all different labels associated with a product, even if EPA were to request it. If registrants choose to provide the URL link for labels with bilingual labeling in MyPeST, they should provide a link

for the most representative or complete translated label. However, this field remains optional. Moreover, EPA understands that not all labels have a URL and does not expect registrants to create one exclusively for this purpose. EPA clarified the instructions for providing a link to bilingual labeling in MyPeST.

Comment 3: Pyxis Regulatory Consulting returned a consultation questionnaire and suggested that EPA clarify its instructions for using MyPeST, reformatting them as a step-by-step guide with screen shots from the application. Pyxis also suggested spelling out more explicitly under what circumstances registrants should report in MyPeST. Finally, Pyxis asked that it be possible for consultants to have access to MyPeST to support registrants with reporting.

Response: EPA has reformatted the instructions as Pyxis suggests and clarified what exactly should be reported in MyPeST. The updated instructions contain a list of conditions under which registrants should report. That includes a list of the product types not required to have bilingual labeling (such as MUPs). The updated instructions also more clearly list out the compliance dates and reporting dates. With respect to access to MyPeST, registrants can grant consultants access rights in MyPeST so that they can assist with reporting on bilingual labeling compliance.