

Dated: May 7, 1997.

**Lynn R. Goldman,**

*Assistant Administrator for Prevention,  
Pesticides and Toxic Substances.*

[FR Doc. 97-12786 Filed 5-15-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 180

[OPP-300367A; FRL-5716-6]

RIN 2070-AC02

### Plant-Pesticides; Viral Coat Proteins; Supplemental Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection  
Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Supplemental notice of  
proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** This document announces the availability of information for additional public comment regarding the proposed exemption from the requirement of a tolerance under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) for residues of coat proteins from plant viruses when these coat proteins are produced and used as plant-pesticides in plants or plant parts used as raw agricultural commodities. Comments on this document may also affect EPA's final determination on a proposed exemption under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) for this same category of plant-pesticides. In 1994, EPA proposed to exempt from the requirement of a tolerance viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide because a tolerance would not be necessary to protect the public health. Since publication of the proposal, Congress enacted the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) which amended FFDCA and FIFRA. EPA is issuing this document today to provide the public with an opportunity to comment on EPA's analysis of how certain FQPA amendments to FFDCA and FIFRA apply to the proposed exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide. EPA believes that it considered most of the substantive issues associated with the FQPA amendments when it issued the proposal in 1994. EPA is thus, in this document, specifically seeking comment only on its evaluation of the requirements imposed by FQPA that the Agency did not address in that proposal.

**DATES:** Comments, identified by the docket number "OPP-300367A," must be received on or before June 16, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** By mail, submit written comments to: Public Information and Records Integrity Branch, Information Resources and Services Division (7506C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. In person deliver comments to: Rm. 1132, Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA.

Comments and data may also be submitted electronically by following the instructions under Unit VI. of this document. No Confidential Business Information (CBI) should be submitted through e-mail.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Elizabeth Milewski, Office of Science, Coordination and Policy, Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances (7101), Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460, Telephone: (202) 260-6900, e-mail: milewski.elizabeth@epamail.epa.gov.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### I. Introduction

EPA issued in the November 23, 1994 **Federal Register** a package of five separate **Federal Register** proposals (59 FR 60496, 60519, 60535, 60542 and 60545) (FRL-4755-2, FRL-4755-3, FRL-4758-8, FRL-4755-5, and FRL-4755-4) which together described EPA's approach to substances produced in plants that enable the plants to resist pests or disease. EPA's package of proposals indicated that these substances are pesticides under section 2 of FIFRA (7 U.S.C. 136(u)) if they are "intended for preventing, destroying, repelling, or mitigating any pest" or if they are "... intended for use as a plant regulator, defoliant, or desiccant" regardless of whether the pesticidal capabilities evolved in the plants or were introduced by breeding or through the techniques of modern biotechnology. These substances, and the genetic material necessary to produce them, were designated "plant-pesticides" by EPA in the November 23, 1994 **Federal Register** documents. The notices defined a "plant-pesticide" as "a pesticidal substance that is produced in a living plant and the genetic material necessary for the production of the pesticidal substance where the pesticidal substance is intended for use in the living plant" (59 FR at 60534). Viral coat proteins produced in plants for viral coat protein mediated viral resistance are considered plant-

pesticides because of their intended role in plant resistance to viral infection.

One of the five notices (59 FR 60545) proposed to exempt viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide, or segments of coat proteins, from the FFDCA (21 U.S.C. 346a) requirement of a tolerance based upon an evaluation of the potential for new dietary exposures to the substances when they are produced in plants, or in plant parts, used as food or feed. EPA stated in the proposed exemption that a tolerance is not necessary to protect the public health for these pesticidal substances because no new dietary exposures are likely to occur for viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide. For pesticidal substances in this category, many years of human experience with consumption of food containing plant viruses suggest that these pesticidal substances present negligible risk. Specifically, EPA proposed that "residues of coat proteins from plant viruses, or segments of the coat proteins, produced in living plants as plant-pesticides are exempt from the requirement of a tolerance" (59 FR at 60547).

This supplemental notice addresses the coat protein portion of the plant-pesticide produced in food plants. A companion supplemental notice issued elsewhere in today's **Federal Register** addresses the proposed exemption for the nucleic acid component of plant-pesticides with regard to the FQPA amendments to FFDCA. Because FQPA modified FIFRA (7 U.S.C. 136 *et seq.*) by incorporating the FFDCA safety standard into the FIFRA test for determining whether a pesticide poses an unreasonable adverse effect, comments on this supplemental notice may also affect EPA's final determination on a proposed exemption under FIFRA (59 FR at 60535) for plant-pesticides that are coat proteins from plant viruses.

EPA is publishing this supplemental notice to ensure that the public has had adequate opportunity to comment on certain new considerations raised by the FQPA amendments to FFDCA as these considerations relate to the proposed exemption from a tolerance for residues of viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide. In evaluating a pesticide chemical residue for exemption from FFDCA tolerance requirements, EPA must now explicitly address certain factors, and make a determination that there is a reasonable certainty that aggregate exposure to the residue will cause no harm to the public. The factors to be considered are iterated in Unit II. of this supplemental notice. EPA's evaluation of these factors

relative to the proposed exemption (59 FR 60545) is contained in Unit IV. of this supplemental notice. Consistent with FFDCA section 408(c)(2)(B), EPA has reviewed the available scientific data and other relevant information in support of this action. In today's supplemental notice, EPA requests comment only on the new conclusions identified in Unit V.C. of this supplemental notice.

In light of FQPA, EPA is engaged in a process, including consultation with registrants, states, and other interested stakeholders, to make decisions on the new policies and procedures that will be appropriate as a result of enactment of FQPA. In establishing this exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for residues of viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide, EPA does not intend to set precedents for the application of section 408 and the new safety standard to other tolerances and exemptions. This exemption from the requirement of a tolerance will not restrict EPA's options with regard to general procedures and policies for implementation of the amended FFDCA section 408.

## II. Statutory Authority

Under FFDCA, EPA regulates pesticide chemical residues by establishing tolerances limiting the amounts of residues that may be present in food, or by establishing exemptions from the requirement of a tolerance for such residues. Pesticide chemical residues subject to regulation under FFDCA are defined by reference to the definition of pesticide under FIFRA. FFDCA section 201(q)(1) defines a "pesticide chemical residue" to mean the residue in or on food of a pesticide chemical or other added substance resulting primarily from the metabolism or degradation of a pesticide chemical (21 U.S.C. 321 (q)(2)). A "pesticide chemical" means "any substance that is a pesticide within the meaning of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, including all active and inert ingredients of such pesticide" (21 U.S.C. 321(q)(1)).

FIFRA authorizes EPA to regulate the sale and distribution of pesticides in the United States and to exempt a pesticide from the requirements of FIFRA if it is not of a character requiring regulation (7 U.S.C. 136a(a) and 136w(b)). FIFRA section 2(u) defines "pesticide" as: (1) "any substance or mixture of substances intended for preventing, destroying, repelling, or mitigating any pest, (2) any substance or mixture of substances intended for use as a plant regulator, defoliant, or desiccant, and (3) any nitrogen stabilizer" (7 U.S.C. 136(u)).

FQPA amends both FFDCA and FIFRA. FQPA, which took effect on August 3, 1996, among other things, amends FIFRA such that a registration cannot be issued for a pesticide to be used on or in food unless the residue of the pesticide in food qualifies for a tolerance or exemption from the requirement for a tolerance. FQPA modified FIFRA section 2(bb) by incorporating the FFDCA section 408 safety standard into the test for determining whether a pesticide poses an unreasonable adverse effect (7 U.S.C. 136(bb)). FIFRA section 2(bb) defines the term "unreasonable adverse effects on the environment" to mean (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 FFDCA. Thus, a pesticide used in or on food that does not meet the FFDCA section 408 safety standard also would pose an unreasonable adverse effect under FIFRA and would not qualify for an exemption from the requirements of FIFRA under FIFRA section 25(b)(2).

FQPA amends FFDCA section 408(c)(2)(A)(i) to allow EPA to establish an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for a "pesticide chemical residue" only if EPA determines that the exemption is "safe" (21 U.S.C. 346a(c)(2)(A)(i)). Section 408(c)(2)(A)(ii) defines "safe" to mean that "there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from aggregate exposure to the pesticide chemical residue, including all anticipated dietary exposures and all other exposures for which there is reliable information" (21 U.S.C. 346a(c)(2)(A)(ii)). This includes exposure through drinking water, but does not include occupational exposure. In establishing an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance, FFDCA section 408(c), like the statute prior to FQPA, does not require EPA to consider benefits that might be associated with use of the pesticide chemical.

FFDCA section 408 requires EPA to give special consideration to exposure of infants and children to the pesticide chemical residue in establishing an exemption and to "ensure that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to infants and children from aggregate exposure to the pesticide chemical residue" (21 U.S.C. 346a(b)(2)(C)(i)(I) and (c)(2)(B)). Section 408(b)(2)(D) specifies other, general factors EPA is to consider in establishing an exemption. Section

408(c)(3)(B) prohibits an exemption unless there is either a practical method for detecting and measuring levels of pesticide chemical residue in or on food or there is no need for such a method (21 U.S.C. 346a(c)(3)(B)).

Specifically, EPA must consider the following in deciding whether to grant an exemption:

1. The validity, completeness and reliability of the available data from studies of the pesticide chemical and pesticide chemical residue.
2. Nature of any toxic effect shown to be caused by the pesticide chemical or residues in studies.
3. Available information concerning the relationship of the results of such studies to human risk.
4. Available information concerning the dietary consumption patterns of consumers (and major identifiable subgroups of consumers).
5. Available information concerning the cumulative effects of such residues and other substances that have a common mechanism of toxicity.
6. Available information concerning the aggregate exposure levels of consumers to the pesticide chemical residue and to other related substances, including dietary exposure and non-occupational exposures.
7. Available information concerning the variability of the sensitivities of major identifiable subgroups of consumers.

8. Such information as the Administrator may require on whether the pesticide chemical may have an effect in humans that is similar to an effect produced by a naturally-occurring estrogen or other endocrine effects.

9. Safety factors which in the opinion of experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety of food additives are generally recognized as appropriate for the use of animal experimentation data (21 U.S.C. 346a(b)(2)(D)).

Additionally, with respect to exposure of infants and children, consistent with section 408(b)(2)(C), EPA must assess the risk of the pesticide based on available information concerning:

1. Consumption patterns that are likely to result in disproportionately high consumption of food with pesticide residues.
2. Special susceptibility of infants and children to such residues.
3. Cumulative effects of residues with other substances that have a common mechanism of toxicity (21 U.S.C. 346a(b)(2)(C) and (c)(2)(B)).

## III. Summary of Proposed Rule

In the November 23, 1994 **Federal Register**, EPA proposed to exempt from

the requirement of a tolerance coat proteins from plant viruses, or segments of such proteins when these proteins, or segments of these proteins, are produced in plants for the purpose of protecting plants against viral disease. Coat proteins are those substances that viruses produce to encapsulate and protect their genetic material. When the genetic material encoding the coat protein is introduced into a plant's genome, the plant is able to resist infections by the virus donating the genetic material for the coat protein (as well as infections by virus strains closely related to the donor virus). This resistance is termed viral coat protein mediated resistance or vcp-mediated resistance.

#### IV. Risk Assessment and Safety Determinations

##### A. Risk Assessment in Proposal

EPA's rationale for its 1994 proposal for an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for viral coat proteins was based on the following points: (1) Virus-infected plants have always been a part of the human and domestic animal food supply since most crops are frequently infected with plant viruses and food from these crops have been and are being consumed without detectable adverse human health effects. (2) Plant viruses have never been shown to be infectious to humans, including children and infants, or mammals. Plant viruses are not able to replicate in mammals or other vertebrates, limiting the possibility of human infection. In addition, this exemption applies only to the portion of the viral genome coding for the whole coat protein or a segment of the coat protein which will be expressed in the plant. The coat protein or a segment of the coat protein by itself is incapable of forming infectious particles. Since whole, intact plant viruses are not known to cause deleterious human health effects, it is reasonable to assume that a subunit of these viruses likewise will not cause adverse human health effects when consumed at rates currently found in the food supply.

In developing its regulatory approach for plant-pesticides, EPA requested the advice of a subpanel, composed of experts in the relevant scientific disciplines, of the FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel (SAP). On December 18, 1992, the SAP subpanel was convened to review a draft policy statement for plant-pesticides and respond to a series of scientific questions posed by the Agency. One question that the Agency asked the SAP subpanel was whether coat proteins from plant viruses might

present a dietary risk. In answer to the question, the subpanel stated that "[s]ince viruses are ubiquitous in the agricultural environment at levels higher than will be present in transgenic plants, and there has been a long history of 'contamination' of the food supply by virus coat protein, there is [a] scientific rationale for exempting transgenic plants expressing virus coat protein from the requirement of a tolerance."

As described in the proposed regulation (59 FR 60545), entire infectious particles of the plant viruses, including the coat protein component, have been and are being consumed by humans with no observed adverse effects. Virus-infected food plants have always been a part of the human and domestic animal food supply (Refs. 1, 2, 3, and 4). For example, at the beginning of this century virtually every commercial cultivar of potatoes grown in the United States and Europe was infected with either one or some complex of potato viruses (Ref. 1).

All plants have viruses that can infect them. While some viruses may be limited to certain tissues (e.g., the vascular system) or organs (e.g., roots), most plant viruses are found throughout the various organs and tissues of plants. Viruses, including the coat protein component, are found in the fruit, leaves, and stems of most plants. The long history of inadvertent mammalian consumption of the entire plant virus particle in foods with no observed ill effects presents a strong argument to support the human and domestic animal safety of the entire virus in foods. Concentrations of the virus particles in infected plants vary widely according to the host plant, length of infection, and the reproductive life cycle of the virus itself. In general, EPA anticipates that the amounts of viral coat protein consumed in the diet due to the production of viral coat proteins in vcp-mediated resistance will be similar to the amounts of viral coat proteins currently consumed.

Plant pathogenic viruses have never been shown capable of infecting or replicating in vertebrates (Refs. 1, 2, and 5). Intact, infectious, whole plant viruses, therefore, are not infectious to humans, including children and infants. Given that the complete virus is not infectious to vertebrates, it is reasonable to assume that a noninfectious subcomponent (i.e., a coat protein or a segment of a coat protein) of the virus would not be hazardous to humans or animals.

##### B. Risk Assessment in Light of Amendment to FFDCA

After EPA issued its proposed exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide (59 FR 60545), Congress enacted FQPA and amended certain FFDCA provisions governing pesticide chemical residues and FIFRA provisions governing pesticides (See Unit II. of this supplemental notice). Congress revised the specific wording of the section 408 standard for exemptions and provided more specific guidance regarding some of the factors that EPA should consider in establishing such exemptions (see Unit II. of this supplemental notice). When EPA proposed the exemption for residues of viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide, or segments of such proteins, it considered most of the safety factors spelled out in FQPA even though the Agency may not have explicitly discussed all those factors using the terminology specified in the FQPA amendments. This supplemental notice describes how the Agency took account of most of the FQPA factors in issuing its 1994 proposal to exempt viral coat proteins, or segments of such proteins, produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide and indicates which factors were considered in that proposal. The information the Agency relied on in considering these factors is part of the public record which was available to the public when EPA issued the proposed exemption from the requirement of a food tolerance. This supplemental notice also identifies the factors that were not considered in the proposal. Because FQPA amended FIFRA by incorporating the section 408 safety standard, commenters should be aware that comments on this supplemental notice may also affect EPA's final determination on the proposed exemption (59 FR 60519) under FIFRA for viral coat proteins produced in plants as plant-pesticides.

1. *Available data.* EPA considered in 1994, the validity, completeness and reliability of the available data with regard to coat proteins from plant viruses in the proposals (59 FR 60519 and 60545) and has summarized the evaluation in Unit IV.A. of this supplemental notice.

2. *Nature of toxic effect.* EPA in 1994 considered the nature of the toxic effects caused by viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide in the proposals (59 FR 60519 and 60545) and has summarized its evaluation in Unit IV.A. of this supplemental notice.

3. *Relationship of studies to humans.* EPA in 1994 considered the available information concerning the relationship to humans of toxic effects of viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide when it issued the proposals (59 FR 60519 and 60545) and has summarized that evaluation in Unit IV.A. of this supplemental notice. EPA based its evaluation on the history of human consumption of food derived from crop plants, and from products such as meat and milk from animals that consume forage and other crops (e.g., corn and other grains) that contain residues of pesticidal substances that are the subject of the proposed exemption. Because knowledge of human consumption of food from virus infected crop plants (as well as meat and milk products derived from animals eating such plants) was available and adequately addressed the issues of hazard and exposure, the Agency did not use, for the proposed exemption (59 FR 60545), data generated in the laboratory through animal testing.

4. *Dietary consumption patterns.* EPA considered in the 1994 proposal the available information on the varying dietary consumption patterns of major identifiable consumer subgroups as it pertains to consumption of food from virus infected plants. The Agency's evaluation is summarized in Unit IV.A. of this supplemental notice.

5. *Available information concerning cumulative effects of the pesticide chemical residue and other substances that have a common mechanism of toxicity.* EPA has examined the available information on the cumulative effect of consuming virus infected plants and other substances in plants that may have a common mechanism of human toxicity. EPA summarizes this information and its analysis in Unit IV.A. of this supplemental notice.

Viral coat proteins are nontoxic proteins widespread in food. They have not been associated with toxic or pathogenic effects to animals or humans. Because viral coat proteins in foods have no known human toxicity, no cumulative effects can be identified for viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide. FQPA also directs the Agency to examine whether there are other substances that have a common mechanism of toxicity with residues of viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide. Based on available information which indicates that viral coat proteins in food have no human toxicity, EPA is not aware of any other substances that might have a common mechanism of human toxicity with residues of viral coat proteins produced

in plants as part of a plant-pesticide. Experience with residues of viral coat proteins in the current food supply gives no indication of human or animal toxicity. If information becomes available that indicates this finding is not appropriate, EPA will consider the validity of the new information and act to amend this tolerance exemption as needed.

EPA is not aware of any substances outside of the food supply that may have a common mechanism of toxicity with residues of viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide since viral coat proteins are not toxic to humans or animals.

EPA considered the safety of foods containing residues of viral coat proteins when it issued the proposal and is not requesting additional comment on that topic. Comments are only requested on EPA's conclusion that there are no substances outside of the food supply that may have a cumulative toxic effect with residues of viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide.

6. *Aggregate exposures including non-occupational exposures.* EPA has considered the available information on the aggregate exposure level of consumers to viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide in the 1994 FFDC and FIFRA proposals (59 FR 60519 and 60545). This included a consideration of exposures from dietary sources (59 FR 60545) as well as from other non-occupational sources (59 FR 60519). As indicated in EPA's policy statement, "plant-pesticides are likely to present a limited exposure of the pesticidal substance to humans. In most cases, the predominant, if not the only, exposure route will be dietary. Significant respiratory and dermal exposures will be unlikely" (59 FR at 60513). As explained in the FFDC and FIFRA proposals and EPA's policy statement (59 FR 60496) and associated dockets, plant-pesticides present negligible exposure of pesticidal substances to humans outside of the dietary route because the substances are in the plant tissue and thus are found either within the plant or in close proximity to the plant. EPA considered dietary exposure to residues of viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide in the proposed FFDC exemption (59 FR 60545) and summarized its evaluation in Unit IV.A. of this supplemental notice.

Despite EPA's belief that, because of the nature of viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide, there is little likelihood of exposure other than through the dietary

route, EPA in this supplemental notice sets forth in greater detail its considerations concerning other exposure routes. With regard to the dermal route of exposure, viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide may in some cases be present in sap or other exudates from the plant or the food and thus may present some limited opportunity for dermal exposure to persons coming physically into contact with the plant or raw agricultural food from the plant. Individuals preparing meals are those most likely to experience dermal contact with the substances on a non-occupational basis. However, on a per person basis, the potential amounts involved in these exposures are negligible in comparison to potential exposure through the dietary route. Moreover, substances that occur naturally in food, including viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide, are unlikely to cross the barrier provided by the skin.

With regard to exposure through inhalation, viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide may in some cases be present in pollen and some individuals (those near enough to farms, nurseries or other plant-growing areas to be exposed to wind-blown pollen) may be exposed, through inhalation, to the pollen. On a per person basis, the potential amounts of pollen involved in these exposures are negligible in comparison to potential exposure through the dietary route. It is unlikely that exposure to the pollen is equivalent to exposure to viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide. When present in pollen, the viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of plant-pesticides will likely be integrated into the tissue of the pollen grain and not likely to be bound to the surface of the pollen grain. Pollen grains and the substances that occur naturally in pollen are unlikely to cross the barrier provided by the mucous membrane of the respiratory tract and thus are not additive to dietary exposure. Some viruses are transmitted by wind-borne vectors, i.e., pollen or fungal spores and individuals near enough to farms, nurseries or other plant-growing areas to be exposed to these wind-blown vectors may be exposed, through inhalation, to the whole virus particle. Since no evidence suggests that exposure to whole plant viruses borne by wind-blown pollen or fungal spores results in adverse effects, it is unlikely that exposure to pollen that may contain viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-

pesticide would result in adverse effects.

EPA also evaluated potential non-occupational exposures in drinking water. As noted in the preceding paragraphs, most substances in plants or parts of plants, including viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide, are found only inside the plant itself. Viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide are an integral part of the living tissue of the plant. When the plant dies or a part is removed from the plant, microorganisms colonizing the tissue immediately begin to digest it, using the components of the tissue (including viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide) as building blocks for making their own tissues or for fueling their own metabolisms. Viral coat proteins, or segments of these proteins, produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide are subject to the same processes of degradation and decay that all organic matter undergoes. This turnover of biochemical materials in nature through a process of degradation occurs fairly rapidly. Therefore, viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide do not persist in the environment or bioaccumulate. There is no indication that naturally occurring plant biochemical compounds, including viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of plant-pesticides, are particularly resistant to this degradation. Because of the rapid turnover of these substances, even if they reach surface waters, they are unlikely to present anything other than a very negligible exposure in drinking water drawn from either surface or ground water sources. Therefore, the potential for non-dietary exposure (i.e., non-food oral, dermal and inhalation) in non-occupational settings is limited and EPA expects such exposure to be negligible.

With regard to exposure to "other related substances," EPA is not aware of any other substances either in food or outside the food supply that may be related, via a common mechanism of toxicity, to viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide since viral coat proteins are not toxic to humans or animals. With regard to non-occupational exposure through routes other than dietary exposure, since viral coat proteins are not toxic, EPA is not aware of substances outside the food supply that may be related via a common mechanism of toxicity to the viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide. No evidence indicates that adverse effects due to aggregate exposure of viral coat proteins

with such substances through the dietary, non-food oral, dermal and inhalation routes occurs.

EPA considered exposure to residues of viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide when it issued the proposal and is not requesting additional comment on that topic. Comments are only requested on EPA's conclusion that there are no substances outside of the food supply that are related, via a common mechanism of action, to residues of viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide for which EPA must consider exposure in aggregate with viral coat proteins.

7. *Sensitivities of subgroups.* In 1994, EPA considered available information on the sensitivities of subgroups as it pertains to viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide in the proposal (59 FR 60545). The Agency's evaluation is summarized in Unit IV.A. of this supplemental notice.

8. *Naturally occurring estrogen or other endocrine effects.* FFDCFA now directs EPA, in establishing an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance, to consider "such information as the Administrator may require on whether the pesticide chemical may have an effect in humans that is similar to an effect of a naturally-occurring estrogen or other endocrine effect" (21 U.S.C. 346(a)(q)). Congress allowed EPA 2 years to establish a screening program to determine whether certain pesticide chemicals may have estrogenic effects and an additional year to implement the program (21 U.S.C. 408(p)). As part of the screening and implementation process, EPA is determining what information might be required and how it will address estrogenic effects from pesticide residues in general.

There is some information on estrogenic effects by exposure to pesticides but the data are limited and do not pertain to viral coat proteins. Based on available information concerning the presence of viruses in the food supply with no detectable adverse human health effects, EPA does not expect viral coat proteins expressed in plants as part of a plant-pesticide to cause estrogen or other endocrine effects. If EPA becomes aware of a potential for estrogenic or endocrine effect from exposure to viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide, EPA will reexamine this tolerance exemption in light of that information.

9. *Safety factors.* In the 1994 proposal, EPA did not rely on the available animal data in reaching its determination that a tolerance is not necessary to protect the public from viral coat proteins

produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide (59 FR 60545). As discussed in Unit IV.A. of this supplemental notice, EPA relied on the long history of safe human consumption of food containing plant viruses and consumption of food derived from animals that consume forage and other crops (e.g., corn and other grains) that are also likely to contain plant viruses. EPA continues to believe that long-term evidence of human consumption, not animal experimentation data, is the appropriate information base for the proposed exemption (59 FR 60545). Because EPA did not rely on animal experimentation data, the Agency did not consider which safety factors would be appropriate to use in assessing risk to humans based on data generated through experiments on animals.

10. *Infants and children.*—a. *Dietary consumption patterns.* In the 1994 proposal (59 FR 60545), EPA considered available information on the dietary consumption pattern of infants and children as it pertains to viral coat proteins in food and has summarized the evaluation in Unit IV.A. of this supplemental notice. The range of foods consumed by infants and children is in general more limited than the range of foods consumed by adults. Most newborns rely on milk products for nutrition, although some infants are fed soy-based products. Infants begin as early as 4-months of age to consume specific types of solid foods containing residues of pesticidal substances that are the subject of the proposed exemption. Subsequent to 4 months of age, apart from processing to facilitate swallowing, the diets of infants are based on foods consumed by the general adult population albeit in different proportions. As infants and children mature, more and more of the foods normally consumed by adults become part of their diets and the relative proportions of the different types of food consumed changes to more closely resemble an adult diet. Since plant viruses are ubiquitous in plant foods, EPA concluded that infants and children are exposed as part of a normal diet to viral coat proteins. There is no evidence that such exposure leads to any harm.

b. *Special susceptibility.* In the 1994 proposal (59 FR 60545), EPA considered available information on the potential for susceptibility of infants and children, including pre- and post-natal toxicity, as these factors pertain to viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide. There is no scientific evidence that viral coat proteins as a component of food would have a different effect on children than

they would on the adult population. EPA summarizes its analysis of the effect of consumption in food of viral coat proteins on human health in Unit IV.A. of this supplemental notice.

c. *Cumulative effects of residues with other substances with a common mechanism of toxicity.* In the 1994 proposal (59 FR 60545), EPA examined the available information on the cumulative effect of residues of viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide as well as other substances in food that may have a common mechanism of toxicity. The Agency's consideration in the proposal of the effects of the residues of viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide on the general population also included consideration of effects for infants and children. See Unit IV.B.5. of this supplemental notice for a discussion of cumulative effects of viral coat proteins and other substances that have a common mechanism of toxicity.

EPA considered the safety of foods containing residues of viral coat proteins when it issued the proposal and it is not requesting additional comment on that topic. Comments are only requested on EPA's conclusion that there are no substances outside of the food supply that may have a cumulative toxic effect with residues of viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide.

d. *Margin of safety.* In determining whether the residues of viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide are safe, FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(C) directs EPA to apply a tenfold margin of safety for the residues and other sources of exposure to infants and children to account for potential pre- and post-natal toxicity and completeness of data on threshold effects with respect to exposure and toxicity to infants and children, unless a different margin will be safe. In proposing the exemption, EPA based its assessment of exposure and toxicity upon reliable information including the long history of safe human consumption of food containing residues of viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide and other substances in food, and the unique nature of plant-pesticides. EPA did not rely on animal data. EPA relied on observations concerning whole food consumption by humans and did not rely on single entity testing, wherein animals are exposed to high concentrations of substances isolated from a plant source. EPA relied on the vast base of the human experience with actual food consumption rather than limited testing situations involving exposure to high

concentrations of viral coat proteins. EPA, thus, did not utilize animal or other studies that would yield data that could be subjected to an additional margin of safety. (See Units IV.A. and IV.B.3. of this supplemental notice). As a result, the FQPA amendments to FFDCA do not affect EPA's analysis.

#### *C. Safety Determinations in Light of FFDCA Amendment.*

Based on the information discussed in the 1994 proposals (59 FR 60496 through 60547), the discussion in Unit IV.A. and the analysis in Unit IV.B. of this supplemental notice, EPA concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to the U.S. population in general, and U.S. infants and children, from aggregate exposure to residues of viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide, including all anticipated dietary exposures and all other exposures for which there is reliable information. Under the proposed exemption from the requirement for a tolerance (59 FR 60545), EPA would exempt residues of viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide. Extensive use and experience show the safety of foods containing these substances. No evidence, in the many years of human experience with the growing and consumption of food from plants containing viral coat proteins, indicates that adverse effects due to aggregate exposure through the dietary, non-food oral, dermal and inhalation routes occur.

The conclusion that residues of viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide should be exempt from tolerance requirements under the FFDCA section 408 safety standard also lends support to one of EPA's proposed FIFRA exemptions (59 FR 60519) with respect to human dietary risks: plant-pesticides that are coat proteins from plant viruses (59 FR at 60535). In the FIFRA proposal, EPA utilized two criteria to determine whether plant-pesticides should be exempt; (1) whether they posed a low probability of risk, and (2) whether they caused unreasonable adverse effects on the environment. Based upon the determination that residues of viral coat proteins (59 FR 60545) and the nucleic acid component of a plant-pesticide (59 FR 60542) meet the FFDCA section 408 safety test, EPA concludes viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide would pose only a low probability of human dietary risk and also would not pose an unreasonable adverse effect with respect to such risks.

#### *D. Other Considerations*

When the Agency proposed to establish an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide (59 FR 60545), EPA did not propose any numerical limitation on the amount of viral coat proteins that could be present in food containing these residues. EPA consulted in 1994 with the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) in developing the proposed exemption and this supplemental notice, and will consult with the Secretary of HHS prior to issuing the final rule. Because the 1994 proposal was an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance, the Agency has concluded that an analytical method for detecting and measuring the levels of the residues of viral coat proteins in or on food is not required.

#### **V. Comments**

##### *A. Confidential Business Information*

Information submitted as a comment concerning this supplemental notice may be claimed confidential by marking any part or all of that information as "Confidential Business Information" (CBI). CBI should not be submitted through e-mail. Information marked as CBI will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2. A copy of the comment that does not contain CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public record. Information not marked confidential may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice.

##### *B. 30-Day Comment Period*

EPA is allowing a 30 day-comment period because it has determined that such a period will provide the public with an adequate opportunity to respond to the additional issues raised in this supplemental notice. FFDCA and FIFRA do not specify a comment period for this type of notice. EPA has decided that a 30-day comment period is reasonable because this supplemental notice raises very few new issues that were not already available for public comment. As discussed in Unit IV. of this supplemental notice, EPA effectively considered most of the factors required by the FQPA amendments of FFDCA and FIFRA relevant to the proposed exemptions when it issued the proposed package of notices describing EPA's approach in 1994 (59 FR 60496, 60519, 60535, 60542 and 60545). At that time, the public had an opportunity to review both the Agency's rationale for the proposals and the underlying support documents during a 90-day public comment

period. Only a limited number of new issues have been raised by the FQPA amendments to FFDCA and FIFRA and the Agency continues to rely upon the information already in the docket for the 1994 proposals and thus 30 days should provide adequate time for public comment. In addition, EPA believes that it is in the interest of the public to publish the final exemption from the requirement of a tolerance in a timely manner.

### C. Request for Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments on the new issues raised in this supplemental notice specifically on:

(1) EPA's conclusion that there are no substances outside of the food supply that may have a cumulative toxic effect with residues of viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide.

(2) EPA's conclusion that there are no substances outside of the food supply that are related via a common mechanism of toxicity to residues of viral coat proteins produced in plants as part of a plant-pesticide to which humans might be exposed through non-occupational routes of exposure.

Commenters who possess information on viral coat proteins causing estrogenic effects are requested to send such information to EPA.

In this supplemental notice, EPA describes in greater detail the rationale supporting the statement made in the 1994 **Federal Register** (59 FR at 60513) that "plant-pesticides are likely to present a limited exposure of pesticidal substances to humans. In most cases, the predominant, if not the only route of exposure will be dietary. Significant respiratory and dermal exposures will be unlikely." No comments were received on this statement during the official comment period. Commenters may comment on this more detailed rationale for viral coat proteins.

In this supplemental notice, EPA also describes in greater detail how the rationale presented in the 1994 **Federal Register** (59 FR at 60538) concerning the safety for human consumption of food containing viral coat proteins applies to infants and children. No comments were received on this rationale during the official comment period. Commenters may comment on this more detailed rationale specifically

addressing infants and children as part of the larger human population.

### VI. Public Docket

The official record for this rulemaking, as well as the public version, has been established for this rulemaking under docket control number "OPP-300367A" 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 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The official rulemaking record is located at the address in "ADDRESSES" at the beginning of this document.

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. Comment and data will also be accepted on disks in WordPerfect 5.1 file format or ASCII file format. All comments and data in electronic form must be identified by the docket control number "OPP-300367A." Electronic comments on this supplemental notice may be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries.

### VII. References

- (1) Gibbs, A. and B Harrison. 1976. *Plant Virology: The Principles*, Chap. 1. J. Wiley Sons, New York.
- (2) Matthews, R.E.F. 1981. *Plant Virology*. Chaps. 12, 16, and 19. Second edition, Academic Press, New York.
- (3) Provvidenti, R., R.W. Robinson, and H.M. Munger. 1984. Occurrence of Zucchini Yellow Mosaic Virus in Cucurbits from Connecticut, New York, Florida and California, *Plant Disease* 68:443-446.
- (4) Beemster, A.B.R. and J.A. de Bokx. 1987. Survey of Properties and Symptoms of Potato Viruses, pp. 84-93 In: *Viruses of Potatoes and Seed Potato Production*; J.A. de Bokx and J.P.H. vanderWent. PuDOC, Wageningen, The Netherlands.
- (5) Brun, G. 1991. Rhabdoviridae, Chap. 17, pp. 443-460; In: *Atlas of Invertebrate Viruses*, eds. J.R. Adams

and J.R. Bonami. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

### VIII. Regulatory Assessment Requirements

This supplemental notice merely seeks additional comments on the proposed rules with regard to the potential impact that the new statutory amendments imposed by the August 3, 1996 Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) might have on the provisions as proposed. As such, this notice does not contain any new proposed requirements that would require additional consideration by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under Executive Order 12866, entitled Regulatory Planning and Review (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993) or the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA), 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.* It does not require any other action under Executive Order 12875, entitled Enhancing the Intergovernmental Partnership (58 FR 58093, October 28, 1993), Executive Order 12898, entitled Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994), or the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). The Agency's activities related to these regulatory assessment requirements are discussed in the proposed rules.

EPA did not consider Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) (Pub. L. 104-4) at the proposal stage because the proposed rules were issued prior to its enactment. Although this supplemental notice is not subject to UMRA because it neither proposes or finalizes any regulatory requirements, the applicability of the UMRA requirements will be addressed in the final rules.

### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 180

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Plants, Plant-pesticides, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements

Dated: May 7, 1997.

**Lynn R. Goldman,**

Assistant Administrator for Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances.

[FR Doc. 97-12785 Filed 5-15-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-F