Dear Chair Thompson, Chair Stabenow, Ranking Member Scott, and Ranking Member Boozman,

We write to express our great concern with a rule recently finalized by EPA regarding plant-incorporated protectants (PIP) derived from gene editing. The rule as finalized will suppress access to agricultural innovations greatly needed to reduce inputs, adapt to a changing climate and, respond to increased pest and disease challenges while maintaining a safe, reliable, and affordable food system for a growing global population. This rule will disproportionately stifle innovation by publicly supported federal and academic plant breeders and smaller plant breeding companies, inhibiting their development of new varieties, particularly of specialty and other smaller acreage crops.

PIPs are a broad class of substances that plants produce to protect themselves from pests and pathogens, much like the human immune system. These characteristics have been sought after by plant breeders for centuries. Under longstanding rules, EPA exempts conventionally bred PIPs from regulation under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) due to the history of safe use and the fact that they are inherently low-risk substances to humans and the environment.

In the final rule, EPA recognizes that PIPs created through gene editing from a sexually compatible plant and loss-of-function modifications, “pose no greater risk than the PIPs created through conventional breeding that have been exempt [from FIFRA] since 2001.” The Agency claims the new exemptions are “reducing the regulatory burden for the regulated community,” and will “result in increased research and development activities, commercialization of new pest control options for farmers, particularly in minor crops, and increase the diversity of options for pest and disease management, which could provide environmental benefits.”

However, we find EPA’s claims inaccurate since the rule applies different compliance requirements between conventionally bred PIP and equivalent PIP developed using gene editing. Developers of PIPs created through gene editing from a sexually compatible plant are required to undertake a mandatory premarket process to confirm “eligibility” for the exemption and are subject to a recordkeeping requirement not imposed on conventionally bred PIPs. Further, any PIPs created through gene editing from a sexually compatible plant that do not qualify for the exemptions would be subject to full EPA registration. This is not “reducing the regulatory burden” and will hinder, not incentivize, research and development in crops that most need innovation and can less afford scientifically unjustified regulatory hurdles. These crops are disproportionately specialty and small acreage crops that have historically relied on public sector, academic institutions, and smaller companies for new improved varieties.

EPA’s newly published regulation creating “PIPs created through genetic engineering from a sexually compatible plant” and “loss-of-function PIPs” is not risk-based, science-based and focuses on process of development rather than product. We ask that Congress take the necessary steps to ensure that U.S. agriculture can continue to innovate and respond to the environmental and crop production challenges we
face. The undersigned request that Congress direct EPA to withdraw the current rule and replace it with one that appropriately considers risk and benefits of PIPs created through gene editing from a sexually compatible plant and loss-of-function PIPs and treats them as equivalent to conventionally bred plant characteristics.

Thank you, and we stand ready to assist you in cultivating a risk-appropriate, science-based regulatory system for these vital innovations.
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