



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

OFFICE OF  
PESTICIDES AND TOXIC SUBSTANCES

DEC 1 1986

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Folpet Policy Group Briefing

TO: Addressees

FROM: Valerie M. Bael

Attached is a copy of the Briefing Paper that will be presented to Policy Group this Wednesday, December 3, 1986 (Room 1119) from 1 p.m. to 3 p.m. All folpet team members are asked to attend. If you have any conflicts, please call me so that I can get an alternate. You may reach me on 557-2314.

Addressees:

Eugene Wilson  
Stephen Saunders  
William Burnam  
Dennis McLane  
Alan Reiter  
Lyn Bradley  
Tina Levine  
Jean Luppinacci  
Janet Andersen  
Cara Jablon

Valerie's

BRIEFING PAPER ON FOLPET  
(N-[(trichloromethyl)thio]phthalimide)

(Revised 3/27/87)

I. ISSUE

Based on animal studies showing evidence of oncogenicity (duodenal adenocarcinomas) and teratogenicity (hydrocephalus) should the Agency proceed with initiation of a Special Review (PD 1/2/3) or delay this regulatory action until crop residue, dermal penetration, applicator exposure and metabolism data are received and reviewed.

II. BACKGROUND

Folpet, (N-[(trichloromethyl)thio]phthalimide) is a broad spectrum fungicide and belongs to the dicarboximide group of organic fungicides. A Registration Standard has been drafted and will be issued shortly.

Folpet is registered for use in the culture of both food and nonfood crops (ornamental) and as an industrial fungicide in the manufacturing of interior and exterior paints and coatings and in the manufacturing of plastics.

There are approximately 100 federally registered pesticide products containing folpet as an active ingredient, 18 federal technical and/or manufacturing use registrations and two 24C registrations - one in Florida and one in Arizona.

Approximately 1.5 - 2.0 million pounds active ingredient of folpet are used annually in the United States. Current trends indicate a declining market. Non-agricultural uses, including industrial and home and garden uses, account for about 86% of total usage. Folpet use as a mildewicide in paints and stains accounts for about 59% of total usage and approximately 68% of the industrial usage. Plastics and home and garden use accounts for 12.4% and 15.4%, respectively, of total usage. Agricultural crops, divided between fruits and vegetables account for 10.2% and 3.3%, respectively, of total usage. The largest portion of the agricultural uses are on grapes (8%), apples (2%), and lettuce (3%).

Folpet is incorporated as a dust or flowable concentrate in paints, stains and polyvinylchloride (PVC) products. The percentage of folpet in oil-based paints ranges from 0.27% to 1.76% a.i. The percentage used is based on environmental factors of the area of the country where the paint is to be applied. The percentage of folpet in stains range from 0.27 to 1.0 %. When impregnated in flexible PVC products, the percentage of folpet ranges from 0.0105 to 0.2288%.

Agricultural products containing folpet are predominantly wettable powders (25 to 75%), while home and garden products are wettable powders (14.5 to 75%), dusts (4 to 7.5%) or pressurized sprays (0.5 to 0.75%).

Originally folpet was manufactured in the United States by a joint venture of Chevron Chemical Company and Stauffer Chemical Company. It is now imported into the United States from Israel where it is produced by Makhteshim Beer Sheva Chemical Works, Ltd. and from France where it is manufactured by Chevron Chemical Company.

### III. BASIS FOR CONCERN

#### A. TOXICITY

During development of the Registration Standard, a review of data has indicated that at least two Special Review triggers appear to be met - oncogenicity and teratogenicity.

##### 1. Oncogenicity and Mutagenicity

Chronic feeding mouse studies indicate that folpet causes duodenal adenomas, adenocarcinomas and intestinal mucosal hyperplasia. Two mouse studies with different strains of mice showed a statistically significant ( $p \leq 0.01$ ) dose-related increase in the incidence of malignant duodenal adenocarcinoma, a rare type tumor in mice. Captan, an analog of folpet, also has been shown to induce duodenal carcinomas in the mouse.

Another rodent study also raises toxicological concerns. In a two-year chronic feeding study in the rat, treatment-related increases in the incidence of hyperkeratosis/acanthosis of the stomach were noted in mid and high dose males and females at terminal sacrifice. Equivocal oncogenic responses were noted in the thyroid and testes of male rats. In the thyroid, an increased incidence of C-cell carcinomas was noted in high dose male rats, but not in females. An increase in the incidence of interstitial cell tumors and hyperplasia was also noted in treated males but statistical evaluation of these findings did not yield a significant result. Based upon equivocal evidence of an oncogenic response in the male, historical control data for incidences of these two tumor types were required by OPP.

3

A review of the submitted historical control data indicated that for each of the tumors, the incidence in high dose males was within the historical control range. Therefore, although the incidences of thyroid and testes tumors in the folpet study were suggestive of a treatment-related effect in males, the submitted historical control data indicate that these findings were spontaneous and were not related to treatment with folpet. The chronic portion of the study remains classified as "Core-Supplemental" until data on the results of diet analysis and an explanation of the findings of "medullary tubule hyperplasia of the ovary, spongiosis hepatitis and foci of vacuolated hepatocytes of the liver" are submitted. The registrant will be requested to submit these data through the Registration Standard. Deadline for submission of data will be within 3 months from receipt of the Registration Standard.

Folpet has also been shown to be mutagenic in vitro in bacteria, yeast, and mammalian systems. Although the mutagenic activity of folpet is reduced by the presence of metabolic activators in blood, the potential for causing mutations in mammals is supported by these data. Additional data are being required through the Registration Standard to better characterize the potential for mutagenicity of folpet. Deadline for submission of data will be within 12 months from receipt of the Registration Standard.

Based on the oncogenic response in the two mouse studies with two strains of mice and the structural similarity to the oncogen captan, HED's Peer Review Committee concluded that folpet should be classified as a "B2", or probable human carcinogen. The  $Q^*$  is calculated as  $3.5 \times 10^{-3} \text{ (mg/kg/day)}^{-1}$ .

## 2. Teratogenicity

Folpet was demonstrated to be teratogenic in rabbits causing hydrocephalus and altered development of the skull, with only minimal maternal toxicity. A statistically significant increase in these findings was noted in mid and high dose fetuses; the NOEL for developmental toxicity was established at 10 mg/kg/d. Maternal toxicity in the form of decreased food consumption and body weight gain was also noted in mid and high dose rabbits; the NOEL for maternal toxicity was also 10 mg/kg/d.

Additional studies in the rat, hamster and mouse provide conflicting results. A study in the rat failed to produce any evidence of teratogenicity at the highest dose tested (360 mg/kg/d). A published study in the hamster indicated that folpet caused increases in fetal incidences of exencephaly and fused ribs. Although suggestive of developmental effects, these data are of limited utility as an inadequate number of animals was tested and only summary data were provided. Data reported in a mouse study indicated that the results were equivocal by gavage and negative for oral, subcutaneous or inhalation routes.

After consideration of all available data, it is concluded that folpet possesses teratogenic potential in the rabbit with a NOEL for overall developmental toxicity in this species of 10 mg/kg/d.

### 3. Reproductive Effects

A two-generation feeding study (diets containing 0, 200, 800, and 3,600 ppm) in the rat failed to establish a NOEL for developmental/reproductive toxicity, as potential effects on male fertility were noted at all doses tested. This effect was dose-related with statistical significance at the highest dose tested, but not at the two lower doses. Other findings included decreases in pup body weight gain in second generation rats fed diets containing 3600 ppm nominal (3200 ppm actual). The registrant was required to submit historical control data.

The submitted historical control data for male fertility consisted of one completed study, a study in progress, and a pilot study. The fertility rates for mid and high dose male rats were below the historical control values, however the effect did not appear to be related to dose and therefore is of questionable toxicological significance. The NOEL for this study is now 800 ppm (690 ppm analytical) on the basis of decreased body weight gain and decreased fertility. HED recommends that the reproduction study be upgraded to Core Guideline status. Since the rat reproduction study was previously the basis for the ADI, a new Tolerance Reassessment is required for the Registration Standard. The new ADI will likely be based on the 1-year chronic feeding study in dogs, which is currently under review.

In addition to this study, a mouse somatic cell mutation assay, which is in essence a one-generation feeding study, demonstrated statistically significant decreases in mouse pup survival at all dose levels, with a LOEL of 10.9 mg/kg/d (LDT). No histopathological examinations of mouse pups were conducted. OPP is requiring historical control data in either reproduction studies or in somatic cell mutation assays. The registrant will be required to submit historical control data within 3 months from receipt of the Registration Standard. If the issue cannot be resolved, OPP will require a full two-generation reproduction study in the mouse.

### 4. Toxicity of Folpet-related compounds

In June 1985, a PD 2/3 was issued for captan based on oncogenicity (gastrointestinal tumors in mice and kidney tumors in rats). In laboratory animal studies captan was also shown to induce reproductive (reduced parental and offspring weight gains) and teratogenic (impaired growth of offspring) effects. To further assess these risks, residue data and historical

teratology data were required in a Data Call-In Notice issued April, 1985. Historical control data has already been submitted and is under review. The deadline for submission of the residue data is April, 1987. A PD 4 is scheduled to be issued mid 1988.

In January, 1985, a Special Review was initiated on Captafol based on oncogenicity (lymphosarcomas in mice and neoplastic liver lesions in female rats) and hazards to wildlife. Because of the lack of residue data, dietary exposures were based on 100% tolerance levels. Dietary estimates ranged from  $10^{-5}$  to  $10^{-6}$ . On March 5, 1987, Chevron Chemical Company submitted a formal request to RD to voluntarily cancel all their registrations for captafol.

A comparison of risks for folpet and its major alternatives is presented in Attachment 1.

## B. EXPOSURE

Exposure to folpet is through 1) the dietary route, 2) dermal exposure to mixer/loader/applicators associated with crop, home/garden and paint/stain uses and, 3) possible dermal exposure to factory workers adding folpet formulations to paints, stains and PVC products.

### 1. Dietary

The dietary exposure of folpet is not well characterized because of the lack of adequate residue chemistry data for the tolerances which were established by the Spray Residue Hearings. These data are being required through the Registration Standard. and are due within 48 months from receipt of the Registration Standard.

Thirty established tolerances for residues of folpet in raw agricultural commodities range from 15 to 50 ppm. FDA samplings are spotty, but show in most instances that residue values are less than the tolerances. The dietary exposure estimates are based on the assumption that residues are at 100 percent tolerance levels.

### 2. Mixer/Loader/Applicators

The analysis of exposure to mixer/loader/applicators is based on a 0.4% estimated dermal penetration rate. This estimate is based on folpet's structural similarity to captan and on results of recently completed dermal absorption studies in rats on fourteen pesticides (including folpet and captan). However, to confirm this absorption rate, HED believes a "guideline" study should be conducted for folpet. Therefore, a dermal penetration study on folpet is being required through

6

the Registration Standard. Deadline for submission of data will be 12 months from receipt of the Registration Standard. Inhalation exposure is assumed to be negligible based on studies using surrogate data.

#### a. Agricultural Sites

The major agricultural uses of folpet are on apples, grapes and lettuce. Folpet is applied as a wettable powder suspension by ground airblast sprayers to apples and grapes and by boom sprayers to lettuce. Attachment 2 gives the use practices and exposure values for these crops.

An analysis of exposure to mixer/loader/applicators indicates that the greatest chronic exposure results from the treatment of grapes, 25 mg/kg/yr. The greatest acute exposure resulting from treatment of both apples and grapes is 7 mg/kg/d.

Folpet labels contain no statement concerning use of protective clothing or equipment. However, the labels do state that inhalation of dust or spray mist and contact with eyes, skin and clothing should be avoided. In practice, folpet is usually applied with insecticides which the applicators would consider more toxic than folpet. Therefore, when folpet is mixed with insecticides more protective clothing (long sleeved shirt, hat, gloves) and equipment (respirators and goggles) may be worn.

#### b. Home and Garden Sites

Folpet is applied as a wettable powder suspension by means of a hose end sprayer, hand trigger sprayer, trombone sprayer or compressed air sprayer. It can also be applied as a dust using a squeeze duster package or dust gun. It is estimated that one million home gardeners would be exposed to folpet each year. The average number of applications can be expected to be higher in the South and West where the growing season is longer and less than the average (12) in the Northeast where the season is shorter.

An analysis for chronic and acute exposure to persons applying folpet to ornamentals (roses) by spraying and dusting was done using surrogate data with carbaryl, diazinon and benomyl. The results are as follows:

Spray:	Chronic	0.52 mg/kg/yr
	Acute	0.051 mg/kg/d
Dust :	Chronic	0.17 mg/kg/yr
	Acute	0.014 mg/kg/d

Labels for home and garden products where folpet is the sole active ingredient contain no statement concerning the use of protective clothing or equipment. However, the labels do

state that inhalation of dust or spray mist and contact with skin and eyes should be avoided. Even when insecticides are part of the formulation, most home and garden labels make no statements concerning protective clothing. The extent of protective clothing worn by home gardeners is unknown as it will vary with the individual's concern about the pesticide in use. Nevertheless, protecting the hands would essentially eliminate exposure (85% or more) when applying pesticides in the home garden situation even if only minimal clothing was worn. Since there is no re-entry or preharvest interval with the use of folpet on home garden sites, it can be assumed that gardeners might enter the treated area within 24 hours or less following application of the pesticide. Attachment 3 summarizes exposure information based on use in the home garden.

### c. Paint/stain uses

Based on data from captan exposure studies, exposure to users of paints and stains containing captan was considered to be important because oil base paints generally enhance dermal absorption. The oncogenic risk to users of oil-based paints containing captan was  $10^{-5}$ . Applicator exposure data on folpet are being required through the Registration Standard. Deadline for submission of data will be within 15 months from receipt of the Registration Standard.

Labels for stains containing folpet and oil-based paints believed to contain folpet carry recommendations for protective clothing. The exact type of protective clothing is usually not specified except for some labels that state that rubber gloves should be worn, especially when handling freshly treated lumber. In addition, some labels recommend the use of goggles and respirators. Warnings are given to avoid the vapor or spray mist and to avoid contact with skin, eyes, and in some cases, clothing. Labels generally state that contaminated skin and clothing should be washed with soap and water.

Only registered products claiming pesticidal properties can be regulated under FIFRA. As defined in 40 CFR 162.5(c)(2), "paints and other formulated coatings which are treated with fungicides to protect the coating itself and for which no pesticidal claims are made" are not considered pesticides. Stains containing folpet are registered because the stain product labels claim pesticidal activity.

### 3. Factory workers

Exposure to folpet may occur during addition of folpet formulations to paints, stains, and PVC products. However, no dermal exposure data are available for factory workers who may come in contact with folpet. Exposure data on captan indicates that the potential inhalation and dermal exposure to factory workers during the weighing and addition operations are likely to be mitigated by wearing gloves and a respirator. We believe that folpet is used in the same manner in factories as is captan.

8

## C. RISKS

Due to the lack of data, risk estimates for dietary exposure were based on tolerances rather than actual residues in foods and risks to mixer/loader/applicators were based on an estimated dermal absorption rate of 0.4%. Residue chemistry and dermal absorption data will be received within 4 years and 1 year from receipt of the Registration Standard, respectively. When these data are received and reviewed, risk figures may be lower than assumed for the current risk assessment.

### 1. Oncogenicity

#### a. Dietary (General Population)

Based on a  $Q^*$  of  $3.5 \times 10^{-3} \text{ (mg/kg/d)}^{-1}$  and the estimated Theoretical Maximum Residue Contribution obtained under the "Food Factor" system, the cancer risk from dietary exposure to folpet is calculated as  $3.1 \times 10^{-4}$ .

$$\text{Risk} = 3.5 \times 10^{-3} \text{ (mg/kg/d)}^{-1} \times (0.09 \text{ mg/kg/d})$$

The potential dietary risk from individual crops treated with folpet range from  $10^{-5}$  (lettuce) to  $10^{-7}$  (garlic). These risks estimates are reduced by approximately one order of magnitude when the percentage of crop treated is factored into the risk calculations (See Attachments 4 and 5).

#### b. Mixer/Loader/Applicators - Crop, Industrial and Paint Uses

Oncogenic risks from dermal exposure are not considered likely because folpet's half-life in blood is only 1 minute. It is presumed, therefore, that little, if any, folpet is absorbed systemically. The small amount that is absorbed is probably rapidly degraded.

### 2. Developmental Toxicity

#### a. Dietary

Because of the demonstrated developmental toxicity of folpet in the rabbit, an acute dietary analysis was conducted using the Tolerance Assessment System (TAS). This analysis calculated the acute (single-day) exposure to folpet as a result of consumption of food containing tolerance level residues. The result of the analysis indicates that for females aged 13 years and older, the single-day exposure is 0.11 mg/kg/day. Using the NOEL of 10 mg/kg/day for maternal and developmental toxicity, this exposure results in a Margin-of-Safety (MOS) of 90.0.

However, if the distribution of food consumption is considered, the TAS analysis indicates that 15 percent of this subpopulation is predicted to have an exposure of 0.2 mg/kg/day or greater, and the upper 5 percent of the subpopulation has a single day intake of 0.3 mg/kg/day or greater. These exposures result in MOSs of 50 and 33, respectively.

As these values are based on tolerances rather than actual residues on food "as eaten," a more meaningful dietary risk assessment for developmental hazard requires better estimates of residues of folpet than are likely to be encountered on food. When residue studies are submitted by registrants in response to the Registration Standard, the risks will be recalculated.

#### b. Mixer/Loader/Applicators

Although it is assumed that oncogenic risks (i.e., duodenal tumors) from dermal exposure are not considered likely because of folpet's rapid half-life in blood, a parallel cannot be drawn for developmental effects. The rabbit studies which demonstrated developmental effects were conducted using the oral route of exposure. Since the mechanism of folpet in blood has shown an inability to travel systemically and thus cause oncogenic tumors at distant sites, the developmental effects could not be caused by folpet per se but by its' metabolites. However, OPP cannot make a final determination of this risk until it receives plant and animal metabolism data which are being required through the Registration Standard. Deadline for submission of data is 24 months from receipt of the Registration Standard.

##### 1. Agricultural sites

Based on the NOELs for maternal and developmental toxicity, an acute exposure of 7 mg/kg/d (apples and grapes), and an assumed dermal absorption of 0.4%, the developmental MOS is 340.

##### 2. Home/Garden sites

The highest predicted acute dermal exposure for homeowner use is 0.05 mg/kg/d with a MOS of over 47,000.

##### 3. Paint/stain uses

There are no exposure data available to estimate developmental risks to applicators who use end-products containing folpet. Exposure studies on captan indicate an oncogenic risk of  $10^{-5}$  (based on 0.857 mg/kg/d exposure and 100% dermal absorption) to professional painters using oil-based paints containing captan. Painter exposure data are being required through the Registration Standard and will be received within 15 months of receipt of the Registration Standard.

#### 4. Factory workers

As previously discussed, there are no dermal exposure data available to estimate developmental risks to workers who incorporate folpet into paints, stains and plastics or to users of the end-products. When OPP receives dermal penetration, it will be in a better position to assess these risks. Nevertheless, it was determined that when captan was incorporated as an additive in plastics and paints, there was negligible dermal exposure to workers due to the extensive safety measures and protective clothing required in industrial plants.

#### D. INTERIM RISK REDUCTION MEASURES

Based on the principle to minimize unnecessary exposure to pesticides and the lack of re-entry data, OPP is proposing to require, as is customary with the absence of reentry data, through the Registration Standard a 24-hour reentry period. Once it receives reentry data, this requirement will be reevaluated. It also is imposing greenhouse procedures, irrigation restrictions, and an environmental fish warning.

#### IV. BENEFITS

Folpet is used on five use categories: 1) nonagricultural sites (oil-based paints and stains), 2) in flexible polyvinyl-chloride plastic and caulking compounds, 3) on grapes, apples, cherries and minimal amounts on other fruit crops, 4) on lettuce, garlic, onions, melons and minimal amounts on other vegetable crops, and, 5) as a single active ingredient and in combination with insecticides and other fungicides on home and garden sites (ornamentals and food crops).

Total folpet usage is in the range of 1.5 - 2.0 million lbs a.i. annually. Current trends indicate the folpet market in the United States is stagnant or shrinking. The greatest volume (59%) of folpet is used in oil-based paints. While there are no alternative mildewcides as effective as folpet, the use of folpet has declined because it cannot be used in the increasingly popular latex or waterbased paints. Use of folpet is also declining in the home/garden and agricultural sites as competitive fungicides have replaced the use of folpet on most of the 130 site-pest combinations for which folpet products are registered. On agricultural sites, such as apple orchards, a maximum of up to 12 applications a year of folpet might be applied to control leaf spots and fruit rots; however, in practice only two to three applications are actually applied.

A preliminary benefit review was conducted in order to anticipate the severity of potential economic impacts if folpet were cancelled and users were forced to use alternatives. Representative site registrations having the highest exposure and/or percent of the folpet market were used. As a result, the

11

following use sites were included: oil-based paints, home/garden uses, grapes, apples and lettuce. A preliminary review of the economic impacts resulting from a cancellation of folpet uses along a list of the regulatory status of alternatives are presented in Attachments 6 and 7.

Oil paint formulators as well as consumers would be expected to be affected by the loss of folpet. It is considered to be the superior fungicide to control mildew on surfaces coated with oil-based paints. There have not been any cost effective alternatives to folpet since the suspension of phenylmercuric compounds in the 1970's. While the market for oil-based paints is declining, it is expected that folpet cancellation could accelerate the shift to latex paints.

Folpet is an important component in late season control of summer diseases affecting apples. If only benomyl and thiophanate-methyl were available for late season application, there would be a possibility of increased pathogen resistance. Alternating with folpet or using folpet for the last two sprays of the season helps prevent fungal resistance. The persistence of folpet also helps control fruit rots in storage. Without folpet fruit losses may occur, possibly impacting farm income and consumer prices for fresh market apples.

Numerous efficacious alternatives exist for most pests affecting home gardeners. Nevertheless, effective control of phomopsis cane blight and leaf spot may be difficult if both folpet and captan were no longer available for use. Registered alternatives for use on grapes are mancozeb (one of the EDBC chemicals under the NRDC lawsuit review), dinoseb (under emergency suspension), and sodium arsenite which cannot be used on some vine grapes. Downy mildew of lettuce can be controlled with metalaxyl, however, resistance problems require alternating or tank mixing with folpet, captan or maneb (also an EDBC chemical).

## V. CONCLUSION

The following is a summary of the risks of folpet based on a dermal absorption rate of 0.4% and a dietary exposure based on 100% tolerance levels:

Use Sites	<u>RISKS</u>			
	<u>Oncogenicity</u>		<u>Developmental</u>	
	<u>Dietary</u>	<u>M/L/A</u>	<u>Dietary</u>	<u>M/L/A</u>
Agricultural (General Pop.)	10 <sup>-4</sup>	n/a	MOS 33-90	MOS 340
Home/Garden (ornamentals)	n/a	n/a	n/a	MOS 47,000
Industrial				
Factory workers	n/a	n/a	n/a	negligible (based on captan)
Painters				
°Commerical	n/a	n/a	n/a	?
°Homeowners	n/a	n/a	n/a	?

## VI. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Based on the lack of crop residue, metabolism, dermal penetration, and painter exposure data, the oncogenic and developmental risk estimates for folpet are conservative. In order to more accurately assess the magnitude of these effects, OPTS would need to delay a Special Review decision until critical data are received and reviewed. There are two options available:

Option 1: Wait until 1991 to make a Special Review decision on folpet. All critical data (residue chemistry, metabolism, dermal penetration and painter exposure) will be received within 48 months of receipt of the Registration Standard. If OPP's reassessment of the data indicates that the risk figures are unacceptable, a PD 1/2/3 could be issued.

Option 2: Reassess the developmental risks to mixer/loader/applicators when dermal absorption and painter exposure data are received (within 15 months of receipt of the Registration Standard). If a reassessment of the data yield unacceptable risks, a PD 1/2/3 could be issued based only on the teratogenic trigger. However, if the risks appear acceptable OPTS would postpone a Special Review decision until it receives crop residue data (within 48 months of receipt of the Registration Standard)

to assess the oncogenic and teratogenic dietary risks. In the meantime, OPP would be able to make a preliminary assessment of dietary risks based on receipt of residue data requested from the Grocery Manufacturer's Association and the National Food Processors Association.

Special Review Decision Timeline

<u>Data</u>	<u>Submission Deadline from receipt of RS</u>		<u>OPP Review</u>		<u>Completion</u>
Dermal Penetration Data	12 months	+	4 months	=	16 months
Painter Exposure Data	15 months	+	4 months	=	19 months
Metabolism Data	18 months	+	6 months	=	24 months
Residue Chemistry Data (30 crops)	42 months	+	6 months	=	48 months