

Section 6

The 2004 FSIS Domestic Monitoring Plan Pesticides

Phase I. Generating and Ranking the List of Candidate Compounds

List of Candidate Compounds

The candidate pesticides of concern selected by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) members of the Surveillance Advisory Team (SAT) are presented in Table 6.1, *Scoring Table for Pesticides*. Since the Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) wishes to prioritize which *analyses* should be conducted, compounds that are, or are likely to be, detected by the same analytical methodology have been grouped together.

Ranking of Candidate Compounds

Compound Scoring

Using a simple 4-point scale (4 = high; 3 = moderate; 2 = low; 1 = none), members of the SAT scored each of the pesticides in each of the following categories. Note that some of these categories differ from those used for the veterinary drugs:

- FSIS Historical Testing Information on Violations
- Regulatory Concern
- Lack of FSIS Testing Information on Violations
- Pre-slaughter Interval
- Bioconcentration Factor
- Endocrine Disruption
- Toxicity

Definitions of each of these categories, and the criteria used for scoring, appear at the end of this section in the "*Scoring Key for Pesticides, FSIS 2003 Domestic Residue Program*."

The results of the compound scoring process are presented in Table 6.1. Where compounds were grouped together, the score assigned to each category is the highest score for all members of the group.

Compound Ranking

1. Background

Repeating Equation (4.1), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Risk} &= \text{Exposure} \times \text{Toxicity} && (6.1) \\ &= \text{Consumption} \times \text{Residue Levels} \times \text{Toxicity} \\ &= \text{Consumption} \times \text{"Risk per Unit of Consumption"} \end{aligned}$$

As stated above, FSIS chose to employ techniques and principles from the field of risk assessment to obtain a ranking of the relative public health concern represented by each of the candidate compounds or

compound classes. However, unlike the case with veterinary drugs (see Section 4), FSIS does not have historical data on a sufficient range of different pesticide compounds or compound classes to predict violation scores (and thus risk per unit of consumption) using a regression equation. Therefore, a somewhat different approach (although related to that used for the veterinary drugs) was necessary to estimate the "Risk per Unit of Consumption" term.

2. Rating the Pesticides According to Relative Public Health Concern

The categories of "Regulatory Concern," "Pre-slaughter Interval" and "Bioconcentration Factor" were employed as predictors of risk per unit of consumption from pesticides in animal products. As indicated above, the "Regulatory Concern" category reflects EPA's professional judgment of the likelihood that a compound or compound class will exceed EPA's level of concern in meat, poultry, or egg products. Thus, it combines residue level and toxicity information. As with the "Withdrawal Time" category for veterinary drugs, the "Pre-slaughter Interval" category is expected to correlate with residue level because longer pre-slaughter intervals are less likely to be properly observed. When the pre-slaughter interval is not observed, the carcass may contain violative levels of residues since the time necessary for sufficient metabolism and/or elimination of the pesticide may not have passed. Bioconcentration is a measure of the extent to which a pesticide concentrates within the fat deposits of animals. Pesticides that bioconcentrate are more likely to accumulate to higher levels within animal tissue, which is expected to increase the potential for human exposure.

The "Toxicity" category reflects both the dose required to achieve a toxic effect and the severity of that effect. Since the numerical value assigned to toxicity is independent of other parameters, it can be used directly as a term in Equation (6.1).

EPA assigns a value to regulatory concern, pre-slaughter interval and bioconcentration factor to each pesticide compound or class of compounds. These values are multiplied by a weighted average and then by the toxicity value to give an estimate of the relative risk per unit of consumption. As with the veterinary drugs, we can refine the equation by adding a modifier for the category, "Lack of FSIS Testing Information on Violations." With an appropriate substitution, we obtain the following equation:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\text{Relative Public Health Concern} && (6.2) \\
 &= \text{Estimated relative risk per unit of consumption} \\
 &\quad \times \text{modifier for "Lack of FSIS Testing Information on Violations"} \\
 &= \text{Estimated relative exposure} \times \text{Relative toxicity} \\
 &\quad \times \text{modifier for "Lack of FSIS Testing Information on Violations"} \\
 &= \text{Weighted average of {"Regulatory Concern," "Pre-slaughter Interval," "Bioconcentration"} \times "Toxicity" \times \text{modifier for "Lack of FSIS Testing Information on Violations"}
 \end{aligned}$$

In comparing Equation (6.2), above, to Equation 4.3, it can be seen that the "Weighted average of {'Regulatory Concern,' 'Pre-slaughter Interval,' 'Bioconcentration factor'}" has been used in place of "Predicted or Actual Score for 'FSIS Historical Testing Information on Violations'." Endocrine Disruption" was not included in Equation 6.2, because scores for this category were not available for most of the pesticides.

The pesticides in Table 6.1 are rated according to their relative public health concern by combining the scoring categories presented in Equation 6.2 using a weighting formula. The formula is presented in Equation (6.3) and in Table 6.1. FSIS selected this formula, based on a consensus about the relative importance of each modifier, and of how much each modifier should be allowed to alter the underlying risk-based score for Relative Public Health Concern. The value of the selected mathematical formula is that it formalizes the basis of FSIS's judgement. This enables others to observe and understand the

adjustments that were made, and it ensures consistency in how these adjustments were applied across a wide range of compounds.

$$\text{Relative public health concern rating, pesticides} = \{[(2*R+P+B)/4]*T\}*\{[(L-1)*0.05]+1\} \quad (6.3)$$

Where: R = score for "Regulatory Concern"
 P = score for "Pre-slaughter Interval"
 B = score for "Bioconcentration Factor"
 T = score for "Toxicity"
 L = score for "Lack of FSIS Testing Information on Violations"

In formula 6.3, the variable for regulatory concern (R) is given twice as much weight as the pre-slaughter interval (P) and bioconcentration factor (B) because FSIS considers regulatory concern to be more of a direct measurement of exposure. Moreover, as with the veterinary drugs, the final ratings of compounds or compound classes receiving scores of 4, 3, 2, and 1 in "Lack of FSIS Testing Information on Violations" are increased by 15%, 10%, 5%, and 0% respectively. In other words, the rating of a compound or compound class that had never been tested by FSIS (in the production classes and matrices of concern) would be increased by 15%, while the rating of one that had been recently tested by FSIS (again, in the production classes and matrices of concern) would remain unchanged.

Formula 6.3 and formula 4.4 have been normalized to give the same maximum value so that their values appear to be comparable. However, because formula 6.3 for the pesticides uses variables that are derived from terms (scoring categories) that are not the same as the terms used in formula 4.4 for the veterinary drugs, their scores are not precisely comparable. The scores for the pesticides and drugs were normalized to provide a rough comparison between these two different categories of compounds.

In Table 6.2, *Rank and Status for Pesticides*, the pesticides are ranked by their rating scores, as generated using the selected weighting formula (Equation (6.3), above). The scores presented in Table 6.2 enable FSIS to bring consistency, grounded in formal risk-based considerations, to its efforts to differentiate among a very diverse range of pesticides and pesticide classes in a situation that is marked by minimal data on relative exposures. These rankings do not account for differences in exposure due to differences in overall consumption. Data on relative consumption are applied subsequently, in Phase IV, when relative exposure values for each compound/production class (C/PC) pair are estimated.

Phase II. Selecting Pesticides for Inclusion in the 2004 NRP

Once SAT completed ranking the pesticides according to their relative public health concern, the ranking scores were used to select compounds for the 2004 NRP. Using professional judgment, SAT participants decided that the pesticide compounds and compound classes that received a ranking of fifteen or higher represent a potential public health concern that is sufficient to justify their inclusion in the 2004 NRP.

Once these high-priority compounds and compound classes had been identified, it was necessary for FSIS to apply considerations beyond those related to public health to determine the compounds that would be sampled. The principal consideration that was not related to public health was the availability of laboratory resources, especially the availability of appropriate analytical methods within the FSIS laboratories. Based on this constraint, only the chlorinated hydrocarbon/chlorinated organophosphate (CHC/COP) compound class can currently be included in the NRP. There are 39 compounds in this compound class that FSIS will analyze for quantity and chemical identity. There are 4 additional compounds that will only be identified. The compounds are:

HCB, alpha-BHC, lindane, heptachlor, dieldrin, aldrin, endrin, ronnel, linuron, oxychlordane, chlorpyrifos, nonachlor, heptachlor epoxide A, heptachlor epoxide B, endosulfan I, endosulfan I sulfate, endosulfan II, trans-chlordane, cis-chlordane, chlorfenvinphos, p,p'-DDE, p, p'-TDE, o,p'-DDT, p,p'-DDT, carbophenothion, captan, tetrachlorvinphos [stirofos], kepone, mirex, methoxychlor, phosalone, coumaphos-O, coumaphos-S, toxaphene, famphur, PCB 1242, PCB 1248, PCB 1254, PCB 1260, dicofol*, PBBs*, polybrominated diphenyl ethers*, and deltamethrin* (*identification only; not quantitated)

The sampling status of each compound or compound class in the 2004 Monitoring Plan is provided in Table 6.2. For each highly ranked compound or compound class that was not scheduled for inclusion in the 2004 NRP, a brief explanation of the reason for its exclusion is provided. This table will be used to identify future method development needs for pesticides for the FSIS NRP.

It can be seen that a number of highly ranked pesticides could not be included in the 2004 NRP due to methodological limitations. FSIS will apply methodology capable of capturing chlorinated hydrocarbons and chlorinated and non-chlorinated organophosphates when such methodology can be implemented.

Phase III. Identifying the Compound/Production Class (C/PC) Pairs

The CHC/COP class includes pesticides that may be present in the foods animals eat, creating the potential for the occurrence of "secondary residues" (i.e., residues that are not the result of direct treatment) in all classes of animals. Other compounds within this class (such as the PCBs) are environmental contaminants to which any animal may be exposed. **For the 2004 NRP, FSIS has suspended monitoring testing for CHCs and COPs for the following production classes: minor species (ducks, geese, ratites, rabbits, squab, and bison); horses; and bob veal. However, horses are of concern for residue violations and enforcement testing will continue. Not scheduling the minor species will allow FSIS to focus those resources on the development of methodologies in areas that are of high public health concern.** FSIS will continue sampling for CHCs and COPs as a means of monitoring for the occurrence of accidental contamination incidents.

Phase IV. Allocation of Sampling Resources

Since only the CHC/COP compound class will be included in the 2004 NRP, this phase is relatively straightforward. FSIS has sufficient analytical capability to implement CHC/COP analysis in all production classes. To establish a relative sampling priority for each C/PC pair, the ranking score for the CHC/COPs (as calculated in Table 6.1) was multiplied by the estimated relative percent of domestic consumption for each production class (presented in Table 4.4). This is identical to Equation (4.6), which was used to calculate the relative sampling priorities for the veterinary drugs:

$$(\text{Rel. sampling priority})_{C/PC} = (\text{Ranking score})_C \times (\text{Est. rel. \% domestic consumption})_{PC} \quad (6.4)$$

As stated above for veterinary drugs, Equation (6.4) is analogous to the equation used to estimate risk (Equation 6.1), in which risk per unit of consumption is multiplied by consumption. While the results of Equation (6.4) do not constitute an estimate of risk, they provide a numerical representation of the relative public health concern associated with each C/PC pair, and thus can be used to prioritize FSIS analytical sampling resources according to the latter. Note that the risk ranking provided by Equation (6.4) is based upon average consumption across the entire U.S. population, rather than upon maximally exposed individuals.

A ranking of the C/PC pairs within this single compound class could be obtained merely using the estimated relative percent of domestic consumption for each production class. In other words, the *rank order and the relative magnitude of the score* assigned to each of the C/PC pairs within this compound class is not changed by multiplying all the relative consumption values by the ranking score, since the ranking score is a constant term. Nevertheless, to maintain a rough parity between the sampling numbers assigned to the veterinary drugs and those assigned to the pesticides, all of the relative consumption figures were multiplied by the ranking score for the CHC/COP compound class. Then, rather than simply dividing the production classes into quartiles, the initial sampling levels were chosen using the same cutoff numbers employed in Table 4.5 for the veterinary drugs. The cutoff scores are as follows: >29.00 = 460 samples; 2.51 – 29.00 = 300 samples; 0.14 - 2.50 = 230 samples; < 0.14 = 90 samples. The results are presented in Table 6.3, *Pesticide Compound/Production Class Pairs, Sorted by Sampling Priority Score, with Adjusted Number of Analyses*. As described in Section 3, above, these sampling levels provide varying probabilities of detecting residue violations. Larger sample sizes, which provide the greater chance of detecting violations, are directed towards those C/PC pairs that have been identified as representing higher levels of relative public health concern.

Bob veal, Horses, rabbits, ratites, squab, geese, ducks, and bison will not be scheduled for the 2004 domestic monitoring program for the 2004 NRP because the minor species are low production animals. However, horses are of concern for residue violations and enforcement testing will continue. Not scheduling the minor species will allow FSIS to focus those resources on the development of methodologies in areas that are of high public health concern.

Adjusting Relative Sampling Numbers

Adjusting for historical data on violation rates of individual C/PC pairs

Extensive FSIS historical testing information on violations, subdivided by production class, is available for the CHC/COP compound class. This information has been used to further refine the relative priority of sampling each C/PC pair. Table 6.3 lists, for the period 01/01/1993 -12/31/2002 the total number of samples analyzed by FSIS in each production class under its monitoring plan (i.e., random sampling only), and the percent of samples found to be violative (i.e., present at a level in excess of the action level

or regulatory tolerance; or, for those compounds that are prohibited, present at any detectable level). Using these data, the following rules were applied to adjust the sampling numbers:

1. Less than 300 samples from the C/PC pair tested over the 10-year period: +1 level (i.e., increase by one sampling level, e.g., from 230 samples to 300 samples).
2. At least 300 samples tested over the 10-year period, violation rate $\geq 0.25\%$: +1 level.
3. At least 300 samples tested over the 10-year period, violation rate = 0.00%: -1 level.
4. The maximum number of samples to be scheduled for testing is 460.

Exceptions to these rules are:

1. Because the use of the CHC/COP method to test for phenylbutazone did not start until recently, FSIS has limited data on the occurrence of this drug in the production classes of interest. Therefore, all production classes for which phenylbutazone was designated as of potential concern (in Table 4.3, with a "●") were assigned a minimum of 300 samples.
2. **For the 2004 NRP, FSIS has suspended monitoring testing for for CHCs and COPs for the following production classes: minor species (ducks, geese, ratites, rabbits, squab, and bison); horses; and bob veal** (marked with a "■" in table 4.3).

All of the above adjustments were applied. The sampling numbers obtained following these adjustments are listed in Table 6.3 under the heading "Initial Adjust" (initial adjusted number of samples).

Adjusting for laboratory capacity

No adjustment for laboratory capacity was necessary for the 2004 NRP.

Adjustment for the Number of Slaughter Facilities

An adjustment to the total number of monitoring samples was made based on the number of production facilities (Table 6.3). For this adjustment, FSIS considered the total number of production facilities (USDA Inspected Establishments for 2002) for each production class. If the total number of production facilities for a production class was found to be low relative to other production classes, the total number of monitoring samples was reduced for that production class. The number of samples selected for the reduction is based on FSIS professional judgment. If the number of facilities is less than 100, but greater than 10, the number of monitoring samples was adjusted down by 1 level. If the total number of facilities is less than 10, the number of monitoring samples was adjusted down by 2 levels. Based on these parameters, the number of monitoring samples was adjusted for the following production classes: "Young Turkeys", "Mature Chickens", "Ducks", "Mature Turkeys" and "Horses." As mentioned above, testing for horses and ducks has been suspended for the 2004 NRP.

Scoring Key for Pesticides

FSIS Historical Testing Information on Violations (01/01/1993 - 12/31/2002)

Violation rate scores were calculated by two different methods, A and B, using violation rate data from FSIS random sampling of animals entering the food supply:

Method A: Maximum Violation Rate. Identify the production class exhibiting the highest average violation rate (the number of violations over the period from 1993 - 2002, divided by the total number of samples analyzed). Score as follows:

4 = > 0.5%

3 = 0.25% - 0.5 %

2 = 0.07% - 0.24%

1 = < 0.07%

NT = Not tested by FSIS.

NA = Tested by FSIS, but violation information does not apply.

Method B: Violation Rate Weighted by Size of Production Class. For each production class analyzed, multiply the average violation rate (defined above) by the relative consumption value for that class (weight annual U.S. production for that class, divided by total production for all classes for which FSIS has regulatory responsibility). Add together the values for all production classes. Score as follows:

4 = > 0.08%

3 = 0.035% - 0.08%

2 = 0.003% - 0.034%

1 = < 0.003%

NT = Not tested by FSIS.

NA = Tested by FSIS, but violation information does not apply.

The final score is determined by assigning, to each pesticide or pesticide class, the greater of the scores from Method A and Method B.

It can be seen that Method A identifies those pesticides that are of regulatory concern because they exhibit high violation rates, independent of the relative consumption value of the production class in which the violations have occurred. Method B identifies those pesticides that may not have the highest violation rates, but would nevertheless be of concern because they exhibit moderate violation rates in a relatively large proportion of the U.S. meat supply. By employing Methods A and B together, and assigning a final score based on the highest score received from each, both of the above concerns are captured.

Regulatory Concern

These scores represent EPA's professional assessment of the extent to which the acute or chronic dietary exposure to this compound may exceed EPA's level of concern. For compounds other than carcinogens, this was determined by comparing a compound's Acute or Chronic Population Adjusted Dose (PAD) (whichever was lower) to the estimated level of exposure. The Acute and Chronic PAD's are calculated as follows:

The Acute Reference Dose (Acute RfD) is an estimate (with uncertainty spanning an order of magnitude or greater) of a single oral exposure level for the human population, including sensitive subpopulations, that is likely to be without an appreciable risk of deleterious effects.

The Chronic Reference Dose (Chronic RfD) is an estimate (with uncertainty spanning an order of magnitude or greater) of a daily oral exposure level for the human population, including sensitive subpopulations, that is likely to be without an appreciable risk of deleterious effects during a lifetime.

The Acute and Chronic RfD's are calculated by dividing the No Observed Adverse Effect Level (NOAEL) (i.e., the highest dose that gave no observable adverse effect) or the Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL) (i.e., the lowest dose at which an adverse effect was seen) by Uncertainty Factors (UF). UF's are used to account for differences between different humans (intraspecies variability) and for differences between the test animals and humans (interspecies extrapolation). If the LOAEL is used, an additional UF is required.

$$\text{RfD} = (\text{NOAEL or LOAEL}) / \text{Total UF}$$

The Acute and Chronic Population Adjusted Dose (PAD) are the Acute and Chronic RfD, respectively, modified by the FQPA Safety Factor:

$$\text{Acute or Chronic PAD} = (\text{Acute or Chronic RfD}) / \text{FQPA Safety Factor}$$

The acute and chronic dietary risks are expressed as a percentage of the Acute or Chronic PAD. A dietary risk of 100% of the Acute or Chronic PAD (*whichever is lower*) is the target level of exposure that should not be exceeded (i.e., the estimated risk associated with any exposure that is less than 100% of the PAD has been judged not to be of concern). In the following, "PAD" is the lower of the Acute and Chronic PAD's.

- 4 = PAD exceeded or carcinogen.
- 3 = Close to PAD.
- 2 = Exposure estimated to be a low percentage of PAD.
- 1 = Exposure estimated to be a very low percentage of PAD.

Lack of FSIS Testing Information on Violations

A numerical value of 1, 2, 3 or 4 is assigned to a pesticide compound (or a group of compounds) for the category “Lack of Testing Information on Violations” (Table 6.1). To determine the numerical value, FSIS considers how long a pesticide substance has been in the monitoring program, the number of production classes that were tested, the number of samples analyzed and any change in how the pesticide compound is used. These factors are assessed and a numerical score is assigned as follows:

- A value of 4 is assigned when:
 - FSIS has not included this compound in its sampling program within the past 10 years (1/1/93 - 12/31/02); or,
 - FSIS has included this compound within its program only between 6 and 10 years ago (1/1/93 - 12/31/97), but the sampling does not meet the criteria specified for a "3;" or,
 - FSIS has included this compound in its sampling program, but the information is not useful in predicting future violation rates because of significant changes in the conditions of use of the compound (e.g., the reduction in withdrawal time for carbadox) or because regulatory intelligence information indicates that the situation has changed significantly since the last time the compound was sampled; or,
 - The compound is of concern in several production classes of interest, but testing has been carried out in only one.

- A value of 3 is assigned when:
 - FSIS has tested within the past 5 years (1/1/98 - 12/31/02), but in fewer than 75% of the production classes of interest; or,
 - Testing was between 6 and 10 years ago, where FSIS has analyzed at least 75% of production classes of interest for at least 2 of these 5 years, with a total of at least 500 samples per production class during this 5-year period and, in the case of a multi-residue method, the method used covers all compounds of interest within the compound class; or,
 - The compound would normally have qualified for a "1" or "2," but the method used was not sufficiently sensitive to permit accurate determination of the true violation rate.

- A value of 2 is assigned when:
 - FSIS has included this compound in its sampling program within the past 5 years in at least 75%, but less than 100% of the production classes of interest; or,
 - 100% of the production classes of interest have been sampled, but the amount and duration of sampling has been insufficient to qualify for a "1."

- A value of 1 is assigned when:

FSIS has included this compound in its sampling program within the past 5 years, and has analyzed each production class of interest for at least 2 of these 5 years, with a total of at least 500 samples per production class during this 5-year period, and in the case of a multi-residue method, the method used covers all compounds of interest within the compound class.

Pre-Slaughter Interval

A numerical value of 1, 2, 3 or 4 is assigned by EPA to pesticides for the category “Pre-Slaughter Interval” (Table 6.1). Pesticides in this category have been accepted for direct dermal application and have a minimum pre-slaughter interval, which is the interval between the last dermal application and the time of slaughter. FSIS determines a value for a pesticide in this category as follows:

- A value of 4 is assigned when dermal application is permitted and the pre-slaughter interval is 1 day or greater.
- A value of 3 is assigned when dermal application is permitted and pre-slaughter interval 0 days.
- A value of 2 is assigned when dermal application is not permitted, but the treatment of premises (e.g., holding cells, feedlots, barns, etc.) is permitted.
- A value of 1 is assigned when neither dermal application nor premise treatment are permitted.

Bioconcentration Factor

A numerical value of 1, 2, 3 or 4 is assigned by EPA to pesticides for the category “Bioconcentration Factor” (Table 6.1). Bioconcentration is a measure of a compound's relative affinity for fat, as measured by the $K_{o/w}$. The $K_{o/w}$ is defined as the logarithm of the partition coefficient between octanol and water ($\log P_{o/w}$). Compounds that have a high affinity for octanol (and thus a high $K_{o/w}$) tend to bioaccumulate in body fat. A bioconcentration value is determined according to the following criteria:

- A value of 4 is assigned if the $\log K_{o/w}$ is greater than 3.
- A value of 3 is assigned if the $\log K_{o/w}$ is between 2 and 3.
- A value of 2 is assigned if the $\log K_{o/w}$ is between 1 and 2.
- A value of 1 is assigned if the $\log K_{o/w}$ is less than 1.

Endocrine Disruption

A numerical value of 3 or 4 (or NT if not tested) is assigned by EPA to pesticides for the category “Endocrine Disruption” (Table 6.1). Endocrine disruption is a measure of the extent to which the compound changes endocrine function and causes adverse effects to individual organisms and/or their progeny, or to organism populations and subpopulations. A value for endocrine disruption is assigned as follows:

- A value of 4 is assigned if endocrine disruption is likely.
- A value of 3 is assigned if endocrine disruption is suspected.
- NT is reported if the compound has not been tested.

Toxicity

A numerical value of 1, 2, 3 or 4 is assigned by EPA to pesticides for the category “Toxicity” (Table 6.1). The toxicity value represents EPA’s professional judgment of the toxicity of the compound, including both the dose required to achieve a toxic effect, and the severity of the toxic effect. In the following, “RfD” is the lower of the Acute and Chronic RfD’s. [An explanation of Acute and Chronic RfD is provided in the description of Regulatory Concern, above.] A value for toxicity is determined as follows:

- A value of 4 is assigned if the pesticide compound is a cholinesterase inhibitor, carcinogen or has a low RfD.

- A value of 3 is assigned if the pesticide compound has a medium RfD.
- A value of 2 is assigned if the pesticide compound has a high RfD.
- A value of 1 is assigned if the pesticide compound has a high RfD.

Table 6.1
Scoring Table for Pesticides
2004 FSIS NRP, Domestic Monitoring Plan

Compound / Compound Class	HIST. VIOL. (FSIS)	REG. CON. (R) (EPA)	PSI (P) (EPA)	BIOCON. (B) (EPA)	ENDO. DISRUP. (EPA)	TOX. (T) (EPA)	LACK INFO. (L) (FSIS)	$\frac{((2 * R + P + B) / 4)^{*} T}{*((L - 1) * 0.05) + 1}$
Benzimidazole Pesticides in FSIS Benzimidazole MRM (5-hydroxythiabendazole, benomyl (as carbendazim), thiabendazole)	NT	3	1	4	3	4	4	12.7
Carbamates in FSIS Carbamate MRM (aldicarb, aldicarb sulfoxide, aldicarb sulfone, carbaryl, carbofuran, carbofuran 3-hydroxy)	NA	4	4	2	3	4	4	16.1
Carbamates NOT in FSIS Carbamate MRM (carbaryl 5,6-dihydroxy, chlorpropham, propham, thiobencarb, 4-chlorobenzylmethylsulfone, 4-chlorobenzylmethylsulfone sulfoxide)	NT	4	1	3	NV	4	4	13.8
CHC's and COP's in FSIS CHC/COP MRM (HCB, alpha-BHC, lindane, heptachlor, dieldrin, aldrin, endrin, ronnel, linuron, oxychlorane, chlorpyrifos, nonachlor, heptachlor epoxide A, heptachlor epoxide B, endosulfan I, endosulfan I sulfate, endosulfan II, trans-chlordane, cis-chlordane, chlorfenvinphos, p,p'-DDE, p, p'-TDE, o,p'-DDT, p,p'-DDT, carbophenothion, captan, tetrachlorvinphos [stirofos], kepone, mirex, methoxychlor, phosalone, coumaphos-O, coumaphos-S, toxaphene, famphur, PCB 1242, PCB 1248, PCB 1254, PCB 1260, dicofol*, PBBs*, polybrominated diphenyl ethers*, deltamethrin*) (*identification only)	3	4	4	4	NV	4	1	16.0
COP's and OP's NOT in FSIS CHC/COP MRM (azinphos-methyl, azinphos-methyl oxon, chlorpyrifos, coumaphos, coumaphos oxon, diazinon, diazinon oxon, diazinon met G-27550, dichlorvos, dimethoate, dimethoate oxon, dioxathion, ethion, ethion monooxon, fenthion, fenthion oxon, fenthion oxon sulfone, fenthion oxon sulfoxide, fenthion sulfone, fenthion sulfoxide, malathion, malathion oxon, naled, phosmet, phosmet oxon, pirimiphos-methyl, trichlorfon, tetrachlorvinphos, tetrachlorvinphos-4 metabolites, acephate, methamidophos, chlorpyrifos-methyl, fenamiphos, fenamiphos sulfoxide, fenamiphos sulfone, fenamiphos sulfoxide desisopropyl, fenamiphos sulfone desisopropyl, isofenphos, isofenphos oxon, isofenphos desisopropyl, isofenphos oxon desisopropyl, methidathion, ODM, parathion (ethyl), parathion oxon, parathion methyl, parathion methyl oxon, phorate, phorate oxon, phorate oxon sulfone, phorate oxon sulfoxide, phorate sulfone, phorate sulfoxide, profenofos, sulprofos, sulprofos oxon, sulprofos oxon sulfone, sulprofos oxon sulfoxide, sulprofos sulfone, sulprofos sulfoxide, tribufos (DEF))	NT	4	4	4	NV	4	4	18.4
Synthetic Pyrethrins in FSIS Synthetic Pyrethrin MRM (cypermethrin, cis-permethrin, trans-permethrin, fenvalerate, zeta-cypermethrin)	NT	3	4	4	3	4	4	16.1
Triazines in FSIS Triazine MRM (atrazine, simazine, propazine, terbuthylazine)	NT	4	2	3	4	4	4	15.0
Triazines NOT in FSIS Triazine MRM (atrazine chloro metabolites, metribuzin, metribuzin DADK, metribuzin DA, metribuzin DK, amitraz, amitraz 2,4-DMA metabs., desdiethyl simazine, desethyl simazine, simazine chloro metabs.)	NT	4	4	3	4	4	4	17.3
1-(2,4-dichlorophenyl)-2-(1H-imidazole-1-yl)-1-ethanol	NT	3	4	4	NV	4	4	16.1
1,1-(2,2-dichloroethylidene)bis(4-methoxybenzene)	NT	3	4	4	NV	4	4	16.1

Table 6.1 – Continued
Scoring Table for Pesticides
2004 FSIS NRP, Domestic Monitoring Plan

Compound / Compound Class	HIST. VIOL. (FSIS)	REG. CON. (R) (EPA)	PSI (P) (EPA)	BIOCON. (B) (EPA)	ENDO. DISRUP. (EPA)	TOX. (T) (EPA)	LACK INFO. (L) (FSIS)	$\frac{((2 * R + P + B) / 4) * T}{*[(L - 1) * 0.05] + 1}$
1-methoxy-4-(1,2,2,2-tetrachloroethyl)benzene)	NT	3	4	4	NV	4	4	16.1
1-methyl cyromazine	NT	3	4	2	NV	4	4	13.8
1,2,4-Triazole	NT	4	1	3	NV	4	4	13.8
2-((2-ethyl-6-methylphenyl)-amino)-1-propanol	NT	3	1	3	3	4	4	11.5
2-(1-hydroxyethyl)-6-ethylaniline	NT	4	1	3	3	4	4	13.8
2-(4-((6-chloro-2-benzoxazolyl)oxy)phenoxy)propanoic acid	NT	3	1	4	NV	4	4	12.7
2,3-dihydro-3,3-dimethyl-2-oxo-5-benzofuranyl methyl sulfonate	NT	2	1	2	NV	2	4	4.0
2,4-D	NT	3	2	1	3	2	4	5.2
2,5-dichloro-4-methoxyphenol	NT	1	1	2	NV	3	4	4.3
2,6-diethylaniline	NT	4	1	3	3	4	4	13.8
2-aminobenzimidazole	NT	3	1	2	3	4	4	10.4
2-amino-n-isopropylbenzamide	NT	3	1	2	NV	3	4	7.8
2-carboxyisopropyl-4-(2,4-dichloro)-5-isopropoxyphenyl)-1,3,4-oxadiazolin-5-one	NT	3	1	4	NV	4	4	12.7
2-hydroxy-2,3-dihydro-3,3-dimethyl-5-benzofuranyl methyl sulfonate	NT	2	1	2	NV	2	4	4.0
2-t-butyl-4-(2,4-dichloro-5-hydroxyphenyl)-delta 2-1,3,4-oxadiazolin-1,3,4,5-one	NT	3	1	4	NV	4	4	12.7
3-(1-(2,4-dichlorophenyl)-2-(1H-imidazole-1-yl)ethoxy)-1,2-propane diol	NT	3	4	4	NV	4	4	16.1
3-(2-chloro-4-hydroxyphenyl)-6-(2-chlorophenyl)-1,2,4,5-tetrazine	NT	3	1	1	NV	4	4	9.2
3-(3,4-dichlorophenyl)-1-methoxyurea	NT	3	2	3	NV	4	4	12.7
3,4-dichloroaniline	NT	3	2	3	NV	4	4	12.7
3,4-dichlorophenylurea	NT	3	2	3	NV	4	4	12.7
3-carboxy-5-ethoxy-1,2,4-thiadiazole	NT	3	1	4	NV	3	4	9.5
3-t-butyl-5-chloro-6-hydroxymethyluracil	NT	1	1	1	NV	3	4	3.5
4-(2-ethyl-6-methylphenyl)-2-hydroxy-5-methyl-3-morpholinone	NT	3	1	3	3	4	4	11.5
4-chloro-2-trifluoromethylaniline	NT	3	1	4	NV	3	4	9.5
4-hydrocythidiazuron	NT	2	1	2	NV	4	4	8.1
6-chloro-2,3-dihydro-3,3,7-trimethyl-5H-oxazolo(3,2a)pyrimidin-5-one	NT	1	1	1	NV	3	4	3.5
6-chloro-2,3-dihydro-7-hydroxymethyl-3,3-dimethyl-5H-oxazolo(3,2-a)pyrimidin-5-one	NT	1	1	1	NV	3	4	3.5
6-chloro-2,3-dihydro-benzoxazol-2-one	NT	3	1	4	NV	4	4	12.7
6-chloronicotinic acid	NT	3	1	1	NV	3	4	6.9
6-chloropicolinic acid	NT	1	1	4	NV	3	4	6.0
6-methyl-2,3-quinoxalinedithiol	NT	3	1	2	NV	4	4	10.4
Abamectin	NT	2	1	4	NV	4	4	10.4
Abamectin delta 8,9 geometric isomer	NT	2	1	4	NV	4	4	10.4
Acifluorfen, amino analog	NT	3	1	2	NV	3	4	7.8
Alachlor	NT	4	1	3	3	4	4	13.8
Allophanate	NT	3	1	2	NV	4	4	10.4

Table 6.1 – Continued
Scoring Table for Pesticides
2004 FSIS NRP, Domestic Monitoring Plan

Compound / Compound Class	HIST. VIOL. (FSIS)	REG. CON. (R) (EPA)	PSI (P) (EPA)	BIOCON. (B) (EPA)	ENDO. DISRUP. (EPA)	TOX. (T) (EPA)	LACK INFO. (L) (FSIS)	$\frac{((2 * R + P + B) / 4) * T}{*((L - 1) * 0.05) + 1}$
Aminomethylphosphonic acid	NT	1	2	1	NV	1	4	1.4
Arsanilic acid	NT	4	1	4	NT	4	4	15.0
Azoxystrobin	NT	1	1	3	NV	2	4	3.5
Azoxystrobin Z isomer	NT	1	1	3	NV	2	4	3.5
Benoxacor	NT	1	1	3	NV	4	4	6.9
Bensulfuron methyl ester	NT		1	1	NV	2	4	1.2
Bentazon, 6-hydroxy bentazon, 8-hydroxy bentazon	NT	3	1	2	NV	3	4	7.8
Bifenthrin	NT	3	1	4	NV	4	4	12.7
Bifenthrin, 4'-hydroxy	NT	3	1	4	NV	4	4	12.7
Bis(trichloromethyl)disulfide	NT	3	1	4	NV	4	4	12.7
Bromoxynil	NT	3	1	1	NV	4	4	9.2
Buprofezin	NT	2	1	2	NV	4	4	8.1
Butylamine, sec-	NT	2	1	2	NV	2	4	4.0
Cacodylic acid	NT	3	3	3	3	4	4	13.8
Captan epoxide	NT	3	1	4	NV	4	4	12.7
Carboxin	NT	3	1	2	NV	4	4	10.4
Carboxin sulfoxide	NT	3	1	2	NV	4	4	10.4
Carfentrazone Ethyl	NT	1	1	4	NT	1	4	2.0
CGA 150829	NT	2	1	1	NV	4	4	6.9
CGA 161149	NT	1	1	1	NV	3	4	3.5
CGA 171683	NT	2	1	1	NV	4	4	6.9
CGA 195654	NT	1	1	1	NV	3	4	3.5
Chlorfenapyr	NT	1	1	2	NV	4	4	5.8
Chlorobenzilate	NT	3	1	4	NV	3	4	9.5
Chloroneb	NT	1	1	2	NV	3	4	4.3
Chloroneb, hydroxy-	NT	1	1	2	NV	3	4	4.3
Chlorsulfuron	NT	3	1	2	NV	3	4	7.8
Chlorsulfuron, 5-hydroxy-	NT	3	1	2	NV	3	4	7.8
Clethodim	NT		1	2	NV	3	4	2.6
Clofencet	NT	1	1	2	NV	3	4	4.3
Clofentezine	NT	3	1	1	NV	4	4	9.2
Cloprop	NT	1	1	1	NV	3	4	3.5
Clopyralid	NT	1	2	1	NV	2	4	2.9
Compound 125670	NT	2	1	2	NV	2	4	4.0
CP 101394	NT	4	1	3	3	4	4	13.8
CP 108064	NT	4	1	3	3	4	4	13.8
CP 108065	NT	4	1	3	3	4	4	13.8
CP 108267	NT	4	1	3	3	4	4	13.8

Table 6.1 – Continued
Scoring Table for Pesticides
2004 FSIS NRP, Domestic Monitoring Plan

Compound / Compound Class	HIST. VIOL. (FSIS)	REG. CON. (R) (EPA)	PSI (P) (EPA)	BIOCON. (B) (EPA)	ENDO. DISRUP. (EPA)	TOX. (T) (EPA)	LACK INFO. (L) (FSIS)	$\frac{((2 * R + P + B) / 4) * T}{*((L - 1) * 0.05) + 1}$
CP 51214	NT	4	1	3	3	4	4	13.8
Cyclanilide	NT	3	1	4	NV	4	4	12.7
Cyclohexylstannoic acid	NT	2	1	2	NV	4	4	8.1
Cyfluthrin	NT	4	4	2	NV	3	4	12.1
Cyhalothrin, lambda-	NT	4	4	2	NV	4	4	16.1
Cyhexatin	NT	2	1	2	NV	4	4	8.1
Cyromazine	NT	3	4	2	NV	4	4	13.8
Dalapon	NT	2	2	2	NV	3	4	6.9
Dialifor	NT	3	1	4	NV	4	4	12.7
Dialifor oxon	NT	3	1	4	NV	4	4	12.7
Dicamba	NT	3	2	3	NV	4	4	12.7
Dicyclohexyltin oxide	NT	2	1	2	NV	4	4	8.1
Difenoconazole	NT	4	1	4	NV	3	4	11.2
Difenzoquat	NT	1	1	1	NV	4	4	4.6
Diflubenzuron	NT	3	4	4	NV	2	4	8.1
Diflufenzopyr	NT	1	1	2	NV	4	4	5.8
Dimethenamid	NT	2	1	1	NT	2	4	3.5
Dimethipin	NT	1	1	1	NV	3	4	3.5
Dioxathion	NT	3	1	3	NV	4	4	11.5
Diphenamid	NT	3	1	1	NV	3	4	6.9
Diphenamid, desmethyl	NT	3	1	1	NV	3	4	6.9
Diphenylamine	NT	3	3	1	NV	3	4	8.6
Dipropyl isocinchomerate	NT	3	4	4	NV	2	4	8.1
Diquat dibromide	NT	1	1	3	NV	4	4	6.9
Diuron	NT	3	2	3	NV	4	4	12.7
Dodine	NT	2	1	1	NV	3	4	5.2
Emamectin	NT	2	1	4	NT	3	4	7.8
Esfenvalerate	NT	3	4	3	NV	3	4	11.2
Ethalfuralin	NT	3	1	2	NV	4	4	10.4
Ethephon	NT	3	1	1	NV	2	4	4.6
Ethofumesate	NT	2	1	2	NV	2	4	4.0
Ethoxyquin	NT	4	2	4	NV	2	4	8.1
Etridiazole .	NT	4	1	4	NV	3	4	11.2
ETU	NT	3	1	2	3	4	4	10.4
Fenarimol	NT	1	1	4	NV	3	4	6.0
Fenarimol metabolite B	NT	1	1	4	NV	3	4	6.0
Fenarimol metabolite C	NT	1	1	4	NV	3	4	6.0
Fenbuconazole	NT	4	1	4	NT	3	4	11.2

Table 6.1 – Continued
Scoring Table for Pesticides
2004 FSIS NRP, Domestic Monitoring Plan

Compound / Compound Class	HIST. VIOL. (FSIS)	REG. CON. (R) (EPA)	PSI (P) (EPA)	BIOCON. (B) (EPA)	ENDO. DISRUP. (EPA)	TOX. (T) (EPA)	LACK INFO. (L) (FSIS)	$\frac{((2 * R + P + B) / 4) * T}{*((L - 1) * 0.05) + 1}$
Fenbutatin Oxide	NT	2	1	4	NV	3	4	7.8
Fenoxaprop ethyl	NT	3	1	4	NV	4	4	12.7
Fenpropathrin	NT	4	1	1	NV	3	4	8.6
Fenridazon	NT	2	1	2	NV	3	4	6.0
Fipronil	NT	3	4	4	NV	4	4	16.1
Fluazifop-butyl	NT	3	1	2	NV	3	4	7.8
Fludioxanil	NT	1	1	4	NT	1	4	2.0
Flufenacet (thiafluamide)	NT	3	1	4	NT	3	4	9.5
Fluridone	NT	2	1	2	NV	3	4	6.0
Fluroxypyr	NT	2	1	1	NT	2	4	3.5
Fluthiacet-Methyl (CGA-248757)	NT	1	1	1	NT	1	4	1.2
Flutolanil	NT	2	1	4	NV	2	4	5.2
Fluvalinate	NT	4	1	4	NV	3	4	11.2
Glufosinate-Ammonium	NT	1	2	1	NV	3	4	4.3
Glyphosate	NT	1	2	1	NV	1	4	1.4
Glyphosate-Trimesium	NT	1	1	1	NV	2	4	2.3
Halosulfuron	NT	1	1	2	NV	2	4	2.9
Hexazinone	NT	3	1	2	NV	3	4	7.8
HOE-061517	NT	1	2	1	NV	3	4	4.3
HOE-099730	NT	1	2	1	NV	3	4	4.3
Imazalil	NT	4	4	4	NV	4	4	18.4
Imidacloprid	NT	3	1	1	NV	3	4	6.9
IN-A3928	NT	3	1	2	NV	3	4	7.8
IN-B2838	NT	3	1	2	NV	3	4	7.8
Indoxacarb (DPX-MP062)	NT		1		NT		4	0.0
IN-T3935	NT	3	1	2	NV	3	4	7.8
IN-T3936	NT	3	1	2	NV	3	4	7.8
IN-T3937	NT	3	1	2	NV	3	4	7.8
Iprodione	NT	3	1	3	NV	4	4	11.5
Iprodione isomer	NT	3	1	3	NV	4	4	11.5
Iprodione metabolite	NT	3	1	3	NV	4	4	11.5
Iprodione metabolite 2	NT	3	1	3	NV	4	4	11.5
Isoxaflutole	NT	4	1	3	NT	3	4	10.4
Kresoxim-methyl	NT	4	1	4	NT	3	4	11.2
Maleic hydrazide	NT	3	1	4	NV	1	4	3.2
Mancozeb	NT	3	1	2	3	4	4	10.4
Maneb	NT	3	1	2	3	4	4	10.4
MB 45950	NT	3	4	4	NV	4	4	16.1

Table 6.1 – Continued
Scoring Table for Pesticides
2004 FSIS NRP, Domestic Monitoring Plan

Compound / Compound Class	HIST. VIOL. (FSIS)	REG. CON. (R) (EPA)	PSI (P) (EPA)	BIOCON. (B) (EPA)	ENDO. DISRUP. (EPA)	TOX. (T) (EPA)	LACK INFO. (L) (FSIS)	$\frac{((2 * R + P + B) / 4) * T}{*(((L - 1) * 0.05) + 1)}$
MB 46136	NT	3	4	4	NV	3	4	12.1
MB 46513	NT	3	4	4	NV	4	4	16.1
MCPA	NT	1	1	1	NV	4	4	4.6
Mepiquat chloride	NT	3	1	1	NV	4	4	9.2
Methoprene	NT	2	1	3	NV	2	4	4.6
Methoxychlor olefin	NT	3	4	4	4	4	4	16.1
Methyl 3,5-dichlorobenzoate	NT	3	1	4	NV	3	4	9.5
Metiram	NT	3	1	2	3	4	4	10.4
Metolachlor	NT	3	1	3	3	4	4	11.5
Metsulfuron Methyl	NT	1	1	1	NV	2	4	2.3
Myclobutanil, myclobutanil alcohol metabolite, myclobutanil dihydroxy metabolite	NT	3	1	2	NV	2	4	5.2
N-(3,4-dichlorophenyl)-N'-methylurea	NT	3	2	3	NV	4	4	12.7
N-(4-chloro-2-trifluoromethylphenyl)-propoxyacetamide	NT	3	1	4	NV	3	4	9.5
Nicotine	NT	1	1	3	NV	4	4	6.9
Nitrapyrin	NT	1	1	4	NV	3	4	6.0
Norfluraxon, desmethyl-	NT	3	1	1	NV	4	4	9.2
Norflurazon	NT	3	1	1	NV	4	4	9.2
N-phenylurea	NT	2	1	2	NV	4	4	8.1
NTN33823	NT	3	1	1	NV	3	4	6.9
NTN35884	NT	3	1	1	NV	3	4	6.9
Octyl bicycloheptene dicarboximide (MGK-264)	NT	3	4	4	NV	3	4	12.1
Oxadiazon	NT	3	1	4	NV	4	4	12.7
Oxyfluorfen	NT	3	1	4	NV	4	4	12.7
Oxythioquinox	NT	3	1	1	NV	4	4	9.2
Paraquat dichloride	NT	3	1	1	NV	4	4	9.2
PB-7	NT	2	1	1	NV	4	4	6.9
PB-9	NT	2	1	2	NV	4	4	8.1
Phosalone oxon	NT	4	1	3	NV	4	4	13.8
Picloram	NT	1	2	1	NV	2	4	2.9
Piperonyl butoxide	NT	3	4	2	NV	3	4	10.4
PP 890	NT	3	4	2	NV	4	4	13.8
Primisulfuron-methyl	NT	2	1	1	NV	4	4	6.9
Propanil	NT	1	1	3	NV	4	4	6.9
Propargite	NT	3	1	2	NV	3	4	7.8
Propargite	NT	3	1	2	NV	3	4	7.8
Propiconazole	NT	4	1	3	NV	4	4	13.8
Propiconazole metabolite 1,2,4-triazole	NT	4	1	3	NV	4	4	13.8
Propiconazole metabolite CGA 118244	NT	4	1	3	NV	4	4	13.8

Table 6.1 – Continued
Scoring Table for Pesticides
2004 FSIS NRP, Domestic Monitoring Plan

Compound / Compound Class	HIST. VIOL. (FSIS)	REG. CON. (R) (EPA)	PSI (P) (EPA)	BIOCON. (B) (EPA)	ENDO. DISRUP. (EPA)	TOX. (T) (EPA)	LACK INFO. (L) (FSIS)	$\frac{((2 * R + P + B) / 4) * T}{*((L - 1) * 0.05) + 1}$
Propiconazole metabolite CGA 91305	NT	4	1	3	NV	4	4	13.8
Propyzamide	NT	3	1	4	NV	3	4	9.5
Prosulfuron	NT	1	1	3	NV	3	4	5.2
Pymetrozine	NT	1	1	1	NT	1	4	1.2
Pyradostrobin	NT	1	1	3	NV	2	4	3.5
Pyrazon	NT	3	1	1	NV	4	4	9.2
Pyrazon metabolite A	NT	3	1	2	NV	4	4	10.4
Pyrazon metabolite B	NT	3	1	2	NV	4	4	10.4
Pyrethrin I	NT	2	4	4	NV	3	4	10.4
Pyridaben	NT	2	1	2	NV	4	4	8.1
Pyriproxifen	NT	1	1	4	NT	1	4	2.0
Quinclorac	NT	2	1	2	NV	2	4	4.0
Quizalofop-ethyl	NT	3	1	2	NV	4	4	10.4
SD 31723	NT	2	1	4	NV	3	4	7.8
SD 33608	NT	2	1	4	NV	3	4	7.8
SD 54597	NT	3	4	3	NV	3	4	11.2
Sethoxydim	NT	2	1	2	NV	2	4	4.0
Sethoxydim hydroxylate sulfone	NT	2	1	2	NV	2	4	4.0
Sethoxydim sulfoxide	NT	2	1	2	NV	2	4	4.0
Sodium acifluorfen	NT	3	1	2	NV	3	4	7.8
Spinosad	NT	1	1	4	NT	1	4	2.0
Sulfosulfuron	NT	2	1	1	NT	2	4	3.5
TCP=3,5,6-trichloro-2-pyridinol	NT	3	2	1	NV	4	4	10.4
Tebuconazole	NT	4	1	2	NV	3	4	9.5
Tebufenozide	NT	3	1	4	NV	3	4	9.5
Tebuthiuron	NT	2	1	2	NV	3	4	6.0
Teflubenzuron	NT		1		NT		4	0.0
Terbacil	NT	1	1	1	NV	3	4	3.5
Tetradifon	NT	1	1	2	NV	4	4	5.8
Thiamethoxam	NT	4	2	1	NV	4	4	12.7
Thidiazuron	NT	2	1	2	NV	4	4	8.1
Thiophanate methyl	NT	3	1	2	NV	4	4	10.4
THPI	NT	3	1	4	NV	4	4	12.7
Tralkoxydim	NT	2	1	2	NT	2	4	4.0
Triadimefon	NT	3	1	4	NV	4	4	12.7
Triadimefon metabolite KWG 1323	NT	3	1	4	NV	4	4	12.7
Triadimefon metabolite KWG 1342	NT	3	1	4	NV	4	4	12.7
Triadimefon metabolite KWG 1732	NT	3	1	4	NV	4	4	12.7

Table 6.1 – Continued
Scoring Table for Pesticides
2004 FSIS NRP, Domestic Monitoring Plan

Compound / Compound Class	HIST. VIOL. (FSIS)	REG. CON. (R) (EPA)	PSI (P) (EPA)	BIOCON. (B) (EPA)	ENDO. DISRUP. (EPA)	TOX. (T) (EPA)	LACK INFO. (L) (FSIS)	$\frac{[(2 * R + P + B) / 4] * T}{* [(L - 1) * 0.05] + 1}$
Triadimenol (for metabolites see triadimefon)	NT	3	1	4	NV	4	4	12.7
Triasulfuron	NT	1	1	1	NV	3	4	3.5
Triazole analine	NT	4	1	3	NV	4	4	13.8
Triazole lactic acid	NT	4	1	3	NV	4	4	13.8
Triclopyr	NT	3	2	1	NV	4	4	10.4
Trifloxystrobin	NT	1	1	3	NV	2	4	3.5
Triflumazole	NT	4	1	4	NV	3	4	11.2
Triphenyltin hydroxide	NT	1	1	4	NV	4	4	8.1
WAK4103	NT	3	1	1	NV	3	4	6.9

Key:

MRM = Multiresidue method

CHC = Chlorinated hydrocarbon

COP = Chlorinated organophosphate

OP = Organophosphate

NT = Not Tested by FSIS (01/01/93 - 12/31/2002)

NA = Compound has been tested by FSIS (01/01/93 - 12/31/2002), but the information is Not Applicable (e.g., compound has not been tested in the appropriate matrix)

NV = Value not available

(FSIS) = Scores in this column supplied by FSIS

(EPA) = Scores in this column supplied by EPA

HIST. VIOL. = FSIS Historical Testing Information on Violations

REG. CON. (R) = Regulatory Concern

LACK INFO. (L) = Lack of FSIS Testing Information on Violations

PSI (P) = Pre-slaughter Interval

BIOCON. (B) = Bioconcentration Factor

ENDO. DISRUP. = Endocrine Disruption

TOX. (T) = Toxicity

In the first column, where compounds have been grouped together for analysis or potential analysis by an MRM, the title of that group has been bolded (e.g., “Carbamates in FSIS Carbamate MRM”).

Table 6.2
Rank and Status for Pesticides
2004 FSIS NRP, Domestic Monitoring Plan

Rank	Compound / Compound Class	Score	Status in the 2004 NRP
1	COPs and OPs NOT in FSIS CHC/COP MRM (azinphos-methyl, azinphos-methyl oxon, chlorpyrifos, coumaphos, coumaphos oxon, diazinon, diazinon oxon, diazinon met G-27550, dichlorvos, dimethoate, dimethoate oxon, dioxathion, ethion, ethion monooxon, fenthion, fenthion oxon, fenthion oxon sulfone, fenthion oxon sulfoxide, fenthion sulfone, fenthion sulfoxide, malathion, malathion oxon, naled, phosmet, phosmet oxon, pirimiphos-methyl, trichlorfon, tetrachlorvinphos, tetrachlorvinphos-4 metabolites, acephate, methamidophos, chlorpyrifos-methyl, fenamiphos, fenamiphos sulfoxide, fenamiphos sulfone, fenamiphos sulfoxide desisopropyl, fenamiphos sulfone desisopropyl, isofenphos, isofenphos oxon, isofenphos desisopropyl, isofenphos oxon desisopropyl, methidathion, ODM, parathion (ethyl), parathion oxon, parathion methyl, parathion methyl oxon, phorate, phorate oxon, phorate oxon sulfone, phorate oxon sulfoxide, phorate sulfone, phorate sulfoxide, profenofos, sulprofos, sulprofos oxon, sulprofos oxon sulfone, sulprofos oxon sulfoxide, sulprofos sulfone, sulprofos sulfoxide, tribufos (DEF))	18.4	NIP
2	Imazalil	18.4	NIP
3	Triazines NOT in FSIS Triazine MRM (atrazine chloro metabolites, metribuzin, metribuzin DADK, metribuzin DA, metribuzin DK, amitraz, amitraz 2,4-DMA metabs., desdiethyl simazine, desethyl simazine, simazine chloro metabs.)	17.3	NIP
4	Carbamates in FSIS Carbamate MRM (aldicarb, aldicarb sulfoxide, aldicarb sulfone, carbaryl, carbofuran, carbofuran 3-hydroxy)	16.1	NIP
5	1-(2,4-dichlorophenyl)-2-(1H-imidazole-1-yl)-1-ethanol	16.1	NIP
6	1,1-(2,2-dichloroethylidene)bis(4-methoxybenzene)	16.1	NIP
7	1-methoxy-4-(1,2,2,2-tetrachloroethyl)benzene)	16.1	NIP
8	3-(1-(2,4-dichlorophenyl)-2-(1H-imidazole-1-yl)ethoxy)-1,2-propane diol	16.1	NIP
9	Fipronil	16.1	NIP
10	MB 45950	16.1	NIP
11	MB 46513	16.1	NIP
12	Methoxychlor olefin	16.1	NIP
13	Cyhalothrin, lambda-	16.1	NIP
14	Synthetic Pyrethrins in FSIS Synthetic Pyrethrin MRM (cypermethrin, cis-permethrin, trans-permethrin, fenvalerate, zeta-cypermethrin)	16.1	NIP
15	CHCs and COPs in FSIS CHC/COP MRM (HCB, alpha-BHC, lindane, heptachlor, dieldrin, aldrin, endrin, ronnel, linuron, oxychlordane, chlorpyrifos, nonachlor, heptachlor epoxide A, heptachlor epoxide B, endosulfan I, endosulfan I sulfate, endosulfan II, trans-chlordane, cis-chlordane, chlorfenvinphos, p,p'-DDE, p, p'-TDE, o,p'-DDT, p,p'-DDT, carbophenothion, captan, tetrachlorvinphos [stirofos], kepone, mirex, methoxychlor, phosalone, coumaphos-O, coumaphos-S, toxaphene, famphur, PCB 1242, PCB 1248, PCB 1254, PCB 1260, dicofol*, PBBs*, polybrominated diphenyl ethers*, deltamethrin*) (*identification only)	16.0	Monitoring Plan, MRM, all domestic production classes except: minor species (rabbits, ratites, squab, geese, ducks, and bison); horses; and bob-veal. Import residue plan, all import production classes.

Table 6.2 – Continued
Rank and Status for Pesticides
2004 FSIS NRP, Domestic Monitoring Plan

Rank	Compound / Compound Class	Score	Status in the 2004 NRP
Based on consultation with EPA and other agencies, compounds below this point were not considered to represent a broad potential public health risk. However, some of these compounds may be samples on a specific, as-needed basis.			
16	Triazines in FSIS Triazine MRM (atrazine, simazine, propazine, terbuthylazine)	15.0	NIP; low priority
17	Arsanilic acid	15.0	NIP; low priority
18	Alachlor	13.8	NIP; low priority
19	Cyromazine	13.8	NIP; low priority
20	Carbamates NOT in FSIS Carbamate MRM (carbaryl 5,6-dihydroxy, chlorpropham, propham, thiobencarb, 4-chlorobenzylmethylsulfone, 4-chlorobenzylmethylsulfone sulfoxide)	13.8	NIP; low priority
21	1-methyl cyromazine	13.8	NIP; low priority
22	2-(1-hydroxyethyl)-6-ethylaniline	13.8	NIP; low priority
23	2,6-diethylaniline	13.8	NIP; low priority
24	Cacodylic acid	13.8	NIP; low priority
25	CP 101394	13.8	NIP; low priority
26	CP 108064	13.8	NIP; low priority
27	CP 108065	13.8	NIP; low priority
28	CP 108267	13.8	NIP; low priority
29	CP 51214	13.8	NIP; low priority
30	Phosalone oxon	13.8	NIP; low priority
31	PP 890	13.8	NIP; low priority
32	Propiconazole	13.8	NIP; low priority
33	Propiconazole metabolite 1,2,4-triazole	13.8	NIP; low priority
34	Propiconazole metabolite CGA 118244	13.8	NIP; low priority
35	Propiconazole metabolite CGA 91305	13.8	NIP; low priority
36	1,2,4-Triazole	13.8	NIP; low priority
37	Triazole analine	13.8	NIP; low priority
38	Triazole lactic acid	13.8	NIP; low priority
39	Thiamethoxam	12.7	NIP; low priority
40	Benzimidazole Pesticides in FSIS Benzimidazole MRM (5-hydroxythiabendazole, benomyl (as carbendazim), thiabendazole)	12.7	NIP; low priority
41	2-(4-((6-chloro-2-benzoxazolyl)oxy)phenoxy)propanoic acid	12.7	NIP; low priority
42	2-carboxyisopropyl-4-(2,4-dichloro)-5-isopropoxyphenyl)-1,3,4-oxadiazolin-5-one	12.7	NIP; low priority
43	2-t-butyl-4-(2,4-dichloro-5-hydroxyphenyl)-delta 2-1,3,4-oxadiazolin-1,3,4,5-one	12.7	NIP; low priority
44	3-(3,4-dichlorophenyl)-1-methoxyurea	12.7	NIP; low priority
45	3,4-dichloroaniline	12.7	NIP; low priority
46	3,4-dichlorophenylurea	12.7	NIP; low priority
47	6-chloro-2,3-dihydro-benzoxazol-2-one	12.7	NIP; low priority
48	Bifenthrin	12.7	NIP; low priority
49	Bifenthrin, 4'-hydroxy	12.7	NIP; low priority
50	Bis(trichloromethyl)disulfide	12.7	NIP; low priority

Table 6.2 – Continued
Rank and Status for Pesticides
2004 FSIS NRP, Domestic Monitoring Plan

Rank	Compound / Compound Class	Score	Status in the 2004 NRP
51	Captan epoxide	12.7	NIP; low priority
52	Cyclanilide	12.7	NIP; low priority
53	Dialifor	12.7	NIP; low priority
54	Dialifor oxon	12.7	NIP; low priority
55	Dicamba	12.7	NIP; low priority
56	Diuron	12.7	NIP; low priority
57	Fenoxaprop ethyl	12.7	NIP; low priority
58	N-(3,4-dichlorophenyl)-N'-methylurea	12.7	NIP; low priority
59	Oxadiazon	12.7	NIP; low priority
60	Oxyfluorfen	12.7	NIP; low priority
61	THPI	12.7	NIP; low priority
62	Triadimefon	12.7	NIP; low priority
63	Triadimefon metabolite KWG 1323	12.7	NIP; low priority
64	Triadimefon metabolite KWG 1342	12.7	NIP; low priority
65	Triadimefon metabolite KWG 1732	12.7	NIP; low priority
66	Triadimenol (for metabolites see triadimefon)	12.7	NIP; low priority
67	Cyfluthrin	12.1	NIP; low priority
68	MB 46136	12.1	NIP; low priority
69	Octyl bicycloheptene dicarboximide (MGK-264)	12.1	NIP; low priority
70	2-((2-ethyl-6-methylphenyl)-amino)-1-propanol	11.5	NIP; low priority
71	4-(2-ethyl-6-methylphenyl)-2-hydroxy-5-methyl-3-morpholinone	11.5	NIP; low priority
72	Dioxathion	11.5	NIP; low priority
73	Iprodione	11.5	NIP; low priority
74	Iprodione isomer	11.5	NIP; low priority
75	Iprodione metabolite	11.5	NIP; low priority
76	Iprodione metabolite 2	11.5	NIP; low priority
77	Metolachlor	11.5	NIP; low priority
78	Difenoconazole	11.2	NIP; low priority
79	Esfenvalerate	11.2	NIP; low priority
80	Etridiazole .	11.2	NIP; low priority
81	Fenbuconazole	11.2	NIP; low priority
82	Fluvalinate	11.2	NIP; low priority
83	Kresoxim-methyl	11.2	NIP; low priority
84	SD 54597	11.2	NIP; low priority
85	Triflumazole	11.2	NIP; low priority
86	2-aminobenzimidazole	10.4	NIP; low priority
87	6-methyl-2,3-quinoxalinedithiol	10.4	NIP; low priority
88	Abamectin	10.4	NIP; low priority
89	Abamectin delta 8,9 geometric isomer	10.4	NIP; low priority
90	Allophanate	10.4	NIP; low priority
91	Carboxin	10.4	NIP; low priority
92	Carboxin sulfoxide	10.4	NIP; low priority
93	Ethalfuralin	10.4	NIP; low priority

Table 6.2 – Continued
Rank and Status for Pesticides
2004 FSIS NRP, Domestic Monitoring Plan

Rank	Compound / Compound Class	Score	Status in the 2004 NRP
94	ETU	10.4	NIP; low priority
95	Isoxaflutole	10.4	NIP; low priority
96	Mancozeb	10.4	NIP; low priority
97	Maneb	10.4	NIP; low priority
98	Metiram	10.4	NIP; low priority
99	Piperonyl butoxide	10.4	NIP; low priority
100	Pyrazon metabolite A	10.4	NIP; low priority
101	Pyrazon metabolite B	10.4	NIP; low priority
102	Pyrethrin I	10.4	NIP; low priority
103	Quizalofop-ethyl	10.4	NIP; low priority
104	TCP=3,5,6-trichloro-2-pyridinol	10.4	NIP; low priority
105	Thiophanate methyl	10.4	NIP; low priority
106	Triclopyr	10.4	NIP; low priority
107	3-carboxy-5-ethoxy-1,2,4-thiadiazole	9.5	NIP; low priority
108	4-chloro-2-trifluoromethylaniline	9.5	NIP; low priority
109	Chlorobenzilate	9.5	NIP; low priority
110	Flufenacet (thiafluamide)	9.5	NIP; low priority
111	Methyl 3,5-dichlorobenzoate	9.5	NIP; low priority
112	N-(4-chloro-2-trifluoromethylphenyl)-propoxyacetamide	9.5	NIP; low priority
113	Propyzamide	9.5	NIP; low priority
114	Tebuconazole	9.5	NIP; low priority
115	Tebufenozide	9.5	NIP; low priority
116	3-(2-chloro-4-hydroxyphenyl)-6-(2-chlorophenyl)-1,2,4,5-tetrazine	9.2	NIP; low priority
117	Bromoxynil	9.2	NIP; low priority
118	Clofentezine	9.2	NIP; low priority
119	Mepiquat chloride	9.2	NIP; low priority
120	Norfluraxon, desmethyl-	9.2	NIP; low priority
121	Norflurazon	9.2	NIP; low priority
122	Oxythioquinox	9.2	NIP; low priority
123	Paraquat dichloride	9.2	NIP; low priority
124	Pyrazon	9.2	NIP; low priority
125	Diphenylamine	8.6	NIP; low priority
126	Fenpropathrin	8.6	NIP; low priority
127	Ethoxyquin	8.1	NIP; low priority
128	4-hydrocythidiazuron	8.1	NIP; low priority
129	Buprofezin	8.1	NIP; low priority
130	Cyclohexylstannoic acid	8.1	NIP; low priority
131	Cyhexatin	8.1	NIP; low priority
132	Dicyclohexyltin oxide	8.1	NIP; low priority
133	Diflubenzuron	8.1	NIP; low priority
134	Dipropyl isocinchomerate	8.1	NIP; low priority
135	N-phenylurea	8.1	NIP; low priority
136	PB-9	8.1	NIP; low priority

Table 6.2 – Continued
Rank and Status for Pesticides
2004 FSIS NRP, Domestic Monitoring Plan

Rank	Compound / Compound Class	Score	Status in the 2004 NRP
137	Pyridaben	8.1	NIP; low priority
138	Thidiazuron	8.1	NIP; low priority
139	Triphenyltin hydroxide	8.1	NIP; low priority
140	1,1,3,3,-tetrakis(2-methyl-2-phenylpropyl)-1,3-dihydroxydistannoxane	7.8	NIP; low priority
141	2-amino-n-isopropylbenzamide	7.8	NIP; low priority
142	Acifluorfen, amino analog	7.8	NIP; low priority
143	Bentazon, 6-hydroxy bentazon, 8-hydroxy bentazon	7.8	NIP; low priority
144	Chlorsulfuron	7.8	NIP; low priority
145	Chlorsulfuron, 5-hydroxy-	7.8	NIP; low priority
146	Emamectin	7.8	NIP; low priority
147	Fenbutatin Oxide	7.8	NIP; low priority
148	Fluazifop-butyl	7.8	NIP; low priority
149	Hexazinone	7.8	NIP; low priority
150	IN-A3928	7.8	NIP; low priority
152	IN-B2838	7.8	NIP; low priority
153	IN-T3935	7.8	NIP; low priority
154	IN-T3936	7.8	NIP; low priority
155	IN-T3937	7.8	NIP; low priority
156	Propargite	7.8	NIP; low priority
157	SD 31723	7.8	NIP; low priority
158	SD 33608	7.8	NIP; low priority
159	Sodium acifluorfen	7.8	NIP; low priority
160	6-chloronicotinic acid	6.9	NIP; low priority
161	Benoxacor	6.9	NIP; low priority
162	CGA 150829	6.9	NIP; low priority
163	CGA 171683	6.9	NIP; low priority
164	Dalapon	6.9	NIP; low priority
165	Diphenamid	6.9	NIP; low priority
166	Diphenamid, desmethyl	6.9	NIP; low priority
167	Diquat dibromide	6.9	NIP; low priority
168	Imidacloprid	6.9	NIP; low priority
169	Nicotine	6.9	NIP; low priority
170	NTN33823	6.9	NIP; low priority
171	NTN35884	6.9	NIP; low priority
172	PB-7	6.9	NIP; low priority
173	Primisulfuron-methyl	6.9	NIP; low priority
174	Propanil	6.9	NIP; low priority
175	WAK4103	6.9	NIP; low priority
176	6-chloropicolinic acid	6.0	NIP; low priority
177	Fenarimol	6.0	NIP; low priority
178	Fenarimol metabolite B	6.0	NIP; low priority
179	Fenarimol metabolite C	6.0	NIP; low priority
180	Fenridazon	6.0	NIP; low priority

Table 6.2 – Continued
Rank and Status for Pesticides
2004 FSIS NRP, Domestic Monitoring Plan

Rank	Compound / Compound Class	Score	Status in the 2004 NRP
181	Fluridone	6.0	NIP; low priority
182	Nitrapyrin	6.0	NIP; low priority
183	Tebuthiuron	6.0	NIP; low priority
184	Chlorfenapyr	5.8	NIP; low priority
185	Tetradifon	5.8	NIP; low priority
186	Diflufenzopyr	5.8	NIP; low priority
187	2,4-D	5.2	NIP; low priority
188	Dodine	5.2	NIP; low priority
189	Flutolanil	5.2	NIP; low priority
190	Myclobutanil, myclobutanil alcohol metabolite, myclobutanol dihydroxy metabolite	5.2	NIP; low priority
191	Prosulfuron	5.2	NIP; low priority
192	Difenzoquat	4.6	NIP; low priority
193	Ethephon	4.6	NIP; low priority
194	MCPA	4.6	NIP; low priority
195	Methoprene	4.6	NIP; low priority
196	2,5-dichloro-4-methoxyphenol	4.3	NIP; low priority
197	Chloroneb	4.3	NIP; low priority
198	Chloroneb, hydroxy-	4.3	NIP; low priority
199	Clofencet	4.3	NIP; low priority
200	Glufosinate-Ammonium	4.3	NIP; low priority
201	HOE-061517	4.3	NIP; low priority
202	HOE-099730	4.3	NIP; low priority
203	2,3-dihydro-3,3-dimethyl-2-oxo-5-benzofuranyl methyl sulfonate	4.0	NIP; low priority
204	2-hydroxy-2,3-dihydro-3,3-dimethyl-5-benzofuranyl methyl sulfonate	4.0	NIP; low priority
205	Butylamine, sec-	4.0	NIP; low priority
206	Compound 125670	4.0	NIP; low priority
207	Ethofumesate	4.0	NIP; low priority
208	Quinclorac	4.0	NIP; low priority
209	Sethoxydim	4.0	NIP; low priority
210	Sethoxydim hydroxylate sulfone	4.0	NIP; low priority
211	Sethoxydim sulfoxide	4.0	NIP; low priority
212	Tralkoxydim	4.0	NIP; low priority
213	3-t-butyl-5-chloro-6-hydroxymethyluracil	3.5	NIP; low priority
214	6-chloro-2,3-dihydro-3,3,7-trimethyl-5H-oxazolo(3,2a)pyrimidin-5-one	3.5	NIP; low priority
215	6-chloro-2,3-dihydro-7-hydroxymethyl-3,3-dimethyl-5H-oxazolo(3,2-a)pyrimidin-5-one	3.5	NIP; low priority
216	Azoxystrobin	3.5	NIP; low priority
217	Azoxystrobin Z isomer	3.5	NIP; low priority
218	CGA 161149	3.5	NIP; low priority
219	CGA 195654	3.5	NIP; low priority
220	Cloprop	3.5	NIP; low priority
221	Dimethenamid	3.5	NIP; low priority

Table 6.2 – Continued
Rank and Status for Pesticides
2004 FSIS NRP, Domestic Monitoring Plan

Rank	Compound / Compound Class	Score	Status in the 2004 NRP
222	Dimethipin	3.5	NIP; low priority
223	Fluroxypyr	3.5	NIP; low priority
224	Sulfosulfuron	3.5	NIP; low priority
225	Terbacil	3.5	NIP; low priority
226	Triasulfuron	3.5	NIP; low priority
227	Pyradostrobin	3.5	NIP; low priority
228	Trifloxystrobin	3.5	NIP; low priority
229	Maleic hydrazide	3.2	NIP; low priority
230	Clopyralid	2.9	NIP; low priority
231	Halosulfuron	2.9	NIP; low priority
232	Picloram	2.9	NIP; low priority
233	Clethodim	2.6	NIP; low priority
234	Glyphosate-Trimesium	2.3	NIP; low priority
235	Metsulfuron Methyl	2.3	NIP; low priority
236	Carfentrazone Ethyl	2.0	NIP; low priority
237	Fludioxanil	2.0	NIP; low priority
238	Pyriproxifen	2.0	NIP; low priority
239	Spinosad	2.0	NIP; low priority
240	Aminomethylphosphonic acid	1.4	NIP; low priority
241	Glyphosate	1.4	NIP; low priority
242	Bensulfuron methyl ester	1.2	NIP; low priority
243	Fluthiacet-Methyl (CGA-248757)	1.2	NIP; low priority
244	Pymetrozine	1.2	NIP; low priority
245	Indoxacarb (DPX-MP062)		NIP; low priority
246	Teflubenzuron		NIP; low priority

Key:

MRM = Multiresidue Method

NIP = Not Included in 2003 FSIS National Residue Program

CHC = Chlorinated hydrocarbon

COP = Chlorinated organophosphate

OP = Organophosphate

In the second column, where multiple compounds have been grouped together for analysis or potential analysis by a single MRM, the title of that group has been bolded (e.g., “Carbamates in FSIS Carbamate MRM”).

Table 6.3
Pesticide Compound/Production Class Pairs, Sorted by Sampling Priority Score, with Adjusted Number of Analyses
2004 FSIS NRP, Domestic Monitoring Plan

Compound Class	Production Class	Priority Score	TNS. ^a	Violation Rate (%) (10 Year) ^b	UNS. ^c	Adjust ^d	Initial Adjust. ^e	Adjust: LC ^f	Adjust: PV ^g	Final Adjust ^h
CHCs/COPs	Young chickens	687.09	3,756	0.03	460		460			460
CHCs/COPs	Market hogs	295.79	4,380	0.00	460		460			460
CHCs/COPs	Steers	231.54	4,126	0.05	460		460			460
CHCs/COPs	Heifers	137.12	4,146	0.03	460		460			460
CHCs/COPs	Young turkeys	109.62	4,006	0.05	460		460		300	300
CHCs/COPs	Egg products	38.21	1,027	0.00	460	-1	300			300
CHCs/COPs	Beef cows	28.90	4,213	0.07	300		300			300
CHCs/COPs	Dairy cows	24.69	3,805	0.03	300		300			300
CHCs/COPs	Sows	16.21	3,821	0.10	300		300			300
CHCs/COPs	Mature chickens	9.06	3,010	0.00	300	-1	230		90	90
CHCs/COPs	Bulls	8.75	3,484	0.11	300		300			300
CHCs/COPs	Lambs	3.22	4,134	0.02	300		300			300
CHCs/COPs	Ducks	2.56	2,754	0.00	300	-1	230		90	0
CHCs/COPs	Formula-fed veal	2.46	3,432	0.00	300	-1	230			230
CHCs/COPs	Mature turkeys	1.38	1,639	0.06	230		230		90	90
CHCs/COPs	Boars/Stags	1.02	3,384	0.27	230	+1	300			300
CHCs/COPs	Goats	0.48	3,975	0.30	230	+1	300			300
CHCs/COPs	Bob veal	0.42	2,033	0.10	230		230			0
CHCs/COPs	Horses	0.34	3,584	0.39	230	+1	300		90	0
CHCs/COPs	Bison	0.26	61	0.00	230	+1	300			0
CHCs/COPs	Heavy calves	0.22	3,150	0.19	230		230			230
CHCs/COPs	Roaster pigs	0.18	NT	NT	230	+1	300			300
CHCs/COPs	Non-formula-fed veal	0.14	2,465	0.12	230		230			230
CHCs/COPs	Sheep	0.14	3,263	0.06	230		230			230
CHCs/COPs	Ratites	0.11	152	0.00	90	+1	230			0
CHCs/COPs	Geese	0.05	142	0.00	90		90			0
CHCs/COPs	Rabbits	0.05	912	0.11	90		90			0
CHCs/COPs	Squab		59	0.00	45		45			0
TOTAL #					7,775		7,895			5,940

a. NS = the total number of samples analyzed in the FSIS Monitoring Plan (01/01/1993 to 12/31/2002)

b. Violation rate for the period 1993-2002 (10 Years). The percent of samples with residue concentrations exceeding the tolerance or action level (or, for a drug whose use was not permitted in the production class in which it was detected, the percent of samples with any detectable residue)

c. UNS. = Unadjusted number of samples

Table 6.3
Pesticide Compound/Production Class Pairs, Sorted by Sampling Priority Score, with Adjusted Number of Analyses
2004 FSIS NRP, Domestic Monitoring Plan

- d. Adjustment based on FSIS Historical Testing Information (refer to text discussion in Section 4); +1 level, +2 levels, -1 level. There are four different sampling levels: 90, 230, 300 and 460. Sampling levels were increased or decreased (e.g., changed from 300 samples to 230 samples) based on the rules described in Section 6
- e. Number of samples proposed following adjustment for lack of testing information
- f. Adjustment for Laboratory Capacity. For a discussion, see Section 6
- g. Adjustment for Production Volume. For a discussion, see Section 6
- h. Final adjustment numbers were obtained following an assessment of laboratory capacity and production volume. In addition, FSIS has suspended sampling for CHCs/COPs in bob veal, horses and minor species (ducks, ratites, geese, rabbits, and squab) for the 2004 NRP.