

**SECTION 6**  
**PLANNING THE 1999 FSIS**  
**DOMESTIC MONITORING**  
**PLAN AND**  
**SPECIAL PROJECTS:**  
**PESTICIDES**

# **SECTION 6. PLANNING THE 1999 FSIS DOMESTIC MONITORING PLAN AND SPECIAL PROJECTS: PESTICIDES**

## **PHASE I - GENERATING AND RANKING 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) is presented in Table 6.1, *Scored Pesticide Residues, Rated with Various Weighting Formulas*. 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 (all scores, except for those in the first category, were generated by EPA). 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 1999 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**

##### **Background**

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 above candidate compounds or compound classes. Unlike the case with veterinary drugs (see above), FSIS does

not have historical data on a sufficient range of different pesticide compounds or compound classes to predict violation scores using a regression equation. Therefore a somewhat different approach (although related to that used for the veterinary drugs) was necessary. Repeating Equation (4.1), we have:

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

### 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 that a compound or compound class will exceed the Reference Dose. It thus 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 prior to slaughter, the carcass may contain violative levels of residues, since the time necessary for sufficient metabolism and/or elimination of the pesticide would 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, thus increasing the potential for human exposure.

The "Toxicity" reflects both the dose required to achieve a toxic effect and the severity of that effect. It can thus be used directly as a term in Equation (6.1).

By multiplying toxicity times a weighted average of those categories used as indicators of potential residue level, we can obtain a rough estimate of the relative risk per unit of consumption represented by each compound or compound class. And as with the veterinary drugs, we can refine the equation somewhat by adding a modifier for "Lack of FSIS Testing Information on Violations." Thus, with appropriate substitution, we obtain the following equation:

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

Scores for "Endocrine Disruption" and "FSIS Historical Testing Information on Violations" were not available for most of the compounds, making it impossible to use these categories in determining a relative ranking among the different pesticide compounds. Therefore, these categories were not employed in Equation (6.2).

The pesticides are rated for relative public health concern by combining the scoring categories presented in Equation (6.2), using four different weighting formulas. The rating numbers are presented in Table 6.1. Inspection of this table reveals the extent to which changes in the

weighting formula result in changes in rating score. In this case, the results from all four formulas are relatively similar. The SAT chose to use the second formula (bolded in Table 6.1):

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

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 this formula, "Regulatory Concern" was weighted twice as heavily as both "Pre-slaughter Interval" and "Bioconcentration Factor," because "Regulatory Concern" was considered to be a more direct measure of exposure. And 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.

All of the formulas used here for the pesticides, and above for the veterinary drugs, have been normalized. In other words, the veterinary drug and pesticide weighting formulas have been adjusted to give the same maximum value. For a given pesticide or pesticide class, this permits comparison of the scores generated by the four different weighting formulas presented in Table 6.1. Because the formulas for veterinary drugs use different terms from those for pesticides, the scores cannot be precisely compared across these two different types of residues. However, as a result of this normalization, the scores for pesticides and veterinary drugs are comparable in magnitude, permitting a rough comparison to be made across these two very different categories of compounds.

In Table 6.2, *Pesticides Residues Rated with the Selected Weighting Formula, Sorted by Rating*, 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 the Residue Prioritization Committee (RPC) to bring consistency, grounded in formal risk-based considerations, to its efforts to differentiate among a very diverse range of drugs and drug 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 1999 NRP**

Following the completion of the ranking of the pesticides, the RPC (1) used these rankings to select those compounds and compound classes that should be included in the 1999 NRP, based purely on their relative public health concern and (2) determined which of these compounds and compound classes actually could be included in the 1999 NRP, based on the availability of laboratory resources.

The consensus of the RPC participants was that those compounds and compound classes ranked tenth or higher represented a potential public health concern sufficient to justify their inclusion in the 1999 FSIS National Residue Program (NRP).

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

Table 6.3, *Rank and Status for Pesticides in the 1999 NRP*, lists all of the original candidate pesticides and pesticides classes in rank order. For each compound or compound class, the table specifies if it will be sampled under the 1999 Monitoring Plan or Special Projects, or if it will not be included in the 1999 NRP. For each highly ranked compound or compound class that was not included in the 1999 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.

Because a number of highly ranked compound classes could not be included in the 1999 NRP due to methodological limitations, FSIS is currently working with EPA to extend its CHC/COP method to the 63 chlorinated and non-chlorinated organophosphate compounds that were collectively rated as the top priority compound class. FSIS will implement this extended methodology as soon as it becomes available, probably in late 1999. In addition, in 2000 FSIS also plans to work with EPA to attempt to extend this methodology to the 10 triazine and six synthetic pyrethrin compounds that are ranked second and third, respectively. If this is accomplished, FSIS will have in place a single methodology capable of simultaneously identifying and quantitating over 100 compounds from five different chemical classes.

### **PHASE III- IDENTIFYING THE COMPOUND/PRODUCTION CLASS (C/PC) PAIRS**

The CHC/COP class includes pesticides that are applied to grains. Some of these grains are used as animal feeds, creating the potential for the occurrence of "secondary residues" (i.e., residues that are not the result of direct treatment) in the animals. Other compounds within this class (such as the PCB's) are environmental contaminants. *Since all animals are fed grains, and since environmental contaminants can occur in any food animal, the SAT judged it to be prudent to sample for CHC's and COP's in all production classes.* FSIS also wishes to continue sampling for these compounds in all production classes 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 1999 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/COP's (as calculated in Table 6.1) was multiplied by the estimated relative percent of domestic consumption for each production class (presented in Table 4.6). This is identical 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 represented by 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 sampling levels were chosen using the same cutoff numbers employed in Table 4.7 for the veterinary drugs. The cutoff scores are as follows:  $\geq 28 = 460$  samples;  $2.2 - 27 = 300$  samples;  $0.19 - 2.1 = 230$  samples;  $< 0.19 = 90$  samples. The results of this are presented in Table 6.4, *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. Thus the 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.

### ADJUSTING RELATIVE SAMPLING NUMBERS

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

As described above, the RPC used "FSIS Historical Testing Information on Violations" as a critical factor in ranking the various pesticides and pesticide classes according to their relative public health concern. Because this information is available for each production class individually, it can also be used to further refine the relative priority of sampling each C/PC pair. Table 6.4 lists, for the period 1/1/93 -10/15/98 (1/1/96 - 12/31/97 for egg products), the total number of samples analyzed by FSIS under its Monitoring Plan and Special Projects (i.e., random sampling only), 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), and the percent of samples found to be positive but not violative ("non-violative

positive," or NVP). Using these data, the following rules were applied to adjust the sampling numbers:

1. C/PC pair never tested: +1 level (i.e., increase by one sampling level, e.g., from 230 samples to 300 samples)
2. At least 300 samples tested, violation rate  $\geq 0.25\%$ : +1 level
3. The maximum number of samples to be scheduled for testing is 460

The one exception to this system is that geese are never to be scheduled for more than 90 samples (because very few geese are produced, and because virtually all the geese are slaughtered by a very limited number of plants, its is impractical to collect a larger number of samples).

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 4.6, with an "X" *not* surrounded by parentheses) were assigned a minimum of 300 samples.

All of the above adjustments were applied, and the sampling numbers obtained following these adjustments are listed in Table 6.4 under the heading "INITIAL ADJ. #" (initial adjusted number of samples).

#### **Adjusting for laboratory capacity**

No adjustments for laboratory capacity were necessary. Therefore the final sampling numbers for the pesticides, which are listed in the last column of Table 6.4 under the heading "FINAL ADJ. #" (final adjusted number of samples), are unchanged from those listed under the heading "INITIAL ADJ. #."

# **SCORING KEY FOR PESTICIDES 1999 FSIS DOMESTIC RESIDUE PROGRAM**

## **FSIS Historical Testing Information on Violations (1983-1997)**

- 4 = Violation rate of 0.6% or greater for at least one year in at least one major production class, i.e., one which represents at least 1.5% of the U.S. consumption of meat poultry, and egg products. Based on this definition, the major production classes are: *beef cows, dairy cows, heifers, steers, market hogs, young chickens, young turkeys, and egg products.*
- 3 = More than two violations detected, but does not qualify for a "4"
- 2 = Total of one or two violations detected over all years of sampling
- 1 = No violations detected over all years of sampling
- NT = Not tested by FSIS

## **Regulatory Concern**

These score were generated by a professional assessment of the extent to which the acute or chronic dietary exposure to this compound may exceed EPA's level of concern. Concern for chronic toxicity is judged by comparing a compound's Reference Dose (RfD) to the estimated level of exposure. The RfD is an estimated daily exposure to an agent that, when sustained over a lifetime, is assumed to be without appreciable risk to the human population.<sup>1</sup>

Concern for acute toxicity is judged by estimating the combined toxicity of all agents sharing the same mechanism of toxicity

- 4 = Reference Dose (RfD) exceeded, carcinogen, or possible high combined acute toxicity
- 3 = Close to RfD, or close to acceptable levels for combined acute toxicity
- 2 = Exposure estimated to be a low percentage of RfD, or to be below acceptable levels for combined acute toxicity
- 1 = Exposure estimated to be a very low percentage of RfD, or to be far below acceptable levels for combined acute toxicity

## **Lack of FSIS Testing Information on Violations**

This represents the extent to which FSIS analytical testing information on a residue is limited, absent or obsolete.

- 4 = Not tested within the past 6 years

---

<sup>1</sup>Klassen, CD, ed. *Casarett and Doull's Toxicology: The Basic Science of Poisons, 5<sup>th</sup> Ed.* McGraw-Hill: New York, 1996, p. 80.

3 = Tested within the past 5-6 years, but not more recently

2= Tested within the past 4-5 years, but not more recently

1= Tested within the past 3 years.

### **Pre-Slaughter Interval**

Pesticides accepted for direct dermal application have a minimum specified pre-slaughter interval. This is the interval between the last dermal application and the time of slaughter.

4 = Dermal application permitted, pre-slaughter interval 1 day or greater

3 = Dermal application permitted, pre-slaughter interval 0 days

2 = No direct dermal application permitted, but treatment of premises (e.g., holding cells, feedlots, barns, etc.) is permitted

1 = No direct dermal application or premise treatment permitted

### **Bioconcentration Factor**

This is a measure of the 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. Compounds that have a high affinity for octanol (and thus a high  $K_{o/w}$ ) tend to bioaccumulate in body fat.

4 =  $\log K_{o/w}$  greater than 3

3 =  $\log K_{o/w}$  between 2 and 3

2 =  $\log K_{o/w}$  between 1 and 2

1 =  $\log K_{o/w}$  less than 1

### **Endocrine Disruption**

This 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.

4 = Widely known

3 = Suspected

NT = Not yet tested

## **Toxicity**

This represents 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

4 = Highly acutely toxic, cholinesterase inhibitor, carcinogen, or low RfD

3 = Moderately acutely toxic, or higher RfD

2 = Low toxicity concern

1 = Very low toxicity concern or eligible for tolerance exception