UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ON MEAT AND POULTRY INSPECTION MEETING

SUBCOMMITTEE 1
EVALUATION AND MANAGEMENT OF CHEMICAL HAZARDS WITHIN THE NATIONAL RESIDUE PROGRAM

Washington, D.C.

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

PARTICIPANTS:

Moderator:

DANIEL PUZO

Panelists:

MICHAEL CRUPAIN
Consumer Product Safety and Sustainability

GEORGE WILSON
Wilson and Associates, LLC

KRZYSZTOF MAZURCZAK
Illinois Department of Agriculture

MANPREET SINGH
Purdue University

BRIAN SAPP
White Oak Pastures

MICHAEL RYBOLT
Hillshire Brands Company

BETSY BOOREN
North American Meat Institute

JOHN MARCY
University of Arkansas

PATRICIA CURTIS
Auburn University

MICHAEL LINK, JR.
Ohio Department of Agriculture

MARGARET O'KEEFE
FSIS, USDA

PATTY BENNETT
FSIS, USDA

P R O C E E D I N G S

(1:26 p.m.)

MR. PUZO: (in progress) the Outreach and Partnership Division, who are your hosts for this meeting, and a few of the ground rules that applied in the general session, apply here. So first, state your name and affiliation when you are making a comment, and please mute or put on vibrate all cell phones or electronic devices. We'll take a break at around three, depending on how we're doing in terms of progress. These are normally a little bit more questions than we ask of you, but hopefully, we can get through these, and if we don't, apparently, we have some time tomorrow to catch up.

And I think the first order of business is to decide amongst yourselves who you would like to be the chairman or chairperson, and they will present tomorrow to the general session your deliberations and findings and recommendations. So, is there someone eager to assume that role?

DR. BOOREN: I'll do it.

MR. PUZO: Okay.

DR. BOOREN: Based on the look of no one else volunteering down there. (Laughter)

DR. RYBOLT: I was going to nominate Dr. Marcy, but he gave me a look.

DR. BOOREN: I know he did (Laughter). I saw that look. He looked up at me.

MR. PUZO: Okay, great. Thank you. And we need a second person to come up here and to capture your discussions, not as a transcript. We have our court reporter here. But just in bullet points, how you're going to address each of these questions, which are all on the screen and we'll project as we take them on one at a time.

Let's have one speaker at time, so there's no overlapping, which is especially important for our court reporter. The public is invited and is here, and they are invited to speak, if they raise their hand at the chairman's discretion, and I'm here to facilitate and move us along. As I said, we have seven questions, eight, maybe, and we only have three hours to cover them

all. We will take a break at 3:00, as I mentioned earlier.

And so, let's cover one subject at a time, and if things drift, then I'll hopefully get things back on course, and I'll give you a breakdown as the time elapses and we move forward. So, who's -- Natasha?

MS. WILLIAMS: Just so you know, for the public, in order to be on the transcript, we'll need you kind of close to the mic. So, if you do have a comment, just float over there close to Dr. Booren or Meg, and they're very friendly. They'll be more than willing to share (Laughter) and you can record your comments for the record.

MR. PUZO: Great. So, I guess Madam Chairperson, would you like to --

DR. BOOREN: Sure.

MR. PUZO: -- stay where you are or come up here? What would be your preference?

DR. BOOREN: Yes. Do you want to --

SPEAKER: I'll go up there and do that.

(Simultaneous discussion)

MR. PUZO: Michael is going to be the scribe.

(Discussion off the record)

MR. PUZO: Oh, and I forgot to mention that Dr. Patty Bennett and Margaret O'Keefe are here. If there's any clarifications you want on the presentation or the collections themselves, and as you ask them, their comments will also become part of the record. So, we can begin.

DR. RYBOLT: Are we going to wait for her, or do you want me to --

DR. BOOREN: I would say let's sort of go through them, and -- I've found when we go through these types of things, we sort of get into a rhythm. We may be jumping back and forth, but let's just start at the beginning. And I would be interested in people's insights. Michael, does that work for you?

DR. RYBOLT: Yeah. Or first, are there any other questions --

DR. BOOREN: Yeah.

DR. RYBOLT: -- anybody has from the

follow up question for Patty or for Margaret from the follow up?

DR. Bennett: Or Naser. I'd like to introduce the statisticians infinitely involved with our program. So, this is Mr. Naser Abdelnajib, and he actually responded to Betsy's one question. Hopefully, that was enough. And he can really help with the questions about the algorithm. I think there were some questions about that, and he really is our data entry person - do that for you.

MS. O'KEEFE: And just to clarify something. Dr. Bennett had a question. When Dr. Bennett presented the numbers about the samples, like the 5,000 that were positive and the thousand that confirmed positive, there could very well still be a drug in the other 4,000 or not. It's just looking at the violative level.

So, don't think that there was nothing in those samples, because -- you know? So just -- and we would use that for like exposure or something like that. We would know, okay, well,

look, the producers, they are using it. So, it's not a violative level. But that's also valuable information. So, just don't think when those -- that there was absolutely nothing in those other samples that went.

MR. PUZO: Okay, well starting immediately, you need to say your name and affiliation for the record.

(Discussion off the record)

MS. O'KEEFE: The 5,000 samples that are --

DR. BOOREN: Say your Meg O'Keefe.

MS. O'KEEFE: Oh, Meg O'Keefe. Margaret O'Keefe.

(Discussion off the record)

MS. O'KEEFE: Margaret O'Keefe, FSIS, USDA.

DR. BOOREN: Okay, good.

DR. MAZURCZAK: It's Krys Mazurczak, Illinois Department of Agriculture. I have a few questions asking for clarification.

On slide 15, one of the points is that

Major slaughter classes eligible for Inspector-generated testing. What about minor subspecies? Can they be a subject for inspector generated testing?

DR. BENNETT: So, this is Patty Bennett with FSIS. What usually happens is, if for some reason the KIS test isn't approved for that particular species, then an inspector would simply just collect the sample, send it on to the labs, and then the labs could go ahead and run the confirmatory tests, which are better, anyway. I mean, the KIS screen is only as good as it is. So, that's what they usually do.

DR. MAZURCZAK: Okay.

MS. O'KEEFE: And this is Margaret O'Keefe. Another example of that would be if the inspector were to suspect beta agonists. That's not -- so if they always have the opportunity to collect that sample to see whether --

DR. MAZURCZAK: Okay. I have a couple more questions. Still Krys Mazurczak, Illinois Department of Agriculture.

One of the charge questions is if FSIS is allocating the right proportion of samples for domestic versus the import program. I simply do not know the numbers for the import coming to the U.S. to make this determination. So, could you kindly provide that background? Are we talking about major species or minor subclasses? And how this falls.

MS. O'KEEFE: Which one is that? For the scheduled program? It's that we allocate 800 samples per production class of the nine that you saw, except for steers and heifers. They get 400 each.

And based on that level, historically, if epi-science presumes a 1 percent violation rate, we're like over 98 percent confident that if there is a violation, we will find it. So that's where -- and this is in CODEX -- it's a standard table. That's where the 800 comes from, when we talk about allocating the samples.

DR. BENNETT: Okay. I think what you actually need is --

MS. O'KEEFE: I'm sorry.

DR. BENNETT: -- how much poundage do we get in from imports.

DR. MAZURCZAK: Correct.

DR. BENNETT: Is that what you're saying?

DR. MAZURCZAK: And what kind of species we are talking about, because that's kind of you know -- it will help us to understand the whole --

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. BENNETT: And my apologies, I actually had --

MS. O'KEEFE: For imports?

DR. MAZURCZAK: For imports, yes. So you know, beef versus pork versus, I don't know, sheep -- lamb. How it will -- how will the numbers will fall.

DR. BENNETT: Right. I actually have that upstairs. Let me see. And my apologies. I thought I brought everything back down with me, but I can go back and get it.

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. RYBOLT: Patty, I was going to ask if -- because that wasn't directly one of the questions. So if you guys --

DR. BENNETT: Yep.

DR. RYBOLT: -- Tom to get that number.

DR. BENNETT: Yep.

DR. RYBOLT: And then when we get to that discussion point or that question, then we can provide that information to help educate the answer. Does that make sense?

DR. MAZURCZAK: Yes.

DR. RYBOLT: Did you have other questions?

DR. MAZURCZAK: Well, yeah. I think somebody mentioned it's another charge about allocating the right proportion of samples, and it was mentioned using algorithm. Can we have a little bit more explanation about what drives algorithm? It's data derived from PHIS slaughter data, et cetera, et cetera.

MR. PUZO: Okay.

DR. RYBOLT: Yeah, let's wait -- because

I have one on that, as well, so let's wait until we get to that particular question.

DR. MAZURCZAK: Okay. Thank you.

DR. RYBOLT: And then we'll -- and that will give them time to get some answers for us. Perfect. So you want to -- oh, I'm sorry. Go.

MR. SAPP: Brian Sapp, White Oak Pastures. I do have one more question. It looks like when you're scheduling these tests, especially the screen test -- not the screen testing, but the targeted test, the major slaughter facilities are probably being tested more, because they're processing more animals.

The way I kind of see things is, smaller facilities that are bringing in animals that are usually not under the care of a veterinarian, may see higher incidences of you know, some kind of contamination. I guess what I'm saying is, if you've got cattle in a feed lot that are being looked after by a veterinarian, it seemed to me like those incidences of you know, meeting withdrawals or something may be less than if you

have a smaller facility sourcing cattle from you know, farmers that are not under the care of a veterinarian.

Do you have numbers of -- you know, maybe percentages of you know, tests in small plants, test in very small plants, or tests in large plants of how those -- your percentage of positives within those plants.

(Discussion off the record)

DR. BENNETT: I think -- this is Patty Bennett with FSIS. Just because you used some words -- so, I think what you mean is the scheduled program that we actually generate from headquarters. So, it's kind of the random that's not targeted. Right? That's really what you --

MR. SAPP: Yes, ma'am. That's correct.

DR. BENNETT: So what he really wants is, when you get the scheduling algorithm or if it divides out by again large, small, very small, and then associated positive/violative --

SPEAKER: (Inaudible)

MR. PUZO: Hi. You need to speak into

the microphone, please.

SPEAKER: Regarding the algorithm, it's volume driven, and it also depends on the number of plants associated with each animal class.

So when you associate, for example, 800 samples for bob veal, or the number of bob veal plants are much -- way less than dairy cows. But those numbers, again, it's allocated by volume, which means plants that produce a lot more animals, they are highly likely to receive multiple requests or even requests compared to lower level plants.

DR. BENNETT: And so you understood too, what he said where -- and I'm going to -- these numbers are coming off the top of my head, but you can correct it. If there are 50 plants that primarily slaughter dairy versus maybe 300 plants that slaughter hogs, so it's still 800 samples allocated across the dairy plants, the market hog plants and then the more they produce, the more likely they are going to be to get to a sample request.

So, we can in that sense -- so doing it for each slaughter class, how long would it take you to pull that up for them, for them to see the numbers?

SPEAKER: With respect to what we schedule or what we test?

DR. BENNETT: Right. Just schedule.

SPEAKER: Well, we don't do the scheduling ourselves. It's only IFP who does the scheduling.

DR. BENNETT: Right. But can you pull up what's been allocated?

SPEAKER: Sure. We can do that.

DR. BENNETT: Okay. Now, how helpful would -- is that what you're -- would that be helpful, if we said -- you know, again, it does, it just depends. But I don't know -- and it's not like we would say, well, 50 percent of all sampling allocated to a certain slaughter class is going to go to the large, and then the rest of the percentages will meet out between the other two classes. It probably is variable from slaughter

class to slaughter class.

SPEAKER: Right.

DR. BENNETT: Is that useful information for you to have, to know exactly -- well, more or less approximately how samples are across the different slaughter classes? I mean, what actually would be helpful for you?

MR. SAPP: Brian Sapp, White Oak Pastures. Let me -- I guess what I need to do is clarify just a little bit. So, I guess what I'm saying is, you're testing more in larger facilities, but typically, your larger facilities would be sourcing -- I'm just going to use cattle, for instance -- would be sourcing animals that have been under veterinarian care at a feed lot or at you know, some kind of facility.

DR. BENNETT: Mm-hmm.

MR. SAPP: When you get into the very small facilities, those smaller facilities are sourcing cattle from you know, different places, that those animals were not under veterinarian care. So, is there an instance where very small

establishments may have a higher percentage of positives, but we're not capturing that, because we're not testing as much in the very small facilities?

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. BENNETT: Right, because exposure is more important than it is passive size. So, Naser, can you -- if you did it for I mean, a couple of like maybe market hogs versus, I don't know, maybe bob veal or dairy? I don't know. Or maybe beef and market hog. Maybe just do a couple of classes, and just go, you know, here's how the allocation fell out relative to the violations that we found?

And then -- because I see what you're saying. So right now, for us, exposure has been the most important -- has been the driving force for the algorithm. It's not the only thing, but it certainly is the most important. And you might be asking us to reverse and say, is it violations found.

But the other thing is, is I don't know

how useful that will be, in the sense that if you look at the 800 count allocation, is that again out of the -- say we actually collected 6,500 samples in that program, we find 20, 25 violations. You know? And is it more useful, perhaps, to pull it out of the inspector generated program? And even then, it might be biased, because that's driven by the PHVs, and so it's more about their training and what they're seeing and the quality of animals.

And I don't know that even if we tease that out by passive size, if it is a fair correlation to make that the only reason -- you know, like what the reason is for inspectors to pull for KIS testing, if that makes sense. Like yeah, I guess the derivation of the animals versus something else in these processes that they're seeing.

So, I mean, if you think it's important, that's great. But I just want to make sure what you think would be helpful in looking at that kind of allocation.

DR. BOOREN: Can I respond? This is Betsy Booren with the Meat Institute. I think that's what my question was in the larger session. It was trying to understand -- why we're trying to better understand the domestic through the import. I'm looking for some sort of checkpoint of -- it would be, I think that inspector drive, because it's going to give us an incidence of, if they see something, do we perhaps need to tweak the algorithm for the standard domestic sampling -- are we tracking the right establishments?

We might see certain trends. That's what I was trying to figure out. Are there stories to be told within the inspected generated samples that perhaps show certain classes, whether it's species or certain types of establishments that may be being missed on your domestic, and can you adjust for that in the next year?

DR. BENNETT: Okay, so I want to say something. So again, this is Patty Bennett with FSIS.

So, here's one thing that I would like

you to consider as a committee, is that really, when you think about the inspector generated program, it really is our veterinarians looking for veterinary drug abuse. Right? Either it's the type of animal -- a dairy cow who may have been treated for mastitis, nutritis or laminitis, because of the work that we do with these animals; or again, bob veal, because we understand the husbandry practices.

But please, remember that those aren't the only chemical hazards that we worry about in this program. I mean, that's an easy one. There's tolerances. We have violations. That's easy. But that's only part of the story. And yes, we don't find many pesticide violations, but to me, I think the purpose of the surveillances -- of all of the chemical hazards we might worry about, how do we look at it in such a way that if there was something out of play, that we would capture it.'.

And if you come back to me, and you say, well Patty, the most important thing is probably

veterinary drugs, okay. Then that's your recommendation. But I think -- and with our inspectors, I think like looking to see whether there was pesticide abuse,that might be really hard for them. Unless they actually saw the person -- in this one case that we had, they were literally spraying the pesticide before they slaughtered the animals. Okay, that was easy.

But in other situations, they may not -- like we talk about how the animals were raised. They may not have that information to say, oh, these animals were raised in a situation where they might have been exposed to x, y or z. So, that's something else that I'm just going to put out there to consider when you're thinking about sample allocation.

MR. PUZO: Let's take the committee members first, and then we'll go to the public.

DR. RYBOLT: Yeah, I was going to let Kryzs, and then I'll come to you.

DR. MAZURCZAK: Kryzs Mazurczak, Illinois Department of Agriculture. A few things.

First, I have clarification regarding collecting samples from very small establishments. All state inspected plants are participating in the national residue program. That means that on a regular basis, monitoring samples are being scheduled and collected at those plants. I'm not sure, though, how this information is being collected and captured in the headquarters -- FSIS headquarters.

But at least speaking on what we had in Illinois, on average, we have probably, out of 44 states and other establishments, three or four on a monthly basis selected for collecting residue samples. In addition to it, there is also a requirement that all state programs will have to follow that during a state fair season, we have to collect a certain number of residue samples from show animals.

And just to give you an example, again, on an annual basis, and this is a seasonal event, I think last time, we had around 180 residue samples collected in Illinois. So, the monitoring

on the inspection side at a very small glance, I would say, is at equal level with FSIS. So, that was just a clarification for my end, maybe adding a little bit more to the background.

And I have a question going to back to the overall big picture of monitoring. Is there any link that will kind of align consumer preferences and quantity of purchase, meat and poultry products classes versus, for example, you know, with allergic lately -- well, not lately, but with concerns related to dietary requirements. People were switching to the white meat, and obviously, pork was getting into the place, being purchased more frequently, and the pricing also is a factor.

So, I'm asking, is there any attempt to link what is purchased by consumers in the largest amount versus overseeing, you know, and making sure that scheduling sample is adjusted? Is anybody linking those two things? I was kind of surprised to know the reason why the bob veal was targeted so much. Maybe because you know, like we

do not slaughter this class, period. But again, it was a question from my end, you know, how the numbers of scheduled residue samples relate with what's being purchased by the consumers.

DR. BENNETT: Okay, that's a great question. Would you like -- Naser, did you want to comment? This is Patty Bennett with FSIS.

Did you want to comment on his -- the state sampling the show animals?

MR. ABDELNAJIB: I'm not familiar with the show animals. I could talk about the state sampling, but not the show animals.

DR. BENNETT: Okay. Well, the show animals is just simply, again, another targeted program. We do have requirements for a level of testing, and so it's just part of when show animals come to plants, our inspectors know to pull so many numbers of animals relative to what shows up at their doorstep, and those animals are just -- those samples are sent immediately to our labs where they're just tested.

Because again, what are they? They're

the sheep and the goats and the lamb or whatever. But whatever is the show -- sorry, I wasn't 4H (Laughter). But I assume there are 4H animals that go to the thing. And so, we do have a level of collection. And you're right, I mean, we see a spike in the spring and the summer, because that's when -- or maybe the fall, I guess, because that's when people have their shows. But Naser can speak to our state sampling, which is captured in our program.

MR. ABDELNAJIB: As far as the state scheduled samplings, they also run through a similar algorithm. It's volume based, and I believe we have a plan from 21 to 25 states only, and we have received -- we would capture the volume information and we allocate samples similar to federal plans. So, the algorithm doesn't change significantly.

DR. MAZURCZAK: But in your -- I'm sorry.

MR. ABDELNAJIB: Sure.

DR. MAZURCZAK: Krzys Mazurczak,

Illinois. In your database, can you distinguish those numbers from -- are we just going by the size of the plant -- by those we make distinctions federal versus state?

MR. ABDELNAJIB: For the state plans, the allocation is separate from the federal plans. Okay?

DR. MAZURCZAK: Okay. So that's --

DR. BENNETT: So we can't tease out. And your other question -- this is Patty Bennett with FSIS. Relative to final product.

So, with the chemical testing program it has been emphasized as policy for quite some time, and I don't know how long, that we sample at the carcass level. So, we do not go further downstream to say you know, we're going to do ground beef, and ground beef might be some bob veal, maybe dairy cow or something like that, or you know, that the beef cow turns into choice cuts because they're younger animals or something like that.

So, that is not part of our program, but

certainly that we could be open to. And really, I would just say it's precedent right now. So, what I had been told when I started with the program was just that people felt that if we start upstream, then if we test at the carcass level and we find that the carcasses are clean, then it shouldn't be a problem when we go downstream. So, that has been our policy --

MS. O'KEEFE: I think the rationale --

DR. BENNETT: -- 10, 15 years, maybe.

MR. PUZO: Dr. Marcy?

DR. MARCY: John Marcy, University of Arkansas. You know, in relation to the question about your approach in your program, you know, it strikes me that you're looking at actually, multiple programs that -- your domestic and your import. You're trying to baseline (Laughter) it, and you know, you use the term random. And evidently, it's not totally random.

DR. BENNETT: Right. Exactly.

DR. MARCY: You know, it's stratified based on class. And I guess what I would like to

think is you know, you can tell us whether or not you feel like you're getting an adequate representation depending on -- so you make an inference to the whole class of your domestic production. And that's separate from your inspector driven --

DR. BENNETT: Mm-hmm.

DR. MARCY: -- which is certainly biased sampling, you know, based upon their judgment.

DR. BENNETT: Right.

DR. MARCY: You know? And actually, it shouldn't be comingled with inference data from your other --

DR. BENNETT: Right. So, this is Patty Bennett from FSIS.

So, here's our issue. Because a lot of people will come up to us and go -- and even people within the agency, and say, well, most of the violations are in the inspector generated program, so we should allocate even more samples and force that program, at the expense of -- and maybe do less of something else.

And so, I think that's one of the things -- and I did say that during my presentation, is that we're very cognizant that this isn't limitless. I mean, I can't go, please tell me -- you can certainly say, hey, you should allocate a hundred thousand samples for residue. Like great, thank you very much.

But it does have to be balanced with the pathogen sampling that goes on with this agency and anything else that we do. So, we're very careful about that. And I think we are certainly open -- if you came back and you said, well, so let's add the numbers. So, it's probably what, 15 -- 12 to 15,000 samples maybe for our program? I mean, there are programs we didn't talk about, but the basic one is maybe 15,000. Right?

You could come back and say, you know, Patty, I don't think that you can really evaluate your program under 20,000 or 25,000. Okay. Tell me why. And that's certainly something I can bring back to my management. But I think what I am interested in you saying is, so tell me what's

important. Do you think the surveillance is -- I mean, how important do you think it is, kind of having your fingers on the pulse of the animals that we produce? Is that important to you?

Or, do you think that, no, chasing after the dairy cows or the bob veal or you know, whatever -- old sows, that that's more important, because we eat a lot of meat. Okay. Or even the import. So, we understand that import is re-inspection. Right? So, we shouldn't be doing the job of the countries who are bringing and selling us their product.

But I think a good question, is 1,300 samples enough with -- is that 33 billion --

MS. O'KEEFE: Billion?

DR. BENNETT: Three billion pounds of product. Is that enough? And before, we had 3,000 samples. Was that enough? And now, we have about 1,500. So I think again, and just in generalities, can you give us some advice on other things that we'd worry about? Is that good? I mean, maybe it's too much. Right?

Maybe you go look. It's not our job to re- inspect. We should just -- you know, whatever. I mean, that's what we're here for.

(Discussion off the record)

MR. PUZO: If you have a comment, can you please sit in of these two chairs and speak into the microphone?

(simultaneous discussion)

MR. FROST: Okay. So, it's Jason Frost here with the New Zealand Embassy. And I find this conversation or the whole meeting just spectacularly interesting on a number of fronts. A bit of a background. About 25 years ago, I worked in our residue program back in New Zealand, and a lot of the stuff that's being discussed, we've all been through back in New Zealand, as well.

And we had a group of scientists, as I was the non-scientist in the room, and all in the group, and you know, had to write the letters to the farmers when there was known violations and things like that. So, a lot of the stuff that's

being said is really quite interesting from a historic perspective, but also, exactly the issues that we are grappling back in New Zealand in terms of residues.

We're one of the biggest exporters here, obviously. Well, you know, agriculture is our thing back in New Zealand. We export to 160 markets. And so, our residue program is a key component of the assurances we're providing not only to our consumers as a food safety regulatory authority, but also, to the markets we're exporting to.

And so, a lot of the stuff you talk about here seems to be a bit more focused, perhaps, on public health, which again, we're involved with. But we're also involved in the exports of things, and so a bit of perspective there. We do actually have a very, very comprehensive residue program in New Zealand. And I know you talk about the 3 billion pounds worth of product exported here, but I know of those countries, Australia will have a very

comprehensive residue program, as well.

In fact, we have to do it. In the meeting, the early part of the meeting, we talked about the international affairs and equivalents, and a major component of that over the years has been having a residue program. If you don't have a residue program, you don't export here. And we're grappling with the same thing as you guys. Resources.

You know, where do you target your sampling? Is it at the dairy cows? Is it at bobby veal? All the same stuff that Patty talks about here is exactly what we're grappling with. The question I have on this, and I know Tony Corbo is going to question me later on, on this (Laughter). But I ask you, and obviously, 20 years, I'm married to an American, so I have a bit of another side on it all (Laughter). It's all good that way. And where do you best put your resources? Is it really -- you know, if we're doing the testing in New Zealand, which we have to submit every year to FSIS, and you can come and --

we do a lot of exchanges in Patty -- something that I've picked up on today is certainly -- and I was talking to Bob about it, what a great exchange it would be. We used to have a bit more exchange between the residue people in New Zealand and yourself, and --

DR. BENNETT: If you're offering me a trip to New Zealand, I'm all over it (Laughter).

MR. FROST: I know --

DR. BENNETT: I'll talk to my boss immediately (Laughter).

MR. FROST: I'll talk to Al. But we do -- you know, there's always been a strong component in here about exchange and stuff. And I know maybe you guys that run the table don't probably comprehend that we do -- we have a massive amount of testing going on. I really don't care if you test the port of entry. You know? We're probably the same profile as you.

We've got a couple of -- you know, there will be instances where we have some farmers that are dairy -- we've been on dairy, so there will be

the odd instance -- and I still remember these, where the farmer basically made a screw up; treated his cow. Soon after slaughter, we picked up on it. All those levels of confidence that you were talking about before, that would be very similar to what you have.

And so, the only thing that I put on the table here is, you know, I don't expect to see you're not going to test them. Also, I know this. Tony's here (Laughter). But you know, just think about that. We do a lot of this testing. And what are you going to get out of it by testing anything more? If they are not -- if our compliance rate starts dropping or if in New Zealand, the way we approach things is the government of New Zealand -- if we had started finding problems you know, on a big scale, we'd actually start coming to you guys and talking about it, or we'd stop exports. And we've done it in the past for certain producers and certain farmers.

We trace back all the way back to the

farm. So, these are just a whole lot of things which I could sit down and talk about as Patty could probably, for days and days and days. But before you go off thinking that testing more on imports is a good idea or a bad idea, it's probably about where you're putting those resources on the imports as it is what you're doing domestically.

That's more important than just lumping a number out there going 1,500. And I don't know how you allocate because it wasn't explained how the international group allocates the samples from New Zealand. Maybe they're not doing anything in New Zealand. But I know they are, and we've never been advised of a residue -- a level that's beyond -- that's a violative.

I've been here 20 years, and I think once in 20 years, we've been notified that there was a -- and I'll just wrack my brains. I've got a whole file of residues, and it's -- you know, so anyhow, just those are things just to think about from an international perspective, because I know

there's no one else to represent us. Tony, you're next. Thanks very much.

MR. PUZO: Hi, this is Dan Puzo, the moderator. Tony, we're anxious to hear what you have to say, and we will in a second, but we've been doing this 45, 50 minutes, and it's been fascinating and great questions and commentary, but we haven't answered one question.

SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. PUZO: So, maybe these comments and questions that are coming up can start falling into the questions that we need you all to deliberate upon, and then go forward. We have two committee members that want to ask a question or comment.

Tony, you were addressing which aspect?

MR. CORBO: What I wanted to -- Tony Corbo from Food and Water Watch.

I filed a FOIA a number of years ago dealing with the residue program, and it was precipitated by an import issue, because one country -- we actually suspended all of the

imports because of a systemic issue with residue testing. But what I found fascinating, when I got the results, I asked the agency to give me a list by plant of the residue violations.

And what was interesting was, what showed up, the top two were bob veal plants. But then, and I'm going to name names, of the top 20 plants that had residue violations, a little plant by the name of Rancho Feeding showed up. This was from 2011.

So, my question is, I mean, we've raised the issue of small plants versus large plants. How did that come about? You had a relatively small plant, and it had -- it specialized in culled dairy. So, how was that determined that you were going to sample that plant over some other plant?

DR. BENNETT: So, this is Patty Bennett with FSIS. Tony, don't go. So, let me ask you, with the FOIA results, it was all violations?

MR. CORBO: These were violations.

DR. BENNETT: Okay, so because again,

what we talked about before is, we find very few violations in the scheduled program. Primarily, they're in the inspector generated program.

So, my first guess, without looking at your request, would be that this plant was targeted. What did they slaughter? Bob veal?

(Simultaneous discussion)

MR. CORBO: They slaughtered --

DR. BENNETT: Primarily?

MR. CORBO: -- culled dairy.

DR. BENNETT: Culled dairy.

MS. O'KEEFE: Culled dairy.

DR. BENNETT: Okay. Again, and I've thrown out some numbers earlier -- I'm going to guess now sort of 50 -- 97,000 screens get done -- almost a hundred thousand screens get done with dairy cow every year. So, it doesn't surprise me that it would have either been a dairy cow or bob veal, because they are very highly sampled slaughter classes.

And again, it's for the things that I talked about. You know, we know that a dairy cow

might have a life of six to seven years, and so -- and I heard this from a dairy producer a couple of years ago, was that these animals are valuable, as long as they produce milk. If their volume drops after a certain level, you have to sit there and decide, okay, is it worth treating her to get her back up to that volume or not, and send her to slaughter?

If I treat her, what I don't want her to do is die on my farm. This is coming out of the dairy producer. I didn't say this. I don't want her dying on my farm. So, even if I haven't met the withdrawal times, I'm going to take a gamble and say better to send her to slaughter while she can stand, because of the downer cow rule. Right? Unintended consequences.

I sent her to slaughter. She still has Seten Pure, penicillin, whatever you want her to have her in her, and I'm going to cross my fingers that she's not the cow that they're going to sample. Oh, but wait, she is (Laughter). And so that's what I hear from producers, and I do

understand the economics. Right? Better to get $1,500 out of her and cross my fingers than have her dead and have to call EPA and wonder how I'm going to bury her. And I think those happen all the time, Tony, and that's where I think where -- and maybe that's the thing about with the inspection generated samples, is that you know, we understand that these are heavily used animals. They have a purpose, and we want to keep them functional as long as possible. And then, it becomes a gamble of how much to treat before you call it.

And so, that's where I think we see a lot of the violations with dairy cows. Right? It's that they choose not to have the luxury of time withdrawing them and then pasturing them. And so, without knowing any more information on that rancher, if they're dealing with dairy cows because they buy them at sale barns or wherever, then it is a bit of a crap shoot. You know? Because to me, it's like if you're not testing at a certain level, then no telling what's going into

the market if we're not testing every dairy cow.

I don't know if that's helpful or not.

SPEAKER: Definitely.

DR. BENNETT: But Dan, again, this is Patty Bennett with FSIS. Before we go anymore, I just want to know, because he can't do this in two seconds, if it is valuable for Naser to go and divide out by size, we need to know now.

MR. SAPP: It's all here.

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. BOOREN: Well, I've asked a couple of questions. I'll defer and then come back.

DR. BENNETT: Okay.

DR. RYBOLT: Now, remember, we're -- in 2 1/2 hours, we have to have this thing completed. So I'll say, Mike, if you got -- or Michael -- let's try to get answers to the first question.

MR. LINK: Go ahead.

DR. BENNETT: Okay.

MR. LINK: I'll pass right now.

DR. RYBOLT: Okay.

DR. BOOREN: My question is -- Betsy

with the Meat Institute, and then I'm ready to get in the weeds.

DR. RYBOLT: Yeah.

DR. BOOREN: And one of the things we haven't discussed is the practicality of what's actually going on in establishments. How long -- if a sample is culled, whether it's inspector generated or in the standard domestic or import sampling, how long before the establishment or the importer receives a result from FSIS so they can make business decisions?

MS. O'KEEFE: And that's -- this is Margaret O'Keefe, FSIS.

And that is completely dependent on what they find. If it's a non-detect, negative, it's like three to five days. If it has to go through the confirmation procedure, the analytical procedure to confirm it, that adds more time. If it is a drug with a tolerance, then, it has to be quantitative.

So, it truly depends on what the result is. It can be three to five days. But it can be

10, if it has to go through the confirmation. Now remember, they're not all -- not everything has to go through the confirmation process, but it is dependent on what they find and where.

DR. RYBOLT: I would say about two weeks.

DR. BENNETT: Yeah.

DR. RYBOLT: They're at a definitive level.

(Inaudible) more about.

MR. PUZO: Maybe we could jump ahead to question two, part A. It seems like that has been the discussion to this point. Maybe you all can come to a consensus, or at least if there are dissenters, they can express their views on that. But it seems like in the past hour, we've covered that. So, maybe we can say now, do we have the right before you? We have our friend here from New Zealand who gave his perspective. So, committee members, where do you all land?

MR. PUZO: So the question is, is FSIS -- well, the first part of the question is, does

the committee agree with how FSIS allocates samples across the current national residue program sampling structure? Is FSIS allocating the right proportion of samples for the domestic versus the import program?

DR. BOOREN: I'll kick it off.

MR. PUZO: Thank you.

DR. BOOREN: If no one else -- I have no problem starting.

I think the process of what is being done, especially for the Meat Institute, is a good process and it's a great backbone. I think the importance of domestic and import, I like the idea of weighted volume. I think that's very telling, and I think there's further delineation that can be done within the weighted volumes per species.

The import program, I think is going to be a very delicate balance between ensuring that equivalence is being met with your international office. And I think as testing is going through, when I listened to Jane this morning, she talked about certain international countries that

perhaps, are at different levels of equivalence.

My personal recommendation is that a program is -- a process is developed that if you have certain countries that are certain levels of equivalence, that there are stratified sampling programs. For instance, Canada. And this -- wanted on the record, I have nothing against Canada (Laughter), because I have members in Canada. But let's assume Canada drops down in equivalence.

They should have a more -- like a weighted volume. They should have a higher incidence of a certain type of testing until they change their equivalence status. If it's good, it changes. I think that allows the equivalence of the international programs, and it also gives us equal balance as we're trading outside of those countries, as well. Personal thoughts?

DR. BENNETT: So let me -- and this is Patty Bennett with FSIS.

And I will tell you, just so that you know, if this helps your response --

You may correct me if I'm wrong. I believe that the 1,500 samples is really allocated for the first level where either you can target, you can survey, but the -- and by the target, I mean like they say, I think we should do Canada more, because they're not quite as good as New Zealand there. Okay.

But the next two levels, the intensified and increased --

MS. O'KEEFE: Increased and intensified?

DR. BENNETT: That doesn't come out of the 1,500 pool. The labs find the resources to do that. So, in terms of how are we allocating samples, the 1,500 is really a surveillance level of testing --

MS. O'KEEFE: It's the normal.

DR. BENNETT: -- for import. And if we had go mad with sampling, it wouldn't affect that start line of say -- we'll make it 1500, if that's helpful.

DR. RYBOLT: So, it's sort of your inspection generated, if you will. If you get a

positive or something, a trend, then you can allocate more towards that, but --

DR. BENNETT: Labs do.

DR. RYBOLT: Yeah.

DR. BENNETT: Right. Don't ask me how they make it work, but Emilio assures us that the samples are there. If there's an issue -- and on occasion, we have had issues with countries. So, I do know that to affect -- and the system just starts ramping up, and it just gets faster and harder, depending on if we continue to find problems.

DR. RYBOLT: So, I captured some of Betsy's comments here, talking about equivalency balance with equivalency maybe having a stratified sampling pan based on that -- weighted volumes. I don't know what I was writing, but the process of weighting volume by species. I don't know where I was going with that.

Any other thoughts or comments on this one? Add to it. Any disagreement with the general -- we'll have to flesh out what it

actually says after we get the thoughts down.

MR. PUZO: If there aren't any, it seems you also have this -- Dan Puzo, FSIS -- address C. Maybe somebody can articulate the views of the committee and the subcommittee on that.

DR. RYBOLT: Which is --

MR. PUZO: Question two, number C.

DR. RYBOLT: Yeah. Is FSIS allocating samples across slaughter classes effectively?

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. RYBOLT: Yeah, Michael?

DR. CRUPAIN: Michael Crupain from Consumer Reports.

I asked the question earlier. I think it's hard to answer some of these questions without really understanding how you're doing your sampling plan, like in detail. Because I mean, at Consumer Reports, we spend a lot of time sampling things from across the country, and we don't do nationally representative samples, because we find them very difficult to do in food safety, anyway. In other things, we can do it. If we're testing a

car, perhaps.

So, it's hard to know how effective your program is in sort of looking at the state of meat in the United States if we don't know how good this sampling is. But aside from that, I --

DR. BENNETT: May I ask you some questions about that?

DR. CRUPAIN: Yeah.

DR. BENNETT: Because I think for us, the question really becomes -- right now, our focus has been on the primary slaughter classes, right, versus testing everything. And when I say everything, again, if you look at all of the animals that we have jurisdiction over, again, ostriches and geese and --

MS. O'KEEFE: That type of thing.

DR. BENNETT: -- rabbits. Exactly.

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. BENNETT: Right. All those different animals. Years ago, we would try and take a little bit from everybody. A hundred samples here, 200 samples here. So, the question

really, for us is, we stopped doing that as part of the surveillance, and we just said we're going to focus on dairy cows. We're going to focus on beef cows. We're going to focus on workaholics -- swine, you know, old sows.

If we feel a need to test the ratites, then we will go okay, this year -- we haven't tested ratites for a while, so let's set 200, 300 samples over here aside, and we'll run that for a year or six months, get some information. If we're good, we're probably going to stop; not sample them again for another couple of years.

And so in that sense -- and so, that's where I'm not really sure, when you say, I don't know enough about your program. So, we allocate 6,500 samples across nine slaughter classes.

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. RYBOLT: You're talking about scheduled. Right?

DR. BENNETT: Yes.

DR. RYBOLT: Scheduled. That doesn't include the inspection generated.

DR. BENNETT: Right. Okay. So, not to make your life too confusing, when we talk about -- There's actually a couple of tiers in our program, too. That's another something I didn't want to get into. So, tier 1 is kind of the surveillance. That's the 6,500 samples over -- so, 800 samples for each of the nine major slaughter classes.

The inspector generated, in addition to the 200,000 screens that we talk about, what we've also done is kind of created this framework where if you wanted to test rabbits, because we haven't tested them for a few years, we're going to say okay, for this year, we're going to allocate 300 samples. We're going to test rabbits and then we're going to be done.

And so when we talk about -- when we ask for that question, it really becomes, is that an effective way of looking at looking this program, that we focus primarily on the majority of poundage that we slaughter, or whatever, numbers that we slaughter, or would you rather that we go

back -- and we kind of have our fingers in every slaughter class that we have jurisdiction over?

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. CRUPAIN: So, can I --

MS. O'KEEFE: This is Margaret from FSIS. Now, our justification for doing the top nine was those particular slaughter classes covered 95 percent of the meat and poultry consumed. So, that was the initial thought behind selecting those top nine.

SPEAKER: I just want to clarify. So --

DR. CRUPAIN: I think that doing the top nine is -- I don't think you should test rabbits. I don't think you should test other things in proportion -- whatever. You shouldn't test too many samples of those.

Within -- talking about slaughter classes, though, I don't know if it's -- if you test 800 chickens and 800 beef cattle and you slaughter nine billion chickens, I don't know that we're getting the representative sample of chickens, so you can tell me more about that.

But I was getting at more is that we're thinking about chickens or we're thinking about beef, there's a certain number of plants that test them and a certain number of locations in here testing from the largest plants who are owned by a certain group of companies -- are we over sampling from some, because that's where the majority of meat is coming from?

I don't know if that's telling us about meat as a whole or if that's telling us about those four companies where most of the meat comes from, but certainly not all of it.

DR. BENNETT: Okay, Naser, I think that's your question. But I will say, before he starts, depending on the slaughter classes, had he done it with FSIS, you know, the honest truth is, there are some companies that produce the bulk of one of our slaughter classes.

So, you know, and again, maybe if you're asking, what percent of weight do we give to volume. And I mean,if that's your question, great, I mean, maybe we can pull out for you

today. But you know, I think we're kind of corporately owned in a lot of production classes. So, I mean, I think that is our reality.

Now, I'm going to turn this statistical component over to Naser.

MR. ABDELNAJIB: Right. This is Naser Abdelnajib, FSIS. Again, what we were mentioning about is volume driven. I mean, it depends on how many plants associated with every animal classes; whether you have four plants that they produce the bulk of the volume or not, still, every plant will have the probability of selection.

Now, the more you produce, the more likely you are to get one or more samples. Of course, we keep in mind that we will allocate samples across more plants. We are trying to cover more plants, even though if you have the sort of plant that they produce the bulk of it. Okay?

Of course, we also take into consideration what we call the non-response rate. But again, if you talk about bob veal, we have

like -- from the top of my mind, I think we have like 60 plants that produce bob veal, for example, the number could be wrong, versus 600 plants for dairy cows.

So, when we allocate 800 samples, which is what, samples a month or something like that, you talk about 50 samples that are going to be allocated over 600. So chances are, again, the small plant -- they might not get selected, versus bob veal, which means they're going to get hit every month, because you have very few plants. And some of those plants will get more than one sample, as an example. So, it's a volume weight, and it's also based on how many animal plants.

But we don't target specific plants based on their volume. Every plant will be given a weight, a probability weight based on what they produce.

DR. BENNETT: And then statistically speaking, what does 800 represent relative to the nine billion chickens that are produced?

MR. ABDELNAJIB: I'm not sure what --

DR. BENNETT: The statistical -- I mean, that you don't have to sample every animal to know. How many animals do you have to sample in a group to have an idea of what you're looking for, the 300 --

MR. ABDELNAJIB: Again, I'm not sure what is the question, again.

DR. BENNETT: Okay. He asked is 800 samples enough, if we're talking about nine billion birds?

MS. O'KEEFE: Representative samples.

DR. BENNETT: Right.

(Simultaneous discussion)

MR. ABDELNAJIB: Well, when we talk about -- if we talk about the 300 samples, again, the criteria that we have to use for 300 samples is that if the true violation rate is 1 percent, and we found one violation after 300 samples, that means we are 95 percent confident that the true violation rate is less than 1 percent -- more than 1 percent.

Now, with respect to the 800 -- with the

800 samples, we are being more stringent by assuming that the violation rate is much lower. I'm not sure. Does that answer your question?

DR. BENNETT: You know, again, we don't -- there's nobody that samples every single animal that's slaughtered, unless they only slaughter 10 animals. So, I mean, you have to do a representative population when it comes to doing a surveillance. And 800 is almost three times as much as the standard, which is 300 samples.

So you know, I think in that respect, I'd say whether it's nine billion or nine trillion or nine -- okay, maybe not nine, 900, I still think that I would -- I think as an agency, we still stand behind it. Eight hundred is a solid number to have an idea of what's going on collectively; maybe not specifically in a plant or specifically with a particular company or whatever.

But if you disagree, then you disagree. So --

DR. RYBOLT: Well, Michael?

MR. LINK: This is Michael Link with the Ohio Department of Agriculture.

This might be a follow-up to Brian's, to a certain extent. Like these numbers here are representative of only FSIS generated samples. It doesn't incorporate the state generated samples.

SPEAKER: This is the KIS --

(Simultaneous discussion)

MR. ABDELNAJIB: This is the inspector generated program for January through September, 2013.

MR. LINK: For USDA only?

MR. ABDELNAJIB: USDA only, yes.

MR. LINK: Okay. So, and I think the earlier question was, you're scheduling a certain amount of samples, and it's based on volume, and it doesn't matter from a federal side if it's a small, very small or large establishment. They're all grouped together, and then the numbers are punched out to what -- how many samples are going to be generated from a plant.

Have you ever compared -- because we

have that information or should have this information, the majority of the plants that the states inspect are very small volume establishments. And compared -- the number that the states are collecting on these to the same size plants in the USDA system to see if you're actually getting a fair look at those small -- very small plants,that you're not losing some of those ones with -- like what Brian just talked about.

MR. ABDELNAJIB: This is not something that we emphasize. Are you saying that the state -- they do something -- I mean, if it's a similar program and it's a inspector directed sample like --

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. BENNETT: Just testing -- if they're doing their own testing.

MR. ABDELNAJIB: They do that? What --

MR. LINK: We're doing -- like what your directives are saying as far as --

MR. ABDELNAJIB: Right.

MR. LINK: -- these scheduled samples.

MR. ABDELNAJIB: Right.

MR. LINK: We're following the same schedule.

MR. ABDELNAJIB: Okay.

MR. LINK: And sending them to the USDA labs for testing. Well, we'll do the KIS test and then we'll send them -- some of them will send -- so my question is --

MR. ABDELNAJIB: Right.

MR. LINK: -- for those tests, have you compared the small, very small plants at the state level to the same percentage of samples being collected in the large -- in the federal system in the same size plants?

MR. ABDELNAJIB: No. I think the quick answer is no, we do not do that.

DR. BENNETT: But I also think there's not that many KIS tests being submitted by state plants.

MR. ABDELNAJIB: That's true as well, yes.

DR. BENNETT: There's very few. Your one chart that you have, where you have colgen and state and KIS and fast, there's very few that are submitted by state. I mean, it's -- most of the states that we do business with -- this is Patty Bennett with FSIS -- they rely on us to do all of their samples.

There is some KIS tests being done, or whatever they're using. Most of them are using KIS. But I don't -- honestly, I don't know that we would have enough of a number to make it a significant comparison. It's something we could look at, but -- I don't know. I don't know that it would be significant.

DR. SINGH: Yeah, this is Manpreet Singh with Purdue University, and I just wanted to follow up on the question that we're discussing here as -- you know, and building on Betsy's comment is, you know, the sampling -- the amount of sampling which is done across slaughter species, yeah, we're weighing the volume of production.

But again, how much of it is data driven also, saying historical data of what you're seeing from residues, and then allocating the number of samples?

DR. BENNETT: For the domestic schedule or the import?

DR. SINGH: It could be for domestic or for import.

DR. BENNETT: For domestic scheduled, the slate is wiped clean every year. The domestic part hasn't -- the violations have no bearing on the domestic scheduling.

DR. SINGH: So, the base -- sorry, this is Manpreet Singh again.

Like whatever baseline -- I'm going to call it baseline data.

DR. BENNETT: Sure.

DR. SINGH: So, you have -- whatever baseline data you have collected over, let's say 2012, 2013, would that have any bearing on how you schedule these samples for the upcoming years or upcoming programs?

DR. BENNETT: Not the scheduled portion. But for the domestic side. Of course, it does impact what happens on the import side. Does that make sense?

MS. O'KEEFE: Because it will increase --

DR. SINGH: Yeah, but --

MS. O'KEEFE: -- if the find a violation.

DR. BENNETT: So with the scheduled program -- I'm sorry, go ahead.

DR. RYBOLT: So, we're talking here to emphasize allocation sanctions across slaughter classes, effectively. And what your question is, is who will use -- prior to your results or historical data to schedule domestic samples to 800, or whatever?

DR. BENNETT: Mm-hmm.

DR. RYBOLT: Do we re-allocate so many of those the following year to a different slaughter class, given the incidence that we saw the prior year? And the answer is no.

DR. BENNETT: No.

DR. RYBOLT: That's not currently done.

SPEAKER: There's 800, and that's it.

DR. BENNETT: Yeah, right. Since 2012, we have made the decision to do 800. Right? So for the last couple of years. So it's eight every -- you know, the class starts all over again. Right? So, 800 across the major slaughter classes, irrespective of what we might have found for violations like the inspector generated report.

MR. PUZO: Hi. This is Dan Puzo, the moderator -- Something that has come up in a number of your comments is about small plants and whether or not they're tested sufficiently. Maybe somebody wants to address that as a sub-bullet to question 1B, because a number of you continue to bring up this issue of small plants. And they're not particularly targeted to this 800 sampling, or whatever the actual figure may be.

Is that an issue that concerns any of you? And if not, that's fine, but --

MR. SAPP: This is Brian Sapp with White Oak Pastures.

First off, Dr. Singh, I think brings up a good point. We'll go back down to that -- the question we're working on there. You know, if we're seeing you know, on the surveillance program -- you know, if we're seeing -- you know, if you got -- so you're having 800 tests designated for each slaughter class.

DR. BENNETT: The major ones, yes.

MR. SAPP: And it wipes clean at the beginning of every year. But let's say that in the years 2010, '11, '12, '13, you know, we're seeing you know, 6 or 8 percent positive in the dairy cow industry, and you know, less than a half percent in the young turkeys. Why not allocate some more of those turkey tests to the dairy cow testing program, to make sure that we're really getting a representative sample of what the dairy industry looks like? Is that kind of what you're alluding to?

DR. SINGH: Yes, I was trying to get --

this is Manpreet Singh again. I was trying to get a better understanding of -- does any historical data play into how you design the scheduled test?

DR. BENNETT: Not the scheduled portion.

DR. RYBOLT: All the plants would be inspector generated, because the inspector would use the historical and then, the imports.

DR. BENNETT: Right.

DR. RYBOLT: Those are the only two places where historicals also play into it.

DR. BOOREN: I was going to -- this is Betsy with the Meat Institute.

I've been -- in my head, and I don't know if this is helpful, but in my head, I see the domestic and import is really baseline data. And the challenge with switching that 800 samples from a process standpoint, as someone who looks at historical data to help with trends, we change that dataset in a way.

And it makes it very difficult to look back for trends. The inspector generated is, I think, getting at the smaller plant issue or the

volume weighted. If you have four or five establishments that produce 99 percent of that product class, it's like that the best resources are there, and we're going to see more samples from that. That's where I'm leaning towards from a weighted standpoint.

I'm hesitant from a statistical standpoint. It's been a while since I've done this in real world time. But changing some of those population sets, what does that do to the baseline data? I'm not saying it can't be done, but I think any recommendation we make should be very thoughtful, because it does change how we review historical data and how we compare it with future data.

I'm not saying it shouldn't be done, but we need to be thoughtful about that, because we changed the context of the data.

DR. BENNETT: And so something else that I think -- Patty Bennett with FSIS. You know, there is something -- do you remember when I talked about with the inspector generated program,

is that we don't set limits. It's at the discretion of the inspectors.

It's when we talk about the KIS testing. Now, if we're doing a discreet program, like we're going to look at rabbits, or we're going to look at sheep or goats, we're directing that from headquarters. But that's very discreet. It's finite, and it's going to go away most likely after a year. Right?

But if we're talking about the inspector generators where it's happening in the plant, if we give them guidance, it's at their discretion. So, that is something else. And I don't know, Dan -- and if this isn't our perfect question, you know, please, and you say -- don't answer it.

I don't -- again, we can't test every animal. I mean, and that's to me, a waste of resources. So, I'm very curious. We already test 800 animals as a representation of all of these populations. How is testing a thousand or 1,500 more really, really telling anything more about the health of that population? And I don't think

the purpose of the surveillance is to go looking for problems.

I mean, again, I just want to know, how are we doing? And if there's a problem, I'm going to go down that road and start targeting. So, I'm very curious. And I'm not a statistician. So if you go, you know, Patty, 800 really isn't a good sample and you should do 3,000 if your population is 9 billion, great. I'd love to understand that.

But as little as I know of statistics, as I understand it, that 800 is a good thing, when we say, I'm not testing every animal. I'm not trying to test most of the animals. I'm trying to get a representative peek at these slaughter classes. So, I'm curious. And Dan, if that's not a perfect question, then I take it off the table.

MR. PUZO: Well, that's for the -- and we need members to answer.

MR. SAPP: Brian Sapp with White Oak Pastures. I really think -- yeah, I can see where Dr. Singh is coming from, and then when you brought up the point of you're messing with the

historical data, I'm in total agreement. But I think that if you are sampling at you know, 800 per slaughter class, and then you're going back and looking at those numbers and targeting, you know, some of those slaughter classes with more testing, I think that's all you can do.

I mean, I really think that's a representative sample of what we're seeing in the industry, and then you're targeting, you know, some of those slaughter classes more than others, you know, through the KIS testing and in plant testing. So, I really don't think there's anything else that you could do.

MS. O'KEEFE: And this is Margaret O'Keefe, FSIS. If we were to see a situation like, you know, if we saw a great increase in the scheduled slaughter, that would automatically parlay more samples into what we would call the two two. So, we would investigate it that way, if we were to see a trend or something like that. So, we would have that ability.

DR. BENNETT: But then again, I think

that is a recommendation. I think we could possibly be more aggressive about doing that. I don't know that we're as aggressive as we could be. I'll be honest. I don't know that we'd do that. But if that's something that you feel strongly that that would be an important way to address what you're seeing with the 800 samples, absolutely. And that would be something that we would certainly -- if that's what comes out of your recommendation, I think that's something for us to consider, because not to make this even more complicated, even with the inspector generated, it's very different. Right?

I mean, what I see at headquarters is very different than you know, Dr. Smith sees in the one plant that he or she is in all the time, or even the circuit. And it's my impression that the inspector generated samples, sometimes the results represent the microcosm of the PHVs and that plant or that circuit or that whatever district, right, versus what I think maybe perhaps we're talking about right here, is saying you

know, as we step back and we go, hmm, you know, maybe we could certainly be more aggressive at it at a headquarters level to say we're still having problems with dairy cows, in spite of the level of testing that we're getting to the inspector generated sampling.

Sure, I think that would be a different way of looking at it.

MR. SAPP: And Brian Sapp, White Pastures, just real quick. Testing is not solving the problem.

DR. BENNETT: Absolutely.

MR. SAPP: You know? It's giving us the window of opportunity to say, okay, we've got a problem here. Now, how do we fix it? You know, the testing and the results that you're giving us are not fixing the problem.

(Simultaneous discussion)

MR. SAPP: So you know, any information -- I mean, all you've got to do is say hey, we're having you know, a problem in the dairy case. You know? And then we need to fix it. You know, it's

not just, hey, we're still having a problem in the dairy class next year.

I think that you know, that's the main goal of this reporting is, tell us where the problems are. And then, let's find a way to fix it, not just let's raise our hand every year and say, we still have this problem.

DR. BENNETT: And I will say, to industry's defense -- this is Patty Bennett, again, with FSIS.

I think industry -- and I think I've noticed over the last couple of years, I think since we've moved the problem over to these more multi analytic methods, industry is very hip to the changes, especially like the shifts in antibiotics. There have been a lot of discussions about, are we increasing the use of antibiotics or changing our choice of antibiotics or see all of the above. And why are we doing that?

And that's just not conversations with FSIS, because you know, we're collecting the samples, analyzing and reporting out, and taking

care of it at a plant level. But the stuff that's going on with Farmer Brown and the veterinarian, you know, have those conversations going, what is FDA doing in terms of changing drug approval or drug usage or the cost. Right?

I mean, you know, let's face it. If I can get my hands on it and it's cheap, it's a great drug. And I practice. I understand that. It's not throwing stones. And so, I think having those conversations and then being aware of how we raise the animals, how we use drugs, what's allowed, withdrawal periods, cost, those are very important aspects that should come out of the conversations, that should come out of the information that we're finding in these samples.

DR. RYBOLT: So, does somebody want to try to take a stab at an answer to this question based on what we just talked about, or this last one anyway? Are we allocating samples across classes effectively? I just captured comments that were made.

MR. SAPP: Brian Sapp, White Oak

Pastures. I'll take a stab and say yes. I think they're allocating them correctly. You know, as long as they're you know, using that information to you know, further target problem areas, I think that's kind of all we can do at this point.

DR. RYBOLT: Anybody disagree with that?

(No response heard)

DR. BOOREN: This is Betsy with the Meat Institute.

I would generally agree with that. I think the baseline data is really important to understand, and that will direct the regulatory agency to take a variety of actions, or then inform other agencies like APHIS or other ones to go on farm and evaluate. You know, we're taking establishment samples. FSIS does not have purview on farm. So, this is a way of helping communicate across different regulatory agencies, issues on the whole continuum. I'm supportive of that.

DR. RYBOLT: So, the subcommittee believes that the FSIS is appropriately allocating samples across slaughter classes effectively per

the domestic scheduled sampling program. Does that answer the question?

DR. BENNETT: Are you satisfied with our focus on major, instead of -- well, what we did before was everything?

DR. RYBOLT: Major and minor, yeah.

DR. BENNETT: So, just curious about that.

DR. RYBOLT: I've got to get to the last part, too.

MR. PUZO: Thoughts on the major? Dr. Marcy?

DR. MARCY: Yeah, John Marcy, University of Arkansas.

Yeah, I would agree with what Betsy was saying in relation to you know, it needs to be a baseline, you know, which goes back to, that this needs to be a random sampling. You know, you've got market classes that you're targeting, but you need to make sure you're capturing at a random basis, you know, different from your inspector generated, which is bias sampling. You know, so

it needs to be inferential.

DR. BENNETT: And that you're comfortable with -- because do base a little bit on weight. I mean, there is a weighted component of probability in the test that's just kind of exposure. So I give anybody (Inaudible) getting to more than two seconds. Does that --

DR. MARCY: On which plant or which market?

DR. BENNETT: Well, it's across the board. Right?

DR. MARCY: Yeah.

DR. BENNETT: So again, like Naser was explaining, it depends on the number of plants and the total volume and all that kind of stuff.

DR. MARCY: Yeah, but that's still not targeted, per se.

DR. RYBOLT: Yeah.

DR. MARCY: Other than volume.

DR. BENNETT: Other than volume. That's the question --

SPEAKER: And not to make trouble, but

it's something --

DR. BENNETT: Oh no.

DR. RYBOLT: Yeah, let me go to Dr. Vetter. I think earlier she kind of sat quietly.

DR. VETTER: That's okay.

SPEAKER: Dana.

DR. RYBOLT: You need to come up here so we can hear.

DR. VETTER: I'm pretty loud (Laughter).

DR. RYBOLT: She's got headphones on.

DR. VETTER: Dana Vetter representing NAFV. I kind of had a question earlier, and I'm not sure what we do or if we've looked at it, because what I heard the discussion being around is, is there a greater risk with small establishments that may have a smaller volume than larger establishments, where we're kind of doing more of our sampling, because of the volume weights.

Is that something that we've ever looked at?

DR. BENNETT: That's a great question.

I'm not sure that we've looked at it specifically in that way, and I think that's something -- that would be something very important. I mean, I would love to go back. Your perspective of this being a recommendation of yours is going back and saying, okay, if we divide it out by small, how many violations do we see relative to what the big guys are giving us.

And assuming -- because some of the large plants truly produce a lot of product. So we can do that and look. So I think my thing is, on top of my head again, so that we kind of preserve the sanctity of a baseline, if that becomes your recommendation, is that again, maybe that's something we can address with our tier two kind of concept, and do some additional targeting if we're finding that the very small plants struggle.

MS. O'KEEFE: And actually -- this is Margaret O'Keefe, FSIS. And actually, Dana, that's a good point many years ago, there was a study by Dr. Jay Votella. Jay, I believe we did a

small project like that, and it might be in one of the reg books I mean, it would be all (Inaudible) toward reviewing or --

(Simultaneous discussion)

MS. O'KEEFE: But I believe something like that was done, and I'll go through the reg books and look at what year.

DR. BENNETT: And it may be something -- again, not to take us too much off, is also looking -- because not every slaughter class is the same. So, you know, maybe we can break it down and maybe start with the major slaughter classes, maybe do a section, or maybe do like a species or something, and kind of work our through and see what information we have. And that might be something that we can report back to you next year.

Again, regardless of what you guys recommend, I think it's kind of curious. And Naser, looks like he's very excited about doing it, so (Laughter) -- so, yeah, if you can -- I'll actually write that down, and then we can look

into that.

MR. PUZO: But is that something the committee wants to put in the report?

DR. RYBOLT: I was going to say, I think we ought to put it in the report.

MR. PUZO: Yeah.

DR. BENNETT: So that would be kind of like our homework assignment?

MR. PUZO: I mean, you can give us a recommendation for us to -- material for that.

DR. BENNETT: Okay.

MS. MASTERS: Barb Masters, OFW. I was going to recommend that you put it in question one as not necessarily that you're saying the -- there's room for improvement. Just a suggestion on B.

Dan had asked earlier about recommendations and all the small plant information. I think the recommendation is that the agency evaluate whether or not there's more findings in small plants in the domestic scheduled sampling program to look at their own data, as

well as the state scheduled sampling program, and look at those datasets and use that information to determine whether or not there's areas for improvement in their scheduled sampling program.

DR. BENNETT: Great. Sounds good. Naser, did you have a comment?

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. BENNETT: Okay, Naser is just excited (Laughter). Okay.

DR. CRUPAIN: I'll just make my comment.

MR. PUZO: Sure, go ahead.

DR. CRUPAIN: It's Michael Crupain from Consumer Reports.

MS. MASTERS: Imports, as well.

DR. BENNETT: Okay.

(Discussion off the record)

DR. RYBOLT: Domestic and import?

DR. CRUPAIN: So, I think your sample size probably is good enough. I think what I was trying to say, maybe I wasn't saying it well before, is if you're thinking about chickens, and there's four companies that produce the majority

of chickens -- I'm not sure what percentage of the entire market they have, but I know there's four that have a huge portion of the market.

So, if the plants from them just keep getting hit over and over again, then maybe sampling 60 percent of the market, but 40 percent of the market is coming from these smaller plants that you're not sampling. So, I don't know if that's the case or not, so that's what I'm trying to curious (sic).

Because that's when -- like when I tested chicken, that's what I did. I tested the four major brands and a scattering of smaller ones, but I didn't say that this was a representative sample. I said I had a sample from these four brands, and then I knew a little bit more.

Now, I don't know if that's -- that's somewhat important, I think, if you're going to call -- as a baseline, you're going to talk about the industry as a whole. But you're probably getting a good estimate of that with your 800s. I

think it's just important to recognize the limitations of it. And then the other thing I was going to say -- I forget. That was it.

DR. BENNETT: This is Patty Bennett with FSIS. Sorry, guys for just interrupting.

Well first, we would be -- they would pull our fingernails out if we actually said officially baseline, so we can't really say officially baseline (Laughter). And I don't think we've ever tried to say baseline. And actually, that brings up another thing, something we have kicked around with the agency, as well.

Do we need to do a baseline targeting chemical residues, and doing it proper so that we really do have -- we've sampled across the board the way you do it baseline, which is different than the algorithm that we use for sampling. So you're right. I mean, if you're saying that, and you're saying I don't think this is a baseline, I agree with you completely. This isn't a baseline. Not interview baseline.

But if we should do a baseline and

that's something, like I said, we have thought about, you know, maybe that is something -- again, it doesn't have to be a recommendation. Something that we have kicked around in OPHS, and you know, maybe it's past time to focus on some of the chemical hazards -- maybe antibiotics or something?

I mean, maybe it's easy because we have multi analytic methods. And you know, if we agree we can find 5,000 samples and test a production class or something, you know, maybe that's something that we can do and see how that impacts the algorithm that we use now. And yeah, I guess I don't need to make your recommendations for you, but you know, (Laughter) It's a thought.

DR. BOOREN: Michael, I was going to -- this is Betsy with the Meat Institute.

I know what you're saying, and I think your concern is addressed when they do the volume weighted, because it's not companies, it's the whole population of that class. And so, they'll look within, and they'll look at all the different

-- they'll make sure all the establishments are tested within that class. So, knowing what I know from the pathogen side, I feel pretty comfortable with the weighted volume. I think we're getting -- of all of the testing we get, probably one of the more representative of that population, of that species in that type of testing.

One of the things that -- and I'm going to jump down a little to number three, if you don't mind, because you brought up a point that struck with me. On unknown chemicals, I think the domestic and the international program -- you know, one of the concerns that I hear from industry is, you may not have levels that exceed regulation, but there are a lot of questions on why is that level there.

I think it's good to understand within the domestic and international what type of residues are present within the meat. But I think we need to be very careful on can you take regulatory action on that. And so, I don't have a problem per se with -- we only know what we know

until we recognize we don't know it.

And I think the domestic import program allows us to do sort of that general population testing that may pick up some of those unknowns. But how that data is used, that's a different discussion, but I think it's good that the agency is considering that, because we don't know what the next major hazard would be. And I would assume that the domestic and international program would be the first program to maybe pick up something, if we didn't know that there was a large event.

I mean, if there was a train accident and we had chemicals and we knew that there was targeted -- but that type of -- the domestic and import program is the best program probably, to see if we're seeing new peaks of something.

DR. BENNETT: This is Patty Bennett with FSIS. So Betsy, again, you understand that the -- our methods right now, they only find what we ask them to find.

DR. BOOREN: Right.

DR. BENNETT: So, there's no unknown peaks. And so that was our question.

Do you think it is worth putting -- again, let me just resource into saying -- maybe we need to invest into a method or pay a school or pay somebody to look into a method where we're looking for peaks to go, okay, so what's normal, so that we can say, gosh, we've always seen these peaks, but that's a weird peak. Is that worth pursuing?

And again, I don't -- for us, I think the concern is what's coming in through the feed. Right? I mean, that's where these animals could possibly get exposed. And I think working in this agency, when the mistakes happen -- you know, I meant to grab a blue bag and I grabbed a red bag. So, what does that mean? But these mistakes do happen. I mean, we've been doing this for several years, and people, instead of putting in the food grade oil, they put in the diesel oil, and you worry about dioxins. Right? And that's something that happens in Europe, so it's not a United

States thing.

Or you know, again, it's mostly a feed thing. You think, well, what if they give a supplement? They meant to put this in, but they put in that. Or you know, maybe the intentional adulteration thing or something like that. So that's kind of where that goes.

You know, do you think that we should put energy trying to stay on top of that, knowing that is a little bit elusive. Right? I don't know what I'm looking for until I trip over it.

DR. BOOREN: Well, then my recommendation would be -- and open for the subcommittee, would be that the samples that are taken within the domestic group, that is something to emphasize beliefs (sic) they need to do; that it seems to me that the historical samples taken within this program might be the most appropriate, versus inspector generated.

DR. BENNETT: Okay, got it. Okay.

DR. BOOREN: Because you would then have a clear sample set across species. It's clear to

understand, as well.

MS. O'KEEFE: This is Margaret O'Keefe, FSIS. To expand on what Dr. Bennett was saying, one thinks that we're very good with things that are regulated. We're good with that. We can evaluate those, and you know, we can put them in the method. Are there (Inaudible) that we're missing, (Inaudible), things like -- I mean, that we wouldn't necessarily -- that we should be aware of, and that -- I mean, if the group could think about that, also.

I mean, are we missing -- we know we have veterinary drugs. You know, we have this at great ranges, and our methods are very broad and encompassing now. Are we missing anything, also, as far as unknown chemicals to --

DR. RYBOLT: I'm trying to get an answer to the question, first. Is this on this one?

DR. VETTER: Yes.

DR. RYBOLT: Okay.

(Discussion off the record)

DR. VETTER: Dana Vetter, NAFV.

Recently, and I haven't read the entire report, and maybe I shouldn't bring it up, but there was an OIG report on chemical residues, and it touched on FDA and FSIS. And I've not read the entire report, but one of the things that stuck out in reading the news article on it is, for example, one of the most commonly used defoliants in agriculture is something that is not actually tested for, and I'm wondering if it's possible that we have that same sort of issue in our feed.

So, I personally think it might be worthwhile at least knowing that what we're testing for compared to what's being most commonly used -- is there some way to compare that and make sure that we're not missing something?

DR. BENNETT: The most commonly used in feed? The most commonly used in production animals?

DR. VETTER: In feed or in production animals. I would say in feed, because like you said, that's usually where the residue is coming from. It could be a spray, possibly, but more

likely in our meat and poultry, it's feed. And so, is there something that's changed historically that we might not be aware of?

DR. BENNETT: So, this is Patty Bennett with FSIS. So, I think for us, the genesis of that question is really melamine.

DR. VETTER: Melamine?

DR. BENNETT: I mean, that's it. And so that's why it's just a difficult question, just because you don't know -- I mean, I don't know who's trying to do something with it that we wouldn't want them to do. So, that's why it's kind of a difficult question.

Should we focus on what we know (Inaudible) because of history, because EPA asked us to look at a slew of pesticides and FDA wants us to look at vet drugs? Or, do we need to set aside some money and chase after the next melamine? That's really the hard -- does that make sense?

DR. BENNETT: I mean, maybe it's a needle in the haystack, and --

DR. RYBOLT: Go ahead, Patricia.

DR. CURTIS: Pat Curtis, Auburn University. How often do you evaluate these common ones that you're going to look at, and you know, determine if something should be added or something should be removed?

DR. BENNETT: So, let's see. We actually talk about it a lot, because our labs need time to roll the chemicals into the thing. So, the conversations kind of go, EPA says, hey, we need you to do these exposure assessments. These are the pesticides we're interested in.

And FDA says, hey, we brought some new chemicals -- veterinary drugs on the market. We think -- we're worried about them getting abused, because of the next new toy. So, we should roll them into the method. And then, you know, what Meg had hinted at before, it's us kind of sitting there saying, are there other things that we need to consider, and can we get some exposure information or roll them into the methods?

So, I would say that it's an ongoing

conversation. Our labs are constantly working on the methods. They're constantly -- they're extending them to all of the different species that we have, or they're constantly making the methods better, or they're constantly adding chemicals to the methods, based on something FDA wants or EPA wants.

It's not as structured as I would like it to be. A lot of it is kind of the demands of our trading -- or our sister agencies. And we are actually working on trying to develop a more structured framework, where we kind of sit there and say, you know, these are the chemical hazards that people say that they're worried about, filtering them down to, we think they would get into our products, and then we think they would get into our products at a level that we should be testing, because we need to make sure that they're not exceeding a CD level. Does that help at all?

DR. CURTIS: Yeah. It just seems like there should be some point at which you do an evaluation to determine, you know, it's sort of --

DR. BENNETT: We've actually been working on that for a couple of years. We actually went to the FDA Food Safety Advisor Committee as part of a charge that FDA had. And one of the questions that we had asked was, we wanted to use a logit model. I don't know if you're familiar with that.

DR. CURTIS: Mm-hmm.

DR. BENNETT: And we have many variables. You know, NOAELs, LOAELs, tolerances, historical data, that kind of thing. So, that's something that we're still considering, can we use that as this initial -- let's take everybody's wish list, run it through this prioritization model, get a list of these chemicals, and then, just start having to make the hard decisions of you know, can you lump any -- all of the veterinarian -- veterinary drugs, because then you think about in terms of methods and say, well it's better for our labs to spend a year extending the method to these 50 vet drugs as opposed to 50 different drugs that might require a different

method.

So, we're working on that, but it's not fully out there.

DR. MARCY: John March, University of Arkansas. Now, I think you've hit a lot on what it is that -- you know, you're not a research group.

DR. BENNETT: No, not at all.

DR. MARCY: You've got memorandums of understanding with people that are -- seem to be pointing -- you know, we wish you would do this.

DR. BENNETT: Mm-hmm. Yeah.

DR. MARCY: And I like the way that Margaret put it. You know, we know what we're good. We're good at doing the regulatory part. You know, there is a branch of USDA that is research and it's a matter of funding. But I wouldn't want you to take your dollars to do it.

DR. BENNETT: And some of it's timing, too. Right?

DR. MARCY: Yeah.

DR. BENNETT: I mean, it's -- sure, we

can get into the queue, but in the meantime -- and that's something, too, with our labs that they constantly say to us. They say, what is it that you want us to do? And we're saying, okay, we're trying to get this framework established so it's less knee jerk and what EPA or FDA want when the call us.

DR. MARCY: Yes. Mm-hmm.

DR. BENNETT: And that is more systematic and thoughtful. But while we're busy trying to put that in place, the labs are going, so what do you want me to do. And like okay, fine, just keep adding to the method. And then, at the end of you're like, ugh, okay. How did that work for us? You know?

DR. MARCY: Sure.

DR. BENNETT: But I still think it's -- I think having these multi analytic methods onboard, being able to test one sample against all of these methods, it's really opened the door for us. I think even though violations have gone up somewhat, because the methods are good enough to

detect things that they wouldn't have detected with past -- the other methods, I still sit back and go, even though we are looking at pesticides and vet drugs and metals and now we've added hormones -- yes, I know, part of the vet drug thing.

But it's not like the violations went through the roof. They didn't. Right? We have more information. So, I mean, I still feel like walking away, it's like I think we do a really good job keeping our food safe. Could we improve? Yeah, absolutely. Right? And that's why we're here before you guys. And so really, it's just like, you know, what's the best way to spend our time? Spend tax dollars and money?

DR. RYBOLT: So, would your recommendation be that they keep doing what they're doing?

DR. MARCY: Yes, that's it --

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. RYBOLT: And if they knew -- known is (sic) arises, then it would actually be part of

the program. But that's not really their focus. Is that what I'm hearing? Yes? No?

DR. CRUPAIN: I have a question. This is Michael Crupain from Consumer Reports. I have a question.

If the purpose of the scheduled sampling isn't really to do a baseline, what is the purpose? How do you use that? And maybe it is better if it's not that useful as a baseline -- maybe it is better to do a baseline and then stop doing it and use that money for something else.

DR. BENNETT: Okay.

DR. CRUPAIN: Is that --

DR. BENNETT: I think for us, it's -- again, it's a survey. I mean, we're surveying these products on an annual basis, looking for something above what we normally see. I mean, we have 30 something years of reporting the information, and it's saying, has anything changed? I mean, when we talk about the shift in antibiotic use, and you know, we see very few pesticide hits over the last years.

But here's the other thing, too. So, let's talk about this from another perspective; trade. So, when we go and do business with New Zealand or Canada, immediately, they're like, so what's your sampling program? And our answer cannot be we have a targeted program. Not gonna fly. So that's something else to consider.

They're going to want to know, we want a surveillance program. We have a surveillance program. You're going to have a surveillance program. So, some of it's politics. And I don't think it's bad politics, because it's kind of saying hey, by and large, out of all the stuff that we produce, all the samples that we take, here's what it looks like. And then when there's trouble, here's what the trouble looks like and how we chase it down.

MS. O'KEEFE: This is Margaret, FSIS. We also get a lot of information from the -- our risk assessors use it, because even though we're not maybe seeing a violation, if we see level of it, that's what we were calling a non violative

positive. That still gives us a lot of information. They're still using the drug. If it's that high we can detect it, they're like maybe on the edge, like they're just -- I mean, they know when to withdraw.

And we need to be aware of those things, and we can keep our eye on that and maybe -- so we do get a lot of information from that.

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. BENNETT: Meg makes a good point. And the FDA pays attention to the levels, as well. Right? So even the non violatives, because again, it really helps. A lot of times we struggle with withdrawal levels, and that's a big part of the conversation that we have with industry relative to vet drugs in saying, you know, we followed the withdrawal levels and we still got busted for a violation.

And being able to have that exposure information actually is useful. So you know, again, is it a baseline? No, not really. Is it meant to be a baseline? No. Is it useful

information? I think so, and I still stand behind it. And then again, politically, it's almost a necessity. You know, certainly if your recommendation was we don't think you should do this; you should do something else, okay.

DR. BOOREN: Michael, I was --

MS. O'KEEFE: This is Margaret again. We also see -- we can see, like, I guess you would call it like a cocktail. They're not just using one. We find multiple drugs, and they're not always the violation. But oftentimes, we'll see a sample that has penicillin or more than one drug in it, also, and that gives us information, which is --

DR. BOOREN: Michael, I was --

MR. PUZO: At this time -- this is Dan Puzo, the moderator. I just want to remind you all that your deliberations and the conversation you'll all have with your colleagues tomorrow and the committee, these recommendations go to the administrator, and then ultimately, to the secretary of agriculture.

So, I think right now, we're starting to come down to earth where we need you all to be somewhere higher in elevation. And there are no limits to what you can recommend, or there are no lack of resources, potentially, that you can request we enlist. So, I think that after the break, and we're going to break right now -- there's a new service of coffee and tea for all of you folks out there.

And anyway, we will break now and return at quarter after three, and a lot of work has been done; great conversation. So, we will reconvene in about 15 minutes. Thank you.

(Recess)

MR. PUZO: All right, all the committee members are here, so we can reconvene.

Madam Chairwoman, would you like to --

DR. BOOREN: We're ready. Let's go.

MR. PUZO: What would you like to start off with?

DR. BOOREN: I would say, I think from the standpoint -- well, we've had some good

discussion. When do we have to be in the other room?

MR. PUZO: Four thirty.

DR. BOOREN: Four thirty. Let's be a little bit targeted here. I think we've had some good dialogue, if it leads to other things. But I think as an advisory committee, we can put forth recommendations, and I think we -- Dr. Masters put forward a couple.

When I was having a break, one of the recommendations I would put up a little earlier, but let's go through these and fine tune them so some of us don't have to do homework tonight.

SPEAKER: That's good.

DR. BOOREN: Because I have a feeling it might be me and Michael (Laughter).

DR. RYBOLT: It would be.

DR. BOOREN: It would be.

DR. RYBOLT: I just volunteered the time, but I didn't say all mine.

DR. BOOREN: What was clear to me as we had the discussion, and I think -- I find value in

the National Residue Program. I find value in what you're doing. What became evident as we were breaking is that I don't think people know what it is, and I think part of the challenge that we just spent in the first two hours was understanding what's being done and why it's being done.

And I think one of the recommendations I would make to the secretary would be a clear, concise way of explaining this program to stakeholders.

DR. BENNETT: Okay.

DR. BOOREN: And I've given the same recommendation to CBM, and I charge you with this as well as CBM. They put out very similar reports on antibiotic use. You have to be really in the weeds to understand all of that. I think you have a lot of valuable data that tells a great story, but it needs to be summarized in a way that is friendly to the average consumer, or many times, press.

But you need to explain what this program is, because I think that will add value on

a lot of these things. That's just my personal recommendation to start off the bat, because when I listened to everyone is, everyone saw value in the program. We were getting into the nuances, and I think that this program should be kept. But I think we need to do a better way of explaining what it is just outside of just FSIS and the staff.

DR. BENNETT: Okay.

DR. BOOREN: And I'll start off with that. But I agree with generally, the approach, but that's one of the recommendations I would forward.

MR. PUZO: And when you suggested group communications or a start of communications, you were saying to industry, academia, the public.

DR. BOOREN: I would say industry --

MR. PUZO: Or all?

DR. BOOREN: I would say allied stakeholders, and that to me, includes all of that. I think when you are reporting out, I know you do quarterly reports.

DR. BENNETT: Mm-hmm.

DR. BOOREN: But I think there's value -- those that know what the red and the blue book are, I think having a user friendly, and I say this example -- if my mom can understand this --

DR. BENNETT: Okay.

DR. BOOREN: -- generally speaking. But those are top lines. You know, this gets reported in the media, and I spent more time as a staff person explaining what it means, and I think you would have more value and the importance -- more people would support the program that when you're reporting out, that there is some sort of consumer friendly, media friendly summary that goes out, as well as to the industry that it supports. Is that clear as mud?

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. BENNETT: I have a question. This is Patty Bennett with FSIS.

So, I need to make it understandable to my parents and your parents, or I need to make it understandable to everybody at this table? And I

think that's slightly -- of course, you would understand better than my parents.

DR. BOOREN: I think there's two. I think one, you need to make the industry understand what's going on and why.

DR. BENNETT: Okay.

DR. BOOREN: And I don't think there's a clear understanding.

DR. BENNETT: Okay, okay.

DR. BOOREN: But two, this report does get reported out, and there also needs to be -- and I would recommend, if you're looking for a way, I think CBM has done a better job reporting out the NARMS report that they put out.

DR. BENNETT: Okay.

DR. BOOREN: They've made it much more consumer user friendly. And that's a challenging topic, and I think there are parallels in how you talk about, report out data that there might be a good conversation to have with CBM, and I'm happy to provide you contacts.

DR. BENNETT: And I'd say that's a very

fair comment. I think I looked at the quarterly report. We were very excited to put the quarterly report out, but I was gearing it towards Scott Goltry. I mean, that was his report, so it wasn't for any of you. And if you didn't already know about the NRP, then it would make no sense to you. But you're right. Okay, that's a good --

DR. BOOREN: But the context is needed.

DR. BENNETT: Yeah, okay. Fair enough.

DR. SINGH: This is Manpreet Singh, and I do want to second what Betsy just said, because I feel it's important from the communication perspective. Yes, academia, everybody on the table understanding it, that's a different situation. But like you said, parents -- like you put in the terminology of parents understanding it, because there's a lot more -- the term they use now is influencers. And those influencers are, you know, bloggers who are putting information out there without knowing it.

And if we put it in those terms that they can understand it very clearly, it's -- I

hate to use the term, but it's like laymen's terms, but still, it's a very rudimentary document.

DR. RYBOLT: Well, it goes beyond that, too. Right? It's (Inaudible 00:05:49) to tie into that, the data at least, that's coming? Because if this data may be one of those things that's released, it's going to be imperative for the agency to make sure they have concise communications, so that when that information does get released, that they establish with specific data, that there is a tool already available that explains that data. Otherwise, you're going to come back and redo it anyway. Right?

DR. RYBOLT: And you would say, you need to develop this tool (Laughter). So we're going to go ahead and make that recommendation now.

DR. BENNETT: Well, I think -- you know, and we do write a lot of user documents with some of our documents, but I really do. I see what you get -- I still write the document for somebody who already has -- they don't have to have our

understanding, but I do expect you to have some understanding. And maybe not even everybody at this table would understand. So, okay. Accepted. That's cool. Thanks.

DR. CRUPAIN: Michael Crupain from Consumer Reports.

I would just add that I agree totally with that. Also, one of my jobs as a physician at Consumer Reports is to take this information and explain it to reporters, explain it to the public. But also, I didn't quite understand the full intent of how you use it. And one of the reasons I like to look at these reports is to look at sort of that -- not just violations, because I don't expect there to be any violations or to be very few violations.

I've looked at enough of the reports to see that it's rare, but I am interested in this more subtle thing that you're saying you use it for, the use. And I think you can do -- and I didn't know you were interested in that at all, because it seems to me that the report is

violations, violations, violations.

So, I think it would be, from my perspective and the public's perspective, good to have more data on some of the finer, subtle use information, like what are these levels that we're seeing. How close are we to that line? How common are these?

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. CRUPAIN: That would be useful for me.

DR. BENNETT: So, I will tell you that when we look at the red book for us, again, it's a political tool, it's something that our international staff folks will go and take to the other countries and go, see, here's our results. And honestly, when you're doing business, it's like, I'm more interested in the violations, because the violations tell me you've got a problem. Right? Because we were allowed to use chemicals, and we know that chemicals are in our products.

When I think of the quarterly report, I

think of more domestic use. It's Betsy or Scott looking at it saying, okay, so what are we doing with antibiotics and how much testing is going on. That's it. But to be honest, I don't think that we've really -- we haven't really sat down and said, do we think that anybody else cares enough that we would write for them. And if that's something you're saying, good, you know, I really am interested, cool. Okay. I'm excited.

DR. MAZURCZAK: Krzys Mazurczak, Illinois Department of Agriculture.

I have one short recommendation and a comment. And the recommendation is we all heard about turnaround time to get a final result might go up to 10, over 10 days. So, my suggestion would be to propose the USDA to actively seek new, better technological -- you know, methods of testing that will speed up this process.

We are dealing with perishable goods. If they have to hold the product, because as we all know they cannot -- this product is subject to sampling, cannot enter countries -- it is on hold.

So, if they have to store this product waiting for the final result, that's using up storage space. So, it's one of the obstacles on both sides, I think, inspection and industry.

What to do in the meantime, while we are waiting for the results? So, one of my suggestions would be to emphasize the need -- there is a new technology on the horizon. Please pursue it, making sure that it could be adopted and used. And going back to issues related to outreach and communication, it was mentioned in the beginning, before lunch, that this whole issue of residue involves quite a few regulatory agencies. And it's true.

And let me give you an example. I had a call from one of the local farmers whose pasture was over sprayed by accident with pesticides, and it just happened, he had a herd of his cattle on it. And he asked me what to do. And I was stunned. I didn't have an answer.

I knew it was not a mini inspection at this time. Right? We're still talking about the

livestock. So you know, I kind of took a very careful approach, and I said, you know, I really appreciate you being a concerned citizen and concerned about food safety, and I would try to get back to him. I think we all need some kind of a clear picture outlining responsibilities, channels of communication and what agency will do what at certain times.

And I know there's no easy answer, but I think we should attempt, at least to be aware about the right path through this maze of existing regulations.

MR. PUZO: Where would you like to place that in a report?

DR. MAZURCZAK: I think in outreach, because there is a need to communicate between all parties involved, regulatory agencies, stakeholders. You know, we are all in the industry, and regulatory agencies are operating in a hazardous environment since January 25, 2000. Right?

MR. PUZO: Mm-hmm.

DR. MAZURCZAK: The concept was from the farm to table.

MR. PUZO: Right.

DR. MAZURCZAK: And right now, we are focusing on the meat industry. Somebody mentioned being proactive. Well, to be proactive, that means reaching out to the producer, to the rancher. Right? Making him a part of this dialogue and the process and increase awareness about residue on the farm.

DR. RYBOLT: This to me is the unknown of where this goes, but it kind of goes back to what (Inaudible 00:11:50) talked about earlier too, with the one issue in Montana or wherever it was that you talked about where you had the fire, and you all got involved, obviously, even though it wasn't FSIS at that point. You still said yeah, but, and I think that's what you're getting at.

DR. BENNETT: Actually, I'm a little bit confused. I mean, I'm not sure what you're asking or proposing in terms of -- like when somebody has

a problem, like so that they know, do they call Dan's group? Do they call our field offices?

DR. MAZURCZAK: Well --

DR. BENNETT: Well, I guess the animals are alive. They may not think to call FSIS.

DR. MAZURCZAK: First of all, there's no simple answer, because as we all know, you have multiple regulatory agencies with responsibilities.

DR. BENNETT: Mm-hmm.

DR. MAZURCZAK: You have the EPA, you have the FDA and you have the USDA. Right?

DR. BENNETT: Mm-hmm.

DR. MAZURCZAK: And each of these agencies places a role at a certain part in the production cycle. So, what I was mentioned is to come up with kind of a process flow and then to find, you know, who has a role at what level of production and kind of clearing this picture. Because you know, I tried to get to the bottom of it.

DR. BENNETT: Mm-hmm.

DR. MAZURCZAK: And let's use this scenario, that you having a proper use of pesticides at the ranch. And the producer wants to know what he or she is supposed to do; what's the next step. What's the withdrawal time? You know, how to treat the schedule. How long they have to wait before sending them to slaughter.

DR. BENNETT: Okay. Okay, that's great. And you're right. On occasion, questions will come to use and we'll turn them over to our toxicologist or risk assessors, depending on what the issue is.

Dan, I don't know -- I mean, I think they have to know enough to go that they want to sell their animals to slaughter to ring us. But if somebody knows that they're going to keep the animals alive for a period of time, I don't know if they would know who to call. And this is an outreach thing with universities? Do they do that? What is it that the programs are called?

(Simultaneous discussion)

MR. PUZO: Extension programs.

DR. BENNETT: Is that something where you see those kinds of questions?

MR. PUZO: That's one resource.

SPEAKER: Yeah.

DR. BENNETT: Okay.

DR. RYBOLT: Barb has a comment on that.

DR. BENNETT: Does John have a comment?

MR. PUZO: Well, we pretty much guide them to the FDA guy.

DR. BENNETT: That's fine.

MS. MASTERS: Barb Masters, OFW. And I think what I'm hearing asked, and I've run into myself is maybe the regulatory framework in which the regulatory agency has responsibilities.

So for example, that Kryzs might have known that the EPA was the regulatory agency that might have responsibility on pesticides before they came to slaughter, and what level of the program area within EPA to contact if he wanted to know -- if the farmer was trying to leave them on the farm. Because I will tell you, I have actually given presentations since I've been

working at OFW where producer groups have called me, state veterinarians have called me and said, we have producers that want residue presentations, and we've contacted the FDA, because we know they visit the farms.

But when we contact the FDA, they say, well, we're not really the right group, because you're really dealing with you know, FSIS findings. And they say, well no, we really want you to come, because we're talking about you know, the most common causes of residue, et cetera, et cetera. We really want you to talk to the producers. Oh no, you're talking about FSIS findings.

And so, there does seem to be some disconnect on the regulatory agencies and who has responsibilities. And so they said, well, we just gave up and we called you so that you can talk about both sides. And so, okay, all right. That's fine. So, I do those in the evening and talk to producer groups.

There seems to be that disconnect of FDA

does the after work after there's been a violation on the farm. And EPA would have pesticides, and FDA would have if there was, you know, a feed incident -- FDA might be the one that would be responsible. And there seems to be some regulatory responsibilities that maybe I think Kryzs is asking about. Maybe I'm wrong, Krzys.

DR. MAZURCZAK: No, you're right.

MS. MASTERS: But I've worked with you a long time (Laughter).

DR. RYBOLT: So, I don't think that really fits any of the questions that we're asking, but as Dan mentioned a second ago, it doesn't matter (Laughter).

MR. PUZO: Well, we can pretty much add what we want to as the advisory committee.

DR. RYBOLT: I'm just following instructions.

(Laughter)

MR. PUZO: And so I think if -- does somebody have a summary of what they want this to say?

DR. BOOREN: That there's interagency alignment on responsibilities and that it's effectively communicated to stakeholders on -- and just generally, who does what, when and where. I think that's what you were getting at, Barb.

MS. MASTERS: No, Kryzs.

DR. BOOREN: Or Kryzs. Both.

DR. RYBOLT: Interagency communications.

DR. BOOREN: Who has responsibility, communications. There's a lot of gray areas in this issue, and I think clarification on perhaps agencies' roles.

DR. BENNETT: Okay, fine. No, you're right. I think that answer that this person was given was absolutely right. It just kind of depends on where you are at the stage of bandwidth.

DR. BOOREN: John, do you have a comment?

DR. MARCY: Yes, I do. John Marcy, University of Arkansas.

To tag onto A in the first one, to

capture that statement that you made, that the global community would expect you to have a surveillance program if you're going to require them to have one.

DR. RYBOLT: Mm-hmm. Right.

DR. MARCY: I think that's good to put in there.

DR. BENNETT: Okay.

DR. MARCY: You know, because I hadn't thought about it until you said it. I think it's totally perfect to put in that explanation of what. You know, it really does need to be done.

DR. BENNETT: Okay.

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. MARCY: We certainly expect New Zealand to.

(Laughter)

DR. RYBOLT: He's not here (Laughter).

DR. BOOREN: Did you get that, Michael?

DR. RYBOLT: So you want this in A? What was the comment again?

DR. BOOREN: To make sure that the

surveillance is important to not only domestic, but international --

DR. RYBOLT: International?

DR. BOOREN: -- trade.

DR. RYBOLT: Yeah.

SPEAKER: Requirements.

DR. BOOREN: Equivalency.

DR. MARCY: You know, this is the type of program that's expected for training private partners internationally --

DR. MARCY: So, we have to do it, as well.

MR. PUZO: And just a point of order -- this is Dan Puzo, moderator, is that for C, there are working groups within the USDA that crossed jurisdiction this morning. There was a very innovative program called Know Your Farmer, Know Your Food. And that involves five or six USDA agencies that work together to promote local agriculture and production.

There's also one on poverty, and what your suggestion is in C is relevant in that we

need to know or do a better job of communicating residue issues throughout those agencies that are responsible, whether it be APHIS, ERS, us. And then, you know, interagency -- bringing in the EPA and FDA, if those groups don't already exist.

DR. BOOREN: This is Betsy Booren from the Meat Institute. Can you drop down? We have had little to no discussion on the question of pork. And before we get too long into --

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. BOOREN: -- we can cobble some things together for the rest of them, if we get into a time crunch, but I don't think we've had any discussion here. I would be interested in the subcommittee's thoughts.

MR. PUZO: And we do have an hour remaining.

DR. BOOREN: Yeah.

DR. RYBOLT: I would like to try to get as much as we can capture, so that maybe a couple of us could sit and actually flesh out the responses, and then if we have time, we could read

back. Otherwise, we'll have to take -- come in early in the morning and do that, and I don't think anybody wants do to that (Laughter). All right. So, the question is, how should FSIS consider chemical categories; equally or ranked relative to each other.

DR. BENNETT: Does that make sense?

DR. RYBOLT: I was going to ask you to elaborate a little bit (Laughter).

DR. BENNETT: So right now -- and it's not that we're asking should we move away from the holistic sampling that we're doing right now. So, this is Patty Bennett with FSIS. Meaning that one sample tested against several methods.

Really, the question is, it talks about where do we spend our extra time. Right? So, right now, when we think about, do we add more chemicals to the veterinary drug methods or the pesticide methods or any other method that we're dealing with, we've never really had a discussion going, oh my god, we should always be -- pesticide should always be first, and then, we should do vet

drugs and then we should do --

Honestly, it's like who asked me first and who has time to do it, because when you think about enhancing the methods, and by that, we're either extending chemicals or extending the methods to slaughter classes, the methods are kind of housed in different labs. So, pesticides live in one lab, and the other ones live in --

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. BENNETT: But the more important thing is, so it's not like we could say, well, I want all three labs to work on extending the pesticide method, because it's really that one lab that's going to -- if they have time, they're going to do that. Right?

So, our question to you is, should we just ask people that have time to work on their methods, or should we really say to the labs, look, we really think that pesticides are more important than vet drugs or whatever, and really, we should always be focusing on padding one method, right? Or one class type of chemical

hazard than another. Does that make sense?

(No response heard)

DR. BENNETT: And again, in general, we don't need numbers.

MS. O'KEEFE: This is Margaret. Or, should we add a new group?

DR. BENNETT: Right. And invest energies into something that we don't know. I mean, we talked a little bit about the unknown category or -- we don't really do a lot with environmental contaminants. So really the stocks are, we have vet drugs, we have pesticides, we have metals. That's our main bins, if you were.

DR. SINGH: This is Manpreet Singh. I think we were talking a little bit over the break, and it kind of ties into the third question, too. If we're saying there's time, and what do need to invest our time and monies in, the unknown is actually a big category.

DR. BENNETT: Uh-huh.

DR. SINGH: And given the talk we had in the morning, where there was the international

component of -- there was three phases of the training. There was one which was an audit, where you know, for equivalency. So, I think in that if -- an unknown is an unknown until you actually find out what it is. And maybe there is an unknown for us here in the U.S., and it could be a known in some other country; they're using different --

DR. BENNETT: Chemicals, yeah.

DR. SINGH: -- drugs. So, for animal treatment. And that's probably what needs to be also gathered into the information and saying, okay, we're going to develop a method for potentially some other drug which is not used here in the U.S. So, I don't know that's just something which I thought was interesting to me.

DR. BENNETT: So, I think to add to that, too, what I would say is, a lot of times when we get equivalency reports from the other countries, and they say so -- and we say, so what do you do in your country, they go, exactly what you do (Laughter). Wow. Really? That's amazing.

So to your point, we certainly have talked, and we certainly could put more energy into going, okay, yeah, I know you do everything that we do. Is there anything that you do that we don't do? And sometimes, we need to put energy into combing those reports. They go, oh, you know what? You use these vet drugs that either we don't approve or we don't have approved. Right? So you can't use, versus we don't even have them -- or pesticides or something, to say, okay, great. So, maybe we need to talk about them across the agencies and see if that's worth putting into the program.

DR. SINGH: One quick comment. This is Manpreet again.

It's not necessarily only a list of drugs which are -- they use, because you said, you know, there was like that unexpected chance, also. And what if there is a chance that the unexpected is happening, and here, we have to go and identify that.

DR. BENNETT: So, something is happening

in their country, and we need to figure out what that is, and then consider testing for it?

DR. SINGH: Right. Maybe there is someone who is exporting into the U.S. from their country, but then there's an unexpected chance that something happens from a --

DR. BENNETT: Okay. Something happened to that product?

DR. SINGH: Right.

DR. BENNETT: Okay.

DR. SINGH: I don't know how that would be captured.

DR. BENNETT: Yeah, and I was just going to say, so how do we identify that? I mean, certainly, if we could, that would fall into like our Montana fire, right? Chemical fire?

SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. WILSON: This is George Wilson, Wilson and Associates.

I think from my perspective in ranking -- if it's relative, you've got to look at risk.

DR. BENNETT: Mm-hmm.

MR. WILSON: What is the risk for food borne illness? Short-term or long-term? You know? I mean, if you have a continuous problem, that may be at an acceptable level, but over a long-term exposure, do you have a problem there?

So, I think you've got to weigh -- it's not one bucket fits all. You've got to weigh what is the chemical; is it an herbicide, a pesticide, antimicrobic, hormone? You know? And really look at what are those risks, and focus on those that are really critical.

And then, on the international perspective, each country is different. Southeast Asia; they have stringent regulations on the use of herbicides and pesticides. However, they're not able to enforce those regulations. And I picked up a lot of information in sitting in on some of the Chifsan training programs for the lab capacity building.

And every country is unique, I mean, in the world. So you've got to know what's going on in each country. And so, that's another factor or

element when you're looking on the import side, because the samples you're taking right now are really verification of -- you know, they are testing and nothing is getting through. It's just a board -- you know, it's not one bucket is going to fit all. You're going to have to look at geographies, countries by specific -- and take the tiered approach that you have, those countries that have a very robust system versus those that are in development that are now developing the lab capacity, which is good, but it's still that area that is going to take time.

So, those may be those countries that you want to focus more emphasis on, on the importance coming. That was just a general comment I had in that area.

DR. BENNETT: You know, I think when we talk about ranking, too -- so there's a practical side of me that's coming out. Right? And with our lab folks, it's not like -- they don't want me to say, so, will you just add this chemical A? They want me to say, will you add a class of

chemicals or a group of stuff --

MS. O'KEEFE: Justify it.

DR. BENNETT: -- because it takes almost as much energy to add 20 very similar chemicals than just to add the one. And so that's where I kind of go -- and we sit there and say to them, look, you can add a few of these and a few -- you know, so the question is, should we add a few of these and a few of those, because of risk?

And certainly, that's something we can determine and say, you know, there really is a smattering of risk across all these types. Or just say for practicality, and it's better to have as many chemicals as possible to say, fine, do as many as you can, and you know, with a cutoff saying we'll kind of rank them, and then push as many as you can. And maybe that's not a fair question, and that's okay for you to say that, as well.

DR. BOOREN: This is Betsy with the Meat Institute.

You know, one of the things I'm getting

here is, what's the process. You know?

DR. BENNETT: Mm-hmm.

DR. BOOREN: What is the process of evaluating these chemical risks? And the challenge I'm having is, it's not just emphasized because you're in establishments. It's also the EPA. It's also APHIS. It's FDA approvals.

One question would be, how often -- it would seem to me that that collaboration of regulatory groups, it would be beneficial if you're not getting together and saying, what trends are you seeing. Because if FDA is approving new classes of drugs, that will have a downstream implication as well as initiating.

I don't know from an interagency standpoint how many of those discussions come on, but from a process standpoint, it would seem that the communication among those agencies should give an idea of what might be coming down the track outside of the emergency, outside of a fire or a chemical spill or a pesticide; that there would be a process to track either new innovations or for

seeing other samples. Is that going on?

DR. BENNETT: It is probably more expert elicitation, I think, than truly a, let's start with the risk and prioritize from there, if that makes sense. And certainly, I mean, I think we all agree that we need to control the beast of it more. I mean, we've got it by the -- no, we don't even have it by the tail.

DR. BOOREN: Then one of my recommendations would be, and I'd open this up to the group -- would be to have that -- recommend that you have a collaboration with those interagencies to have some of those discussions. You should have indications from the FDA that they're getting the new drug approvals or chemical approvals, or EPA with the pesticides.

That should help you decide if there should be further investigation into your own methods and tracking. To me, that's a process that I could recommend. I don't know what others in the group think of that, but again, this gets to the gray area of these issues.

DR. BENNETT: So, let me say something else, too. That's great, Betsy, with stuff that's new. So also -- and what I have to say is that once we brought these new methods on, these multi analytic methods, then there's also still a catch up period. Right? And this is maybe part of what we're asking you, is -- so there's the chemicals that we never had in the program that we probably should have had.

And then, there's new chemicals that are coming on board. And then, there's the information about what the international folks are doing, and it's just trying to figure it out. And maybe, really the answer is that we need to figure out a prioritized system, and then say, you know, here's the 20 year plan, and this is where we'll be in 20 years, and let's just keep backing it up, and now we know what our folks are going to be doing over the next three to five years of adding -- which chemicals they add to, barring the weird stuff that comes down the pike.

DR. BOOREN: I think having a process

set up that allows industry to comment, other groups to comment -- you would get some feedback that could help longer term.

DR. BENNETT: Okay.

DR. BOOREN: I know, you know, challenges are when we see new methods, we may not -- certain industry may not be engaged, but I think having those and then having a report out could provide you across all the agencies, very important information that may help.

DR. CURTIS: Pat Curtis, Auburn. This is what I was trying to get at earlier when I asked you about --

DR. BENNETT: Yeah, you're right. You were, weren't you?

DR. CURTIS: You know, what was your process for determining what was on your list, and when you added something new or got rid of something. And to me, I agree with Betsy. I think you need a process, and you need it at a time -- maybe it's my HAACP background (Laughter) that comes through. But you need to have a set

time that you're evaluating this, and you need all the parties in. And it would make sense that the lab people that were developing these methods heard what the rest of the group that was looking at the risk and what those components were, because they may see certain ways of you know, grouping things together or finding better methods to do those.

DR. BENNETT: Okay.

DR. CURTIS: And it just seems like maybe the recommendation is that you create a process with all of the groups and have a regular re-evaluation of what they are testing --

(Discussion off the record)

DR. RYBOLT: -- should establish a method for reviewing included hazards at some periodic basis with its partner agencies to include international partners. And so that came in for the unknowns. Right? And so, if there was a new known in another country, melamine -- you know, of course, we found an (Inaudible) with that, but then, we know we can add that to our

list or whatever.

DR. BENNETT: Okay.

DR. RYBOLT: So that might include up here as well as down here, somehow. But some of the key points, relative risk, public health based. You know, I threw that in there, and just threw in a conversation, because what's the point in testing if it's not public health based? Right?

DR. BENNETT: Absolutely. And that's a big thing.

DR. RYBOLT: I mean, I'm not going to --

DR. BENNETT: People say they want us to test everything under the sun.

DR. RYBOLT: Yeah.

DR. BENNETT: It's like, but it's not in our products at a certain level.

DR. RYBOLT: Yeah.

DR. BENNETT: Not in our box.

DR. RYBOLT: If there's no risk, why do it?

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. RYBOLT: There was a variation of things. George made a comment about variations, or Manpreet made a comment about variation between countries.

DR. BENNETT: Okay.

DR. RYBOLT: Betsy has established process, the vet chemical hazard with interagency collaboration, similar to what Pat was saying. So, I think that kind of captures the spirit of the conversation.

Other comments on this last one that's not captured here?

DR. MARCY: John Marcy, University of Arkansas. Just to elaborate a little bit where -- you know, not just vet chemicals, but BPA with pesticides -- you know, they're being released. There's a mechanism -- you know, they have a registered use. So, you need to evaluate -- or the safety of these as they're being used by their listing is one thing. And then you know, also, the possibility of -- is there any possibility of them being used off label?

And will that increase the possibility of them getting into the meat supply? But that doesn't mean you test for it, but you need to consider what happens if it's not used according to list.

DR. BENNETT: And I think that's something that we've really been trying to work on these last couple of years --

DR. MARCY: Right.

DR. BENNETT: -- is to be flexible enough. You know, like the machine is always going. We've got the surveillance. We're constantly trying to kind of think about the chemicals that we should have in the program.

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. BENNETT: And manage them, because we don't need to test them at all times. And then, kind of dealing with you know, the little fires that pop up and trying to do all things at all times for all people.

DR. BOOREN: But I think the review of the surveillance program, it allows you to add

risk if needed, but also, remove risks.

DR. BENNETT: And I think the labs would love you for that --

DR. BOOREN: But I think that we need to make sure, Michael, we document that. It's really easy to keep adding, but I think there are many times where we have issues that we perhaps deal with and address, and it gets down to where do we put resources? In my mind, we need to -- it's both review to keep and review to remove.

DR. BENNETT: And I think FSIS would absolutely agree with you on that. I mean, again, it's something that -- especially with our lab folks, that we're constantly saying, we're happy to continue to add, but at what point do you say we have enough information to know that we don't need to test this for this --

DR. BOOREN: And it's not to say you can't add it on a later date.

DR. BENNETT: Exactly.

DR. BOOREN: But it's a living --

DR. BENNETT: Right. Absolutely.

MS. O'KEEFE: And this is Margaret, FSIS. I guess also part of the question for is --

Traditionally, what is your -- should they all be grouped together to see -- like pesticides, vet drugs, knowing that risk of exposure are different for pesticides and vet drugs. When we talk about -- that's one of the things -- do we consider them -- the categories -- do we treat the categories differently or with different frequencies or things like that?

DR. RYBOLT: In what way?

MS. O'KEEFE: That was also --

DR. RYBOLT: In what way would you --

DR. BENNETT: As your question again.

DR. RYBOLT: In what way, though? That's what I was trying to understand on this question. We kind of took it in a different direction than what I was thinking --

DR. BOOREN: Perhaps allocation of resources?

DR. BENNETT: And maybe that's based on really finally coming to grips and creating a

prioritization list. And the prioritization risk -- again, so let's go back and use the logit model that we have been toying with --

MS. O'KEEFE: And those are all together.

DR. BENNETT: Because -- right, they're all together. But we agree upon these variables, that you know, we could get blessed kind of across the stakeholders and say these are the things that we should be looking at, our risk factors. And so, we come up with our list of 500, or whatever the chemicals, because we know it's something we want to work on for a period of time.

And we go, okay, great. So now, how do you start going about dividing the baby -- well, that wasn't probably the right analogy (Laughter). But anyway --

DR. CRUPAIN: I would add -- Michael Crupain from Consumer Reports.

I would add that I couldn't -- I think it would be hard to rank them, like pesticides versus antibiotics versus something -- heavy

metals. Like they're all public health issues, and so I wouldn't feel comfortable saying we should work on one over the other.

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. CRUPAIN: But maybe I would be comfortable saying I have some intelligence that suggests that I'm going to find more pesticide residues or higher levels of pesticide residues, and I should focus on that, because I don't have that data right now. You know what I mean?

DR. BOOREN: Put in the context of why you perhaps, are doing certain types --

DR. CRUPAIN: Yeah, I would prioritize things that raise the level of concern, because I had some evidence pointing to their presence being there now, and I need to know more about that.

DR. BENNETT: And again, what we are talking about is, it's the -- there are different labs working on different methods, and they all have their own agendas and they have their own time schedules. So, it could be that there's a few methods that are being moved along.

And like I said, the other issue is, we're also continuing to extend methods to the different production classes, because the new methods -- you know, we start and go species by species. And so that takes time. And again, you're right. It's never saying this is -- that it's not going to be done. It's just what am I going to do first? And that's really the question.

So okay, so maybe it's just we figure out how we think -- we figure out the kind of world of chemicals we should at least start prioritizing, figure out an accepted way to prioritize them, and then figure out how to roll them in and out of the system.

DR. RYBOLT: Does this kind of capture what you were saying, though, in really brief, concise (Laughter) --

DR. CRUPAIN: You need to add a few more letters to intelligence, I think we can (Laughter) --

DR. RYBOLT: To building that process.

DR. BENNETT: Yes. So, we actually have been talking for a couple of years -- and this is Patty Bennett, again, with FSIS.

And what we have called it is hazard identification, prioritization and management. And that's really been the phrase, so to speak, of what we've been doing. And so, it's actually quite a validation for you guys, going at -- you know, you actually do need a system.

And it's hard to -- it's not so black and white. And maybe the black and white doesn't matter. So maybe that's -- I think that's a little bit of what I'm hearing, as long as we all kind of agree that this is probably the right direction to go in, and to be flexible enough that when the crisis happens, we're okay to stop, deal with the crisis and then come back and kind of keep progressing down our little pathway.

MR. PUZO: Okay, we have three committee members that have wanted to make comments.

DR. RYBOLT: And we have a little over minutes to finish, too. So I think, Brian?

MR. SAPP: Brian Sapp, White Oak Pastures. It kind of goes back to my question from this morning. You've got the targeted implant testing going on, and you've got 5,000 tests, of which 1,000 were sent to the lab and confirmed.

MS. O'KEEFE: Five thousand were sent to the lab. One thousand were violative.

MR. SAPP: Okay, thank you for that clarification.

MS. O'KEEFE: Yes.

MR. SAPP: But what if there is an unknown chemical there in 1,000 other samples that you don't have a test for? How is the agency addressing you know, something like that? If there's a chemical being used off label somewhere in the United States and the KIS test is picking it up, but you don't have a test in the lab to verify that that's what it is, how does that system work?

And is there a way to try to identify you know, more of those KIS test positives and

identifying oh yeah, we've got -- there are 500 samples here that are the same chemical. Where is it coming from? Is it an off label use? Is it an overuse you know, through VETMED? You know, how does that work?

MS. O'KEEFE: This is Margaret, FSIS. In the eastern lab, we've recently tried -- and maybe you know more -- we tried a system where the labs analyzed a certain number of samples and scanned like the top 20 peaks, just to see what we were finding in that. But again, that's a method that there's a finite number of compounds in it. And we did look at that as -- but it was again, coming from like a regulatory agency that was --

DR. BENNETT: And I think a lot of it, too, is intelligence. It's somebody telling us that they did it. And thank goodness, people do rat each other out (Laughter), and so we do get intelligence that way. But you're right. And that goes back to the question that we asked you before; how much energy should we spend in the unknowns?

So, at least -- for once I said, at least you guys are saying go and really look at it internationally and see if there are chemicals, because here's something else. And I hadn't put this together until recently, and it was like oh my gosh, the chloramphenicol thing. So, it's not just what they might be using on their animals and sending it to us. It's also the drugs that we are buying from them and using on our animals and sending them to slaughter.

And then, that gets exactly to what you said, because we're not testing for that chemical because of course, it's not approved in our country. But they bought it someplace else. And that's something that -- you're right. Okay, I worry about that. So, that's my question to you guys. How much should I worry about it?

MR. SAPP: Well, I think that -- Brian Sapp with White Oak Pastures again.

I think that also goes back to you know, having these meetings with the EPA, the APHIS, you know, figuring out what drugs you know, the FDA

has approved where you can say, you know, FDA doesn't come back when you have a problem and say, oh yeah, we approved that six months ago. Well, why didn't you tell us? We don't have a test for that.

DR. BENNETT: Well, but no, we have those conversations.

MR. SAPP: Okay.

DR. BENNETT: So, I don't worry about that. They are very good. Because again, remember what I said before, was that -- I mean, drug is -- it's like a great new pair of shoes. Right?

MR. SAPP: Mm-hmm.

DR. BENNETT: I mean, you can't wait to wear them and buy them and have them. Right?

MS. O'KEEFE: Right.

DR. BENNETT: So, I don't worry about the drugs that FDA says it's on the market, because everybody is going to want to use it. Right?

MS. O'KEEFE: It's like a little

present.

DR. BENNETT: Exactly. Right?

(Laughter) It's the new miracle drug.

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. BENNETT: It's the new magic bullet. It's the stuff that FDA didn't approve, isn't going to, but somebody else and we can get -- somebody else can get their hands on it and use it. So that is a concern, but I don't know how much of a concern it is, because we're not looking for it.

DR. RYBOLT: Is that domestic or international?

DR. BENNETT: Well, two ways. Right?

DR. RYBOLT: Yeah.

DR. BENNETT: So the one way is kind of what we're talking about. They're using it in their country and sending us the meat products. But the other concern, too, is -- so we had chloramphenicol issue. Well you know, nobody should be using chloramphenicol in our production

animals. Somebody was using it. And you just kind of go, okay, so where did you get this from? And we didn't use it. Uh-huh. So, where did they get it from?

So, it's that kind of thing. It's like where are people getting drugs that they could be using that we wouldn't have -- because we're having a conversation with the FDA. We're catching what they're putting on the market, but we're perhaps not getting the drugs that somebody else has got on the market. So, I think that's a gap in our system. I just don't know how important it is.

DR. VETTER: Dana Vetter, NAVV. Just two really quick -- two really quick comments just on public health risk, and I'm sure you're aware of it, Meg, when you flesh this out. You know, some chemicals -- usually when you're talking about pesticides and metals, you're talking about long-term exposure, and when you're talking about antibiotic risk, that can have more immediate impacts. So you know, those are very different

aspects of risk that need to be considered if you're going to rank it.

And then, another aside to piggyback on what you were just saying is, have we consulted with or had any dialogue with AVMA on off label drug use; practices in particularly, agriculture?

MS. O'KEEFE: Aside from knowing the approved drugs, just think that -- I mean, we're well aware of that, but the --

DR. VETTER: And would that be useful?

DR. BENNETT: Do you think AVMA would have that information (Laughter)?

DR. VETTER: I don't know (Laughter). But they might be willing to look into it.

DR. BENNETT: Okay.

DR. CRUPAIN: So, Michael Crupain, Consumer Reports.

I think that if a drug is not approved in this country or is actually banned in this country, or we know that they're using it and that it's approved in another country, it could be used in another country, I think that would be a

valuable thing to look at, because there's a reason we don't have it approved here, and that's because we haven't demonstrated its safety or efficacy, or we have decided it's not safe. And so, I think that's a valuable --

DR. BENNETT: And particularly if we can get that information, yes. That would --

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. CRUPAIN: I mean, yeah, if you can get that intelligence from what's going on in another country, I think that should be on your list of something that you should look for.

DR. BENNETT: Okay.

DR. CRUPAIN: I think that's important. And that's different than extra label use --

DR. BENNETT: Right.

DR. CRUPAIN: -- which is an approved drug, which that's a different thing.

DR. BENNETT: Right, so we're talking about something that's coming in to this country.

DR. CRUPAIN: Yeah, or as you said, it could come in actually in the meat, or it could

come in in the feed or something that's being imported.

DR. BENNETT: Or we're being it and we're using it on our own animals domestically.

DR. CRUPAIN: Yeah. The other thing I just wanted to say from before is, I think -- I don't know which question this fits in, and maybe it's too specific, but before you remove something from the list that you're testing for, you'd better be damn sure that you're really not finding it.

So I look at -- I'm really interested in arsenic. I spend a lot of time looking at arsenic, and you find no level -- zero arsenic in any samples you test, but the levels that you're looking for are way too high. So you're looking for 200 parts per billion, which you'll never find in meat, because that's really, really high. So, I would like you to reconsider the levels that you're testing for.

I would think you should lower your level of protection for that. That might be too

specific, but I wouldn't want you to stop testing that, because I think arsenic is an important issue, and there's lots of ways we input arsenic into our food system.

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. BENNETT: I think that's a fair comment.

MR. PUZO: We trust that's a --

DR. BENNETT: And we do struggle with -- because that is a decision. Right? How low do we want to go? And is it because there's a tolerance? Is it because we need to be aware? Is it because -- how much energy do we have to get it to a level where it would be useful? Absolutely.

But I would say, too, when we talk about managing chemicals, really, if it was important for us to put into the method, the program to begin with, we're not going to get rid of it. Now, we may rotate it out for a few years, but my guess is that would be something -- and so that would be part of that decision process.

So, how often do we need to check on

that to make sure that we're doing okay? Because it's not worth investing in any chemical if we're really not going to keep it, even if we don't test for it all the time.

MR. PUZO: Okay. Well, we're coming on the final minutes, and do you want to have the arsenic --

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. CRUPAIN: I would like that, if they would --

MR. PUZO: That's up to you, committee members.

DR. BOOREN: Well, I would disagree. I don't think we need to be specific, but I think we should be specific in the process in which we recommend that they evaluate. I think if we get into specific chemicals, Mike -- when you were talking, Michael, my thought was -- we want to be thoughtful if you're adding and removing.

But I think what you hit on is there's something very important for your segment of whom you're representing. I may have other interests.

I think it's incumbent on the agencies in this meeting to solicit comments and review them thoughtfully. And that way, you have a chance to comment. I have a chance to comment.

We can go through this process and then trust the agencies to make the best public health decision. But I wouldn't want to specifically target specific chemicals and levels. I don't think we have the expertise of this group to do that.

DR. BENNETT: Okay.

DR. BOOREN: But I would recommend a process of soliciting that type of information and making sure that's included.

DR. RYBOLT: It makes sense to me do that. And so, would we throw that in here with the removing -- the part we talk about removing and adding? And then also, looking at levels, tolerances or whatever?

DR. CRUPAIN: I don't know if it's in, but I guess there should be -- maybe there exists already? Can I -- I mean, I could probably just

send you an email and say you should look at --

DR. BENNETT: Send it in.

DR. CRUPAIN: We're talking about a process for -- like for me, for example, for this arsenic issue, I think I would like you to re-review how you do this test. Is there a process for that, or should I just send you an email?

(Laughter) Or should it be a more formal process?

DR. BENNETT: That's a great question. I don't know the answer. If another agency asked us, that's a different answer, because it's an interagency process. I don't know what to say when a stakeholder says, hey, would you review that.

Can I think about that and see if I can find an answer for you tomorrow?

DR. CRUPAIN: Yeah.

MS. O'KEEFE: Yeah.

DR. BOOREN: But I think that just reiterates the process --

MR. PUZO: Okay, two quick things we need. We're in the final minutes. We haven't answered 2B. And the other issue, while you're thinking about that, is that we are state colleagues here, suggested comparing state laboratory test data to FSIS data, in particular, the small plants.

(Simultaneous discussion)

MR. PUZO: But is that a formal recommendation to compare the state data with FSIS?

DR. CRUPAIN: Michael Crupain, again. Is there anyone against adding something in here that they -- that FSIS should release more of the data or more interpretations of the data, as I suggested earlier?

DR. BENNETT: The communication? Was that not part of the recommendations --

DR. CRUPAIN: It didn't get written up there that there should be more --

DR. BENNETT: -- or whatever -- however Betsy described it would good.

DR. CRUPAIN: A more detailed analysis of data.

DR. BOOREN: Context, yeah. I think we were all saying sort of the same -- sort of -- I would have no problem adding the language. It's more for the importance of the context; what is actually being said. It can be applied to different stakeholder groups.

DR. BENNETT: But I think that's different from what you just said.

DR. CRUPAIN: Well, that would include, for my stakeholder group --

DR. BENNETT: Yeah.

DR. CRUPAIN: -- having more data. So, maybe if we could -- if there's no objection to including the language -- including you know, parentheses or something, including releasing a more detailed analysis of the available data.

DR. RYBOLT: That's what you were saying?

DR. CRUPAIN: Yeah.

DR. BENNETT: So we have -- this is

Patty Bennett again, with FSIS.

We should have like standard language in the red book, blue book and the quarterly reports that if you would like to -- so maybe that answers your question. If you would like to see changes in the documents that we put out currently that you can actually contact --

SPEAKER: Email and phone number.

DR. BENNETT: We have an email and a phone number that you can actually call, so either red book or the quarterly reports, there should be contact information. So that actually might answer your question.

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. BENNETT: At least we would have it down and we could start moving it to --

DR. RYBOLT: Where is the residue on the data release? Is it on the list?

DR. BOOREN: It was RTE and it was E coli.

DR. BOOREN: But you know, the red book -- which one is -- one is sampling. I never know

which colors, which book (Laughter). The result book?

MS. O'KEEFE: Is the red book.

DR. BOOREN: The red book. I got it right. The red book does show a lot of that data, but I know that there's a backlog. I think Michael, to your point, is encouragement of recommending that that report be released in a more timely fashion.

DR. BENNETT: Yeah, and to that end, I will tell you that we have been working very hard, and we have actually proposed, because of our international folks, that we put out the blue book by September 30th to meet with our fiscal year, because that helps with our trading partners, and the red books come by the end of the calendar year, December 31st.

So yes, we are two years behind. But we do have the quarterly reports out, so that kind of closes the gap a little bit. But absolutely, we are -- if it kills somebody, we're going to get those books out (Laughter).

MS. O'KEEFE: Yes.

DR. BENNETT: So that is our goal, and it makes sense. It's very hard to do business when we don't even have the data available. So,absolutely. But we're happy for you to make that recommendation, if that's what you want. Yes, Naser said thank you, too (Laughter).

DR. BOOREN: It's good to put a name to a face for a report (Laughter).

DR. BENNETT: Poor Naser, he's going to have to do a name change.

DR. RYBOLT: I think we captured the spirit of what you were suggesting there, and we'll flesh out details. Obviously, we'll have to get more --

DR. BENNETT: Right, plus, we will have to get --

DR. RYBOLT: Wordy. But one thing we haven't touched on is, emphasize allocating the right portion of samples across the domestic program scheduled versus inspector generated. That's one that I haven't heard any comments on,

really. We've talked around it, but we really haven't addressed the question itself.

And so we have -- go ahead.

DR. BOOREN: I was just going to say, based on what I have -- this has been a very enlightening conversation in the last couple of hours. It's been interesting. I think from a domestic program, based on what I'm hearing from staff is you're very -- you're confident that the number of samples are representative of the surveillance program for the population within each species.

And the inspector generated program is, we have trained inspectors in facilities that if they initiate -- see a concern that they're able and have the power to take a sample as often as they need to, to feel confident of safety of the food supply. Is that --

DR. BENNETT: Yes.

DR. BOOREN: Okay. If that's the case from a process standpoint, I think we've hit the target.

DR. RYBOLT: Yeah.

DR. BOOREN: That's just my gut feeling. I get the feeling knowing -- talking to our members and knowing how many inspector generated samples are being taken, they feel confident that their inspectors can do that. I'm comfortable with what's proposed. I'm open to other recommendations, but that's just we're I'm at.

DR. RYBOLT: I'm at the same place.

DR. BOOREN: Betsy at the Institute. Forgot to do that at the beginning.

MR. SAPP: Brian Sapp, White Oak Pastures. I would agree with you. If we, you know, do something to make sure that those employees are being trained correctly and taking the test correctly. If they're not trained and they're not taking the test correctly, the test is really no good for us to use.

So, I guess that training program would come through the district offices. You know? But I think that's an important aspect of the testing is, you know, the employee training part of it.

DR. BENNETT: You mean in terms of how to interpret the test or how to choose -- decide when to do the test?

MR. SAPP: All of the above.

DR. BENNETT: See the above.

MR. SAPP: All of the above.

DR. BENNETT: So, the test has been in place for a few years now, 2009. Right? 2009?

DR. BENNETT: So, we've gotten over the hump of people understanding literally, how to run the test. So, I think we're good there.

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. BENNETT: We just reissued directive 10,800 where we kind of cleaned up the guidance that we've always had, and reissued that. Certainly, training is always something that I think we can always get better at and to stay on it. So yeah, always a work in progress.

DR. RYBOLT: What about correlations?

DR. BENNETT: We do have correlations. There are district correlations. I don't always get the opportunity to attend all of them. There

is also a -- in fact, it was today, but I came here instead. The DVMSs -- so the veterinarians who are kind of specialists in terms of looking for residue issues -- they meet monthly, and they actually talk about you know, what are they seeing kind of across the districts, and talk about some of the issues that -- and they try and resolve them collectively.

You know, again, I don't work in OFO, so I'm not a hundred percent sure, but it seems like there are some processes in place for them to correlate over these issues.

MR. SAPP: Brian Sapp, White Oak Pastures again. You know, and I think there's some disconnect as well, in inspection personnel in large facilities and inspection personnel in small facilities or very small facilities as far as their training and what they're capable of doing.

DR. BENNETT: Okay.

MR. SAPP: Or, you know, the resources they have as far as, you know, if you're in a

large facility, you've got a veterinarian on staff. If you're in a very small facility, you would be you know, an inspector in charge. You know, and then the veterinarian may be four hours away. You know, so who is doing that testing, and you know, going through the district offices to make sure that the right person is doing the test and doing the test right in a timely fashion, you know, for the facility? Those are three points that I think would be important.

DR. RYBOLT: Is that a training opportunity or how --

DR. BENNETT: It may be a resource thing, as well.

DR. RYBOLT: I mean, you have the directive. Right?

DR. CURTIS: So, you're primarily concerned with the small plant training?

MR. SAPP: Correct. Inspectors in small facilities for your state sponsored program, as well.

DR. RYBOLT: Does that work with the

cooperative extension unit somehow? You know, I guess it's not planned through inspectors only though.

SPEAKER: Yeah, I don't --

MR. SAPP: Yeah, never mind

(Laughter).

(Pause)

MR. SAPP: I guess training through the district office.

DR. RYBOLT: Yeah.

MR. SAPP: You know, through directives or you know, in person training.

DR. CURTIS: Well, there is inspector training.

DR. MARCY: Sure.

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. MARCY: At the district. Right?

DR. BENNETT: And I know that they also -- this is Patty Bennett with FSIS.

It's my impression that a lot of the inspectors have closer ties with the policy group that's in Omaha. And a lot of them, especially

the veterinarians, do a lot of Q&A back and forth with the inspectors. And I know they'll do like (Inaudible 00:58:40) relations with some of the inspectors, if they're having trouble -- I don't know, making judgment calls on what they're seeing or when to test or something like that.

Now, is it enough? I don't know. I'm not there. But I am aware that it exists.

DR. CRUPAIN: This is Michael Crupain. Is this question asking should there be a limit on inspector generated testing? Because it seems like that at the moment, you can have as much as you want.

DR. RYBOLT: You can.

DR. CRUPAIN: So, is that what this question is getting at?

MR. SAPP: Yeah, the term allocation is kind of confusing.

DR. BENNETT: Oh, okay, sure. You know, I think it goes back to -- so again, we have about 15,000 samples that we put towards residues. And about five of those -- did I do that right? Does

that make sense? Five, six, 7,000 -- six or 7,000 go towards the inspector generated. Seven, six, yeah, go towards the inspector generated, you know, as a result of the KIS screens.

Is that enough? I mean, should we encourage more testing at the implant level, so that there are more samples that are kind of moving in that direction? Or again, move samples from another program and put it towards encouraging more inspector generated?

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. CRUPAIN: Are you saying -- go ahead.

DR. MARCY: John Marcy, University of Arkansas. I just got confused that -- I thought 5,000 was,if they were positive on the KIS, they went to the -- you know, you're not allocating. It's everything that was positive on that test went on for --

DR. BENNETT: Right, but the --

DR. CRUPAIN: -- confirmation.

DR. BENNETT: But we still say --

because we can look and say, okay, so we've been doing KIS testing for a years, and we know that yeah, about -- I know it was a little lower for '13, but about six to seven thousand samples end up going to the lab for further confirmation that come out of those KIS screens.

So, we can kind of plan for that, because we see that same number of samples coming out of the plant that are KIS positive and going on to the lab. That's what I meant. Now, and you say, well yeah, but Patty, they're being generated out of the plant. But of course, we can drive that a little harder if we wanted.

Right now, our policy is to say we've provided you guidance. We train you. We leave it to your direction. I mean, we could certainly drive more targeted testing if we wanted to. For instance, for a period of time, FDA had come to us and they said, hey, we think that KIS negative tests are actually positive, and you're missing some positive results. You need to look into that.

We said okay, we will. So, we said, we'll want 300 KIS negative tests sent to the lab, and we're going to -- if they're done for mastitis, then we want you to lab confirm it. So, that was a driven thing. Right? You know, as it turns out, KIS was actually pretty good. I mean, we found a few positives that we wouldn't have.

MS. O'KEEFE: Right.

DR. BENNETT: But by and large, they were negative. So in that sense, I could see we could drive them. Maybe not that the inspectors have to do KIS tests, but maybe we could drive some other targeted testing. So, that's what I mean by that, if you're interested.

DR. CURTIS: Pat Curtis, Auburn University. If there's a need for that, that's fine. Otherwise, it looks like you could put in the efforts for the training, and they were really, truly trained, they should be able to determine if they need to do the test.

DR. BENNETT: Right.

DR. CURTIS: And that goes back to what

Brian was saying. We just need to make sure that everybody is equally trained --

DR. BENNETT: Okay.

DR. CURTIS: -- across.

DR. BENNETT: Sure.

DR. CURTIS: And I think there are better opportunities for training in the large plant for those inspectors than they are for some of the small plant inspectors to get their training. And so I think just emphasizing that it's important that every -- all of the inspectors across at all sized plants are truly trained on this, so that they can understand.

DR. BENNETT: Sure.

DR. CURTIS: And there may still be needs for occasional times, if you want to do the targeted testing.

DR. VETTER: Dana Vetter, NAFV. And just to -- as a side note, I do want to stress that I think this is one of the things that we actually do really good.

DR. BENNETT: Okay.

DR. VETTER: And that inspectors -- and I think part of that is, again, the KIS test. I think we implement really good training in how to do it and perform it. But I think the other side of that is that these suspect animals that we're targeting, truly do tend to be more objective than subjective. They usually do stand out. They're typically sick animals or show animals or like we said, we target these bob veal that have been bottle fed and that sort of thing.

So, I'm not saying that we shouldn't put that in there. I just wanted to make that comment,that I feel like it is one of those things that we do a really good job at when it comes to that sort of thing, this targeted testing.

DR. RYBOLT: So I think I captured what Brian -- what you were getting at, a recommendation review. And the agency should review inspector training and conduct periodic reviews across research to ensure adequate implementation with specific focus on small establishments? I think it was not just small,

but you know, there should be -- to make sure that we have that covered somehow. I don't know what that means.

MR. SAPP: Maybe with more emphasis on small

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. RYBOLT: Yeah, with more --

DR. RYBOLT: Okay. We still use the word allocation in here. I don't know if that's still confusing for folks as far as the first part of the question or really, the root of the question, which is allocation across domestic scheduling versus the inspector generated as appropriate. Do we still think it's appropriate, based on the way the question is worded?

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. RYBOLT: I mean, allocation might not be the right word, but I think everybody kind of agrees with the way you have it set up. Right? There's no cap on the inspector generated.

DR. BENNETT: Right.

DR. RYBOLT: So, yeah. So that covers

all the questions, I believe. We have 15 minutes. I mean, we've still got to go through and work out --

DR. BOOREN: Let's go through them, Michael.

DR. RYBOLT: Yeah, that's what I wanted to make sure.

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. BOOREN: I know Michael had a concern that we might not have captured some of the communication (Inaudible 01:04:43), so I just want to make sure --

DR. CRUPAIN: I think we can edit it.

DR. BOOREN: Okay, good.

DR. RYBOLT: So, do you want me to read through it, or do you want to?

DR. BOOREN: Yeah.

DR. RYBOLT: Soon the first question -- I'm not going to read each one of the questions. You guys have it in front of you and you have it at the top. But for subpart A, the committee -- and please disregard some of the shorthand -- I'll

fix all that.

The subcommittee finds great value in the National Residue Program. The subcommittee recommends that the agency develop communication tools to fully and clearly explain the program for all stakeholders (consumers, industry, academia, international trading partners, et cetera). Surveillance is important for the international trading partners, and therefore, domestic should be included. That goes back to -- we require that we should do it, too. Should include release of more detailed analysis of available data in a more timely fashion. That goes to kind of what Michael was talking about.

Questions, comments on that; parts that are not missing, if it's just -- okay?

DR. CRUPAIN: I don't understand when it says, and therefore, domestic should be included.

DR. RYBOLT: That goes back to -- I think Marcy made the comment.

DR. MARCY: Yeah, if we --

DR. RYBOLT: And Patty --

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. MARCY: You know, foreign people to --

DR. RYBOLT: Have a surveillance program --

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. MARCY: You have to do -- we can't require them to do something that you're not doing.

DR. RYBOLT: Yeah.

(Inaudible portion)

DR. MARCY: Right.

DR. BENNETT: That's a nice way to say, is this accepted practice across the board?

DR. MARCY: It is.

DR. BOOREN: It's from a standpoint of -- I think what we're getting at is the equivalency of residue testing here; that that domestic is for other international efforts.

DR. RYBOLT: Yeah. And we'll flesh that out.

DR. CRUPAIN: Do you want to say,

therefore, a domestic program is important?

DR. MARCY: Right. Surveillance is required for international. Right? Is it not?

DR. BENNETT: Yes.

DR. MARCY: Yeah, it's required.

DR. RYBOLT: Yeah.

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. RYBOLT: Okay. We'll flesh that out. But otherwise, is everybody okay with A?

(No response heard)

DR. RYBOLT: All right. And once we get it finalized, printed out, everybody will have a copy to review it and have your final say so. Probably not this morning, but we'll do that.

Subpart B: The agency evaluate if there are more findings in small plants, domestic and import both within FSIS data, and also, state residue programs. So, I think that kind of goes with a little bit of what Kryzs was saying, and I think Dr. Masters was up to talk about that. Good?

(No response heard)

DR. RYBOLT: I'm just going to keep going unless somebody just yells at me and tells me to stop. (Laughter) We added subpart B. The subcommittee recommends that the agency develop interagency communications and clearly define agency roles and responsibilities for stakeholders.

Know your farmer, know your food was something that Dan mentioned across departments, also, so that kind of goes back to what Kryzs was talking about, and Dr. Masters talked about, as well, as far as having some sort of clear understanding of how the residues play out across the different agencies, whether it's EPA, FDA, APHIS, whoever it is -- FSIS. Right?

(No response heard)

DR. RYBOLT: Okay. Number 2 has three parts. So, subpart A. The process of weighing the volume by species -- I don't know what I was getting at with that one, but we were talking about -- is emphasizing or allocating the right proportion of samples for domestic versus import;

need to balance with equivalence, may have stratified sampling programs.

Agency should consider appropriate drugs in use in another country which are excluded or banned in the U.S. I think that may have been -- somebody over here made that comment. Does that make sense? Are there questions about that?

(No response heard)

DR. RYBOLT: It's still got to be fleshed out, obviously, but Michael's like what

(Laughter)?

(Discussion off the record)

DR. BOOREN: The weighted by volume was how they're currently doing it.

DR. RYBOLT: Mm-hmm.

DR. BOOREN: They're looking at -- they're making sure they're getting the right sampling in the right areas of the whole population of the subcategory. And much of that is done by volume of establishment.

(Pause)

DR. RYBOLT: Any additions, added

comments?

(No response heard)

DR. RYBOLT: Does it make sense to you?

(No response heard)

DR. RYBOLT: All right. The subcommittee believes that the allocation across the domestic should -- or domestic schedule versus the inspector generated is appropriate. The subcommittee recommends the agency review inspector training and conduct periodic reviews across districts to ensure adequate implementation with more emphasis on small establishments. Kind of the last one we worked on, so I think we've got agreement on that one.

Moving forward, subpart C: The subcommittee believes that FSIS is appropriately allocating samples across slaughter classes effectively from the domestic schedule and sampling program. The domestic scheduled sampling program should be a random baseline -- I don't think we can use that word.

DR. BOOREN: Surveillance.

DR. RYBOLT: We'll have to take that out (Laughter).

DR. BOOREN: I think it's -- is surveillance fine with the subcommittee?

SPEAKER: Yes.

DR. RYBOLT: Yeah. Okay?

(No response heard)

DR. RYBOLT: All right? Good?

(No response heard)

DR. RYBOLT: Looks like nobody is shaking their head no.

All right, number 3, pretty long here. Let's see. Using the domestic sample set, FSIS is encouraged to investigate. Now, the question here, does the committee agree with FSIS emphasis on known versus unknown chemical hazards? We really didn't get to a complete answer. I just jotted some notes initially. Using the domestic sampling set, emphasized and encouraged to investigate -- I think this was -- you know, it depends on what we -- I don't know where that one was going.

DR. BOOREN: That was my initial interpretation as we sort of fleshed it out was, if there was going to be a sample set for the agency to evaluate new methods or so forth, it should come out of the domestic sampling program.

DR. RYBOLT: Oh, that's right.

DR. BOOREN: But I'm happy to remove that. That was the first attempt on this question.

DR. RYBOLT: I agree.

DR. BENNETT: Right.

DR. BOOREN: So, I can remove that part. It doesn't seem appropriate anymore.

DR. RYBOLT: I would agree with that, actually.

DR. BOOREN: Okay.

DR. RYBOLT: If you're going to look at something new, it should be within the domestic -- well --

DR. BENNETT: Again, it seemed to me that the conversation went to a different direction, but --

DR. BOOREN: Yeah.

DR. BENNETT: -- yeah, it's whatever you guys want to put up there, we'll look at it.

DR. CRUPAIN: Just looking for unknown things. I mean, I don't see why you would want --

DR. BOOREN: The reason -- my thought process on using the domestic is that if there were clear definitions of how the samples were taken -- so if they were archiving the samples for later use, you would have clear population information compared to inspector generated, which is much more weighted towards a bias of perhaps, violations and so forth.

This would be a cleaner population set to test the methods on. And then, it would track easier with some of the historical data. It could just fit into that. That was the thought process for that.

DR. CRUPAIN: I think that makes sense, if you're doing it -- it depends on why you're doing it. So if you're doing it for surveillance, the same thing, then yeah, that makes sense. If

you're doing it because you're looking for an emerging hazard for public health safety kind of thing, then it probably makes sense to do it on a targeted sample where you think there might be something going on. Right?

DR. BENNETT: Or is that too specific?

(No response heard)

DR. BENNETT: So, I think the targeted program -- generally, again, when I think of the inspector generated, that they're looking for issues with veterinary drugs 99 percent of the time. Sometimes other chemicals.

If this is kind of what Betsy's looking at, it's like we don't know or we don't know (sic). So, I don't know that targeting dairy cows tells us what we don't know, because maybe it's not a dairy cow thing; it's a U.S. Cattle issue or something like that, because somebody has introduced it into the feed, or somebody has brought it across the border, and now they're applying it to all kinds of slaughter classes.

So, I guess it depends on what we're

looking for.

DR. BOOREN: I'm happy to keep it in or remove it, but that was sort of my thought process on a population.

DR. RYBOLT: So, on the second paragraph, I think I actually tried to write the answer (Laughter) to the question. The subcommittee agrees with FSIS on unknown chemical hazards. The subcommittee encourages the agency to continue focus on those known hazards, but should establish a method for reviewing included hazards and levels, to Michael's point earlier, at some periodic basis with partner agencies to include international partners. And it also goes to what Pat was talking about, as well.

There was also a comment made -- someone made a comment about the time frame required for a confirmation test; that the subcommittee recommends investigation to more rapid methodology that would ensure more timely results, as it does hinder the establishments to get results, because 10 days -- I think we talked about turnaround of

some results.

(Pause)

DR. RYBOLT: Patty looks -- no?

DR. BENNETT: No, I mean, you're the committee.

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. RYBOLT: Does that make any sense to you (Laughter)?

DR. BENNETT: No, it does. It makes a great deal of sense.

DR. BOOREN: I think it's important to have it in there. And my standpoint is the importance of having it from an advisory committee is it's important for our regulatory agencies to make the investment on continually improving technologies for detection. And that's why I think that statement is important, is that --

DR. RYBOLT: Yeah, and we'll flesh out to work with other agencies or whoever it is, because as Dan mentioned, this is beyond FSIS. This is all the way up to the secretary. So, he'll direct other divisions, ARS or whoever, to

do some work with as well. So, we'll flesh that out.

So everybody is good with that, then?

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. RYBOLT: And we'll take out the first part. Those were just Betsy's thoughts, initially.

DR. CRUPAIN: For the first part, do we -- do we think that? I mean, I don't have a problem with it as a sort of concept. We think that it should focus on the known, but perhaps, as time and resources permit, they should both -- they should look into explored unknowns. Is that something we think they should --

They're asking us, should they look at unknowns?

DR. BOOREN: I think we also sort of answered that question in sort of question 4, when we talked about the process. To me, that gets to that, Michael. The standpoint of --

DR. RYBOLT: Yeah.

DR. BOOREN: Because they have a process

with the other agencies, the interagencies. That will help probably direct known and unknown sampling, because they'll know. And that -- I think we can -- it makes sense to sort of wrap it in that discussion of, if they're recognizing -- if they're hearing, known, do we need to develop -- or unknown, do we need to develop, and then, what is the sampling mechanism?

And I'm happy to leave that at the discretion of the agencies to recommend what's the best. But I think that process could be defined or encouraged.

MR. PUZO: We only have a matter of a few minutes.

DR. RYBOLT: Yeah, literally like five.

MR. PUZO: The other committee finished a while ago, so you can fine tune this tonight --

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. RYBOLT: I think we can add something to that.

MR. PUZO: -- or tomorrow. And tomorrow, during the general session, you can

individually make points that elaborate upon what the committee recommends, as well, including dissent.

DR. RYBOLT: We want to be done by tomorrow, though. We don't want to have to do homework (Laughter).

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. RYBOLT: All right. So the last one, real quick.

House (phonetic 01:15:32) should emphasize, consider chemical categories, nuclear ranks relative to each other. Just general comments were made. They didn't come up with an actual answer here, relative -- risk relative, public health based, variation between countries should be considered, established processed review, as we talked about a second ago.

Interagency collaboration, need process again, to add new hazards, but also need the process to remove hazard risks that are deemed -- I used the word de minimis, even though that really doesn't mean anything. For me, hazard

ranking should be based on public health risk and known issues.

And then, Dana mentioned something about need to make sure we can stir those long-term exposures versus, et cetera. So, does that make sense for this? We'll have to flesh it out, obviously, but anything somebody was thinking that wasn't captured?

DR. BOOREN: We've got two minutes. Is the group comfortable with the framing here? Is there anything missing? Any red flags?

DR. RYBOLT: Yeah, anybody's thoughts?

(No response heard)

DR. BOOREN: And I think there will be time to review and add tomorrow morning, but from a consensus standpoint, if we walk out of the room in a minute, are you comfortable with what we're going to put forward?

DR. MARCY: Yeah, I think this is where we captured this number -- this last one. John Marcy, University of Arkansas.

Where we captured that unknown -- new

versus unknown, which you know, I think back in number 3, we probably need to change that to new versus unknown. It's known to somebody. You know (Laughter)? We're not reinventing it.

(Simultaneous discussion)

DR. BOOREN: This is good?

(No response heard)

DR. BOOREN: Final?

SPEAKER: Yes.

SPEAKER: Yeah.

SPEAKER: Yes.

DR. BOOREN: Feel good about it?

SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. PUZO: Well, I'd like to thank you all for some excellent work and conversations, and now we'll reassemble in the general session.

(Whereupon, at 3:29 p.m., the PROCEEDINGS were adjourned.)

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

I, Irene Gray, notary public in and for the District of Columbia, do hereby certify that the forgoing PROCEEDING was duly recorded and thereafter reduced to print under my direction; that the witnesses were sworn to tell the truth under penalty of perjury; that said transcript is a true record of the testimony given by witnesses; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this proceeding was called; and, furthermore, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the District of Columbia

My Commission Expires: April 30, 2016