



USDA Perspective: Need for Prioritizing Potential Risks from Contaminants in Food

Kerry L. Dearfield, Ph.D. Scientific Advisor for Risk Assessment Office of Public Health Science Food Safety and Inspection Service U.S. Department of Agriculture

Presented to Workshop: Tools for Prioritizing Food Safety Concerns June 4, 2007







- Background need for a science-based process/framework for prioritizing risks from chemical and microbial contaminants in food
- USDA's Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) approach for:
 - Microbiological contaminants
 - Chemical/residue contaminants







The Food Safety and **Inspection Service** (FSIS) is the public health agency in the U.S. Department of Agriculture responsible for ensuring that the nation's commercial supply of meat, poultry, and egg products is safe, wholesome, and correctly labeled and packaged.









Listeria monocytogenes (Lm) as an example





Setting the Risk Assessment Agenda

- Identify Food Safety Problem
- Prioritization based on factors such as:
 - Foodborne outbreaks
 - Epidemiological and clinical findings
 - Public health concern
 - New scientific findings
 - Surveillance and monitoring information
 - Changes in industry practices
- Public input important; mechanism for public access regarding status of agenda
- Prioritization can change





Food Categories

SEAFOOD	
Smoked Seafood (finfish and mollusks)	Food
Raw Seafood (finfish, mollusks, and crustaceans)	1000
Preserved Fish (dried, pickled, and marinated finfish)	Categories
Cooked Ready-to-Eat Crustaceans (shrimp and crab)	Categories
PRODUCE	used in the
Vegetables (raw)	used in the
Fruits (raw, dried)	2003 EDA
DAIRY	2003 I DA
Fresh Soft Cheese (queso fresco, queso de Crema, Queso de Puna)	FCIC
Soft Unripened Cheese, >50% moisture (cottage cheese, cream cheese, ricotta)	1 313
Soft Ripened Cheese, >>0% moisture (brie, camembert, feta, mozzarella)	Quantitativa
Semi-soft Cheese, 39-50% moisture (blue, brick, Monterey, muenster)	Quantilative
Hard Cheese, <39% moisture (cheddar, Colby, parmesan)	I m Diak
Processed Cheese (cheese foods, spreads, slices)	LIII KISK
Pasteurized Fluid Milk	A a a a a a m a m t
Unpasteurized Fluid Milk	Assessment
Ice Cream and Other Frozen Dairy Products	
Cultured Milk Products (yogurt, sour cream, buttermilk)	Interpretive Summary;
High Fat and Other Dairy Products (butter, cream, other miscellaneous milk products)	Quantitative Assessment of the Relative Risk to Public Health from
MEA1 Englishington (schools d)	Among Selected Categories of Ready-to-Eat Foods
Frankfurters (reneated)	Center for Food Satity and Applied Nutriess
Dra Sanci Dra Francasta (Sanca and	Tood and Drug Administration U.S. Departments of Handhi and Human Services Tood Sidey and Impection Service
Dry/Semi-Dry Fermented Sausages	U.S. Department of Agriculture Separates 2003
Den Meats (cooked, feady-to-eat)	A.
COMBINATION FOODS	USDA
Deli-trme Salads (fruit vegetable meat pasta egg or seafood salads)	
Deli-type Salads (fruit, vegetable, meat, pasta, egg, or seafood salads)	

Risk Ranking: Predicted Median ISIS

Cases of Listeriosis for US Population

Relative	Predicted Median Cases of Listeriosis for 23 Food Categories					
Risk	Per Serving Basis ^a			Per Annum Basis ^b		
Ranking		Food	Cases		Food	Cases
1	gh Risk	Deli Meats	7.7x10 ⁻⁸	V ery High	Deli Meats	1598.7
2		Frankfurters, not reheated	6.5x10 ⁻⁸	Risk	Pasteurized Fluid Milk	90.8
3		Pâté and Meat Spreads	3.2x10 ⁻⁸	High	High Fat and Other Dairy Products	56.4
4	Hig	Unpasteurized Fluid Milk	7.1x10 ⁻⁹		Frankfurters, not reheated	30.5
5		Smoked Seafood	6.2x10 ^{-y}		Soft Unripened Cheese	7.7
6		Cooked Ready-to-Eat Crustaceans	5.1x10 ⁻⁹	Risk	Pâté and Meat Spreads	3.8
7	ate c	High Fat and Other Dairy Products	2.7x10 ⁻⁹	erate	Unpasteurized Fluid Milk	3.1
8	Mode Risł	Soft Unripened Cheese	1.8x10 ⁻⁹	Mod	Cooked Ready-to-Eat Crustaceans	2.8
9	-	Pasteurized Fluid Milk	1.0x10 ⁻⁹		Smoked Seafood	1.3





Interventions to Reduce Risk

- Combinations of interventions appear to be much more effective than any single intervention in mitigating the potential contamination of RTE product with L. monocytogenes and reducing the subsequent risk of illness or death
 - Testing and sanitation of food contact surfaces
 - Pre-and post-packaging interventions
 - Use of growth inhibitors/product reformulation





Lm Control Measures

- Established three alternative control measures:
 - Post-lethality treatment and antimicrobial agent/process with sanitation (Alternative 1)
 - Post-lethality treatment (Alternative 2a) or antimicrobial agent/process with sanitation (Alternative 2b); and
 - Sanitation alone (Alternative 3)





Risk Based Verification Sampling

- Generate a 'risk ranking' for all RTE establishments making post-lethality exposed product:
 - Alternative they opt to use to control Lm
 - 2003 FSIS Lm Risk Assessment
 - Product type: potential for Lm to grow
 - 2003 FDA FSIS Risk Ranking
 - Compliance history of the establishment
 - Volume of production
 - Voluntary measures chosen by the establishment





Risk-Based Inspection

- Risk varies across products produced at various establishments
- Exposure: Characteristics that contribute to presence and amount of hazard in a serving of food
 - Product supports the survival and growth of a pathogen
 - Process specifics (time and temperature conditions; line speed)
 - Interventions in place
 - Test and hold programs and testing
 - Disposition of the product
 - Empirical indicators include microbial test results
- Exposure: Number of servings that contain a likely amount of hazard
 - Production volume



- Definitive drivers of risk must be identified and, ultimately, understood quantitatively.
- Valid descriptions of establishments according to those risk factors are needed.
- Eventually, a global model, one tracking all pathogens and processes will allow FSIS to allocate resources of all types (sampling and inspection) according to the risk to human health. In the mean time, we build mechanistic models for each pathogen and process pair (Lm in RTE).







National Residue Program (NRP) as an example





National Residue Program (NRP)

- The foundation of the NRP was a government action to control the occurrence of toxic chemicals in the food supply that resulted from the agricultural and industrial use of new chemicals.
- Purpose of the NRP is twofold:
 - First is to determine what toxic chemicals are present in meat, poultry, and egg products (exposure assessments).
 - Second is to keep the meat, poultry, and egg products free from toxic chemicals before reaching consumers.





USDA/FSIS Emphasis

Once these compounds have been identified, FSIS will:

- Prioritize what chemicals to monitor in the NRP based on risk
- Determine if risk management actions need to be taken



Considerations for **S** Ranking of Compounds for NRP

- Public Health
 - Acute or chronic toxicity concern
 - Impact on new and existing human diseases
 - Development of resistance & impact on human health
- Duration and usage
- FSIS historical testing information
 - Number of animals treated
 - No. of violations reported
- Availability of laboratory resources
- Withdrawal time





Tool for Ranking Criteria

- Score for Acute or Chronic Toxicity Concerns ("T") (FDA)
- Predicted or actual score for "FSIS Historical Testing Information on Violations" ("V") (FSIS)
- Score for "Impact on new and existing human disease" ("D") (CDC)
- Relative Public Health Concern Score (R)

 $R = V^{*}[(D+3^{*}T)/4]$

Professional judgment is always an important consideration in ranking the compounds



Considering Toxicity for Ranking

- Acute effects:
 - Anaphylactic reactions e.g., Penicillins
 - Neuromuscular effects e.g., Organophosphates
 - Potentially life threatening e.g., Clenbuterol
- Subchronic toxicity:
 - Adrenal damage e.g., Carbadox and olquindox
- Chronic toxicity:
 - Carcinogenicity e.g., Nitroimidazoles and Nitrofurans





Clenbuterol

- In one 6 month period in 1993 more than 1,200 hospitalizations and 3 deaths in France and Spain were reported to have resulted from eating beef livers contaminated with the illegal growth promotant clenbuterol.
- These patients were reported to complain of tremor, headaches, tachycardia, atrial fibrillation and dizziness 1-3 h after eating veal liver.

ILLEGAL USE OF CLENBUTEROL IN FOOD ANIMALS

s we mentioned in the last issue Hof the FDA Veterinarian, FDA is investigating the illegal use of the drug, clenbuterol, in animals used for food. particularly animals being prepared for livestock show competition. The purpose of this article is to illustrate the potential consequences of illegal drug use in food animals by describing an outbreak of clenbuterol-related drug residue poisoning, and to explain the scientific basis for the Center for Veterinary Medicine's (CVM) particular concern for illegal use of clenbuterol in food producing animals. The following description of an outbreak of clenbuterol residue toxicity demonstrates the potential public health consequences of illegal use of drugs in animals used for food.

Numerous cases of illness, which appeared to be due to food poisoning,

or in feed to animals, and of apparent therapeutic or production value in animal husbandry. Based on these criteria, it was suspected that illegal use of a β agonist in cattle was responsible for the poisoning outbreak. Prompt follow-up on a number of patients had allowed the investigators to collect samples of the suspected food. as well as urine samples from the individuals. Analysis of these samples revealed that a β agonist, clenbuterol. was present at levels of 2-4 ppb in patients' urine and 160-291 pob in beef liver samples. This confirmed the investigators' suspicions that an illegal animal drug residue present in liver had produced the outbreak of food-borne poisoning.

"Analysis of these samples ... confirmed the investiga-

By Dr. William C. Keller

9









Thank you very much