

The Humane Society Institute for Science and Policy
Animal Studies Repository

May 2014

An HSI Fact Sheet: Biosecurity Challenges of Industrial Farm Animal Production

Humane Society International

Follow this and additional works at: http://animalstudiesrepository.org/hsi_fact_sheets_fap



Part of the [Agribusiness Commons](#), [Animal Studies Commons](#), and the [Biosecurity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Humane Society International, "An HSI Fact Sheet: Biosecurity Challenges of Industrial Farm Animal Production" (2014). *HSI Fact Sheets: Farm Animal Protection*. 3.

http://animalstudiesrepository.org/hsi_fact_sheets_fap/3

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Humane Society Institute for Science and Policy. It has been accepted for inclusion by an authorized administrator of the Animal Studies Repository. For more information, please contact eyahner@humanesociety.org.



An HSI Fact Sheet

Biosecurity Challenges of Industrial Farm Animal Production

Industrial farm animal production (IFAP) has become increasingly common throughout the world.^{1,2} Worldwide, industrial systems now account for approximately two-thirds of poultry meat production and half of egg and pig meat production,³ with developing countries already producing approximately half of the world's industrial pork and poultry by 2006.⁴

Inherent design and operational requirements of IFAP facilities can create biosecurity problems with both bioexclusion and biocontainment—efforts to prevent the respective influx and efflux of pathogens. These may help explain why large commercial flocks may be up to 10,000 times more likely to report outbreaks with pathogens such as highly pathogenic avian influenza H5N1 compared to small backyard flocks.⁵



Occupation exposure to zoonotic viruses and antibiotic-resistant bacteria poses significant risks to workers and their families.

©Erin Vanvoorhies/HSI

Feed input. The sheer number of animal in such facilities necessitates large material inputs. One cycle of a flock of 10,000 broiler chickens, for example, requires approximately 42 tons of feed and 100,000 liters of water.⁶ The replacement of grazing and forage fodder with commercial feed that may contain animal by-products, waste, and antibiotics⁷ increases risk of exposure to antibiotic resistant bacteria, prions, and other pathogens with human and animal health implication.^{8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17} The worldwide dissemination of multidrug-resistant *Salmonella* has been blamed on the use of contaminated feed made out of farmed fish who had been routinely fed nontherapeutic antibiotics.¹⁸

Stocking Density. Pathogens can enter IFAP operations in a number of ways, including carryover from previous production cycles, from unrelated domestic or wild animal vectors, and through contaminated feed or water.^{19,20} When such a breach of biosecurity occurs, pathogen spread, amplification,²¹ and mutation is magnified by the large number and stocking density of confined, susceptible hosts.²²

Occupational Exposure. The number and stocking density of animals in IFAP operations can increase the intensity of occupational exposure to pathogens. Inadequate protection of worker safety has been noted, including a frequent lack of protective clothing and on-site decontamination.²³ Numerous studies have noted a higher prevalence of zoonotic viral and antibiotic-resistant bacterial exposure and/or infections in farm workers and their

families.^{24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34} Smallholder herds and flocks present less of a risk for pathogen exposure and transmission due to reduced infectious loads and exposure.

Waste Output. The volume of excreta from IFAP operations presents a waste management challenge³⁵ compounded by the regional concentration of such facilities.³⁶ IFAP units can easily rival small cities in terms of waste production.³⁷ Smaller farming systems combine animal husbandry with crop agriculture, thereby balancing the number of animals with crop nutrient needs. At IFAP facilities, the amount of manure produced typically exceeds the capacity of the surrounding land to absorb it. Waste from industrial swine and poultry production is often stored in massive manure pits^{38,39} that have been known to leak and break, contaminating nearby water sources with manure pathogens^{40,41,42,43,44,45} that can survive up to a year in the case of bacteria and up to seven years in the case of helminths.⁴⁶ Unlike human waste, raw animal waste may be sprayed on nearby fields untreated, potentially contaminating water, soil, and air.^{47,48} Spilled feed in disposed poultry waste can

attract wild birds⁴⁹ and creates a likely mode of avian influenza transmission to these wild birds,^{50,51,52} who can then transport it to other susceptible domestic flocks.⁵³ Additionally, workers involved in the transportation, disposal, and spreading of this mass accumulation of biosolids may face a much higher level of exposure to zoonotic pathogens.⁵⁴

Insect Vectors. The concentration of animal waste, decaying organic material, and cesspit standing water at IFAP operations may result in infestations of insects⁵⁵ implicated in the spread of *Escherichia coli*,⁵⁶ *Staphylococcus aureus*,^{57,58} multi-drug antibiotic resistant bacteria,⁵⁹ cholera,⁶⁰ *Shigella*,⁶¹ *Salmonella*,⁶² *Campylobacter*,⁶³ highly pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI),⁶⁴ West Nile virus,⁶⁵ St. Louis encephalitis,⁶⁶ equine encephalitis,⁶⁷ malaria,⁶⁸ yellow fever,⁶⁹ and dengue fever.⁷⁰ Contaminated and/or infected insects can enter and exit IFAP operations via high-volume fans needed to control the heat and humidity created by concentrating so many animals in a confined space.^{71,72} A study examining the spread of *Campylobacter*, a bacteria that causes millions of cases of foodborne illness every year, found that as many as 30,000 flies may enter a broiler facility during a single flock rotation.⁷³ The necessity of high volume ventilation⁷⁴ undermines the perceived biosecurity and biocontainment advantage of indoor confinement.

Geographic Consolidation. Mechanically ventilated IFAP facilities and their attendant waste may introduce pathogens into the surrounding environment more than smaller naturally ventilated farm animal populations.^{75,76,77} Biocontamination risk is amplified by the international trend towards geographic consolidation of IFAP.^{78,79} When facilities are situated in close proximity to one another, pathogens may spread through the wind,^{80,81} a mode of transmission thought to play a role in a 2004 outbreak of HPAI in Canada between multiple IFAP operations positioned several hundred meters apart. A million-fold increase in aerosolized dust has been noted in the air surrounding IFAP units.⁸²

Vertical Integration. IFAP operations may vertically integrate different stages of farm animal production (breeding, supply of young animals, feeds, animal husbandry, slaughter),^{83,84,85,86} which can facilitate the spread of pathogens into multiple IFAP operations. Suppliers that deliver to multiple IFAP operations can also carry pathogens between facilities.⁸⁷

Live Transport. The geographic concentration of IFAP facilities specific to different stages of farm animal production has increased average distances for animal transport.⁸⁸ In 2005, for example, more than 25 million live pigs were traded internationally.⁸⁹ In 2007, investigations of an avian influenza outbreak in the U.K. revealed the movement of birds four times between Hungarian and U.K. facilities within one enterprise before the final product reached retail.⁹⁰ Trucks and shipping containers used to transport farm animals can be contaminated with pathogens,^{91,92,93,94} which are increasingly shed by animals stressed by transport.⁹⁵ Given that a single gram of feces can contain as many as 10 billion infectious particles, small amounts of residual fecal matter can infect susceptible groups of animals⁹⁶ and transporting animals in unenclosed trucks and trains also allows for the spread of pathogens into the surrounding environment.⁹⁷ Smallholder farms do not require the shifting of animals between stages of production and eliminate the need for mass long distance live animal transport. Without the spatial dissemination of swine flu progenitor strains associated with long-distance commercial transport,⁹⁸ the 2009 H1N1 pandemic might have been averted.

Biosecurity Noncompliance. IFAP risks can be mediated with strict biosecurity protocols, but producers are often unwilling to adhere to such standards due to the associated financial expense.⁹⁹ For instance, large poultry operations may reduce the amount of time between flocks and neglect to clean poultry houses between production cycles in order to cut costs.¹⁰⁰ Commercial IFAP operators consistently require neither footbaths nor a change of clothes.¹⁰¹ The U.S. Supreme Court has had to intervene and mandate compensation for employees' time spent donning protective clothing.¹⁰² Public health experts fear the increasing number of IFAP operations worldwide may lead to an international decline in standards of biosecurity and biocontainment.¹⁰³ Even with full compliance with established protocols, the delineated risks inherent to industrialized animal agriculture may pose unacceptable human and animal health risks.

- ¹ Verge XPC, De Kimpe C, and Desjardins RL. 2007. Agricultural production, greenhouse gas emissions and mitigation potential. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 142:225-69.
- ² Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development and Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. 2011. OECD-FAO agricultural outlook 2011-2020, p. 136.
- ³ Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. 2007. The state of the world's animal genetic resources for food and agriculture, p. 156. www.fao.org/docrep/010/a1250e/a1250e00.htm. Accessed September 30, 2012.
- ⁴ Steinfeld H, Gerber P, Wassenaar T, Castel V, Rosales M, and de Haan C. 2006. Livestock's long shadow: environmental issues and options. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, p. 53 Table 2.9, p. 54 Table 2.10. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/010/a0701e/a0701e00.htm>. Accessed September 30, 2012.
- ⁵ Otte J, Pfeiffer, R. Soares-Magalhaes, S. Burgos, and Roland-Holst D. 2008. Controlling avian flu and protecting people's livelihoods in the Mekong region. Rome, Italy: Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations. http://www.aphca.org/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=127&Itemid=120. Accessed January 24, 2013.
- ⁶ Otte J, Roland-Holst D, Pfeiffer D, et al. 2007. Industrial livestock production and global health risks, p. 9. <http://bit.ly/Vbj5Ww>. Accessed September 30, 2012.
- ⁷ Sapkota AR, Lefferts LY, McKenzie S, and Walker P. 2007. What do we feed to food-production animals? A review of animal feed ingredients and their potential impacts on human health. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 115(5):663-670.
- ⁸ Crump JA, Griffin PM, and Angulo FJ. 2002. Bacterial contamination of animal feed and its relationship to human foodborne illness. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 35:859-865. <http://cid.oxfordjournals.org/content/35/7/859.long>. Accessed September 30, 2012.
- ⁹ Davis MA, Hancock DD, Rice DH, et al. 2003. Feedstuffs as a vehicle of cattle exposure to *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 and *Salmonella enterica*. *Veterinary Microbiology* 95(3):199-210.
- ¹⁰ Krytenburg DS, Hancock DD, Rice DH, Besser TE, Gay CC, and Gay JM. 1998. A pilot survey of *Salmonella enterica* contamination of cattle feeds in the Pacific northwestern USA. *Animal Feed Science and Technology* 75:75-79.
- ¹¹ Dargatz DA, Strohmeier RA, Morley PS, Hyatt DR, and Salman MD. 2005. Characterization of *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella enterica* from cattle feed ingredients. *Foodborne Pathogens and Disease* 2:341-347. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16366856>. Accessed January 11, 2013.
- ¹² Lynn TV, Hancock DD, Besser TE, et al. 1998. The occurrence and replication of *Escherichia coli* in cattle feeds. *Journal of Dairy Science* 81:1102-1108.
- ¹³ Sargeant JM, Sanderson MW, Griffin DD, and Smit RA. 2004. Factors associated with the presence of *Escherichia coli* O157 in feedlot-cattle water and feed in the Midwestern USA. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine* 66:207-237. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15579344>. Accessed January 11, 2013.
- ¹⁴ Schwalbe RS, McIntosh AC, Qaiyumi S, Johnson JA, and Morris JG Jr. 1999. Isolation of vancomycin-resistant enterococci from animal feed in USA. *Lancet* 353:722.
- ¹⁵ Hofacre CL, White DG, Maurer JI, Morales C, and Hudson C. 2001. Characterization of antibiotic-resistant bacteria in rendered animal products. *Avian Diseases* 45:953-961.
- ¹⁶ Sturm-Ramirez KM, Hulse-Post DJ, Govorkova EA, et al. 2005. Are ducks contributing to the endemicity of highly pathogenic H5N1 influenza virus in Asia? *Journal of Virology* 79:11269-79.
- ¹⁷ Gizzi G, van Raamsdonk LW, Baeten V, et al. 2003. An overview of tests for animal tissues in feeds applied in response to public health concerns regarding bovine spongiform encephalopathy. *Revue Scientifique et Technique* 22:311-331.
- ¹⁸ Heuer OE, Kruse H, Grave K, et al. 2009. Human health consequences of use of antimicrobial agents in aquaculture. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 49(8):1248-53. <http://cid.oxfordjournals.org/content/49/8/1248.long>. Accessed July 27, 2012.
- ¹⁹ Graham JP, Leibler JH, Price LB, et al. 2008. The animal-human interface and infectious disease in industrial food animal production: rethinking biosecurity and biocontainment. *Public Health Reports* 123:282-99.
- ²⁰ Guerin MT, Martin W, Reiersen J, et al. 2007. A farm-level study of risk factors associated with the colonization of broiler flocks with *Campylobacter* spp. in Iceland, 2001-2004. *Acta Veterinaria Scandinavica* 49:18.
- ²¹ Animal Health and Welfare Panel of the European Food Safety Authority. 2005. Animal health and welfare aspects of avian influenza. *European Food Safety Authority Journal* 266:1-21.
- ²² Leibler JH, Otte J, Roland-Holst D, et al. 2009. Industrial food animal production and global health risks: exploring the ecosystems and economics of avian influenza. *EcoHealth* 6:58-70.
- ²³ Graham JP, Leibler JH, Price LB, et al. 2008. The animal-human interface and infectious disease in industrial food animal production: rethinking biosecurity and biocontainment. *Public Health Reports* 123:282-99.
- ²⁴ Huo X, Zu R, Qi X, et al. 2012. Seroprevalence of avian influenza A (H5N1) virus among poultry workers in Jiangsu Province, China: an observational study. *BioMed Central Infectious Diseases* 12:93. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3348011/?tool=pubmed>. Accessed October 1, 2012.
- ²⁵ Akwar TH, Poppe C, Wilson J, et al. 2007. Risk factors for antimicrobial resistance among fecal *Escherichia coli* from residents on forty-three swine farms. *Microbial Drug Resistance* 13:69-76.
- ²⁶ Withers MR, Correa MT, Morrow M, et al. 2002. Antibody levels to hepatitis E virus in North Carolina swine workers, non-swine workers, swine, and murids. *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene* 66:334-8.
- ²⁷ Olsen CW, Brammer L, Easterday BC, et al. 2002. Serologic evidence of H1 swine influenza virus infection in swine farm residents and employees. *Emerging Infectious Disease* 8:814-9.
- ²⁸ Fey PD, Safranek TJ, Rupp ME, et al. 2000. Ceftriaxone-resistant *Salmonella* infection acquired by a child from cattle. *The New England Journal of Medicine* 342:1242-9.
- ²⁹ Levy SB, FitzGerald GB, and Macaone AB. 1976. Spread of antibiotic-resistant plasmids from chicken to chicken and from chicken to man. *Nature* 260:40-2.
- ³⁰ van den Bogaard AE, Willems R, London N, Top J, and Stobberingh EE. 2002. Antibiotic resistance of faecal enterococci in poultry, poultry farmers and poultry slaughterers. *The Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy* 49:497-505. <http://jac.oxfordjournals.org/content/49/3/497.full>. Accessed October 2, 2012.
- ³¹ Al-Ghamdi MS, El-Morsy F, Al-Musafa ZH, Al-Ramadhan M, and Hanif M. 1999. Antibiotic resistance of *Escherichia coli* isolated from poultry workers, patients and chickens in the eastern province of Saudi Arabia. *Tropical Medicine & International Health* 4:278-83. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1046/j.1365-3156.1999.00392.x/full>. Accessed October 2, 2012.
- ³² Myers KP, Olsen CW, Setterquist SF, et al. 2006. Are swine workers in the United States at increased risk of infection with zoonotic influenza virus? *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 42:14-20. <http://cid.oxfordjournals.org/content/42/1/14.long>. Accessed October 6, 2012.
- ³³ Koopmans M, Wilbrink B, Conyn M, et al. 2004. Transmission of H7N7 avian influenza A virus to human beings during a large outbreak in commercial poultry farms in the Netherlands. *The Lancet* 363:587-93. <http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736%2804%2915589-X/fulltext>. Accessed July 6, 2012.
- ³⁴ Bridges GB, Lim W, Hu-Primmer J, et al. 2002. Risk of influenza A (H5N1) infection among poultry workers, Hong Kong, 1997-1998. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases* 185:1005-10. <http://jid.oxfordjournals.org/content/185/8/1005.long>. Accessed October 6, 2012.
- ³⁵ Spencer JL and Guan J. 2004. Public health implications related to spread of pathogens in manure from livestock and poultry operations. *Methods in Molecular Biology* 268:503-15.
- ³⁶ Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. 1997. Livestock and poultry: world markets and trade. <http://www.fas.usda.gov/dlp2/circular/1997/97-10LP/poultry.htm>. Accessed October 2, 2012.
- ³⁷ United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2004. Risk Assessment Evaluation for Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations. EPA/600/R-04/042. p. iv. <http://nepis.epa.gov/Adobe/PDF/901V0100.pdf>. Accessed October 2, 2012.
- ³⁸ American Public Health Association. 2003. Precautionary Moratorium on New Concentrated Animal Feed Operations. <http://bit.ly/10Saow2>. Accessed October 5, 2012.
- ³⁹ Pew Commission on IFAP. 2008. Putting meat on the table: industrial farm animal production in America, p. 23. <http://bit.ly/W4ksis>. Accessed October 5, 2012.
- ⁴⁰ Mallin MA and Cahoon LB. 2003. Industrialized animal production--a major source of nutrient and microbial pollution to aquatic ecosystems. *Pollution and Environment* 24(5): 369-385.
- ⁴¹ Burkholder JM, Mallin MA, Glasgow Jr HB, et al. 1997. Impacts to a coastal river and estuary from rupture of a swine waste holding lagoon. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 26:1451-1466. <https://www.agronomy.org/publications/jeq/abstracts/26/6/JEQ0260061451>. Accessed January 12, 2013.
- ⁴² Mallin MA, Burkholder JM, McIver MR, et al. 1997. Comparative effects of poultry and swine waste lagoon spills on the quality of receiving stream waters. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 26:1622-1631. <https://www.soils.org/publications/jeq/abstracts/26/6/JEQ0260061622?access=0&view=pdf>. Accessed January 12, 2013.
- ⁴³ Mallin MA, Posey MH, Shank GC, McIver MR, Ensign SH, and Alphin, TD. 1999. Hurricane effects on water quality and benthos in the Cape Fear Watershed: Natural and anthropogenic impacts. *Ecological Applications* 9:350-362.
- ⁴⁴ Westerman PW, Huffman RL, and Feng JS. 1995. Swine-lagoon seepage in sandy soil. *Transactions of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers* 38:1749-1760. http://www.pork.org/ResearchDetail/1012/Swine-lagoonseepage.aspx#_UPB7qLaiZV8. Accessed January 12, 2013.
- ⁴⁵ Wing S, Freedman S, and Band L. 2002. The potential impact of flooding on confined animal feeding operations in eastern North Carolina. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 110:387-391.
- ⁴⁶ Gerba CP and Smith JE Jr. 2005. Sources of pathogenic microorganisms and their fate during land application of wastes. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 34:42-8.
- ⁴⁷ Pew Commission on IFAP. 1998. Putting meat on the table: industrial farm animal production in America, p.11. <http://bit.ly/W4ksis>. Accessed October 5, 2012.
- ⁴⁸ United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2004. Risk Management Evaluation For Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations. (Cincinnati, OH: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, p. 34). <http://nepis.epa.gov/Exec/zyPURL.cgi?Dockey=901V0100.txt>. Accessed January 18, 2013.
- ⁴⁹ Graham JP, Leibler JH, Price LB, et al. 2008. The animal-human interface and infectious disease in industrial food animal production: rethinking biosecurity and biocontainment. *Public Health Reports* 123:282-99.
- ⁵⁰ United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2004. Risk Management Evaluation For Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations. (Cincinnati, OH: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, pp. 35). <http://nepis.epa.gov/Exec/zyPURL.cgi?Dockey=901V0100.txt>. Accessed January 18, 2013.
- ⁵¹ Feare CJ. 2006. Fish farming and the risk of spread of avian influenza. p. 6. 2013. www.birdlife.org/action/science/species/avian_flu/fish_farming_review.pdf. Accessed January 19, 2013.
- ⁵² FAO/OIE/WHO. 2005. FAO/OIE/WHO consultation on avian influenza and human health: risk reduction measures in producing, marketing, and living with animals in Asia, p. 16. http://www.wpro.who.int/entity/foodsafety/documents/docs/FAO_OIE_WHO_Consultation.pdf. Accessed January 18, 2013.
- ⁵³ Sturm-Ramirez KM, Hulse-Post DJ, Govorkova EA, et al. 2005. Are ducks contributing to the endemicity of highly pathogenic H5N1 influenza virus in Asia? *Journal of Virology* 79:11269-79.

- ⁵⁴ Cole D, Todd L, and Wing S. 2000. Concentrated swine feeding operations and public health: a review of occupational and community health effects. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 108:685-99.
- ⁵⁵ Steeves S and Williams R. 2007. Contained Animal Feeding Operations—Insect Considerations. Purdue Extension. <http://bit.ly/WqJN2s>. Accessed October 6, 2012.
- ⁵⁶ Alam MJ and Zurek L. 2004. Association of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 with houseflies on a cattle farm. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 70(12):7578-7580. http://aem.asm.org/content/70/12/7578.abstract?ikey=88a9cac072753875cd900968462e8ab8802366e&keytype=2=if_ipsecsha. Accessed January 24, 2013.
- ⁵⁷ Fotadar R, Banerjee U, Singeh S, Shrinivas SL, and Verma AK. 1992. The housefly (*Musca domestica*) as a carrier of pathogenic microorganisms in a hospital environment. *Journal of Hospital Infection* 20:209-15.
- ⁵⁸ Macovei L and Zurek L. 2006. Ecology of antibiotic resistance genes: characterization of enterococci from houseflies collected in food settings. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 72:4028-35. <http://aem.asm.org/content/72/6/4028.full>. Accessed October 6, 2012.
- ⁵⁹ Ahmad A, Ghosh A, Schal C, and Zurek L. 2011. Insects in confined swine operations carry a large antibiotic resistant and potentially virulent enterococcal community. *BMC Microbiology* 11:23.
- ⁶⁰ Paz S and Broza M. 2007. Wind direction and its linkage with *Vibrio cholera* dissemination. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 115(2):195-200. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1817714/>. Accessed January 24, 2013.
- ⁶¹ Cohen D, Green M, Block C, et al. 1991. Reduction of transmission of shigellosis by control of houseflies (*Musca domestica*). *Lancet* 337(8748):993-7. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1673210>. Accessed January 24, 2013.
- ⁶² Mian LS, Maag H, and Tacial JV. 2002. Isolation of *Salmonella* from muscoid flies at commercial animal establishments in San Bernardino County, California. *Journal of Vector Ecology* 27(1):82-5. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11225877?dopt=Abstract>. Accessed January 24, 2013.
- ⁶³ Nichols GL. 2005. Fly transmission of *Campylobacter*. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 11:361-4. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3298251>. Accessed October 6, 2012.
- ⁶⁴ Sawabe K, Hoshino K, Isawa H, et al. 2006. Detection and isolation of highly pathogenic H5N1 avian influenza A viruses from blow flies collected in the vicinity of an infected poultry farm in Kyoto, Japan, 2004. *The American Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene* 75:327-332.
- ⁶⁵ Andreadis TG, Anderson JF, and Vossbrinck CR. 2001. Mosquito surveillance for West Nile virus in Connecticut, 2000: Isolation from *Culex pipiens*, *Cx. restuans*, *Cx. salinarius*, and *Culiseta melanura*. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 7(4):670-4. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11585530>. Accessed January 24, 2013.
- ⁶⁶ Mitchell CJ, Monath TP, Sabatini MS, et al. 1987. Arbovirus isolations from mosquitoes collected during and after the 1982-1983 epizootic of western equine encephalitis in Argentina. *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene* 36(1):107-131. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2880521>. Accessed January 24, 2013.
- ⁶⁷ Mitchell CJ, Monath TP, Sabatini MS, et al. 1987. Arbovirus isolations from mosquitoes collected during and after the 1982-1983 epizootic of western equine encephalitis in Argentina. *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene* 36(1):107-131. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2880521>. Accessed January 24, 2013.
- ⁶⁸ Burkot TR, Zavala F, Gwadz RW, Collins FH, Nussenzeig RS, and Roberts DR. 1984. Identification of malaria-infected mosquitoes by a two-site enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay. *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene* 33(2):227-231. <http://bit.ly/Y3oPsv>. Accessed January 24, 2013.
- ⁶⁹ Stokes A, Bauer JH, and Hudson NP. 1997. Experimental transmission of yellow fever virus to laboratory animals. *Excerpta from The American Journal of Tropical Medicine* 1928:8:103. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases* 2(1):54-9.
- ⁷⁰ Hammon WM, Rudnick A, and Sather GE. 1960. Viruses associated with epidemic hemorrhagic fevers of the Philippines and Thailand. *Science* 131(3407):1102-3.
- ⁷¹ Jones TA, Donnelly CA, and Dawkins Stamp M. 2005. Environmental and management factors affecting the welfare of chickens on commercial farms in the United Kingdom and Denmark stocked at five densities. *Poultry Science* 84:1155-65.
- ⁷² Power C. 2005. The Source and Means of Spread of the Avian Influenza Virus in the Lower Fraser Valley of British Columbia During an Outbreak in the Winter of 2004: An Interim Report. (Animal Disease Surveillance Unit, Canadian Food Inspection Agency).
- ⁷³ Hald B, Skovgard H, Bang DD, et al. 2004. Flies and *Campylobacter* infection of broiler flocks. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 10:1490-2.
- ⁷⁴ Jones TA, Donnelly CA, and Stamp Dawkins M. 2005. Environmental and management factors affecting the welfare of chickens on commercial farms in the United Kingdom and Denmark stocked at five densities. *Poultry Science* 84:1155-65.
- ⁷⁵ Jones TA, Donnelly CA, and Stamp Dawkins M. 2005. Environmental and management factors affecting the welfare of chickens on commercial farms in the United Kingdom and Denmark stocked at five densities. *Poultry Science* 84:1155-65.
- ⁷⁶ Pew Commission on IFAP. 2008. Putting meat on the table: industrial farm animal production in America, p. 27. www.ncifap.org/images/PCIFAPFin.pdf. Accessed January 18, 2013.
- ⁷⁷ United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2001. Emissions From Animal Feeding Operations. Draft report. EPA Contract No. 68-D6-0011. (Research Triangle Park, NC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Emissions Standards Division, p. 2-13). <http://1.usa.gov/XERqSZ>. Accessed January 18, 2013.
- ⁷⁸ Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. 1997. Livestock and poultry: world markets and trade. <http://1.usa.gov/WzxYYM>. Accessed October 7, 2012.
- ⁷⁹ Steinfeld, H. 2004. The livestock revolution—a global veterinary mission. *Veterinary Parasitology* 125:19-41.
- ⁸⁰ United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2001. Emissions From Animal Feeding Operations. Draft report. EPA Contract No. 68-D6-0011. (Research Triangle Park, NC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Emissions Standards Division, p. 2-13). <http://1.usa.gov/XERqSZ>. Accessed January 18, 2013.
- ⁸¹ United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2004. Risk Management Evaluation For Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations. (Cincinnati, OH: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, p. 69). <http://nepis.epa.gov/Exec/zyPURL.cgi?Dockey=901V0100.txt>. Accessed January 18, 2013.
- ⁸² Power C. 2005. The Source and Means of Spread of the Avian Influenza Virus in the Lower Fraser Valley of British Columbia During an Outbreak in the Winter of 2004: An Interim Report. (Animal Disease Surveillance Unit, Canadian Food Inspection Agency).
- ⁸³ Dickenson-Hoyle S and Reenberg A. 2009. The shrinking globe: Globalisation of food systems and the changing geographies of livestock production. *Geografisk Tidsskrift – Danish Journal of Geography* 109(1):105-112. http://rdgs.dk/djg/pdfs/109/1/GEO_109_1_8.pdf. Accessed January 17, 2013.
- ⁸⁴ Sapkota AR, Lefferts LY, McKenzie S, and Walker P. 2007. What do we feed to food-production animals? A review of animal feed ingredients and their potential impacts on human health. *Environmental Health Perspectives*. 115(5):663-670.
- ⁸⁵ Moretti, IM. 2006. Tracking the Trend Towards Market Concentration: The Case of the Agricultural Input Industry. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTD). U.N. Secretariat, Genève.
- ⁸⁶ Steinfeld, H. 2004. The livestock revolution—a global veterinary mission. *Veterinary Parasitology* 125:19-41.
- ⁸⁷ Craven SE, Cox NA, Bailey JS, and Cosby DE. 2003. Incidence and tracking of *Clostridium perfringens* through an integrated broiler chicken operation. *Avian Diseases* 47:707-711. <http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/1593148?uid=3739704&uid=2129&uid=2&uid=70&uid=4&uid=3739256&sid=21101701741137>. Accessed January 24, 2013.
- ⁸⁸ Burrell A. 2002. Animal disease epidemics: implications for production, policy and trade. *Outlook on Agriculture* 31:151-160.
- ⁸⁹ Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. 2012. FAOSTAT. <http://faostat3.fao.org/home/index.html>. Accessed June 10, 2012.
- ⁹⁰ Lucas C. 2007. Bird flu's link with the crazy trade in poultry. *Financial Times*, February 25. <http://on.ft.com/14cUxbh>. Accessed June 10, 2012.
- ⁹¹ Corry JEL, Allen VM, Hudson WR, Breslin MF, and Davies RH. 2002. Sources of *salmonella* on broiler carcasses during transportation and processing: modes of contamination and methods of control. *Journal of Applied Microbiology* 92:424-432.
- ⁹² Slader J, Domingue G, Jørgensen F, et al. 2002. Impact of transport crate reuse and of catching and processing on *Campylobacter* and *Salmonella* contamination of broiler chickens. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 68(2):713-719. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC126660/>. Accessed January 24, 2013.
- ⁹³ Ellerbroek LI, Lienau JA, and Klein G. 2010. *Campylobacter* spp. in broiler flocks at farm level and the potential for cross-contamination during slaughter. *Zoonoses and Public Health* 57:e81-e88.
- ⁹⁴ Craven SE, Stern NJ, Bailey JS, and Cox NA. 2001. Incidence of *Clostridium perfringens* in broiler chickens and their environment during production and processing. *Avian Diseases* 45:887-896. <http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/1592868?uid=3739704&uid=2&uid=4&uid=3739256&sid=21101701741137>. Accessed January 24, 2013.
- ⁹⁵ Whyte P, Collins JD, McGill K, Monahan C, and O'Mahony H. 2001. The effect of transportation stress on excretion rates of campylobacters in market-age broilers. *Poultry Science* 80:817-820.
- ⁹⁶ Power C. 2005. The Source and Means of Spread of the Avian Influenza Virus in the Lower Fraser Valley of British Columbia During an Outbreak in the Winter of 2004: An Interim Report. (Animal Disease Surveillance Unit, Canadian Food Inspection Agency).
- ⁹⁷ Rule AM, Evans SL, and Silbergeld EK. 2008. Food animal transport: a potential source of community exposures to health hazards from industrial farming (CAFOs). *Journal of Infection and Public Health* 1:33-39.
- ⁹⁸ Nelson MI, Lemey P, Tan Y, et al. 2011. Spatial dynamics of human-origin H1 influenza A virus in North American swine. *PLoS Pathogens* 7(6):e1002077. <http://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1002077>. Accessed January 11, 2012.
- ⁹⁹ Shane SM. 2003. Disease continues to impact the world's poultry industries. *World Poultry* 19(7):22-7.
- ¹⁰⁰ Rudd K. 1995. Poultry reality check needed. *Poultry Digest*, 54(12):12-20.
- ¹⁰¹ Power C. 2005. The Source and Means of Spread of the Avian Influenza Virus in the Lower Fraser Valley of British Columbia During an Outbreak in the Winter of 2004: An Interim Report. (Animal Disease Surveillance Unit, Canadian Food Inspection Agency).
- ¹⁰² IBP, Inc. v. Alvarez (03-1238); *Tum v. Barber Foods, Inc.* (04-66). 2005. U.S. Supreme Court. <http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/cert/03-1238>. Accessed January 7, 2013.
- ¹⁰³ Graham JP, Leibler JH, Price LB, et al. 2008. The animal-human interface and infectious disease in industrial food animal production: rethinking biosecurity and biocontainment. *Public Health Reports* 123:282-99.