

ISSUE BRIEF

# BETTER BACON

## WHY IT'S HIGH TIME THE U.S. PORK INDUSTRY STOPPED PIGGING OUT ON ANTIBIOTICS



### OVERVIEW

Antibiotic resistance is one of the world's greatest health threats.<sup>1</sup> At least 2 million Americans each year suffer infections due to drug-resistant bacteria resulting in more than 23,000 deaths, according to 2013 estimates.<sup>2</sup> Experts predict that global annual deaths from antibiotic-resistant infections will climb into the millions if urgent action is not taken.<sup>3</sup>

According to leading health authorities, including the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the World Health Organization (WHO), the unnecessary use of medically important antibiotics\* is a major driver of this crisis.<sup>4,5,6</sup> Widespread antibiotic overuse in U.S. livestock production, including the pork industry, is a key contributor.

\* "Medically important antibiotics" are antibiotic classes that are used in human medicine as well as in animal agriculture. The World Health Organization maintains a list of Medically Important Antimicrobials, last updated in 2017. It is available at [http://www.who.int/foodsafety/areas\\_work/antimicrobial-resistance/cia/en/](http://www.who.int/foodsafety/areas_work/antimicrobial-resistance/cia/en/).

---

*As resistance worsens, serious infections caused by drug-resistant bacteria are becoming harder and sometimes impossible to treat with antibiotics. This includes food-borne diseases like those caused by Salmonella as well as pneumonia, urinary tract infections, and blood poisoning.*

---

Our key findings reveal:

- **The U.S. pork industry accounts for 37 percent of all U.S. livestock sales of medically important antibiotics.** We also estimate that around 27 percent of all medically important antibiotics sold in the United States, including those sold for human use, are for pig production.
- **The conventional pork industry feeds medically important antibiotics to entire herds of animals even when no pigs are sick**—a practice strongly discouraged by the World Health Organization. The industry has long asserted it needs to feed antibiotics to herds to keep them healthy. Despite the very heavy use of antibiotics relative to other countries, however, U.S. producers report that many diseases are more prevalent in pig herds today than in 2000. Heavy use of medically important antibiotics in pigs that are not sick is unnecessary and is apparently failing to stop the rise of infections.
- **Overuse of antibiotics occurs within a markedly changed U.S. pork industry, dominated by larger, more specialized farms, and by fewer businesses, which dictate production practices.** These entities have the power to catalyze much-needed change in how antibiotics are used throughout the pork production chain.
- **U.S. pork producers use twice as much antibiotics per kilogram of animal as do U.K. producers, for example, and seven times the levels used in Denmark or the Netherlands.** Yet Denmark and the Netherlands produce pigs at an industrial scale similar to that of the United States.
- **Robust information on the use of antibiotics in livestock production, including in pigs, remains scarce in the United States.** The lack of clear data unnecessarily hampers public and government efforts to reduce antibiotic overuse.

Thanks to flawed antibiotics practices and policies in the U.S. pork industry, bringing home the bacon can also bring home superbugs. The irresponsible use of antibiotics on pig farms has created ripe conditions for drug-resistant bacteria—as well as the genes that foster resistance—to multiply and spread from farms to people. Supermarket


pork chops can carry drug-resistant bacteria straight to the kitchen counter. Pig farmers and pork industry workers can carry antibiotic resistance into their homes and communities. Contaminated soil, air, and water near these farms also can transport bacteria and genes from the farms to the outside world.

The heavy use of antibiotics in U.S. pork production is avoidable. Unfortunately, the U.S. federal government has failed to address the issue effectively. While a Presidential Advisory Council established goals for the reduction of antibiotic use in human medicine, it failed to establish such goals for animal agriculture. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) have failed to collect detailed information on antibiotic use in animal agriculture, although such data could highlight variations in practice and lead to benchmarks to improve performance. The FDA continues to allow the routine use of antibiotics in livestock when there are no sick animals, under the guise of “disease prevention.” Both the FDA and industry acknowledge that the FDA’s discontinuation of most “growth promotion” claims will have limited effect on the volume of livestock antibiotic sales.

A WHO-commissioned analysis shows that if livestock industries can kick the antibiotics habit, it could significantly cut down on antibiotic resistance and improve public health.<sup>7,8</sup> Responsible pork producers use antibiotics only sparingly to treat sick animals or occasionally to control disease outbreaks. They don’t use them to compensate for poor facility conditions or for a lack of good animal husbandry. To promote herd health while avoiding antibiotics, responsible producers can make use of a suite of best practices demonstrated in Denmark and the Netherlands and by U.S. leaders in responsible antibiotic use (described further below), which have eliminated the routine use of antibiotics through common sense measures.

It’s time for the U.S. pork industry to adopt responsible antibiotic use practices. By that we mean that medically important antibiotics should be used only to treat pigs that have been diagnosed with a particular bacterial infection by a licensed veterinarian, to control disease outbreaks among pigs in contact with sick animals, or in relation to a medical procedure such as surgery. Medically important antibiotics should not be used routinely when animals are not sick.

**FIGURE 1. INVENTORY OF TOP 3 PIG-PRODUCING U.S. STATES, DENMARK AND THE NETHERLANDS, DECEMBER 2017**



### SNAPSHOT OF THE U.S. PORK INDUSTRY

The United States is the world’s third-largest consumer and producer of pork.<sup>9,10,11</sup> In 2017, U.S. slaughterhouses processed 121 million mature pigs, generating just over 25 billion pounds of pork.<sup>12</sup>

Currently, around 73 million pigs live on U.S. farms.<sup>13</sup> Production is heavily concentrated in a few counties in a few states.<sup>14</sup> Iowa, North Carolina, and Minnesota account for more than 55 percent of the total (Figure 1).<sup>15,16</sup>


### OVERUSE OF ANTIBIOTICS IN U.S. PIG PRODUCTION HELPS SPREAD ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE THAT THREATENS HUMAN HEALTH

Because the overuse of medically important antibiotics hastens the spread of antibiotic resistance, it must be curbed in food animal production. That is the rationale behind the WHO’s recent recommendation against using these precious medicines when there is no confirmed disease—that is, for growth promotion and, except under very special circumstances, for disease prevention.<sup>17</sup> According to the FDA, 18.4 million pounds of medically important antibiotics were sold for use in animal agriculture in 2016, with pork accounting for the second-largest share by a distance.<sup>18</sup>

### Almost the Same Amount of Medically Important Antibiotics Are Sold for Pigs as for Treating Sick People

The latest FDA report on antibiotic sales is the first to estimate medically important antibiotic sales by animal sector in the United States. Chicken production, for example, accounts for just 1.1 million pounds of antibiotics

**FIGURE 2: MEDICALLY IMPORTANT ANTIBIOTICS SOLD (U.S.) FOR PIG PRODUCTION, OTHER LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION, AND HUMAN MEDICINE**



sold, compared with sales for pig production (6.9 million pounds) or cattle production (8.0 million pounds).<sup>19</sup> Antibiotics sold for pig production are nearly equal to the 7.0 million pounds of antibiotics sold for human medicine in 2015.<sup>20</sup> Assuming human antibiotic sales remained level in 2016, we calculate that pork production alone accounts for 27.1 percent of the more than 25 million pounds of medically important antibiotics sold that year for any purpose (Figure 2).<sup>21</sup>

Unfortunately, federal officials have yet to collect any detailed information on how the pork industry uses these antibiotics.<sup>22</sup> Despite the data gap, we do know the pork industry not only administers medically important antibiotics to treat disease and to control the spread of disease, but also gives those same antibiotics to herds of pigs for “disease prevention” when there is no clinical disease present. FDA does report that 95 percent of sales of medically important antibiotics for livestock in 2016 were additives to animal feed or drinking water, the typical routes through which antibiotics for disease prevention are delivered to herds of animals.<sup>23</sup> Until January 2017, medically important antibiotics also could be legally added to pig feed to speed up animal growth.<sup>24,25</sup>

Mass administration of important antibiotics to groups of animals, at low levels in their feed or drinking water, heightens the risk of resistance.<sup>26</sup> The basic principle at work is this: The greater the number of individuals (animal or human) given antibiotics, the more bacteria that are exposed to those drugs, and the more likely that drug-resistant strains of bacteria will emerge and spread.<sup>27</sup> There is also evidence that antibiotics ingested by mouth expose more bacteria to them than do drugs delivered by injection.<sup>28,29</sup>

## Medically Important Antibiotics Are FDA-Approved for Pigs That Are Not Sick

Table A lists medically important antibiotics that remain FDA-approved and labeled for use in pig feed. Despite the 2017 ban on their use in animal feed for growth promotion, antibiotics from each class continue to be added legally to pig feed at similar low levels to “prevent” disease even when no animals are sick. In addition, two specific antibiotics, lincomycin (a lincosamide) and virginiamycin (a streptogramin), are listed in the Code of Federal Regulations as being used for disease control but carry label language that is more consistent with disease prevention—i.e., use of the drug in the absence of disease.

TABLE A. DRUG CLASSES STILL APPROVED FOR FEED USE IN PIGS THAT ARE NOT SICK		
Drug Class	Human Applications of Medically Important Antibiotics <sup>a</sup>	Approved in feed as:
Lincosamides	As clindamycin, used to treat a wide variety of bacterial infections of the lungs, skin, blood, female reproductive organs, and internal organs <sup>b</sup>	Lincomycin (CFR §558.325)
Macrolides	Treatment of severe <i>Campylobacter</i> infection, whooping cough, chlamydia, and pneumonia in children allergic to amoxicillin <sup>b</sup>	Tilmicosin (CFR §558.618); and tylosin (CFR §558.625)
Streptogramins	Treatment of resistant infections, like MRSA, that are unresponsive to other antibiotics <sup>b</sup>	Virginiamycin (CFR §558.635)
Sulfonamides	Treatment of urinary tract infections, food-borne illness due to <i>Salmonella</i> , and other ailments <sup>b</sup>	Sulfamethazine, combined with tylosin (CFR §558.630)
Tetracyclines	Treatment of atypical pneumonia, Lyme disease, pelvic inflammatory disease, chlamydia, gram-negative infections <sup>b</sup>	Chlortetracycline (CFR §558.140)

a World Health Organization, *Critically Important Antimicrobials for Human Medicine*, 3rd Revision, 2011, [apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/77376/1/9789241504485\\_eng.pdf](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/77376/1/9789241504485_eng.pdf).

b David Gilbert et al., *The Sanford Guide to Antimicrobial Therapy 2016*, Antimicrobial Therapy, Inc., 2016.

There are particular strains of gram-negative bacteria responsible for rising numbers of deaths in U.S. hospitals; because they already are resistant to almost every available antibiotic, these strains are getting dangerously close to becoming untreatable altogether. Tetracyclines are among the antibiotics that the CDC considers important for treating potentially life-threatening gram-negative bacterial infections.<sup>30</sup> The health imperative is to keep tetracyclines as effective as possible for as long as possible, in part by


curbing their overuse for other purposes. Yet, as a class, tetracyclines alone account for 70 percent of all medically important antibiotics sold for use in food-producing animals, including pigs.

## The U.S. Pork Industry Uses Antibiotics More Heavily Than Do Pork Producers in Other Developed Nations

The U.S. pork industry uses antibiotics much more intensively in pig production than do other industry leaders. Specifically, U.S. producers use about double the antibiotics per kilogram of pig as are used in the United Kingdom, more than three times as much as in France, and more than seven times the levels used in Denmark or the Netherlands. (Figure 3).

The FDA began reporting on antibiotic sales for use in U.S. pig production only last year. In 2016, nearly 8.4 million kilograms of both medically important (88 percent) and non-medically important (12 percent) antibiotics were sold for use in pig production. To facilitate comparison with other countries with pork industries of different sizes, it is useful to assess these sales against the total weight of the animal population, i.e. in milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg). A methodology that uses an average animal weight to allow a fair comparison is now being widely used across major pork-producing nations in Europe as well as Canada.<sup>31,32</sup> The United States does not release official numbers using this methodology, but to allow comparison, we use the latest FDA sales figures to calculate weight-adjusted consumption of antibiotics in the U.S. pork sector.<sup>33</sup>

**FIGURE 3. MEDICALLY IMPORTANT ANTIBIOTICS FOR PIG PRODUCTION (mg/kg) IN THE U.S., CANADA AND SELECT E.U. COUNTRIES**



Source: Figure 3 is based on two tables found on the NRDC website, at <https://www.nrdc.org/resources/better-bacon-why-its-high-time-us-pork-industry-stopped-pigging-out-antibiotics>. Table 1 shows the mg/kg calculation for the United States, and describes the sources for the underlying data on sales of medically important antibiotics for pig production, as well as data on the numbers of slaughtered pigs and breeding sows. Table 2 provides similar calculations for Canada as well as for European Union members included on Figure 3. Refer to the two tables as well for important caveats to the analysis, including some variation between the countries in the years for which data are available to derive the numerator and denominator in the mg/kg calculation.



## U.S. PIG FARMS ARE RESERVOIRS OF ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE

The CDC points to “strong evidence that antibiotic use in food-producing animals can harm public health.”<sup>34</sup> The health threat occurs because widespread farm use of antibiotics creates a microbial environment on and around those farms that serves as a reservoir, or repository, of antibiotic resistance.<sup>35,36,37,38,39,40</sup> Residues of antibiotics fed to pigs, as well as other livestock, are excreted via the animals’ manure.<sup>41</sup> Pig farm manure is typically collected in tanks or lagoons, then spread or sprayed onto adjacent fields. When dispersed into the environment, that pig manure can carry not only antibiotic residues but also antibiotic resistance genes and drug-resistant bacteria.

Bacteria living in these resistance-rich pig farm environments can exchange antibiotic resistance genes with other bacteria, much as they do in a person’s or an animal’s gut. Antibiotic resistance also can be transmitted from these farm reservoirs to the human population through various routes, including via workers, on the tires of delivery trucks, or through direct contact with contaminated meat, air, water, and soil, as we discuss below.

**Antibiotic-resistant bacteria are found on pork meat.** Improperly cooked meat can spread drug-resistant bacteria to people, as can the improper handling of raw meat in the kitchen.

The National Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring System (NARMS) tracks antibiotic resistance among bacteria collected from supermarket meat. In 2015, for example, 100 percent of the *Enterococcus* and 45 percent of the *E. coli* bacteria that NARMS isolated from retail pork chops were antibiotic-resistant.<sup>42</sup> In 2015, 13 percent of *Enterococcus* were resistant to three or more antibiotics, up from 8 percent five years earlier.<sup>43</sup>

NARMS also regularly tests for levels of antibiotic resistance among bacteria found on hogs waiting to be slaughtered. Of the four types of bacteria tested in 2014, 21.9 percent to 59.0 percent were resistant to three or more antibiotics.<sup>44</sup> NARMS even identified one

*Salmonella* bacterium that was resistant to eight out of nine antibiotics.<sup>45</sup> Even resistant bacteria that don’t directly sicken a human can spread resistance to more dangerous bacteria in a person’s home or gut, increasing the risk of a serious infection in the future.

### Antibiotic-resistant bacteria on pigs colonize and infect farmers and workers.

The people who work directly with farm animals can carry antibiotic-resistant bacteria.<sup>46,47,48,49,50,51,52,53</sup> They also suffer drug-resistant infections at a higher rate than average, as detailed below. A growing proportion of these infections are resistant to multiple antibiotics. These workers can also unwittingly spread antibiotic resistance genes and resistant bacteria to their families and communities.

Several recent studies have focused on resistance-related health risks among pig farm workers in particular. A study of more than 1,300 Iowans determined that people working on pig farms were six times more likely to be carriers of multidrug-resistant *S. aureus* than were Iowans not exposed to pigs.<sup>54</sup> In particular, pig workers and their children are more highly colonized with methicillin-resistant *S. aureus* (MRSA) than the general public.<sup>55,56,57,58</sup> A separate study examined workers from 22 industrialized pig operations and found that 45.5 percent were carriers of MRSA.<sup>59</sup> Of all the *Staphylococcus* bacteria carried by these workers, 82 percent were found to be resistant to tetracycline, the antibiotic most widely used in pig production. A third study, somewhat earlier and more limited, looked at 20 workers from two pig operations in Iowa and Illinois and found 45 percent of them were colonized with MRSA bacteria.<sup>60</sup>

Slaughterhouse workers face elevated risks as well. One recent study found 21.6 percent of them were carrying *S. aureus* bacteria; the *S. aureus* isolated were resistant to more than 2.5 times the number of antibiotic classes than were *S. aureus* from the slaughterhouse workers’ neighbors.<sup>61</sup> Nearly 22 percent of these workers specifically carried MRSA.<sup>62</sup>

### Resistance spreads via air, water, and soil.

Studies of soil from farmland where pig manure has been dispersed find levels of certain drug-resistance genes that are up to six times higher than average—and these genes persist in the soil for up to 16 months.<sup>63</sup> Runoff from these fields can carry contaminants into drinking water supplies, including groundwater, lakes, creeks, and rivers.<sup>64,65</sup> Manure dust can become airborne and carry resistance genes or resistant bacteria with it.<sup>66</sup>

When people are exposed to antibiotic resistance via contaminated air, water, and soil, it can threaten their health and that of their communities.<sup>67</sup> A 2013 study found that Pennsylvanians living closer to swine farms and fields treated with swine manure had higher rates of antibiotic-resistant skin infections, including those caused by MRSA.<sup>68,69</sup> A 2016 study from North Carolina identified methicillin-resistant (MRSA) and methicillin-sensitive *S. aureus* bacteria in surface waters adjacent to fields sprayed with manure from industrial-scale pig operations.<sup>70</sup>

## Overuse of Antibiotics Is Linked to a Changed U.S. Pork Industry

### Pig farms are now fewer, larger, and more specialized.

The U.S. pork industry is following the poultry industry's footsteps toward an industrialized model. Traditional operations raised pigs on one farm from birth to slaughter. Now, those operations make up less than one-fourth of all U.S. pig operations.<sup>71</sup>

Today's pig farms are increasingly specialized to a single phase of production. Some operations exclusively manage sows and piglets up to weaning age. The piglets then travel to nursery or feeder operations, where they remain until they reach a weight of 10 to 60 pounds. Finally, they are transported to finishing operations (also called grower/finisher operations), which raise feeder pigs to a slaughter weight of around 280 pounds.

The industry is also concentrating more pigs on fewer farms. Today, a few thousand mega-farms—those with more than 5,000 pigs—produce more than 93 percent of all U.S. pigs.<sup>72</sup> Meanwhile, the number of pig farms has dropped by 75 percent, from 268,140 in 1990 to a mere 68,300 farms in 2012.<sup>73,74</sup> As previously mentioned, the pig mega-farms are often clustered in particular counties or regions.<sup>75</sup>

The pork industry's shift to fewer, clustered farms with far more pigs per farm—along with greater farm specialization and more frequent transport of pigs between farms—are changes associated with many adverse impacts. This model has made pigs and pig farms vulnerable to more and bigger outbreaks of disease unless efforts to reduce these underlying risk factors are undertaken.<sup>76,77</sup> Other adverse impacts include more air and water pollution, decreased quality of life, and, of course, more reliance on antibiotics.<sup>78</sup>

### With fewer players, each exerts greater control over pig production.

The ownership of pigs is increasingly concentrated in the hands of fewer businesses.<sup>79</sup> In 1992, farmers who housed and raised pigs on behalf of absentee owners accounted for just 5 percent of U.S. pig production.<sup>80</sup> In 2009, these "contract" farmers produced 71 percent of all U.S. pigs and 79 percent of the pigs in finishing operations.<sup>81</sup> That same year, just 40 businesses owned or controlled at least three-quarters of the more than 100 million U.S.-produced pigs—and their share likely has continued to rise in subsequent years, according to USDA economists.<sup>82,83</sup>

Vertical integration is a business strategy whereby meat companies use their market power to tie together two or more functions of production, processing, or marketing by buying them outright or signing legally binding contracts. Vertically integrated pork companies often own slaughterhouses and/or feed mills near their pigs.<sup>84</sup> It is common for integrated companies to require the pig farms they contract with to purchase feed only from the feed mills that they own. Sometimes the contractors don't even know what antibiotics have been mixed into that feed.<sup>85</sup>

Smithfield Foods offers a good example of vertical integration. It began in 1936 as a single slaughterhouse.<sup>86</sup> Today, with more than \$14 billion in annual sales, Smithfield is the world's largest hog producer and pork processor.<sup>87</sup> In 1990 it started buying sow farms as well; the company now owns around 29 percent of the entire U.S. sow inventory, plus their piglets.<sup>88</sup> It continues to own slaughterhouses and feed mills as well.

The rising concentration of pig ownership means that relatively few businesses exert an outsize degree of control or power over the entire U.S. pork sector.<sup>89</sup> Large integrators can dictate practices for contractors—and other market players over whom they have leverage—including practices around the use of antibiotics.

## Higher Levels of Antibiotic Use Haven't Reduced Disease in U.S. Pig Herds

In recent years, nearly every major infectious disease has become more prevalent on pig farms, according to the USDA's most recent swine farm surveys.<sup>90</sup> Table B highlights the rising prevalence of bacterial diseases. Important infections caused by viruses, such as swine flu and porcine respiratory and reproductive syndrome (PRRS), are more common as well and can often lead to subsequent bacterial infections.

The industry claims that antibiotics are needed to reduce the incidence of infections in its herds. As larger facilities raise more pigs in confined settings and the risk of disease rises, it's no surprise that producers regularly use more antibiotics to try to mitigate that risk. The issue is that their increased reliance on antibiotics does not solve the underlying problem.

We know that antibiotic sales for use in animal agriculture in the United States have been increasing since 2009; we also know that sales of medically important antibiotics for pork production made up 37 percent of total livestock antibiotic sales in 2016. Meanwhile, since 2000, the rates of many infectious diseases on pig farms also have increased, sometimes markedly. U.S. pig herds are much sicker, or at least pig farmers report as much. These sicker herds coincide with the shift in industry structure toward fewer production entities and bigger farms.<sup>91,92,93,94</sup>

The regular and heavy use of antibiotics does not seem to work well to prevent or reduce infections, even as it puts the future efficacy of essential human medicines at risk. Prominent swine veterinarians recently described why the increasingly industrial structure and conditions of the U.S. pork sector have created greater vulnerability for the industry: They increase the risk of infection on farms while at the same time undercutting the sector's ability to deal with infectious diseases.<sup>95,96</sup> Operators should therefore be taking stronger action to address those underlying conditions while avoiding antibiotic use. The rising rates of infection on pig farms indicate that overuse of antibiotics alone cannot overcome the disease pressure created by these conditions.

## Pork Production Without Routine Antibiotics Is Scalable and Profitable

Denmark and the Netherlands are two of Europe’s largest livestock producers. They have profitable, growing, export-oriented pig industries even though the use of medically important antibiotics for disease prevention and for growth promotion is prohibited. Though small countries, Denmark and the Netherlands each have more pigs than any U.S. state except Iowa. And their production takes place under confined, indoor conditions, as does the vast majority of U.S. production.

From 1994 to 2016, Denmark reduced all antibiotic use in livestock and poultry by 49 percent. Antibiotic use in Danish pig production has fallen 27 percent just since 2009, while the weight of pork produced has increased by about 2.4 percent.<sup>97</sup> Decreased use of tetracyclines, pleuromutilins, and penicillins has led the way.

Denmark’s phaseout of routine antibiotic use has been achieved through relatively straightforward changes in animal management and biosecurity, including more frequent housecleaning, improved ventilation, and reduced animal densities.<sup>98,99,100,101</sup> Table C describes several of these measures to prevent diseases before they start.<sup>102,103,104,105,106,107,108</sup> The Danish government gives farmers and veterinarians resources to promote better antibiotic stewardship. This includes funding a Pig Research Centre, which conducts practical research on vaccination, on the development of better pig feed, and on biosecurity improvements.<sup>109</sup> The Centre also released a step-by-step producers’ manual on antibiotic reduction.<sup>110</sup>



As recently as 2010, the Netherlands was among Europe’s heaviest users of antibiotics per kilogram of food-producing animal.<sup>111</sup> A series of health crises from 2004 to 2009, including an outbreak of pig-associated MRSA that landed swine veterinarians and farmers in hospitals, inspired calls for change.<sup>112</sup> The Dutch government took several aggressive actions. The Netherlands Veterinary Medicines Institute (SDa) was launched in 2010. Within just two years, the SDA collected data on antibiotic use from 40,000 Dutch farms, including pig farms.<sup>113</sup> These data identified the veterinarians and farms that prescribed or used the most antibiotics. Overall Dutch farm use of antibiotics decreased by 64 percent from 2009 to 2016, while use in pork production specifically dropped 57 percent in the same period.<sup>114</sup>

**TABLE B. RISING DISEASE PREVALENCE ON SPECIALIZED PIG FARMS, 2000-2012**

(based on answers given to USDA by operators of different kinds of pig farms)

Bacterial infections	Phase of operation	% of farm sites knowing of or suspecting disease*		% Increase, 2000-12
		% Swine 2000	% Swine 2012	
Scours (diarrhea) caused by <i>E. coli</i>	Nursery	24.0%	32.4%	35%
Glässer’s disease ( <i>Haemophilus parasuis</i> )	Nursery	7.3%	24.3%	233%
	Finisher	5.4%	29.4%	444%
Greasy pig disease ( <i>Staphylococcus hyicus</i> )	Pre-weaning	25.9%	39.8%	54%
	Nursery	25.3%	33.5%	32%
<i>Mycoplasma pneumonia</i>	Sows	14.2%	31.2%	120%
	Nursery	19.6%	30.7%	57%
	Finisher	29.0%	58.8%	103%
<i>Streptococcus suis</i> (meningitis)	Pre-weaning	29.8%	46.9%	57%
	Nursery	31.6%	65.2%	106%

\* Reflects producer opinion, as expressed to an USDA interviewer, which may or may not have been confirmed by a veterinarian or laboratory diagnosis.

Source: USDA. Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. Swine 2012 - Part III: Changes in the U.S. Swine Industry, 1995-2012. August 2017. pp 60-72.

**TABLE C. KEEPING PIGS HEALTHY WHILE BEING GOOD STEWARDS OF ANTIBIOTICS**

Improvement Category	Explanation	Concrete Actions
<b>Biosecurity</b>	Good biosecurity can help reduce risks that new disease will be introduced to “clean” farms in the first place.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimize visitors.</li> <li>• Regiment how workers change into clean shoes and clothes.</li> <li>• Clean, disinfect, and perhaps limit the frequency of trucks delivering feed and new pigs to a pig site.</li> <li>• To limit airborne disease spread, keep pig sites no closer than 1.5–2 miles from each other.</li> </ul>
<b>Nutrition</b>	Suboptimal nutrition adds to animal stress and risk of disease. Optimal nutrition protects against it.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Give lower-protein feed to piglets immediately after weaning to lessen the stress of transitioning off sow’s milk.</li> </ul>
<b>Hygiene</b>	Clean, disinfected pig housing prevents spread of infectious agents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Move groups of pigs together (all-in, all-out production) to allow thorough cleaning between herds and to help prevent disease from spreading between groups or farms.</li> </ul>
<b>Pig immunity</b>	Younger piglets, right after weaning, have immature immune systems. Later weaning, as well as vaccine use, can boost immunity and reduce disease.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wean piglets later. Doing so at 20 days helps reduce diarrhea (scours) and significantly impacts growth and mortality, compared with piglets weaned at 15 days. In 2013, the European Commission established 28 days as the minimum weaning age for piglets.</li> <li>• Administer vaccines to help immunize piglets against diarrhea (scours) due to some strains of <i>E. coli</i> or <i>Lawsonia</i> bacteria.</li> </ul>
<b>Reduce density</b>	Reducing the stocking density of pigs in the absence of antibiotics may improve animal health and growth by reducing stress.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce stocking density to ensure at least 3 m<sup>3</sup> of air space per pig.</li> </ul>

## Some U.S. Companies Are Kicking the Antibiotics Habit

Some American companies have proved that raising pigs without routine antibiotics can be good business. Niman Pork, Applegate, and Meyer Natural Pork are three growing U.S. companies that have committed to raising and/or marketing pork exclusively from pigs raised without any antibiotics. (Sick pigs on these farms that do require treatment with antibiotics typically are diverted elsewhere and sold as conventional pork.)

In addition, Chipotle and Panera lead the way by only sourcing meat raised with responsible antibiotics use practices, according to the annual *Chain Reaction* antibiotics scorecard.<sup>115</sup> Chipotle’s meat, including its pork, for example, comes from animals raised without the routine use of antibiotics. According to Steve Ells, Chipotle founder and former CEO, “Good animal husbandry reduces the need for antibiotics in livestock and promotes better animal welfare.”<sup>116</sup>

On the other hand, none of the largest conventional U.S. pork companies have a comprehensive policy on responsible antibiotic use that applies across all of their various brands or pork product lines. However, there are some glimmers of hope. In February 2016 Tyson Foods, the 14<sup>th</sup>-largest U.S. pig producer, launched its niche Open Prairie™ line of pork products, which sources from pigs raised without any antibiotics. The company predicts the line could eventually constitute 5 percent of its total production, with up to 1 million slaughtered hogs annually.<sup>117</sup> In early 2017, Smithfield similarly launched its Pure Farms™ brand of fresh pork products from pigs that never received antibiotics.

## THE PATH FORWARD

The scientific consensus for moving forward is clear: Aggressive action must be taken to reduce antibiotic overuse, in animal agriculture as well as in human medicine.<sup>118,119,120,121,122</sup> In terms of pork production, significant reduction in antibiotic use is the goal, especially for the drugs that are important to human medicine.

Prospects for federal administrative or legislative action are currently dim in the United States. That said, there is hope in other arenas. Thanks to consumer demand and actions by producers and fast-food chains, about half of the poultry industry has committed to eliminating the routine use of antibiotics. California and Maryland have restricted the routine use of antibiotics. And San Francisco now requires that retailers report on antibiotic use practices associated with the meat they sell in the city: which uses of antibiotics are allowed, which are prohibited, and how much antibiotics are used for producing a particular product line. This will provide more information for consumers and empower them to make more antibiotic-safe choices. These positive developments point the way forward for better antibiotic stewardship in the U.S. pork industry.

**Governments:** More cities can follow San Francisco’s lead and help inform consumers about the use of antibiotics in the production of meat products sold within their limits. More states can join California and Maryland in restricting the routine use of antibiotics.



**Consumers:** Consumers should continue to demand that companies and restaurants commit to ending the routine use of medically important antibiotics in their pork supply chains. They can do this through their purchases, via their support for better choices by government buyers like their school districts, and by petitioning companies to support better antibiotic use practices. Consumers should use their purchasing power to bring home the bacon—as well as the ribs, pork chops and sausage—from brands and companies that are using antibiotics responsibly. They should look for labels like “USDA Organic” or “No antibiotics administered” (or similar statements such as “No antibiotics ever”). They should be wary of any labels that talk about “growth promotion.” Where consumers cannot find the kind of products with these labels, they should ask their retailer or restaurant to offer more meat produced with responsible antibiotic practices. Consumer demand has made a huge difference in antibiotic use in the chicken industry, and it can help change the pork industry as well.

**Producers and food companies:** Producers and food companies can commit to producing and buying pork that is raised without the routine use of antibiotics. We have seen the impact such action has had on the chicken industry. Companies like Chipotle, Panera, and Subway have modeled such commitments in the pork sector, but unfortunately, not enough companies have joined them yet. There’s a lot of room for leadership.

In the absence of meaningful federal action, the actions taken by state and local governments, consumers, producers, and food companies can help reduce the threat to human health posed by antibiotic resistance.

## ENDNOTES

- 1 World Health Organization. Fact Sheet: “Antibiotic Resistance.” Updated November 2017. <http://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance>.
- 2 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (hereinafter CDC). *Antibiotic Resistance Threats in the United States, 2013*. April 2013. <http://www.cdc.gov/drugresistance/threat-report-2013/pdf/ar-threats-2013-508.pdf>.
- 3 Review on Antimicrobial Resistance. *Tackling a Crisis for the Health and Wealth of Nations*. December 2014. [https://amr-review.org/sites/default/files/AMR%20Review%20Paper%20-%20Tackling%20a%20crisis%20for%20the%20health%20and%20wealth%20of%20nations\\_1.pdf](https://amr-review.org/sites/default/files/AMR%20Review%20Paper%20-%20Tackling%20a%20crisis%20for%20the%20health%20and%20wealth%20of%20nations_1.pdf).
- 4 CDC. *Antibiotic Resistance Threats*.
- 5 World Health Organization (hereinafter WHO). *WHO Global Strategy for Containment of Antimicrobial Resistance*. 2001. [http://www.who.int/drugresistance/WHO\\_Global\\_Strategy.htm/en/](http://www.who.int/drugresistance/WHO_Global_Strategy.htm/en/).
- 6 Review on Antimicrobial Resistance. *Tackling a Crisis*.
- 7 Tang, K.L., et al. “Restriction in the Use of Antibiotics in Food-Producing Animals and Its Associations With Antibiotic Resistance in Food-Producing Animals and Human Beings: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.” *Lancet Planetary Health* 2017; 1: e316–27.
- 8 Vanderhaeghen W., and Dewulf, J. “Antimicrobial Use and Resistance in Animals and Human Beings.” *Lancet Planetary Health* 2017; 1(8):e307–e308.
- 9 National Pork Checkoff. “World per Capita Pork Consumption, 2013-2017.” Updated May 5, 2018. <https://www.pork.org/facts/stats/u-s-pork-exports/world-per-capita-pork-consumption/>.
- 10 Giamalva, J. “Pork Industry and Trade Summary.” U.S. International Trade Commission, Publication ITS-011. September 2014.
- 11 National Pork Checkoff. “Top 10 Pork-Producing Countries.” Updated May 5, 2018. <https://www.pork.org/facts/stats/u-s-pork-exports/top-10-pork-producing-countries/>.
- 12 U.S. Department of Agriculture (hereinafter USDA), National Agricultural Statistics Service. “Livestock Slaughter: 2016 Annual Summary.” April 2018. <http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/usda/current/LiveSlauSu/LiveSlauSu-04-18-2018.pdf>.
- 13 USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service. Quarterly Hogs and Pigs Report, December 22, 2017. Accessed at <http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/usda/nass/HogsPigs//2010s/2017/HogsPigs-12-22-2017.pdf>.
- 14 Ibid.
- 15 Ibid.
- 16 For comparison with the U.S., the pig inventories of 28 countries in the European Union at the end of 2017 are accessible from Eurostat. Number of Pigs. Accessed May 6, 2018 at <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/tgm/table.do?tab=table&init=1&language=en&pcode=tag00018&plugin=1>.
- 17 WHO. “WHO Guidelines on Use of Medically Important Antimicrobials in Food-Producing Animals.” Policy Brief, November 2017. <http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/259243/1/WHO-NMH-FOS-FZD-17.5-eng.pdf?ua=1>.
- 18 U.S. Food and Drug Administration (hereinafter FDA), Center for Veterinary Medicine. “2016 Summary Report on Antimicrobials Sold or Distributed for Use in Food-Producing Animals.” December 2017. <https://www.fda.gov/AnimalVeterinary/NewsEvents/CVMUpdates/ucm588086.htm>.
- 19 Ibid. Table 2b, page 31.
- 20 Data on 2015 sales of antibiotics for human medicine in the United States were obtained from Eili Klein of the Center for Disease Dynamics, Economics & Policy (CCDEP). Klein also provided data for years prior to 2015 in Kar, A., and Klein, E. “Animal Antibiotic Sales Finally Drop, but Much Work Remains.” Natural Resources Defense Council (hereinafter NRDC). December 2017. <https://www.nrdc.org/experts/avinash-kar/animal-antibiotic-sales-finally-drop-much-work-remains>. U.S. sales figures for antibiotics in human medicine are not yet available for 2016. CDDEP also provided those figures for years preceding 2016; 2016 data are not yet available.
- 21 Figure 2 compares sales of antibiotics for human medicine in 2015 with sales for use in pork production in 2016; that approach seems justified since year-to-year sales for human medicine have been mostly constant for the past decade, per CDDEP data. Hence the conclusion reflected in Figure 2 that 27.1% of the more than 25 million pounds of medically important antibiotics sold for any purpose in the United States in 2016 were for pork production.
- 22 The USDA’s National Animal Health Monitoring System (NAHMS) is in the process of doing first-ever surveys specific to antimicrobial use in swine production and in cattle feedlots, but NAHMS results typically are not reported for several years.
- 23 FDA. “2016 Summary Report.”
- 24 FDA. “Update on Implementation of FDA’s Guidance for Industry #213.” December 23, 2016. <https://www.fda.gov/AnimalVeterinary/NewsEvents/CVMUpdates/ucm534549.htm>.
- 25 FDA. “FDA Announces Implementation of GFI #213, Outlines Continuing Efforts to Address Antimicrobial Resistance.” January 3, 2017. <https://www.fda.gov/AnimalVeterinary/NewsEvents/CVMUpdates/ucm535154.htm>.
- 26 The White House, *National Action Plan for Combating Antibiotic-Resistant Bacteria*. March 2015. [https://www.cdc.gov/drugresistance/pdf/national\\_action\\_plan\\_for\\_combating\\_antibiotic-resistant\\_bacteria.pdf](https://www.cdc.gov/drugresistance/pdf/national_action_plan_for_combating_antibiotic-resistant_bacteria.pdf).
- 27 Expert Commission on Addressing the Contribution of Livestock to the Antibiotic Resistance Crisis. *Combating Antibiotic Resistance: A Policy Roadmap to Reduce Use of Medically Important Antibiotics in Livestock*. 2017. <http://battlesuperbugs.com/PolicyRoadmap>. Citing Levy, S.B. *Antibiotic Resistance: An Ecological Imbalance*. Ciba Foundation Symposium 207: Antibiotic Resistance: Origins, Evolution, Selection and Spread. 2007; and Levy, S.B. “Antibiotic Resistance: Consequences of Inaction.” *Clin Infect Dis* 2001; 33(3):S124–S129. <https://doi.org/10.1086/321837>.
- 28 Zhang, L., et al. “Antibiotic Administration Routes Significantly Influence the Levels of Antibiotic Resistance in Gut Microbiota.” *Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy* 2013; 57(8): 3659–3666. <http://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.00670-13>.
- 29 Catry, B. “Antimicrobial Policies in Animals and Human Health” (commentary). *Archives of Public Health* 2017; 75:62 DOI 10.1186/s13690-017-0231-7.
- 30 CDC. *Antibiotic Resistance Threats*.
- 31 Experts in the European Union developed a methodology for a technical measure, mg/PCU (population corrected unit). See: European Medicines Authority. *Trends in the Sales of Veterinary Antimicrobial Agents in Nine European Countries (2005–2009)*. Appendix 2. September 2011. [http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en\\_GB/document\\_library/Report/2011/09/WC500112309.pdf](http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Report/2011/09/WC500112309.pdf). The ration of mg/PCU is a comparison of antibiotic sales (in milligrams of active ingredient) per estimated live weight of animals (in kilograms) at the time they are given antibiotics. The ESVAC (European Surveillance of Veterinary Antimicrobial Consumption) project collects needed data from individual EU member countries to help compare, on a mg/PCU basis, how intensively antibiotics are being used in livestock production, including in pigs.

- 32 The most recent report on antimicrobial resistance surveillance from the Public Health Agency of Canada makes similar comparisons. With respect to pigs, however, Canada provides a mg/PCU figure only for grower/finisher pig operations; excluded from the calculation are feeder pigs, for which antibiotic use is acknowledged to be greatest. See: Public Health Agency of Canada. *Canadian Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance System: 2017 Report*. November 2017. <https://www.wormsandgermsblog.com/files/2017/11/CARSS-Report-2017-EN.pdf>.
- 33 Wallinga, D. "Better Bacon: Why It's High Time the U.S. Pork Industry Stopped Pigging Out on Antibiotics." Natural Resources Defense Council. <https://www.nrdc.org/resources/better-bacon-why-its-high-time-us-pork-industry-stopped-pigging-out-antibiotics>.
- 34 CDC. *Antibiotic Resistance Threats*.
- 35 Salyers, A., and Shoemaker, N.B. "Reservoirs of Antibiotic Resistance Genes." *Anim. Biotechnol.* 2006; 17(2):137-146. doi: 10.1080/10495390600957076.
- 36 Gillings, M.R. "Evolutionary Consequences of Antibiotic Use for the Resistome, Mobilome and Microbial Pangenome." *Frontiers in Microbiology* 2013; 4:4. <http://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2013.00004>.
- 37 Pruden, A., et al. "Management Options for Reducing the Release of Antibiotics and Antibiotic Resistance Genes to the Environment." *Environ. Health Perspect* 2013; 121:878-885. doi: 10.1289/ehp.1206446.
- 38 Aarestrup, F.M. "The Livestock Reservoir for Antimicrobial Resistance: A Personal View on Changing Patterns of Risks, Effects of Interventions and the Way Forward." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 2015; 370(1670): 20140085. <http://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2014.0085>.
- 39 Larsen, J., et al. "Evidence for Human Adaptation and Foodborne Transmission of Livestock-Associated Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*." *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2016; 63(10):1349-1352. <http://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciw532>.
- 40 Chamosa, L.S., et al. "Lateral Antimicrobial Resistance Genetic Transfer Is Active in the Open Environment." *Scientific Reports* 2017; 7:513. <http://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-00600-2>.
- 41 Massé, D.I., Saady, N.M., and Gilbert, Y. "Potential of Biological Processes to Eliminate Antibiotics in Livestock Manure: An Overview." *Animals* 2014; 4(2): 146-163. <http://doi.org/10.3390/ani4020146>.
- 42 Food and Drug Administration (FDA). NARMS Now. Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Available from URL: <https://www.fda.gov/AnimalVeterinary/SafetyHealth/AntimicrobialResistance/NationalAntimicrobialResistanceMonitoringSystem/ucm416741.htm>. Accessed 05/10/2018. Using the interactive tool, 100% of 341 *E. faecalis* bacteria isolated from pork chops in 2015, 44.7% of 161 *E. coli* isolates were resistant to at least one class of antibiotics.
- 43 Ibid.
- 44 Among the four species of bacteria isolated from hogs for which NARMS assesses levels of resistance, 59.0% of *Campylobacter*, 21.9% of *Salmonella*, 21.9% of *E. coli*, and 29.4% of *Enterococcus* tested in 2014 were resistant to three or more antibiotic classes.
- 45 Ibid.
- 46 Ravenholt, R.T., et al. "Staphylococcal Infection in Meat Animals and Meat Workers." *Public Health Reports* 1961; 76(10): 879-888. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1929799/>.
- 47 Levy, S.B., FitzGerald, G.B., and Maccone, A.B. "Spread of Antibiotic-Resistant Plasmids From Chicken to Chicken and From Chicken to Man." *Nature* 1976; 260:40-42.
- 48 Nadimpalli, M., et al. "Livestock-Associated, Antibiotic-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* Nasal Carriage and Recent Skin and Soft Tissue Infection Among Industrial Hog Operation Workers." *PLoS ONE* 2016; 11(11): e0165713. <http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0165713>.
- 49 Ye, X., et al. "Livestock-Associated Methicillin and Multidrug Resistant *S. aureus* in Humans Is Associated With Occupational Pig Contact, Not Pet Contact." *Scientific Reports* 2016; 6:19184. <http://doi.org/10.1038/srep19184>.
- 50 Nadimpalli, M., et al. "Persistence of Livestock-Associated Antibiotic-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* Among Industrial Hog Operation Workers in North Carolina Over 14 Days." *Occupational and Environmental Medicine* 2015; 72(2):90-99. <http://doi.org/10.1136/oemed-2014-102095>.
- 51 Neyra, R.C., et al. "Multidrug-Resistant and Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) in Hog Slaughter and Processing Plant Workers and Their Community in North Carolina (USA)." *Environmental Health Perspectives* 2014; 122(5):471-477. <http://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1306741>.
- 52 Smith, T.C., et al. "Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) Strain ST398 Is Present in Midwestern U.S. Swine and Swine Workers." *PLoS One* 2009; 4:e4258.
- 53 Smith, T.C., et al. "Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in Pigs and Farm Workers on Conventional and Antibiotic-Free Swine Farms in the USA." *PLoS One* 2013; 8:e63704.
- 54 Wardyn, S.E., et al. "Swine Farming Is a Risk Factor for Infection With and High Prevalence of Carriage of Multidrug Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*." *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2015; 61(1): 59-66. <http://doi.org/10.1093/cid/civ234>.
- 55 Nadimpalli, M., et al. "Livestock-Associated, Antibiotic-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* Nasal Carriage."
- 56 Nadimpalli, M., et al. "Persistence of Livestock-Associated Antibiotic-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*."
- 57 Morcillo, A., et al. "Prevalence and Characteristics of Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in Pigs and Pig Workers in Tenerife, Spain." *Foodborne Pathog Dis* 2012; 9(3):207-10. doi: 10.1089/fpd.2011.0982.
- 58 Hatcher, S.M., et al. "The Prevalence of Antibiotic-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* Nasal Carriage Among Industrial Hog Operation Workers, Community Residents, and Children Living in Their Households: North Carolina, USA." *Environ Health Perspect* 2017; 125:560-569. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1289/EHP35>.
- 59 Nadimpalli et al. "Livestock-Associated, Antibiotic-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* Nasal Carriage."
- 60 Smith, T.C. et al., "Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) Strain ST398 Is Present in Midwestern U.S. Swine and Swine Workers.
- 61 Neyra, R.C., et al. "Multidrug-Resistant and Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA)?"
- 62 Ibid.
- 63 Hong, P.Y., et al. (2013). "Monitoring the Perturbation of Soil and Groundwater Microbial Communities Due to Pig Production Activities." *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 79(8), 2620-2629. <http://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.03760-12>.
- 64 Sapkota, A.R., et al. "Antibiotic-Resistant Enterococci and Fecal Indicators in Surface Water and Groundwater Impacted by a Concentrated Swine Feeding Operation." *Environmental Health Perspectives* 2007; 115(7): 1040-1045. <http://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.9770>.
- 65 Chapin, A., et al. "Airborne Multidrug-Resistant Bacteria Isolated From a Concentrated Swine Feeding Operation." *Environmental Health Perspectives* 2005; 113(2): 137-142. <http://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.7473>.

66 Ibid.

67 USDA, Economic Research Service. “Hogs & Pork: Sector at a Glance.” Last updated February 13, 2018. <https://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/animal-products/hogs-pork/sector-at-a-glance>.

68 Casey, J.A., et al. “High-Density Livestock Operations, Crop Field Application of Manure, and Risk of Community-Associated Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* Infection, Pennsylvania, USA.” *JAMA Internal Medicine* 2013; 173(21):1980–1990. <http://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2013.10408>.

69 Casey, J.A., et al. “High-Density Livestock Production and Molecularly Characterized MRSA Infections in Pennsylvania.” *Environmental Health Perspectives* 2014; 122(5):464–470. <http://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1307370>.

70 Hatcher, S.M., et al. “Occurrence of Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in Surface Waters Near Industrial Hog Operation Spray Fields.” *Sci Total Environ* 2016; 15;565:1028-1036. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.05.083.

71 McBride, William D., and Key, N. “U.S. Hog Production From 1992 to 2009: Technology, Restructuring, and Productivity Growth.” ERR-158. USDA, Economic Research Service. October 2013.

72 USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service. “Overview of the United States Hog Industry.” October 2015. <http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/usda/current/hogview/hogview-10-29-2015.pdf>.

73 USDA, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS). “Swine 2012—Part III: Changes in the U.S. Swine Industry, 1995–2012.” August 2017. [https://www.aphis.usda.gov/animal\\_health/nahms/swine/downloads/swine2012/Swine2012\\_dr\\_Trends.pdf](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/animal_health/nahms/swine/downloads/swine2012/Swine2012_dr_Trends.pdf).

74 USDA/APHIS. “Swine 2012—Part III.”

75 USDA, Census of Agriculture. “2012 Census Highlights.”

76 Pig Health Today. “Time to Reboot Disease Surveillance.” May 19, 2017. <https://pighealthtoday.com/time-to-reboot-disease-surveillance/>.

77 Zimmerman, J. “Swine Medicine in the 21st Century: Immovable Object Meets Unstoppable Force.” Howard Dunne Memorial Lecture, 48th American Association of Swine Veterinarians’ Annual Meeting. Denver. February 2017.

78 MacDonald, J., and McBride, W. “The Transformation of U.S. Livestock Agriculture: Scale, Efficiency and Risks.” USDA, Economic Research Service. January 2009. ERS Information Bulletin No. 43. <https://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/pub-details/?pubid=44294>.

79 Giamalva, J., “Pork Industry and Trade Summary.”

80 McBride, William D., and Key, N. “U.S. Hog Production From 1992 to 2009.”

81 Ibid.

82 MacDonald, J., and McBride, W. “The Transformation of U.S. Livestock Agriculture.”

83 MacDonald and McBride offer the 75% figure based on data available at the time of publication of the cited report (2009). Personal communication with William McBride on September 26, 2017, confirms that this figure hasn’t been updated in more recent USDA publications but is almost certainly greater than 75% today or, alternatively, the number of integrators accounting for 75% of market hogs has dropped.

84 *Farm Journal’s Pork* (magazine). “Myths and Facts of Vertical Integration.” January 17, 2011. <https://www.porkbusiness.com/article/facts-and-myths-vertical-integration>.

85 McBride, W. and Key, N., “U.S. Hog Production, 1992 to 2009.” page 20, footnote 14.

86 “Smithfield Foods Is a \$15 Billion Global Food Company and the World’s Largest Pork Processor and Hog Producer.” Smithfield website. Accessed March 31, 2018 at <http://www.smithfieldfoods.com/about-smithfield/company-profile>.

87 In 2013, Smithfield was bought by the even larger Chinese food company WH Group. See WH Group, “About Us: Milestones.” <http://www.wh-group.com/en/about/milestones.php>.

88 Successful Farming. *Pork Powerhouses 2016*. 2017. <http://www.agriculture.com/pdf/pork-powerhouses-2016>.

89 Market power or control arises, for example, when a single company owns a big piece of all the sows or slaughterhouses in a particular region and can thereby exert substantial control over other steps in pork production in that region—processing, pork distribution and marketing, and the manufacture of feed grains, for example—that it doesn’t directly own.

90 USDA/APHIS, “Swine 2012—Part III.” Pages 60-72.

91 MacDonald, J., and McBride, W. “The Transformation of U.S. Livestock Agriculture.” Page 33, note 38.

92 Hurnik, D., et al. “Factor Analysis of Swine Farm Management Practices on Prince Edward Island.” *Prev Vet Med* 1994, 20: 135-146.

93 Stärk, K.D. “Epidemiological Investigation of the Influence of Environmental Risk Factors on Respiratory Diseases in Swine—A Literature Review. *Vet Journal* 2000; 159:37-56.

94 Pig Health Today, “Time to Reboot.”

95 Ibid.

96 See: Zimmerman, J. “Swine Medicine in the 21st Century.” In delivering this 2017 lecture to the American Association of Swine Veterinarians, Iowa State’s Jeff Zimmerman, DVM, explored the conundrum facing the audience: The characteristics that define and have helped to make the current U.S. system so economically efficient in producing pork meat also jeopardize that same system’s ability to deal with what Zimmerman calls an “unstoppable force” of rising threats from infectious disease.

97 DANMAP 2016. “Use of Antimicrobial Agents and Occurrence of Antimicrobial Resistance in Bacteria From Food Animals, Food and Humans in Denmark.” October 2017. [https://www.danmap.org/~media/Projekt%20sites/Danmap/DANMAP%20reports/DANMAP%202016/DANMAP\\_2016\\_web.ashx](https://www.danmap.org/~media/Projekt%20sites/Danmap/DANMAP%20reports/DANMAP%202016/DANMAP_2016_web.ashx). It should be noted that Danish figures are affected by an industry that raises a lot of piglets and then exports them before maturity.

98 Emborg, H., et al. “The Effect of Discontinuing the Use of Antimicrobial Growth Promoters on the Productivity in the Danish Broiler Production.” *Preventive Veterinary Medicine* 2001; 50:53-70.

99 WHO, *Impacts of Antimicrobial Growth Promoter Termination in Denmark: the WHO international review panel’s evaluation of the termination of the use of antimicrobial growth promoters in Denmark*, Foulum, Denmark 6-9 November 2002. Geneva: World Health Organization. <http://www.who.int/iris/handle/10665/68357>

100 Pew Charitable Trusts, “Avoiding Antibiotic Resistance: Denmark’s Ban on Growth Promoting Antibiotics in Food Animals,” undated. Accessed 31 March 2018 at [http://www.pewtrusts.org/~media/legacy/uploadedfiles/phg/content\\_level\\_pages/issue\\_briefs/denmarkexperiencepdf.pdf](http://www.pewtrusts.org/~media/legacy/uploadedfiles/phg/content_level_pages/issue_briefs/denmarkexperiencepdf.pdf).

- 101 Levy, S. "Reduced Antibiotic Use in Livestock: How Denmark Tackled Resistance." *Environ Health Perspect*; DOI:10.1289/ehp.122-A160.
- 102 SEGES (Pig Research Center). "Guidelines on Good Antibiotic Practice: As Little as Possible, but as Often as Necessary." 2013. pigresearchcentre.dk/Practical%20guidelines/Guidelines%20on%20good%20antibiotic%20practice.aspx.
- 103 European Medicines Authority (EMA) and European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). "EMA and EFSA Joint Scientific Opinion on Measures to Reduce the Need to Use Antimicrobial Agents in Animal Husbandry in the European Union, and the Resulting Impacts on Food Safety (RONAFA)." [EMA/CVMP/570771/2015]. *EFSA Journal* 2017; 15(1):4666. doi:10.2903/j.efsa. 2017.4666. Pages 93-115.
- 104 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations/World Organisation for Animal Health/World Bank. "Good Practices for Biosecurity in the Pig Sector: Issues and Options in Developing and Transition Countries." 2010. FAO Animal Production and Health Paper No. 169. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/012/i1435e/i1435e00.htm>.
- 105 Amass, S.F., and Clark, L.K. "Biosecurity Considerations for Pork Production Units." *Swine Health Production* 1999; 7(5), 12.
- 106 Seaman, J.S., and Fangman, T.F. "Biosecurity for Today's Hog Operation." *Agricultural MU Guide*. University of Missouri Extension. <https://extensiondata.missouri.edu/pub/pdf/agguides/ansci/g02340.pdf>. Accessed October 7, 2017.
- 107 Kansas State University. "Swine Management Practices to Reduce the Need for Antibiotics." KSU Agriculture Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service. December 2016. <https://www.bookstore.ksre.k-state.edu/pubs/MF3333.pdf>.
- 108 Pew Charitable Trusts. "Alternatives to Antibiotics in Animal Agriculture." July 2017. [http://www.pewtrusts.org/~media/assets/2017/07/alternatives\\_to\\_antibiotics\\_in\\_animal\\_agriculture.pdf](http://www.pewtrusts.org/~media/assets/2017/07/alternatives_to_antibiotics_in_animal_agriculture.pdf).
- 109 SEGES (Pig Research Centre). "About Us." 2018. pigresearchcentre.dk/.
- 110 SEGES. "Guidelines on Good Antibiotic Practice."
- 111 Grave, K., Torren-Edo, J., and Mackay, D. "Comparison of the Sales of Veterinary Antibacterial Agents Between 10 European Countries." *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy*, Volume 65, Issue 9, 1 September 2010, Pages 2037-2040, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jac/dkq247>.
- 112 McKenna, M. "The Abstinence Method: Dutch Farmers Just Say No to Antibiotics for Livestock." *Modern Farmer*. 17 June 2014. <https://modernfarmer.com/2014/06/abstinence-method/>.
- 113 Sheldon, Tony. "Saving Antibiotics for When They Are Really Needed: The Dutch Example." *BMJ* 2016; 354:l4192.
- 114 Netherlands Veterinary Medicines Institute (SDa). "Usage of Antibiotics in Agricultural Livestock in the Netherlands in 2016." May 29, 2017. <http://www.autoriteitdiogeneesmiddelen.nl/Userfiles/Eng%20rapport%20AB%202016/engels-def-rapportage-2016-deel-1-en-2-22-09-2017.pdf>.
- 115 Brook, L., and Stashwick, S. "Chain Reaction: How Top Restaurants Rate on Reducing Antibiotics in Their Meat Supply." NRDC. September 26, 2017. <https://www.nrdc.org/resources/chain-reaction-how-top-restaurants-rate-reducing-antibiotics-their-meat-supply>.
- 116 Chipotle Mexican Grill. "Chipotle Scores "A" in *Chain Reaction III* Study on Antibiotic Use in Farm Animals." Press release, September 27, 2017. <http://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20170927006105/en/>.
- 117 Shanker, D. "Just Months After Big Pork Said It Couldn't Be Done, Tyson Is Raising up to a Million Pigs Without Antibiotics." *Quartz*. February 24, 2016. <https://qz.com/624270/just-months-after-big-pork-said-it-couldnt-be-done-tyson-is-raising-up-to-a-million-pigs-without-antibiotics/>.
- 118 CDC. *Antibiotic Resistance Threats*.
- 119 Review on Antimicrobial Resistance. "Tackling Drug-Resistant Infections Globally: Final Report and Recommendations." May 2016. [https://amr-review.org/sites/default/files/160525\\_Final%20paper\\_with%20cover.pdf](https://amr-review.org/sites/default/files/160525_Final%20paper_with%20cover.pdf).
- 120 EMA and EFSA. "EMA and EFSA Joint Scientific Opinion."
- 121 EFSA Panel on Biological Hazards, "Scientific Opinion on the Public Health Risks of Bacterial Strains Producing Extended-spectrum  $\beta$ -lactamases and/or AmpC  $\beta$ -lactamases in Food and Food-Producing Animals." *EFSA Journal* 2011; 9:2322.
- 122 WHO. *Global Strategy*.