

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Ongoing mitigation strategies and further needs of the United States food industry to control
COVID-19 in the work environment

Sebastian Llanos-Soto^{1*}, Ece Bulut¹, Sarah I. Murphy¹, Christopher J. Henry¹, Claire Zoellner²,
Martin Wiedmann³, Diane Wetherington², Aaron Adalja⁴, Samuel D. Alcaine³, Renata Ivanek¹

¹ Department of Population Medicine and Diagnostic Sciences, College of Veterinary Medicine,
Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, United States of America

² iFoodDecisionSciences, Inc., Bellevue, Washington, United States of America

³ Department of Food Science, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Cornell University,
Ithaca, New York, United States of America

⁴ School of Hotel Administration, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, United States of
America

* Corresponding author

E-mail: sgl67@cornell.edu

24 **Abstract**

25 The COVID-19 pandemic has had dire effects on the United States (US) food industry through
26 impacts on workers' health and wellbeing and supply chain disruptions. The objectives of this
27 study were to determine what the food industry needs to be able to control COVID-19 impacts in
28 the work environment and what mitigation strategies are being implemented. A web-based needs
29 assessment survey was distributed from January to April 2021, via 13 food professional/trade
30 organizations and 2 social networks, targeting management professionals at food (produce, dairy,
31 poultry, and beef/pork) processing facilities and produce farm operations in the US. Statistical
32 analyses evaluated patterns in self-reported adoption of mitigation strategies against COVID-19
33 in the participants' facilities/operations and perceived needs of the industry regarding COVID-
34 19. Responses to open-ended questions were analyzed using thematic analysis. In total 145
35 responses were received, of which 79 were usable, including 38 (48%) from the dairy, 17 (22%)
36 from the fresh produce, and 24 (30%) from a mixture of other food industry sectors. Only two
37 usable responses were from the beef/pork sector and none from the poultry sector. Findings
38 revealed that several social distancing, biosecurity, and surveillance mitigation strategies against
39 COVID-19 are commonly implemented in the participants' facilities/operations, but their
40 implementation frequency differs by the facility/operation size and industry sector. Also,
41 findings indicated that collaboration between the food industry and government agencies,
42 contingency plans and appropriate training, and new technologies are needed to control COVID-
43 19 in the food industry. Subject to limitations associated with the relatively low response rate
44 (possible selection bias), the findings suggest that the US food industry is prepared to safeguard
45 workers' health and businesses in the event of a new COVID-19 variant or similar future

46 disaster, provided that appropriate structures are put in place to ensure coordination and
47 compliance, both before and during such an outbreak.

48 Keywords: COVID-19, dairy, fresh produce, mitigation strategies, food industry management

49 **Introduction**

50 The COVID-19 pandemic, caused by the SARS-CoV-2 beta-coronavirus virus, has
51 presented important challenges to the food industry in the United States (US) and around the
52 world. The food industry has dealt with disruptions in the supply chain [1–5], difficulties
53 meeting market demands and changes in food consumption patterns [2,6,7], negative effects on
54 production capacity [8], labor shortages [9], and decreases in productivity due to absenteeism
55 [10–12], while adopting various public health measures to safeguard its workforce’s health [13].
56 The US food industry, including transportation and logistics, is more than ever considered
57 critical infrastructure for the nation because of its key role in feeding the US population [14].
58 The maintenance of such activities has led to the occurrence of COVID-19 outbreaks across all
59 industry sectors in the US, including poultry [15], beef/pork [15], dairy [16], and fresh produce
60 [17]. Indeed, from April 2020 to July 2021, more than 90,000 cases and 450 deaths related to
61 COVID-19 have been reported across food industry sectors in the US [18]. Some of these
62 outbreaks have involved widespread transmission of COVID-19 among employees, as was the
63 case for a central New York State greenhouse in which more than half (171/300) of the workers
64 tested positive for the virus [17]. Food and agriculture workers are amongst the occupations most
65 severely affected by excess deaths due to COVID-19 according to a study comparing the total
66 number of deaths in two scenarios, one theoretical scenario in which COVID-19 never happened
67 (established based on pre-pandemic data for 2018 and 2019) and one scenario that projected

68 deaths during the COVID-19 pandemic [19]. To improve the ability of the US food industry to
69 more effectively and quickly respond to COVID-19 related disturbances and similar future
70 disasters, it is essential to understand the needs and concerns of the food industry regarding the
71 ongoing pandemic. This requires understanding the specific needs and concerns of the various
72 industry sectors, as impacts (e.g., COVID-19 related deaths), challenges, and responses to these
73 challenges might be different across food industry sectors. For instance, industry sectors
74 providing employees with housing and transportation might require additional preventive
75 measures to avoid contact between COVID-19 infected and healthy employees [20].

76 In the US, governmental institutions, such as the Centers for Disease Control and
77 Prevention (CDC) and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) have
78 published guidelines and checklists to inform and guide the US food industry and other
79 businesses about the correct implementation of social distancing, biosafety, and surveillance
80 strategies to assist in preventing COVID-19 cases [20–23]. The guidelines usually recommend
81 the adoption of multiple methods to socially distance workers, sanitize and clean the workplace
82 and workers' hands, enforce mask-wearing, and apply surveillance tests to identify COVID-19
83 cases and prevent further spread. These guidelines were established early in the COVID-19
84 pandemic (around June 2020) [20,23] and prior to the widespread availability of vaccines to
85 reduce transmission in the workplace (late 2020 – early 2021) [21,22]. The proper
86 implementation of these strategies is considered important in reducing the occurrence of
87 COVID-19 cases in the workplace and/or limiting the size of an outbreak; for example, air
88 ventilation and social distancing have been shown to be effective in reducing COVID-19
89 dissemination among employees in German meat industry facilities in 2020 [24]. Nonetheless,
90 there is a gap in information regarding what the food industry perceives as needed to properly

91 address COVID-19 transmission in food production facilities and operations. Currently,
92 information about the adoption of mitigation strategies in the US food industry remains scarce
93 and limited to certain sectors, such as the meat [15], poultry [15], and dairy sectors [25].
94 Although, these studies have provided valuable information, they were performed in a
95 comparatively earlier period in the COVID-19 pandemic (April – July, 2020) when the adoption
96 of mitigation strategies by the US food industry could have been different (e.g., vaccine
97 availability) and information, such as guidelines to implement ventilation in buildings [22] and
98 OSHA’s instructions to prevent COVID-19 transmission in the workplace [21], have not yet
99 been published. In addition, the study by Yung et al. [25] was restricted to dairy farmers in the
100 states of Minnesota and Wisconsin, which represents a small part of the US dairy industry and
101 might not reflect the adoption of mitigation strategies in other dairy facilities and operations in
102 the country.

103 This information is important as knowing how commonly social distancing, biosafety,
104 and surveillance mitigation strategies were adopted to prevent COVID-19 cases across the US
105 food industry and the reasons behind such adoption or lack of adoption are crucial to identify
106 areas where prevention could be improved. Therefore, the objectives of this study were to
107 identify the needs of the US food industry (targeting produce farm operations as well as produce,
108 dairy, poultry, beef/pork processing facilities) in mitigating the impact of the COVID-19
109 pandemic on workforce and food production, and to assess the ongoing implementation of
110 COVID-19 mitigation strategies in the work environment. These objectives were addressed
111 through the administration of a needs assessment survey between January and April, 2021,
112 detailed in the “Materials and methods” section.

113 **Materials and methods**

114 **Needs assessment survey design and data collection**

115 A two-part web-based needs assessment survey was developed. Part 1 asked general
116 questions about a survey participant's overall industry sector (produce, dairy, poultry, beef/pork,
117 or other), and part 2 asked about conditions and COVID-19 mitigation strategies in a food
118 production facility or operation of the participant's choice (participants who oversee multiple
119 facilities and/or operations were asked to choose one). The wording of questions can be found in
120 S1 Appendix, S1 Table (additionally, the S1 Appendix includes a complete copy of the survey
121 instrument including introduction letter and the consent statement). Briefly, the questions
122 included in part 1 were about a participant's industry sector, their main role in their organization,
123 how COVID-19 has impacted their industry sector, concerns about COVID-19 control,
124 challenges in maintaining production capacity, needs to successfully mitigate COVID-19,
125 desired features of a computational modeling tool that aids decision making in control of
126 COVID-19, and indicators of a successful response against COVID-19. Part 2 included questions
127 about the industry sector of the participant's selected facility/operation, maximum tolerable
128 reduction in the production labor force that is compatible with maintaining full production
129 capacity, number and age of employees, availability of employer-provided housing and
130 transportation for employees, importance of different specialized job functions for maintaining
131 production in the event of a COVID-19 outbreak, sources of COVID-19 in the facility/operation,
132 and adoption of COVID-19 mitigation strategies (definitions of mitigation strategies provided to
133 survey participants are shown in Table 1). Part 2 also included several questions applicable only
134 to participants from the produce food sector. Survey questions were initially designed by E.B.,
135 R.I., and S.L.-S. The design process included discussing preliminary versions of the survey with
136 A.A., C.Z., D.W., S.D.A., S.I.M., and M.W. until a consensus was reached regarding the

137 phrasing and content of the questions included in the final version of the survey. The survey was
138 piloted between December 8, 2020, and January 6, 2021, by obtaining anonymous responses
139 from 7 out of 10 members of an advisory council for the authors' COVID-19 research grant
140 comprised of executive-level managers representing the produce, dairy, beef/pork, and poultry
141 industry sectors. Feedback from the piloting process was incorporated into the final version of
142 the survey.

143

144 **Table 1. Definitions of social distancing, biosafety, and surveillance mitigation strategies**
145 **provided to study participants in the needs assessment survey.**

Mitigation strategy	Definition
Social distancing	
Installed physical barriers	Clear plastic partitions preventing employees from getting too close and preventing particles or droplets exhaled by one person from entering the breathing zone of another.
Staggered break times	Groups of employees have different break times.
Staggered arrival/departure times (staggered shifts)	Groups of employees have a set number of hours to work during the day, but they have different start and finish times.
Downsizing operation	Reduction of a facility's production capacity accompanied by a reduction in the number of employees.
Adjusted sick day policy	Employee benefits include a paid sick leave granted when an employee is unable to work because the employee is quarantined or isolated due to COVID-19, because of a bona fide need to care for an individual subject to quarantine or isolation, or to care for a child (under 18 years of age) whose school or childcare provider is closed or unavailable for reasons related to COVID-19. (Definition is adapted from US Dept. of Labor "Families First Coronavirus Response Act: Employee Paid Leave Rights").
Spacing workers >6ft during production	Keeping a space at least 6 feet between employees.
Cohorting employees	Establishing groups of employees based on their risk of infection in the company, where each cohort remains as separated from the other cohorts as possible.
Biosafety	
Enhanced handwashing	Implementation of a set of instructions for employees about

	when and how to wash hands that goes above and beyond instructions that were in place pre-COVID-19.
Alcohol-based hand rubs	Implementation of a set of instructions for employees about when and how to use.
Face mask, face shields, and/or goggles	Implementation of a set of instructions about how and when to use face masks, face shields and goggles. Face masks are often referred to as surgical masks or procedure masks. They cover the nose and mouth and are secured under the chin, fit snugly against the side of the face, and do not have gaps. Face shields are secondary protectors intended to protect the entire face against exposure. Goggles shield the eyes against the hazards.
Increased air ventilation rates	Increase in the rate at which external air (fresh air) flows into the building.
Air cleaning/filtering	Destroying or removing hazards like viral particles from the air.
Surveillance	
Temperature screening and quarantine	Screen for employees with a temperature above 99.5°F (or other cut-off value) and keep identified employees away from the workplace to determine whether they develop COVID-19 symptoms or test positive for the disease.
Test for infection and isolation	Test employees for COVID-19 infection (viral test); Isolation: keep away from the workplace an employee who is sick with COVID-19 or tested positive for COVID-19 without symptoms.
Contact tracing and quarantine	Contact tracing is a process to identify individuals who may have been exposed to a person with COVID-19. Quarantine is the practice of separating individuals who have had close contact with someone with COVID-19 to determine whether they develop symptoms or test positive for the disease.
Return to work post recovery policy	Any strategy implemented for employees returning to work following a COVID-19 infection based on symptoms or doctor's recommendation.

146

147 The survey was implemented in the Qualtrics survey platform (Qualtrics, Provo, UT) and

148 made available online to survey participants through a link. After clicking on the link

149 participants were shown an introductory letter that provided information about the purpose of the

150 survey and asked to consent to take part in the study. Individuals older than 18 years and

151 affiliated with a produce farm operation or with produce, dairy, beef/pork, poultry, or other food

152 processing facility in the US were considered eligible to participate in the survey; recruitment

153 targeted management professionals at those facilities and operations. No identifying information
154 was collected from participants and their responses remained confidential. No compensation for
155 participation was provided (S1 Appendix). The survey took approximately 30 minutes to
156 complete.

157 A number of food industry professional/trade organizations were contacted to request
158 their assistance in disseminating the survey to their management professional members. This
159 resulted in successfully collected responses via 13 organizations, including 3 associated with the
160 fresh produce industry, 5 with dairy, 1 with beef/pork & poultry, and 4 with general processing.
161 Additionally, the survey was distributed via two social networks of study authors (Table 2). The
162 period for survey distribution started on January 19, 2021, and concluded on April 6, 2021. The
163 study was approved by the Cornell University Institutional Review Board for Human
164 Participants (IRB protocol #2006009660). No power-based sample calculation was conducted
165 due to the preliminary nature of the investigation.

166

167 **Table 2. Number of needs assessment survey responses (total received and usable) by the**
168 **industry sector and social media recruitment targets.**

Recruitment target	Total responses	Usable responses
- Recruitment venue		
Fresh Produce	31	17
– United Fresh Produce Association		
– Produce Marketing Association		
– IAFP Professional Development Group (PDG) Fruit and Vegetable Safety and Quality		
Dairy	61	35
– Northeast Dairy Foods Association		
– International Dairy Foods Association		
– New York State Cheese Manufacturers' Association		

- IAFP PDG Dairy Quality and Safety
- Dairy Management Inc

Beef/pork and Poultry	3	0
– IAFP PDG Meat and Poultry Safety and Quality		
General processing	29	17
– Minnesota AgriGrowth Council		
– American Frozen Food Institute (AFFI)		
– Midwest Food Products Association		
– Food Northwest		
Social media	21	10
– LinkedIn		
– Twitter		
Total	145	79

169 A response was considered usable when participant completed at least part 1 of the survey.
170

171 **Data management and statistical analysis**

172 Only responses from participants that completed at least part 1 of the survey were
173 considered usable (Table 2). These were organized in an Excel datasheet (Microsoft, Seattle,
174 WA) for subsequent analysis. Responses to multiple choice and open-ended questions asking for
175 specific numbers were treated as numerical data for statistical analysis. If a participant responded
176 an interval to a question asking for a specific number, then the mean of the interval was used.
177 Incomplete responses or those unrelated to the corresponding questions were included as missing
178 values in the datasheet. Statistical analysis was carried out in R v. 4.0.3 [26]. Responses to the
179 survey questions were summarized and organized in tables and visualized using heatmaps.
180 Responses to numeric open-ended questions were summarized using median, mean, interquartile
181 range (IQR), and range. Levels in Likert items were treated as interval (with assigned values
182 values 1-5) or numerical (with assigned values 0, 0.5 or 1) data for statistical analysis, so that the
183 median score of responses to a Likert item could be calculated. Responses to the question Q20

184 “What was the average number of employees in this facility/operation in 2019?” were
185 transformed from interval to nominal data by grouping responses in the levels “Small” (1-49
186 employees), “Medium” (50-249 employees), and “Large” (>250 employees) based on criteria
187 established by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) [31]; this
188 variable served as a proxy for facility/operation size.

189 A complete plan of analysis of survey questions can be found in S1 Appendix, S1 Table,
190 including questions identified as the outcomes of interest and independent variables (predictors)
191 in the analysis of associations. As applicable, Kruskal-Wallis, Fisher’s exact, Mann-Whitney U
192 or Spearman’s rank correlation tests were used to identify predictors associated with the
193 outcomes of interest at the bivariable level. Associations were considered significant at $p \leq 0.05$.
194 Post-hoc assessment of significant associations was carried out using the Dunn’s test to
195 determine specific statistical differences between variable levels. Obtained p -values were
196 adjusted for multiple testing using the false discovery rate (FDR) [27]. The data underlying the
197 results presented in the study are available in Zenodo (doi: 10.5281/zenodo.5165334).

198 **Thematic analysis**

199 Thematic analysis involves determining common themes or ideas that are repeated across
200 participants’ open-ended responses to a certain question [28]. As a follow-up to certain Likert
201 questions or multiple-choice questions, we asked an open-ended question to gain a deeper
202 understanding of participants’ opinions/perceptions. These open-ended questions were
203 preliminarily assessed to select questions with diverse and informative responses for thematic
204 analysis. In other words, questions with responses that provided new information (i.e., not being
205 accounted for in responses to other questions in the survey) and diverse enough to generate at

206 least two codes were selected. During the initial assessment, a preliminary codebook was
207 generated to classify participants' responses into codes and subsequently identify themes
208 emerging from those codes. This codebook was further refined through discussions among
209 authors (S.L.-S., S.I.M., E.B., and R.I.). Theme identification across questions was first carried
210 out individually by authors (S.L.-S., S.I.M., E.B., and R.I.), and a final consensus was reached
211 following discussion. Details for codes and themes can be found in S2 Table.

212 **Results**

213 **Responses from 79 survey participants could be analyzed, most** 214 **being from the dairy industry sector and acting as corporate food** 215 **safety and quality managers**

216 In total, 145 survey responses were collected. However, based on the decision to only
217 include responses from participants that completed at least part 1 of the survey (usable
218 responses), responses from only 79 participants were retained for statistical (Tables 3-5) and
219 thematic analysis (Table 6). The following results were obtained from responses to questions in
220 part 1, where participants answered general questions about the industry sector to which they
221 belong (Table 3). Among 79 participants, 38 (48%) were from the dairy industry sector, 17
222 (22%) from fresh produce, and 22 (28%) from other food industry sectors (e.g., chocolate
223 production, frozen food, prepared food, wine production, cereals) (Q1, Table 3). Only two
224 responses were obtained from the beef/pork industry and thus were grouped into the "Other"
225 category for statistical analysis. Three participants self-reported association with all 4 food
226 industry sectors (i.e., Fresh produce, Dairy, Poultry, and Beef/pork) and thus were grouped in the

227 “Other” category. No responses were received from the poultry sector. (Note: as stated, Q1 in
 228 part 1 asked for the industry sector of a participant, which is different from Q15 in part 2 that
 229 asked about the industry sector of a facility/operation the participant chose to describe; this is
 230 why responses to Q1 and Q15 are slightly different although they both ask about the industry
 231 sector.)

232

233 **Table 3. Number and proportion of responses among survey participants (N=79) for**
 234 **questions, analyzed as categorical variables, from each of the two parts of the needs**
 235 **assessment survey (part 1: General questions about a participant’s industry sector; part 2:**
 236 **Conditions and COVID-19 controls in a facility or operation of participant’s choice).**

Q ^a	Variable	Response	Number	%
Part 1				
Q1 ^b	What industry sector are you in? (select all that apply)	Fresh produce	17	22
		Dairy	38	48
		Poultry	0	0
		Beef/pork ^c	2	3
		Other ^d	22	28
Q2 ^b	Select your main role within your organization	C-suite	13	16
		Regional manager	0	0
		Facility manager	21	26
		Research and development	3	4
		Corporate food safety and quality	29	37
		Other ^e	11	14
		Prefer not to answer	2	3
Q3	Did COVID-19 have a significant impact on your industry sector?	Yes	67	85
		No	12	15
Q4	In which way(s) has COVID-19 significantly impacted your industry sector? (select all that apply)	Operations/production has been reduced/cut back	38	57
		Operations/production has expanded	23	34
		Implemented robotics, sensors, automation, and/or computer modeling	5	7
		Management/corporate employees working remotely	52	78

		Major changes in operational staffing control and protection protocols	54	81
		Other	1	1
Part 2: Conditions and COVID-19 controls in a facility or operation of participant's choice				
Q15 ^b	In what industry sector is this facility/operation?	Fresh produce	17	22
		Dairy	40	51
		Poultry	0	0
		Beef/pork	1	1
		Other ^f	20	25
		No response	1	1
Q20 ^g	What was the average number of employees in this facility/operation in 2019?	Small (1-49 workers)	25	32
		Medium (50-249 workers)	33	42
		Large (>250 workers)	16	20
		Prefer not to answer	1	1
		Missing	4	5
Q22	Does this facility/operation provide group temporary (seasonal) housing to any of your employees?	Yes	9	11
		No	67	85
		No response	3	4
Q24	Does this facility/operation provide group transportation services (bus, truck, etc.) to employees to/from work?	Yes	8	10
		No	68	86
		No response	3	4
Q31	If in the future the available labor force in this facility/operation is affected by a COVID-19 outbreak, what short/mid-term solutions should be considered to maintain production? (check all that apply)	Extend the number of work hours for remaining workers	59	75
		Backfill with emergency personnel from third-party companies	28	35
		Backfill by reorganizing personnel in the same facility	48	61
		No response	7	9
Q32	To prevent labor shortage in this facility/operation due to a potential future COVID-19 outbreak, should capital investment into mechanization be considered as a long-term solution to maintain production?	Yes	57	72
		No	13	16
		No response	9	11
Q43 ^b	What was the main reason for your choice to describe conditions and COVID-19 mitigation in this particular food production facility/operation?	I am mostly familiar with this facility/operation	24	30
		This is our unique facility/operation	5	6
		This is our typical facility/operation	16	20
		This facility/operation has been impacted greatly by COVID-19	11	14
		This is our strategically important	13	16

		facility/operation		
		Other	4	5
		No response	0	0
<hr/>				
<i>Questions applicable only to the fresh produce industry sector</i>				
<hr/>				
Q16 ^h	How does this facility/operation operate?	Year-round	15	88
		Seasonally	2	12
		No response	0	0
<hr/>				
Q18 ^h	What role best describes this facility/operation?	Grower	2	12
		Packing House	2	12
		Processor	4	24
		Grower and Field packer	5	29
		Grower and Processor	3	18
		Other	1	6
		No response	0	0
<hr/>				
Q19 ⁱ	Please select which part of your Grower and Processor operation will you describe in the remaining questions?	Grower operation	0	0
		Processor facility	3	100
		No response	0	0

237 ^a Question (Q) number in the needs assessment survey.

238 ^b Participants were required to answer the question to continue the needs assessment survey.

239 ^c Two participants from the beef/pork industry were grouped in the “Other” category for statistical analysis.

240 ^d Participants’ provided responses for the “Other” industry sector (number responses): Food processing (2); Frozen
 241 fruits (2); Chocolate (1); Cereal (1); Co-packaging of shelf-stable products (1); Consumer packaged goods with
 242 fresh produce (1); Food manufacturing (1); Food service (1); Frozen produce (1); Manufacturing shelf-stable foods
 243 (1); Prepared food (1); Restaurants (1); Seafood (1); Spirits (1); Sugar (1); Vegetable processing (1). Additional 4
 244 participants were grouped into the “Other” category for statistical analysis: 1 participant who is an academic
 245 affiliated with the food industry and 3 participants who reported affiliation with all 4 sectors (i.e., Fresh produce,
 246 Dairy, Poultry, and Beef/pork).

247 ^e Participants’ provided responses for the “Other” main role within their organization (number responses): Quality
 248 assurance manager (3); Sales service (1); Affineur (1); Human resources director (1); Owner (1); Office manager
 249 (1); CEO (1); Emeritus professor (1); Grower (1).

250 ^f Participants’ provided responses grouped under the “Other” industry sector for the described facility/operation of
 251 the participant’s choice (number responses): Cleaning and sanitation (1); Restaurants (1); Chocolate (1); Prepared
 252 food (1); Food manufacturing (1); Shelf-stable products (2); Frozen Produce (1); CPG sauces (2); Cereal (1); Food
 253 processing (2); Beverage, spirits (1); Vegetable processing (1); Frozen fruits (2); Seafood (1); Sugar (1).
 254 Additionally, one participant who answered “Other” specified working in all industry sectors.

255 ^g Original levels “Less than 10”, “10-49”, “50-99”, “100-249”, “250-499”, “500-999”, “1000-2000”, and “More than
 256 2000” were grouped in the levels “Small” (1-49 employees), “Medium” (50-249 employees), and “Large” (>250
 257 employees) based on criteria established by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

258 ^h This question was only shown to 17 participants who selected the option “Fresh produce” in question Q15.

259 ⁱ This question was only shown to 3 participants who selected the option “Grower and Processor” in question Q18.

260

261

262 **Table 4. Summary statistics for questions included in part 2 of the needs assessment survey**

263 **(that asked about conditions and COVID-19 controls in a food production facility or**

264 operation of participant’s choice), which were analyzed as interval variables (number of
 265 survey participants =79).

Q ^a	Variable	Number of responses	Mean	Median	IQR	Range	No response
Q26	What is the largest percent reduction in the general production labor force that this facility/operation could withstand over a period of one week without reduction in the production capacity?	66	15	15	10-15	5-50 ^b	13 ^c
Q21	What is the approximate proportion (%) of employees in this facility/operation that are between 50-69 years of age? ^d	66	32	28	20-40	0-100	13
Q21	What is the approximate proportion (%) of employees in this facility/operation that are 70 years old or older? ^d	62	3	1	0-5	0-17	17
Q23	Approximately what proportion (%) of employees in this facility/operation are provided with group temporary housing? ^e	7	49	35	35-70	10-100	2
Q25	Approximately what proportion (%) of employees in this facility/operation are provided with group transportation to/from work? ^f	7	40	28	15-63	10-90	1

266 ^a Question (Q) number in the needs assessment survey

267 ^b This was a single-choice question with available responses: 5%, 10% , 15%, 20%, 30%, 40%, 50%, and Do not
 268 know; thus, the observed range spanned the full range of possible responses.

269 ^c Nine participants responded “Do not know” and were grouped with “No response” for analysis.

270 ^d The original question asked about ‘50-69 years of age’ and ‘70 years or older’ but were separated here to more
 271 clearly indicate their values.

272 ^e This question was only shown to 9 participants who selected “Yes” in question Q22: “Does this facility/operation
 273 provide group temporary (seasonal) housing to any of your employees?”.

274 ^f This question was only shown to 8 participants who selected “Yes” in question Q24: “Does this facility/operation
 275 provide group transportation services (bus, truck, etc.) to employees to/from work?”.

276

277 **Table 5. Significant associations found in the bivariable analyses ($p \leq 0.05$) between a**
 278 **specific Likert item (outcome) in a survey question (Q) and independent variables**

279 (predictors) describing “Industry sector” (Q1) and “Facility/operation size” (Q20) after
 280 post-hoc analysis and false discovery rate adjustment.

Likert question (Q) [@] - Item	Predictor	Level [#]	Median [*]	IQR [*]
Q5, Regarding control of COVID-19 in your industry sector, how concerning are the items below?				
- Limited financial resources	Facility/operation size	Small ^a	3.5	2-5
		Medium ^b	2	2-3
		Large ^b	2	1-3.3
- Limited financial resources	Industry sector	Dairy ^a	2	1-3
		Fresh produce ^b	3	2-4
		Other ^{a,c}	3	2-4
- Supplier management	Facility/operation size	Small ^a	3	3-5
		Medium ^{a,b}	3	2-4
		Large ^{c,b}	2	2-3.3
Q9, Regarding needs to successfully mitigate COVID-19 in your industry sector, how important are the items below?				
- Easier way to understand regulations	Industry sector	Dairy ^a	4	3-4
		Fresh produce ^b	5	3-5
		Other ^{a,c}	3	2-4
Q13, Regarding indicators of successful responses to COVID-19 in your industry sector, how important are the items below?				
- Established effective risk communication plan	Facility/operation size	Small ^a	3.5	3-4
		Medium ^{a,b}	4.0	4-5
		Large ^{c,b}	5.0	4-5
Q29, Regarding potential sources of COVID-19 infection in this facility/operation, how concerning are the items below?				
- Indoor common areas	Facility/operation size	Small ^a	2.5	1-4
		Medium ^b	4	3-4
		Large ^{a,c}	3	2-4
Q34, Have any of these social distancing strategies been applied in this facility/operation, at any point since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic?				

- Installed physical barriers	Facility/operation size	Small ^a	0	0-0.6
		Medium ^b	1	0.5-1
		Large ^b	1	0.5-1
- Staggered break times	Facility/operation size	Small ^a	0	0-1
		Medium ^b	1	1-1
		Large ^b	1	0.5-1
- Staggered arrival/departure times (staggered shifts)	Facility/operation size	Small ^a	0	0-0.5
		Medium ^b	1	0-1
		Large ^b	0.5	0-1
- Adjusted sick day policy	Facility/operation size	Small ^a	0	0-1
		Medium ^b	1	0.5-1
		Large ^{a,b}	0.8	0.5-1
- Spacing workers >6ft during production	Facility/operation size	Small ^a	0.5	0-0.5
		Medium ^b	1	0.8-1
		Large ^b	1	0.5-1
- Spacing workers >6ft during production	Industry sector	Dairy ^a	1	1-1
		Fresh produce ^{a,b}	0.5	0.5-1
		Other ^{c,b}	1	0.5-1
- Cohorting employees	Facility/operation size	Small ^a	0	0-0
		Medium ^b	0.5	0-1
		Large ^{a,b}	0.5	0-0.6
Q36, Have any of these employee biosafety strategies been applied in this facility/operation, at any point since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic?				
- Face mask, face shields, goggles	Industry sector	Dairy ^a	1	1-1
		Fresh produce ^b	1	0.5-1
		Other ^{a,c}	1	1-1
- Air cleaning/filtering	Facility/operation size	Small ^a	0	0-0.1
		Medium ^b	1	0-1
		Large ^{a,b}	0.5	0-1
Q38, Have any of these surveillance strategies been applied in this facility/operation, at any point since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic?				
- Temperature screening and quarantine	Facility/operation size	Small ^a	0.3	0-1
		Medium ^b	1	1-1
		Large ^{a,b}	1	0.5-1
- Contact tracing and quarantine	Facility/operation size	Small ^a	0	0-0.8
		Medium ^b	1	1-1
		Large ^b	1	0.9-1
- Contact tracing and quarantine	Industry sector	Dairy ^a	1	1-1

		Fresh produce ^b	0.5	0.5-1	
		Other ^{a,b}	1	0-1	
-	Return to work post recovery policy	Facility/operation size	Small ^a	1	0.4-1
			Medium ^b	1	1-1
			Large ^{a,b}	1	0.9-1

281 Other statistically significant associations found in this study are presented in S3 Table.

282 [@] Likert question (Q) number in the needs assessment survey.

283 [#] Different letters in superscripts indicate statistically significantly different levels. When two levels of a predictor have different superscript letters, it means that the Likert responses for an outcome variable were significantly different between the two levels of a predictor, while having the same letter means no evidence of significant difference. For example, in Q5, the responses to the underlying Likert item outcome “Limited financial resources” were significantly different between “Small” and “Medium”, as well as between “Small” and “Large” levels of the predictor “Facility/operation size” (indicated by different superscripts, a and b) but there was no evidence of difference between “Medium” and “Large” facilities/operations (indicated by the same superscript, b).

284
285
286
287
288
289
290 ^{*} Median and interquartile range (IQR) calculated for the interval (1-5 in Q5, Q9, Q13, and Q29) and numeric values (0, 0.5 or 1 in Q34, Q36, and Q38) that were assigned to the Likert scale responses in each Likert item are included for comparison across facility/operation size and industry sector levels. For Q5 and Q29, values 1 to 5 represented “Not at all concerning” to “Extremely concerning”; while for Q9 and Q13, values 1 to 5 represented “Not at all important” to “Extremely important”. For Q34, Q36, and Q38, the value 0 represented “No” (not implemented), 0.5 represented “Yes, but only partially/temporarily, and 1 represented “Yes”.

296

297 **Table 6. Themes identified in participants’ responses to selected open-ended questions in**
298 **the needs assessment survey, the purpose of which was to provide depth to the**
299 **corresponding Likert items questions.**

Likert question ^a	Corresponding open-ended question (Number (N) of responses)	Themes
Q5	Q6, Regarding control of COVID-19 in your industry sector, are there any other concerns we should consider? (N=19)	Employee fatigue, vaccine hesitancy, health and healthcare access Access to COVID-19 preventative measures, guidance and information; difficulties in implementation of mitigation strategies Supply chain disruption and management of contractor expectations
Q7	Q8, Regarding the labor force needed to maintain the production capacity in your industry sector during the COVID-19 pandemic, are there any other challenges we should consider? (N=20)	Downside of COVID-19 mitigation strategies Government benefits and regulations Labor availability, needs, expectations and behavior
Q9	Q10, Regarding needs to successfully mitigate COVID-19 in your industry sector, are there	Technology to improve infection prevention, time efficiency and internet access Cost-effective mitigation strategies, harmonized

	any other important needs we should consider? (N=8)	guidance and prioritized vaccination of food industry workers Consumer education
Q32	Q33, To maintain production in the event of labor shortage in this facility/operation due to a potential future COVID-19 outbreak, are there any other solutions we should consider? (N=9)	Employee benefits and training Industry collaboration, production adjustment and infrastructure changes
Q34	Q35, For one or more of these social distancing strategies, could you share any reasons for adopting or not adopting it, such as cost, compliance by workers, training requirement, effectiveness in reducing health risks, impact on production capacity, and/or lack of science-based information? (N=12)	Infrastructure, productivity or Union imposed constrains Lack of concern or need
Q36	Q37, For one or more of these employee biosafety strategies, could you share any reasons for adopting or not adopting it, such as cost, compliance by workers, training requirement, effectiveness in reducing health risks, impact on production capacity, and/or lack of science-based information? (N=10)	Infrastructure constrains Lack of funds, supplies or information Lack of need
Q38	Q39, For one or more of these surveillance strategies, could you share any reasons for adopting or not adopting it, such as cost, compliance by workers, training requirement, effectiveness in reducing health risks, impact on production capacity, and/or lack of science-based information? (N=10)	Cost of implementation Increases worker absences Lack of concern or need

300 ^aThe complete wording of the Likert questions can be found in S1 Table.

301

302 The most common roles of the 79 participants in their organizations were corporate food

303 safety and quality manager (29, 37%), followed by facility managers (21, 27%), and c-suite

304 executive (13, 16%) among others (Q2, Table 3). Most (67/79, 85%) indicated that COVID-19
305 has significantly impacted their industry sector. The most common ways COVID-19 has
306 significantly impacted their industry sector was through major changes in operational staffing
307 control and protection protocols (54/79, 68%), remote work of management or corporate
308 employees (52/79, 66%), and reduced or cut back operations/production (38/79, 48%) (Q4, Table
309 3).

310 **Participants' chosen facilities/operations could withstand up to a**
311 **median of 15% reduction of the production labor force over a week**
312 **while still being able to maintain the full production capacity**

313 The following results include responses from part 2 of the needs assessment, which asked
314 about a facility or operation of participant's choice (Tables 3 and 4). The most common reason
315 for selecting a facility to describe in the survey was participant's familiarity with the facility
316 (24/79, 30%) (Q43, Table 3). In terms of the average number of employees in 2019, most
317 participants (33/79, 42%) chose to describe a medium size-facility/operation (50-249 employees)
318 (Q20, Table 3). The largest percent reduction in the general production labor force over a week
319 that the participants' facility/operation could withstand without reducing their production
320 capacity had a median of 15% (IQR: 10%-15%; Q26, Table 4). Only 11% and 10% of the
321 participants' facilities/operations provided group temporary (seasonal) housing and
322 transportation to employees, respectively (Q22 and Q24, Table 4). Regarding short/mid-term
323 solutions to maintain production and prevent their facility/operation labor force from being
324 affected in the event of a COVID-19 outbreak, most of the participants' facilities and operations
325 considered extending the number of work hours for remaining workers (59/79, 75%) and/or

326 backfilling by reorganizing personnel in the same facility (48/79, 61%) (Q31, Table 3). Most
327 participants (57/79, 72%) agreed that capital investment into mechanization should be considered
328 as a long-term solution to maintain production in the face of a future COVID-19-associated labor
329 shortage (Q32, Table 3). Further, participants suggested employee- and production schedule
330 adjustments as additional solutions to maintain production (thematic analysis of Q33, Table 6).

331 **Ever-changing government regulations and easier ways to**
332 **understand these regulations as well as establishing risk**
333 **communication plans were deemed important to participants for**
334 **successful mitigation of COVID-19 in their industry sector**

335 Regarding the control of COVID-19 in their industry sector (Q5, Fig 1A), *Labor*
336 *availability* and *Complex ever-changing government regulations* were considered very
337 concerning (median score = 4) among the majority of participants. Conversely, *Workers' abuse*
338 *of control measures*, *Limited financial resources*, and *Product quality* were only slightly
339 concerning (median score ≤ 2), according to most survey participants (Fig 1A). Kruskal Wallis
340 tests showed that the reported concern for *Limited financial resources* was significantly higher in
341 small compared to medium ($p = 0.04$) and large-sized facilities/operations ($p = 0.04$) and was
342 also significantly higher in the fresh produce industry sector compared to dairy (Q5, $p = 0.05$;
343 Table 5). Similarly, the reported concern for *Supplier management* was also significantly higher
344 in small compared to large-sized facilities/operations (Q5, $p = 0.03$; Table 5). In response to the
345 open-ended question about additional concerns regarding the control of COVID-19 in their
346 industry sector, participants stated concerns related to employees, COVID-19 mitigation, and

347 supply chain factors (thematic analysis of Q6, Table 6). Regarding employee’s mental health, a
348 participant stated the following:

349 “Mental health impact on managerial and office staff. In talking with industry colleagues,
350 my experience is that many facilities have cut back on the staff responsible for ensuring
351 that the facility is operating in an efficient and structured manner, while expanding the
352 production capacity of the facility. It leaves many of these employees in a position where
353 they are stretched thin and feel overwhelmed.” Participant ID #75, Other (co-packaging
354 of shelf stable products)

355

356 <Figure 1 here>

357 **Fig 1. Heatmaps representing responses to 5-point scale Likert questions regarding [A]**
358 **concerns about COVID-19 control and [B] challenges to maintain production.** These Likert
359 questions were included in part 1 of the needs assessment survey asking general questions about
360 a participant’s industry sector. For each item within a Likert question, a median shown to the
361 right of the heatmap was calculated from the interval values (1-5), assigned to answers ranging
362 from “Not at all concerning” to “Extremely concerning” [A] and “Not at all challenging” to
363 “Extremely challenging” [B].

364

365 Among challenges associated with the labor force needed to maintain the production
366 capacity (Q7, Fig 1B), most participants perceived that all of the items presented to them were at
367 least moderately challenging (median score ≥ 3), with the *Need to train labor*, *Access to workers*
368 *with necessary skills*, and *Access to number of workers needed* being considered very

369 challenging (median score = 4). Additional challenges to maintaining the production capacity
370 were related to the COVID-19 mitigation, employee and government factors (thematic analysis
371 of Q8, Table 6). In particular, one participant expressed their frustration when dealing with
372 continuously changing government regulations:

373 “Government directives and laws regarding labor, time off, and pay rules and the changes
374 in these made managing government special rules a full-time job, rather than managing
375 the pandemic we were managing the labor law compliance tasks.” Participant ID #45,
376 Fresh produce.

377 In terms of the needs to successfully mitigate COVID-19 in their industry sector (Q9, Fig
378 2A), most participants indicated that *Easier way to understand regulations* was the most
379 important (median score = 3.5), being valued as a more important need by the fresh produce
380 industry compared to the dairy industry sector and the group of “Other” industry sectors ($p =$
381 0.05 and $p = 0.03$, respectively; Table 5). In the corresponding open-ended question participants
382 further stated needs for improved technology solutions, mitigation strategies and consumer
383 education (thematic analysis of Q10, Table 6).

384

385 < Figure 2 here >

386 **Fig 2. Heatmaps representing responses to 5-point scale Likert questions regarding the [A]**
387 **needs to successfully mitigate COVID-19, [B] preferred features in predictive models, and**
388 **[C] indicators of a successful response against COVID-19.** These questions were included in
389 part 1 of the needs assessment survey asking general questions about a participant’s industry
390 sector. For each item within a Likert question, a median shown to the right of the heatmap was

391 calculated from the interval values (1-5), assigned to answers ranging from “Not at all
392 important” to “Extremely important”.

393

394 If a computational modeling tool were to be available to predict which COVID-19
395 mitigation strategies would be the most successful in a given facility (Q11, Fig 2B), all model
396 features proposed in the survey (e.g., ease of use, confidentiality and customization, etc.) would
397 be considered very important (median score = 4). Regarding the question about indicators of
398 successful responses to COVID-19 in their industry sector (Q13, Fig 2C), participants perceived
399 that almost all items listed in the question were very important (median score = 4), including
400 establishment of contingency and risk communication plans, standard operating procedures,
401 training, and investment into technologies that reduce vulnerability to a future pandemic (such as
402 due to a new COVID-19 variant) or similar system wide disruption. Additionally, large-sized
403 facilities and operations were more likely to have *Established effective risk communication plans*
404 compared to smaller facilities and operations (Q13, $p = 0.03$, Table 5).

405 In terms of the risk of shutdown associated with the facility/operation due to work
406 absences for certain specialized job functions (Q27, Fig 3A), participants indicated that
407 *Specialized production line functions, Engineering and/or maintenance crew, and Sanitation and*
408 *cleaning* presented a high risk of shutdown (median score = 4). Regarding potential sources of
409 COVID-19 infection in the facility/operation (Q29, Fig 3B), participants were particularly
410 concerned about *Activities in the local community* (median score = 4). In addition, respondents
411 from medium-sized facilities/operations were more likely to be concerned about *Indoor common*
412 *areas* as a potential source of COVID-19 compared to small and large-sized facilities/operations
413 (Q29, $p = 0.04$ and $p = 0.05$, respectively; Table 5).

414

415

< Figure 3 here >

416 **Fig 3. Heatmaps representing responses to 5-point scale Likert questions regarding [A] the**

417 **risk of shut down due to absenteeism of employees with specialized job functions and [B]**

418 **sources of COVID-19 in the work environment.** These Likert questions were included in part

419 1 of the needs assessment survey that asked about conditions and COVID-19 controls in a

420 facility or operation of a participant's choice. For each item within a Likert question, a median

421 shown to the right of the heatmap was calculated from the interval values (1-5), assigned to

422 answers ranging from "No risk" to "Very high risk" [A] and "Not at all concerning" to

423 "Extremely concerning"[B].

424

425 **Survey participants self-reported a widespread implementation of**

426 **social distancing, biosafety, and surveillance mitigation strategies in**

427 **their facilities/operations representing different sectors of the food**

428 **industry**

429 Among social distancing measures (Q34, Fig 4A), *Installed Physical barriers, Staggered*

430 *break times, Adjusted sick day policy, and Spacing workers >6 ft during production* were all

431 implemented or partially/temporarily implemented by most facilities/operations, followed by

432 *Staggered shifts* which were adopted or partially/temporarily adopted by about half of the

433 participants' facilities/operations. *Downsizing operations* and *Cohorting employees* were found

434 to be the least implemented social distancing strategies to mitigate COVID-19 transmission (Fig

435 4A). Small facilities/operations implemented several social distancing strategies significantly
436 less frequently than medium- and large-sized facilities and operations, including installing of
437 physical barriers ($p = 0.005$ and $p = 0.005$, respectively), staggered break times ($p < 0.001$ and p
438 $= 0.004$, respectively), and staggered shifts ($p = 0.02$ and $p = 0.04$, respectively; Q34, Table 5). In
439 addition, medium-sized facilities and operations were more likely to adopt *Adjusted sick day*
440 *policy* ($p = 0.003$) and *Cohorting employees* ($p = 0.02$) as one of their social distancing strategies
441 compared to small-sized facilities and operations (Q34, Table 5). In addition, dairy facilities
442 were more likely to adopt *Spacing workers >6ft during production* ($p = 0.05$) compared to
443 facilities/operations from the group of “Other” industry sectors (Q34, Table 5). The responses to
444 the corresponding open-ended question revealed that infrastructure, productivity, and union-
445 imposed constraints as well as the perceived lack of need or concern were reasons for non-
446 implementation of social distancing measures (thematic analysis of Q35, Table 6). For example,
447 in the following quote one of the participants expressed a concern about downsizing the
448 operation as a strategy to contain the infection spread:

449 “If the plant does not run near full production, we are out of business.” Participant ID
450 #56, Dairy.

451

452 < Figure 4 here >

453 **Fig 4. Responses to questions about the implementation of social distancing [A], biosafety**
454 **[B], and surveillance strategies [C] in a facility/operation of participant’s choice.** For each
455 specific mitigation strategy, a median shown to the right of the heatmap was calculated from the

456 numerical values, 0, 0.5 and 1, assigned to answers ‘No’, ‘Yes, but only partially’, and ‘Yes’,
457 respectively.

458

459 *Enhanced handwashing, Alcohol-based hand rubs, and Face mask, face shields, goggles,*
460 *were the most implemented biosafety strategies among facilities/operations (Q36, Fig 4B). The*
461 *latter strategy was implemented more in facilities/operations in the dairy and “Other” industry*
462 *sector group compared with the fresh produce sector (Q36, $p = 0.002$ and $p = 0.05$, respectively;*
463 *Table 5). Air cleaning/filtering was implemented or partially/temporarily implemented in a little*
464 *more than half of the facilities/operations, with medium-sized facilities and operations being*
465 *more likely to adopt it compared to small facilities and operations (Q36, $p = 0.01$; Table 5).*
466 *Meanwhile, less than half of the facilities and operations adopted Increased ventilation rates as a*
467 *biosafety measure to mitigate COVID-19 transmission (Q36, Fig 4B). The responses to the*
468 *corresponding open-ended question indicated that where biosafety interventions were not*
469 *implemented, it was due to infrastructure constrains or lack of funds, lack of supplies or*
470 *information, or due to the perceived lack of need (thematic analysis of Q37, Table 6).*

471 *Among surveillance strategies (Q38, Fig 4C), Temperature screening and quarantine,*
472 *Return to work post recovery policy, and Contact tracing were commonly adopted among*
473 *facilities and operations, while Test for infection and isolation was less frequently implemented*
474 *than the rest of the surveillance strategies based on the comparison of medians of Likert*
475 *responses. Contact tracing and quarantine ($p < 0.001$), Temperature screening and quarantine*
476 *($p = 0.006$), and Return to work post recovery policy ($p = 0.002$) were more commonly adopted*
477 *in medium-sized compared to small facilities/operations (Q38, Table 5). Contact tracing and*
478 *quarantine were also more commonly implemented in large-sized compared to small*

479 facilities/operations ($p < 0.001$). Additionally, dairy facilities more commonly adopted *Contact*
480 *tracing and quarantine* as a surveillance measure compared to the fresh produce sector (Q38, $p =$
481 0.02 ; Table 5). The responses to the corresponding open-ended question stated the cost of
482 implementation and the caused increase in worker absences, as well as the perceived lack of
483 concern or need, as the reasons for no implementation of surveillance strategies (thematic
484 analysis of Q39, Table 6). For example, two participants expressed challenges due to increased
485 absences when implementing temperature screening as a surveillance strategy:

486 “Temperature screenings aren't sufficient, as they aren't always going to detect a mild
487 case. Temperature gun is 30 to 60 dollars. On site Covid tests are borderline unavailable
488 to small and medium sized companies.” Participant ID #56, Dairy.

489 “We do daily employee temperature readings but have had to isolate many employees for
490 symptoms other than low grade fevers such as backaches, coughing, fatigue, etc.”
491 Participant ID #46, Fresh produce.

492 **Discussion**

493 This study aimed to identify the needs of the US food industry to maintain production
494 and assure workers' health during the COVID-19 pandemic and to determine what mitigation
495 strategies are being implemented. Information on this matter is crucial to determine both how the
496 US food industry has already responded to the pandemic and what is still required to enhance its
497 resilience in the face of current and future similar disaster events. The main findings from this
498 study suggest that for the represented sectors of the US food industry: (i) mitigation strategies
499 have been widely implemented in facilities and operations of those who answered our survey,
500 except strategies that reduce productivity, involve major costs, or/and had insufficient

501 information on cost-effectiveness; (ii) facility/operation size and industry sector may impact
502 decision-making regarding implementation of COVID-19 mitigation strategies; and (iii) there are
503 remaining challenges and opportunities to reduce future impacts of COVID-19 and similar
504 disasters. These findings will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

505 Before discussing these findings, it is important to consider that survey responses were
506 collected from January 2021 to April 2021, a period in which COVID-19 cases in the US food
507 industry were still occurring but there was a declining trend [18]. Additionally, during this time
508 vaccines were becoming available in the US and access was prioritized for essential non-
509 healthcare workers [29], including food industry employees, and the percentage of fully
510 vaccinated people among those eligible ranged from 0 to 21% during that period [30]. Thus,
511 results presented in this study reflect the state of the US food industry sectors in terms of needs
512 and regarding the impact of COVID-19 pandemic on the workforce, food production, and
513 regarding implementation of COVID-19 mitigation in early 2021.

514 **The US produce growers and food processors widely implemented**
515 **mitigation strategies except those that would have had negative**
516 **effects on the production capacity, those that required major**
517 **investments, and/or those with insufficient information on cost-**
518 **effectiveness.**

519 The study participants self-reported adopting most social distancing mitigation strategies
520 included in the survey, while those measures that negatively impacted production capacity were
521 scarcely adopted. The widespread adoption of most social distancing strategies across assessed

522 food industry sectors is not surprising given such strategies' well-established key role in
523 reducing the occurrence of COVID-19 cases in different work settings [31] and countries [32].
524 The continuous promotion of such measures since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, as
525 well as the availability of updated guidance on how to implement them, likely facilitated their
526 adoption by food facilities and operations [22,33]. For example, a COVID-19 outbreak that
527 occurred in a Colorado mushroom farm on May 6, 2020, was rapidly controlled and further viral
528 dissemination was prevented based on available public health guidance [34]. Additionally, we
529 hypothesize that the common adoption of social distancing mitigation strategies may be partly
530 due to the availability of funding programs launched by the US federal government to financially
531 assist businesses during the pandemic. These programs include the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and
532 Economic Security Act (CARES Act), the COVID-19 Economic Injury Disaster Loan, and the
533 Coronavirus Food Assistance Program (CFAP), which provided food facilities and operations
534 with financial resources to implement social distancing [35–38]. Despite this, survey participants
535 expressed concerns about financial challenges that limited their ability to install physical
536 barriers, suggesting that additional sources of funding are necessary to further incentivize the
537 adoption of such measures and that companies need to budget in advance for emergency
538 preparedness and responses. Overall, findings from this study suggest that the common adoption
539 of social distancing strategies and the current availability of detailed guidance for their
540 implementation will contribute to rapid implementation of social distancing controls in response
541 to new SARS-CoV-2 beta-coronavirus variants in the current pandemic, future COVID-19
542 pandemics, and similar disasters. Additionally, our findings address the gap in terms of currently
543 limited information available [15] about the adoption of mitigation strategies in the US food
544 industry. However, it is important to note that representation for the beef/pork and poultry

545 industries was barely achieved in our study, thus future studies on COVID-19 adoption of social
546 distancing mitigation strategies in the US poultry and meat industry sectors are required to
547 complement and update the information reported by Waltenburg [15].

548 At the same time, our survey revealed that social distancing measures based on cohorting
549 employees and in particular, downsizing operations, were rarely implemented. Intuitively, this
550 may be because businesses avoid strategies that would reduce production capacity or present
551 organizational disruption [39]. Despite findings in this study, downsizing was an option for some
552 businesses during the COVID-19 pandemic to prevent further dissemination of the virus in cases
553 of facility/operation' outbreaks, even in late 2020 [11]. For instance, capacity reduction in the
554 Canadian beef/pork industry led to financial setbacks to the business and in turn increased the
555 cost to maintain animals for an extended period before slaughter [11]. It has been reported that
556 downsizing operations as well as the increase in sickness-related absences caused an increase in
557 work-related physical demands and job insecurity, which had negative impacts on employees'
558 mental health [40]. This is relevant to consider, given that one survey participant in this study
559 expressed food industry employees' struggles with mental health issues after downsizing,
560 particularly due to facilities and operations cutting back management and office staff while
561 distributing the same weight of responsibilities to a smaller workforce. Thus, if
562 facilities/operations plan on adopting, or are forced to adopt, downsizing as a strategy to reduce
563 COVID-19 transmission, measures should be taken not only to prevent downstream food supply
564 disturbances and production losses to the facility but also to protect employees' mental
565 wellbeing. Further studies are needed to determine the specific economic and other effects of
566 downsizing on the US food industry facilities/operations and their workers prior to and during
567 the COVID-19 pandemic.

568 Cheap and easy to implement biosafety mitigation strategies were widely adopted by the
569 survey participants' produce farm operations and food processing facilities, but more information
570 is needed about cost-effectiveness for air cleaning and air filtering/ventilation. The self-reported
571 use of personal protective equipment (PPE) observed in our study agrees with an earlier report
572 from Waltenburg [15], in which 86 out of 111 (77%) of the meat and poultry processing facilities
573 required workers to wear masks. However, this is in contrast with findings by Yung et al. [25],
574 who indicated that between June and July 2020, only a little more than half (20/37, 54%) of
575 consulted dairy farmers in Wisconsin and Minnesota believed that face masks are being used by
576 workers after the COVID-19 pandemic had started. The authors explain that this moderate use of
577 PPE was due to a perceived safeness against COVID-19 transmission in well-ventilated spaces,
578 and because of the difficulties of using such protection in the hot and humid environment of a
579 dairy farm [25]. The discrepancy in findings between Yung et al. [25] and our study could be
580 because the latter assessed dairy processing facilities rather than dairy farms, and targeting the
581 dairy industry in the US instead of being restricted to Wisconsin and Minnesota. Furthermore,
582 survey participants in the current study mentioned that the lack of access to preventive measures,
583 including PPE, was an important concern in efforts to control COVID-19 in their industry sector.
584 Previous reports indicate that the unavailability of supplies early in the COVID-19 pandemic was
585 a severe challenge for businesses, even for front-line essential workers in healthcare institutions
586 in the US [41] and abroad [41,42]. This shortage in PPE and other hygiene supplies was a
587 consequence of disruptions in the PPE supply chain in the US [43] and elsewhere, whose
588 weaknesses were exposed during this pandemic [44]. The survey findings about the lack of
589 access to preventative measures strongly suggest that establishing a reliable and efficient system
590 to ensure PPE availability and distribution to food facilities/operations is essential for the success

591 of disaster preparedness plans against future pandemics. Altogether, our findings suggest that
592 sectors of the food industry represented in the survey are prepared to implement biosafety
593 strategies in the event of a new variant of the SARS-CoV-2 beta-coronavirus, future COVID-19
594 pandemics or similar disasters caused by airborne-transmitted pathogens, although the success in
595 their adoption will strongly depend on the establishment of measures to strengthen the local and
596 global supply chain of PPE and other relevant resources.

597 Contrary to other biosafety strategies, the current study revealed that air filtering and
598 ventilation were scarcely implemented among facilities/operations (at least as of early 2021) due
599 to the lack of or insufficient information about cost-effectiveness and guidance. These findings
600 are somewhat unexpected considering that ventilation and air filtering have been recommended
601 in late 2020 by the CDC as engineering controls (i.e., measures that do not interfere with
602 employees' work but prevent their interaction with COVID-19) intended to reduce airborne
603 concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 beta-coronavirus in indoor environments [22]. Moreover, poor
604 air quality and air flow inside meat and poultry processing plants have been associated with an
605 increased risk of workers becoming infected with COVID-19 [24]. Reasons for not
606 implementing air filtering expressed by survey participants include the disruption of the
607 controlled environmental conditions required for production, consideration of air filtering as an
608 unnecessary investment when other mitigation strategies are already in place, and the lack of
609 guidance in how to properly apply this strategy. The CDC recognizes the challenges associated
610 with the application of ventilation as a COVID-19 control strategy [22]. Installing air filtering
611 and ventilation systems is indeed a more complex process compared to other recommended
612 biosafety strategies to combat COVID-19 since it requires consideration of several additional
613 factors before their implementation, including the selection of systems adequate to the size,

614 occupancy level, and specific facilities' features (e.g., production environment) [45]. Because of
615 the complexity of installing air filtering and ventilation systems [22], and the ongoing discussion
616 about the effectiveness of some of these methods in collecting and/or removing viral particles in
617 the air [46], we hypothesize that facility management might favor other, easier to implement and
618 more commonly advised control strategies to prevent COVID-19 transmission. The survey
619 findings highlight the importance of further research and guidance about the implementation of
620 air filtering and ventilation and the advantages in terms of cost-effectiveness they present over
621 other mitigation measures.

622 Surveillance strategies were widely implemented by the participants' produce grower
623 operations and food processor facilities/operations with the exception of testing and isolation due
624 to the cost of detecting positive cases of COVID-19. This finding is not surprising considering
625 that both contact tracing and testing, in conjunction with quarantine, have been proposed as
626 useful methods to prevent COVID-19 transmission in the community [47,48]. These methods
627 have also been promoted by the CDC and OSHA as ways to reduce COVID-19 dissemination in
628 the workplace [33,49]. Indeed, an early report of mitigation strategies used in the food industry
629 pointed out temperature screening as a widely applied method in the US poultry and meat
630 industry sectors [15], and it is currently being recommended by the CDC to be implemented in
631 the food industry facilities and operations [20]. Nonetheless, some survey participants mentioned
632 difficulties in implementing surveillance mitigation strategies due to funding limitations; this is
633 expected as a significant investment is required to continuously test suspected cases among
634 employees and temporarily remove positives from the workforce. Our findings suggest that the
635 US food industry is willing to apply surveillance measures to prevent further transmission of
636 COVID-19 cases in their facilities/operations and underline the need to improve access to these

637 measures and to strategically apply them to avoid increasing the costs associated with
638 absenteeism and productivity loss.

639 Regarding temperature screening, some survey participants expressed distrust to use it as
640 an approach to detect mild cases of COVID-19 infection, a topic that has been a matter of
641 discussion throughout the pandemic [50–53]. Slade and Sinha [51] identified issues associated
642 with temperature screening through non-contact infrared thermometers, namely the risk of close
643 interaction between the employees and testers when measuring temperature, the variability in
644 measurements due to lack of training in its application, and the costs associated with hiring
645 employees to continuously measure temperature among workers. Additionally, previous reports
646 have suggested poor specificity [54,55] and sensitivity [56] of temperature screening (both
647 infrared thermometers and thermal imaging cameras) when used to detect mild COVID-19 cases,
648 which results in many false positives, thus leading to an unnecessarily increased absenteeism and
649 the associated rise in costs due to productivity loss. Chen et al. [55] found that specificity for
650 infrared thermometers can range between 61% to 67%, depending on the part of the body being
651 measured (wrist and forehead, respectively). This is an extremely important drawback for labor-
652 intensive sectors of the food industry, which rely on the availability of qualified workers to
653 continue food production. It was proposed that temperature screening has been a valuable and
654 easy to implement tool to reduce COVID-19 cases, particularly at the beginning of the pandemic
655 when the knowledge about the virus and the effectiveness of preventive methods and available
656 guidance was limited [57,58]. However, given the issues associated with this strategy, the
657 increased access to vaccination against COVID-19, and the widespread implementation of other
658 controls in the food industry, we believe it relevant to reevaluate the current role and contribution
659 of temperature screening as a surveillance strategy and how it should be implemented (if its

660 implementation is needed at all) to avoid increasing absenteeism among workers. Ideally,
661 surveillance methods should be adopted based on tests' availability, ease of implementation, and
662 accuracy. For the application of temperature screening, maximizing specificity would be crucial
663 to avoid the costs associated with false-positive cases. This can be achieved by raising the cut-off
664 value used to define a positive case (increasing the temperature cut-off), establishing more
665 stringent criteria for diagnosis of COVID-19 cases (e.g., presence of COVID-19 symptoms,
666 recent exposure to the virus through interaction with infected individuals, or the requirement of
667 follow-up testing for confirmation of suspected individuals), or applying temperature screening
668 in series with a second highly specific diagnostic test.

669 **Large and medium-sized food industry facilities/operations have**
670 **better ability to implement mitigation strategies compared to small**
671 **businesses. Additionally, there are differences among the dairy and**
672 **fresh produce industry sectors in their needs and adoption of**
673 **mitigation strategies**

674 Large and medium-sized facilities/operations of survey participants more frequently
675 implemented social distancing, biosafety, and surveillance mitigation strategies compared to
676 small businesses. It is also important to consider that, due to scale economies, implementing
677 mitigation strategies might lead to a greater reduction in production capacity for smaller
678 businesses than for larger ones, resulting in greater economic losses that cannot be sustained by
679 those small businesses, as evidenced by studies pointing out their lack of financial resilience to
680 sustain the impacts of COVID-19 [59,60]. For example, the implementation of complex

681 measures, such as air cleaning/filtering, which entail high fixed costs, is likely to be
682 economically infeasible or even unnecessary for operations that consist of only a few employees.
683 Findings from the survey reveal that small facilities/operations are more commonly concerned
684 about funding, while participants also mentioned that small facilities/operations struggle to
685 manage COVID-19 related work absences and that better financial support is required to assist
686 small to medium-sized businesses. Because small businesses typically lack access to the types of
687 financial resources readily available to large firms (i.e., institutional funding), research has been
688 directed to develop cutting-edge and low-cost technologies to assist them in responding to the
689 COVID-19 pandemic [61,62]. Our findings suggest that small food industry facilities and
690 operations would benefit from development of low-cost, effective, and flexible mitigation
691 strategies to help maintain production in their operations during the COVID-19 pandemic.

692 We found that participants' facilities from the dairy industry sector more commonly
693 adopted specific biosafety and surveillance mitigation strategies compared to the fresh produce
694 industry sector, while the latter was more likely to be concerned about funding and required
695 easier approaches to understand continuously changing governmental regulations. We
696 hypothesize that the comparatively lower adoption of PPE in the fresh produce industry is due to
697 some operations (farms) being conducted outdoors in the field, in which case the use of goggles
698 and face shields might prevent employees from performing their tasks efficiently. Indeed, in
699 contrast to dairy processing plants, the decentralized nature of the fresh produce industry coupled
700 with the significant heterogeneity in operating practices suggest that not all mitigation strategies
701 may be appropriate for some operations. Additionally, reduced implementation may be due to
702 the fact that transmission risk of COVID-19 outdoors is considered lower than indoors.
703 Differences may also exist in how consistently both industry sectors can access mitigation

704 strategies, as survey participants from the fresh produce sector expressed concerns about funding
705 limitations. Moreover, our survey findings indicate that the fresh produce industry sector also
706 needed easier approaches to understand the continuously evolving governmental regulations,
707 potentially due to the continuous turnover of workers that are incorporated into the workforce
708 seasonally. These findings reveal important differences in terms of challenges and needs of the
709 dairy and fresh produce industries and further suggest that innovative approaches are needed for
710 fresh produce operations to overcome the limitations in PPE use, as well as develop novel
711 strategies to train the newly recruited workforce more efficiently.

712 **To reduce the US food industry’s vulnerability, it is important to**
713 **establish plans and guidelines to minimize business interruptions,**
714 **train the workforce about risk and mitigation strategies, and**
715 **develop new technologies to face COVID-19-related disruptions**

716 The survey participants considered the establishment of plans and guidelines as very
717 relevant for reducing the impact of current and future COVID-19 outbreaks. These approaches
718 would enhance industries’ ability to effectively respond to current and future disruptions in a
719 timely manner, considering the consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic in the US food
720 industry, particularly at the beginning of the pandemic [6]. Our findings are consistent with a
721 previous study calling for the food industry to proactively establish plans and mitigation
722 strategies to assist in building resiliency and ensuring the correct continuation of the productive
723 process [63]. This supports the idea that the development of plans and guidelines to prevent
724 future impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic and similar disasters should be established taking into
725 consideration the complexity of the food supply chain. More specifically, government and

726 businesses should develop contingency plans to be prepared to effectively address workforce
727 reduction, economic losses, and facility shutdowns as consequences of the simultaneous effects
728 of dramatic changes in products' demand [64,65], modifications to products' specifications (e.g.,
729 package size) [64,65], government-mandated suspension of operations [64,65], and facility
730 shutdown-related increase in work absences [6].

731 The survey participants also acknowledged the importance of training employees in risk
732 and mitigation strategies to prevent COVID-19 transmission in their food facilities and
733 operations. This finding was expected given that training has been a fundamental tool to educate
734 the workforce on how to behave during the pandemic, correctly implement mitigation strategies,
735 and understand the current state and federal rules and regulations around the COVID-19
736 pandemic. Guidelines and training resources made available by the CDC and OSHA have been
737 useful to train employees in the use of PPE, social distancing practices in the workplace, and
738 identification of signs and symptoms associated with COVID-19 cases. Importantly, ensuring
739 access to the internet in facilities and operations located in remote areas is also crucial to allow
740 them to implement training strategies promptly, a need expressed by survey participants. This is
741 essential if novel technologies, such as augmented and virtual reality, are to be implemented for
742 training the workforce on disaster preparedness [66]. Previous reports evidence important
743 advantages of these novel approaches compared to traditional methods for training, including the
744 opportunity to socially distance while allowing workers to immerse themselves in the activity at
745 hand and learn effectively [67].

746 The development of new technological approaches to respond to the COVID-19 and
747 future pandemic events (e.g., due to new SARS-CoV-2 beta-coronavirus variants) was
748 considered important by the survey participants. The COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in new

749 technologies being developed at an accelerated pace to promptly assist the food industry in
750 dealing with the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond [66]. Future advances in digitalization and big
751 data analysis will assist the food industry in rapidly responding to COVID-19-related or other
752 similar disruptions through improved access to knowledge for decision-making [5]. For instance,
753 the design of modeling tools to predict impacts of COVID-19, including costs associated with
754 absenteeism, effects on productivity, and the cost-effectiveness of implementing available
755 mitigation strategies would provide useful information to assist the food industry in better
756 managing the ongoing pandemic. Furthermore, improvements in data collection and
757 management, such as shared access to data and data traceability, can facilitate relevant
758 improvements in the efficiency of the food supply chain, while the implementation of automation
759 and robotics technologies could assist in improving food security and facilitate the adoption of
760 social distancing measures to prevent airborne pathogen transmission [5,65]. Unquestionably, the
761 development of new technologies will assist in building resilience to withstand COVID-19-
762 related disruptions in the US food industry. Nonetheless, we suggest that the implementation of
763 novel technological approaches must consider maintaining previous efforts made by the industry
764 sector to improve efficiency, as well as consider the financial investment necessary to implement
765 technological advances, such as automation [6,68]. Further studies are needed to determine the
766 specific technological requirements across industry sectors in the US, the ability of food industry
767 sectors to invest in new technologies, and the mechanisms in which these new advances could
768 contribute to improving resilience in the industry.

769 **Study limitations**

770 The major limitation of the conducted needs assessment survey is relatively low number
771 of responses received, and the associated potential selection bias, despite the engagement of a
772 number of professional and trade organizations and the distribution of the survey via social
773 media. The concurrent widespread application of survey-based studies to understand different
774 aspects of COVID-19 in the US food industry might have resulted in the industry’s fatigue and
775 increased reluctance to respond to surveys as the pandemic progresses, particularly given that the
776 survey designed for this study was distributed more than a year after the pandemic has begun.
777 This is relevant, as it may have introduced a non-response selection bias to findings presented
778 here, particularly due to the slim response rate from representatives of the beef/pork and no
779 responses from the poultry sectors. Thus, any generalization of findings to these sectors should
780 be done with caution. The reasons for differential participation of the food industry sectors in this
781 study are unknown. Among responses, almost half were from the dairy industry sector, with a
782 much lower representation from the fresh produce industry sector. Similarly, in line with the
783 targeted recruitment efforts, responses were predominantly from individuals in high managerial
784 positions (c-suite, facility managers, etc.), with only a few responses from non-managerial
785 positions. Although this potentially limits the range of perspectives included in the study,
786 opinions, and perceptions from individuals ‘at the top of the ladder’ were targeted because they
787 can provide valuable insight into facilities and operation’s needs, challenges, decisions, and
788 overall impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic in the US food industry. However, we recognize that
789 this study does not include the complete spectrum of worker positions (particularly non-
790 managerial) and therefore not fully address food industry worker needs. Due to the relatively
791 small number of responses, more elaborate approaches to control for potential confounding of
792 the associations between the outcomes and predictors of interest could not be conducted.

793 Considering Likert-item responses as interval/numerical data during statistical analysis led to the
794 application of non-parametric methods for statistical assessment of associations, which are less
795 efficient for detecting existing effects than parametric tests. The survey was open for
796 participation for almost 3 months in early 2021, which was a time characterized by great changes
797 concerning the response to the COVID-19 pandemic in the US, such as the implementation of
798 COVID-19 vaccination among essential non-healthcare workers. It is possible that some of those
799 changes may have affected participants' responses depending on when they completed the
800 survey and might not represent needs of the US food industry and adoption of mitigation
801 strategies early in the COVID-19 pandemic. Additionally, although in open-ended questions
802 participants commented about concerns regarding limited access to COVID-19 vaccines for food
803 industry employees and their vaccination hesitancy, the survey did not include questions about
804 vaccination because vaccines were not available at the time the pilot process was finished and
805 the survey was initially distributed. Thus, timely assessment of the food industry needs regarding
806 COVID-19 vaccination is still needed. Finally, although information about COVID-19 morbidity
807 and mortality in the participants' facilities and operations could have provided valuable insights,
808 we chose to exclude those to improve the response rate.

809 **Conclusions**

810 Provided that the responses of survey participants are reflective of the wider US food
811 industry, the food industry facilities and operations in the US are broadly prepared to protect
812 their workers and businesses quickly and effectively in the event of a future pandemic due to
813 SARS-CoV-2 or similar airborne pathogens. Future collaborations between the US food industry
814 and federal and state agencies to establish contingency plans and define appropriate training, as

815 well as the development of food industry-directed technologies will be crucial to build resilience
816 against future COVID-19-related and similar disturbances.

817 **Acknowledgments**

818 We thank Alina N. Stelick and Cecil Barnett-Neefs for providing feedback during the needs
819 assessment survey design process. We are also grateful to advisory council members who
820 assisted during the pilot of the needs assessment survey, the professional and trade organizations
821 who assisted in its dissemination, and everyone whose participation made this study possible.

822 **References**

- 823 1. Galanakis CM. The food systems in the era of the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic
824 crisis. *Foods*. 2021;9: 523. doi:10.1146/annurev-soc-060116-053252
- 825 2. Hayes DJ, Schulz LL, Hart CE, Jacobs KL. A descriptive analysis of the COVID-19
826 impacts on U.S. pork, turkey, and egg markets. *Agribusiness*. 2021;37: 122–141.
827 doi:10.1002/agr.21674
- 828 3. Singh S, Kumar R, Panchal R, Tiwari MK. Impact of COVID-19 on logistics systems and
829 disruptions in food supply chain. *Int J Prod Res*. 2021;59: 1993–2008.
830 doi:10.1080/00207543.2020.1792000
- 831 4. Barman A, Das R, De PK. Impact of COVID-19 in food supply chain: Disruptions and
832 recovery strategy. *Curr Res Behav Sci*. 2021;2: 100017. doi:10.1016/j.crbeha.2021.100017
- 833 5. Hobbs JE. The Covid-19 pandemic and meat supply chains. *Meat Sci*. 2021; 108459.
834 doi:10.1016/j.meatsci.2021.108459

- 835 6. Weersink A, von Massow M, Bannon N, Ifft J, Maples J, McEwan K, et al. COVID-19 and
836 the agri-food system in the United States and Canada. *Agric Syst.* 2021;188: 103039.
837 doi:10.1016/j.agsy.2020.103039
- 838 7. Qingbin W, Liu C quan, Zhao Y feng, Kitsos A, Cannella M, Wang S kun, et al. Impacts of
839 the COVID-19 pandemic on the dairy industry: Lessons from China and the United States
840 and policy implications. *J Integr Agric.* 2020;19: 2903–2915. doi:10.1016/S2095-
841 3119(20)63443-8
- 842 8. Muth MK. Effects of COVID-19 Meat and Poultry Plant Closures on the Environment and
843 Food Security. 2021 Dec 1 [cited 7 Jul 2021]. In: SESYNC [Internet]. Available from:
844 [https://www.sesync.org/news/wed-2020-12-02-1543/effects-of-covid-19-meat-and-poultry-](https://www.sesync.org/news/wed-2020-12-02-1543/effects-of-covid-19-meat-and-poultry-plant-closures-on-the-environment-and)
845 [plant-closures-on-the-environment-and](https://www.sesync.org/news/wed-2020-12-02-1543/effects-of-covid-19-meat-and-poultry-plant-closures-on-the-environment-and)
- 846 9. Doering C. Meat processors wrestle with worker shortages as US economy reopens from
847 COVID- 19. 2021 June 9 [cited 7 Jun 2021]. In: FOODDIVE [Internet]. Available from:
848 [https://www.fooddive.com/news/meat-processors-wrestle-with-worker-shortages-as-us-](https://www.fooddive.com/news/meat-processors-wrestle-with-worker-shortages-as-us-economy-reopens-from-co/600941/)
849 [economy-reopens-from-co/600941/](https://www.fooddive.com/news/meat-processors-wrestle-with-worker-shortages-as-us-economy-reopens-from-co/600941/)
- 850 10. McEwan K, Marchand L, Shang M, Bucknell D. Potential implications of COVID-19 on
851 the Canadian pork industry. *Can J Agric Econ.* 2020;68: 201–206. doi:10.1111/cjag.12236
- 852 11. Hailu G. COVID-19 and food processing in Canada. *Can J Agric Econ Can*
853 *d’agroeconomie.* 2021;69: 177–187. doi:10.1111/cjag.12286
- 854 12. Mussell A, Bilyea T, Hedley D. Agri-Food Supply Chains and Covid-19: Balancing
855 Resilience and Vulnerability. *Agri-Food Econ Syst.* 2020; 1–6.

- 856 13. Nakat Z, Bou-Mitri C. COVID-19 and the food industry: Readiness assessment. Food
857 Control. 2021;121: 107661. doi:10.1016/j.foodcont.2020.107661
- 858 14. Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA). Guidance on the Essential
859 Critical Infrastructure Workforce: Ensuring Community and National Resilience in
860 COVID-19 Response. 2020 Aug 18 [cited 7 June 2021]. In: Cybersecurity and
861 Infrastructure Security Agency [Internet]. Available from:
862 <https://www.cisa.gov/publication/guidance-essential-critical-infrastructure-workforce>
- 863 15. Waltenburg M, Victoroff T, Rose CE, Butterfield M, Jervis RH, Fedak KM, et al. Update:
864 COVID-19 Among Workers in Meat and Poultry Processing Facilities - United States,
865 April-May 2020. Report, Mortal Wkly. 2020;69: 557–561.
- 866 16. Shelly M. Maine CDC launches investigation into COVID-19 outbreak at Clinton dairy
867 farm. 2021 Dec 7 [cited 7 Jun 2021]. In: Central Maine [Internet]. Available from:
868 [https://www.centralmaine.com/2020/12/07/cdc-launches-investigation-into-covid-19-](https://www.centralmaine.com/2020/12/07/cdc-launches-investigation-into-covid-19-outbreak-at-clinton-dairy-farm/)
869 [outbreak-at-clinton-dairy-farm/](https://www.centralmaine.com/2020/12/07/cdc-launches-investigation-into-covid-19-outbreak-at-clinton-dairy-farm/)
- 870 17. Kielar M. Lessons learned from one of the largest COVID-19 outbreaks in New York.
871 2021 Nov 9 [cited 2 Jun 2021]. In: CNYCENTRAL [Internet]. Available from:
872 [https://cnycentral.com/news/local/investigation-reveals-lessons-learned-from-one-of-the-](https://cnycentral.com/news/local/investigation-reveals-lessons-learned-from-one-of-the-largest-covid-19-outbreaks-in-nys)
873 [largest-covid-19-outbreaks-in-nys](https://cnycentral.com/news/local/investigation-reveals-lessons-learned-from-one-of-the-largest-covid-19-outbreaks-in-nys)
- 874 18. Douglas L. Mapping Covid-19 outbreaks in the food system. 2020 Apr 22 [cited 7 Jun
875 2021]. In: Food and Environment Reporting Network [Internet]. Available from:
876 <https://thefern.org/2020/04/mapping-covid-19-in-meat-and-food-processing-plants/>

- 877 19. Chen YH, Glymour M, Riley A, Balmes J, Duchowny K, Harrison R, et al. Excess
878 mortality associated with the COVID-19 pandemic among Californians 18-65 years of age,
879 by occupational sector and occupation: March through November 2020. PLoS One.
880 2021;16: 1–10. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0252454
- 881 20. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Agriculture Workers and Employers.
882 2020 June 2 [cited June 18 2021]. In: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
883 [Internet]. Available from: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/guidance-agricultural-workers.html)
884 [ncov/community/guidance-agricultural-workers.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/guidance-agricultural-workers.html)
- 885 21. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). Protecting workers: Guidance on
886 mitigating and preventing the spread of COVID-19 in the workplace. 2021 Jan 29 [cited
887 June 18, 2021]. In: Occupational Safety and Health Administration [Internet]. Available
888 from: <https://www.osha.gov/coronavirus/safework>
- 889 22. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Ventilation in Buildings. 2020 Dec 7
890 [cited June 18 2021]. In: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [Internet]. Available
891 from: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/ventilation.html>
- 892 23. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), Food and Drug administration
893 (FDA). Employee Health and Food Safety Checklist for Human and Animal Food
894 Operations During the COVID-19 Pandemic. 2020 Aug 11 [cited June 18 2021]. In:
895 Occupational Safety and Health Administration [Internet]. Available from:
896 <https://www.fda.gov/media/141141/download>
- 897 24. Pokora R, Kutschbach S, Weigl M, Braun D, Epple A, Lorenz E, et al. Investigation of
898 superspreading COVID-19 outbreak events in meat and poultry processing plants in

- 899 Germany: A cross-sectional study. PLoS One. 2021;16: 1–14.
900 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0242456
- 901 25. Yung MT, Vázquez RI, Liebman A, Brihn A, Olson A, Loken D, et al. COVID-19
902 Awareness and Preparedness of Minnesota and Wisconsin Dairy Farms. J Agromedicine.
903 2021;26: 352–359. doi:10.1080/1059924X.2021.1927925
- 904 26. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
905 Statistical Computing. 2017. Available from: <https://www.r-project.org/>
- 906 27. Benjamini J, Hochberg Y. Controlling the False Discovery Rate□: A Practical and
907 Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. J R Stat Soc Ser B. 1995;57: 289–300.
- 908 28. Clarke V, Braun V. Thematic Analysis. In: Teo T, editor. Encyclopedia of Critical
909 Psychology. New York, NY: Springer New York; 2014. pp. 1947–1952. doi:10.1007/978-
910 1-4614-5583-7_311
- 911 29. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Interim List of Categories of Essential
912 Workers Mapped to Standardized Industry Codes and Titles. 2020 Dec 22 [cited 2 Aug
913 2021]. In: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [Internet]. Available from:
914 <https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/covid-19/categories-essential-workers.html>
- 915 30. John Hopkins University. The vaccine story. 2021 May 16 [cited Jun 7 2021]. In: John
916 Hopkins University [Internet]. Available: <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/vaccines/story>
- 917 31. Kluger DM, Aizenbud Y, Jaffe A, Parisi F, Aizenbud L, Minsky-Fenick E, et al. Impact of
918 healthcare worker shift scheduling on workforce preservation during the COVID-19
919 pandemic. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2020;41: 1443–1445. doi:10.1017/ice.2020.337

- 920 32. Thu TPB, Ngoc PNH, Hai NM, Tuan LA. Effect of the social distancing measures on the
921 spread of COVID-19 in 10 highly infected countries. *Sci Total Environ.* 2020;742: 140430.
922 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140430
- 923 33. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). Guidance on Returning to Work.
924 2020 Jun 17 [cited Jun 17 2021]. In: Occupational Safety and Health Administration
925 [Internet]. Available from: <https://www.osha.gov/Publications/OSHA4045.pdf>
- 926 34. Alamosa News. Mushroom farm confirms COVID-19 cases. 2020 May 9 [cited 29 Jun
927 2020]. In: Alamosa News [Internet]. Available from:
928 <https://alamosanews.com/article/mushroom-farm-confirms-covid-19-cases>
- 929 35. U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). USDA Announces Coronavirus Food Assistance
930 Program. 2020 Apr 17 [cited 17 Jun 2021]. In: U.S. Department of Agriculture [Internet].
931 Available from: [https://www.usda.gov/media/press-releases/2020/04/17/usda-announces-](https://www.usda.gov/media/press-releases/2020/04/17/usda-announces-coronavirus-food-assistance-program)
932 [coronavirus-food-assistance-program](https://www.usda.gov/media/press-releases/2020/04/17/usda-announces-coronavirus-food-assistance-program)
- 933 36. U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA). COVID-19 EIDL. 2021 Jun 16 [cited 17 Jun
934 2021]. Available from: U.S. Small Business Administration [Internet].
935 <https://www.sba.gov/funding-programs/loans/covid-19-relief-options/eidl/covid-19-eidl>
- 936 37. U.S. Congress. H.R.748 - CARES Act. 2020 March 27 [cited Jun 17 2021]. In: U.S.
937 Congress [Internet]. Available from: [https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/house-](https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/house-bill/748)
938 [bill/748](https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/house-bill/748)
- 939 38. U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA). Paycheck Protection Program. 2020 Mar 20.
940 In: U.S. Small Business Administration [Internet]. Available from:

- 941 <https://www.sba.gov/funding-programs/loans/covid-19-relief-options/paycheck-protection->
942 [program](https://www.sba.gov/funding-programs/loans/covid-19-relief-options/paycheck-protection-program)
- 943 39. Zorn ML, Norman PM, Butler FC, Bhussar MS. Cure or curse: Does downsizing increase
944 the likelihood of bankruptcy? *J Bus Res.* 2017;76: 24–33.
945 doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2017.03.006
- 946 40. Kivimäki M, Vahtera J, Pentti J, Ferrie JE. Factors underlying the effect of organisational
947 downsizing on health of employees: Longitudinal cohort study. *Br Med J.* 2000;320: 971–
948 975. doi:10.1136/bmj.320.7240.971
- 949 41. Ahmed J, Malik F, Bin Arif T, Majid Z, Chaudhary MA, Ahmad J, et al. Availability of
950 Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) Among US and Pakistani Doctors in COVID-19
951 Pandemic. *Cureus.* 2020;12: e8550. doi:10.7759/cureus.8550
- 952 42. Kim H, Hegde S, Lafiura C, Raghavan M, Sun N, Cheng S, et al. Access to personal
953 protective equipment in exposed healthcare workers and COVID-19 illness, severity,
954 symptoms and duration: A population-based case-control study in six countries. *BMJ Glob*
955 *Heal.* 2021;6: 1–9. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2020-004611
- 956 43. Cohen J, Rodgers Y van der M. Contributing factors to personal protective equipment
957 shortages during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Prev Med (Baltim).* 2020;141: 106263.
958 doi:10.1016/j.ypped.2020.106263
- 959 44. Dai T, Zaman MH, Padula W V., Davidson PM. Supply chain failures amid Covid-19
960 signal a new pillar for global health preparedness. *J Clin Nurs.* 2021;30: e1–e3.
961 doi:10.1111/jocn.15400

- 962 45. Blocken B, van Druenen T, Ricci A, Kang L, van Hooff T, Qin P, et al. Ventilation and air
963 cleaning to limit aerosol particle concentrations in a gym during the COVID-19 pandemic.
964 *Build Environ.* 2021;193: 107659. doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2021.107659
- 965 46. Ham S. Prevention of exposure to and spread of COVID-19 using air purifiers: challenges
966 and concerns. *Epidemiol Health.* 2020;42: 1–3. doi:10.4178/epih.e2020027
- 967 47. Aleta A, Martín-Corral D, Pastore y Piontti A, Ajelli M, Litvinova M, Chinazzi M, et al.
968 Modelling the impact of testing, contact tracing and household quarantine on second waves
969 of COVID-19. *Nat Hum Behav.* 2020;4: 964–971. doi:10.1038/s41562-020-0931-9
- 970 48. Quilty BJ, Clifford S, Hellewell J, Russell TW, Kucharski AJ, Flasche S, et al. Quarantine
971 and testing strategies in contact tracing for SARS-CoV-2: a modelling study. *Lancet Public
972 Heal.* 2021;6: e175–e183. doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30308-X
- 973 49. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). SARS-CoV-2 testing strategy:
974 considerations for non-healthcare workplaces. 2021 Jul 4 [cited July 17 2021]. In: Centers
975 for Disease Control and Prevention [Internet]. Available from:
976 [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/organizations/testing-non-
977 healthcare-workplaces.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/organizations/testing-non-healthcare-workplaces.html)
- 978 50. Bielecki M, Cramer GAG, Schlagenhauf P, Buehrer TW, Deuel JW. Body temperature
979 screening to identify SARS-CoV-2 infected young adult travellers is ineffective. *Travel
980 Med Infect Dis.* 2020;37: 101832. doi:10.1016/j.tmaid.2020.101832
- 981 51. Slade DH, Sinha MS. Return to Work during COVID-19: Temperature Screening is No
982 Panacea. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.* 2020;2019: 1–2. doi:10.1017/ice.2020.1225

- 983 52. Mitra B, Luckhoff C, Mitchell RD, O'Reilly GM, Smit DV, Cameron PA. Temperature
984 screening has negligible value for control of COVID-19. *Emerg Med Australas.* 2020;32:
985 867–869. doi:10.1111/1742-6723.13578
- 986 53. Facente SN, Hunter LA, Packel LJ, Li Y, Harte A, Nicolette G, et al. Feasibility and
987 effectiveness of daily temperature screening to detect COVID-19 in a large public
988 university setting. medRxiv: [Preprint]. 2021. doi: 10.1101/2021.03.22.21254140
- 989 54. Martinez-Jimenez MA, Loza-Gonzalez VM, Kolosovas-Machuca ES, Yanes-Lane ME,
990 Ramirez-GarciaLuna AS, Ramirez-GarciaLuna JL. Diagnostic accuracy of infrared thermal
991 imaging for detecting COVID-19 infection in minimally symptomatic patients. *Eur J Clin*
992 *Invest.* 2021;51: 1–8. doi:10.1111/eci.13474
- 993 55. Chen G, Xie J, Dai G, Zheng P, Hu X, Lu H, et al. Validity of the use of wrist and forehead
994 temperatures in screening the general population for covid-19: A prospective real-world
995 study. *Iran J Public Health.* 2020;49: 57–66. doi:10.18502/ijph.v49is1.3670
- 996 56. Pană BC, Lopes H, Furtunescu F, Franco D, Rapcea A, Stanca M, et al. Real-World
997 Evidence: The Low Validity of Temperature Screening for COVID-19 Triage. *Front Public*
998 *Heal.* 2021;9: 1–6. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2021.672698
- 999 57. Daga MK. From SARS-CoV to Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) - A Brief Review.
1000 *J Adv Res Med.* 2020;06: 1–9. doi:10.24321/2349.7181.201917
- 1001 58. Izzetti R, Nisi M, Gabriele M, Graziani F. COVID-19 Transmission in Dental Practice:
1002 Brief Review of Preventive Measures in Italy. *J Dent Res.* 2020;99: 1030–1038.
1003 doi:10.1177/0022034520920580

- 1004 59. Bartik AW, Bertrand M, Cullen Z, Glaeser EL, Luca M, Stanton C. The impact of COVID-
1005 19 on small business outcomes and expectations. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2020;117:
1006 17656–17666. doi:10.1073/pnas.2006991117
- 1007 60. Fairlie R. The impact of COVID-19 on small business owners: Evidence from the first
1008 three months after widespread social-distancing restrictions. *J Econ Manag Strateg*.
1009 2020;29: 727–740. doi:10.1111/jems.12400
- 1010 61. Akpan IJ, Udoh EAP, Adebisi B. Small business awareness and adoption of state-of-the-art
1011 technologies in emerging and developing markets, and lessons from the COVID-19
1012 pandemic. *J Small Bus Entrep*. 2020;0: 1–18. doi:10.1080/08276331.2020.1820185
- 1013 62. Akpan IJ, Soopramanien D, Kwak DH. Cutting-edge technologies for small business and
1014 innovation in the era of COVID-19 global health pandemic. *J Small Bus Entrep*. 2020;0: 1–
1015 11. doi:10.1080/08276331.2020.1799294
- 1016 63. Boyacı-Gündüz CP, Ibrahim SA, Wei OC, Galanakis CM. Transformation of the food
1017 sector: Security and resilience during the covid-19 pandemic. *Foods*. 2021.
1018 doi:10.3390/foods10030497
- 1019 64. Luckstead J, Nayga RM, Snell HA. Labor Issues in the Food Supply Chain Amid the
1020 COVID-19 Pandemic. *Appl Econ Perspect Policy*. 2021;43: 382–400.
1021 doi:10.1002/aepp.13090
- 1022 65. Hobbs JE. Food supply chain resilience and the COVID-19 pandemic: What have we
1023 learned? *Can J Agric Econ*. 2021; 189–196. doi:10.1111/cjag.12279

- 1024 66. Galanakis CM, Rizou M, Aldawoud TMS, Ucak I, Rowan NJ. Innovations and technology
1025 disruptions in the food sector within the COVID-19 pandemic and post-lockdown era.
1026 Trends Food Sci Technol. 2021;110: 193–200. doi:10.1016/j.tifs.2021.02.002
- 1027 67. Akçayır M, Akçayır G. Advantages and challenges associated with augmented reality for
1028 education: A systematic review of the literature. Educ Res Rev. 2017;20: 1–11.
1029 doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2016.11.002
- 1030 68. Saitone TL, Aleks Schaefer K, Scheitrum DP. COVID-19 morbidity and mortality in U.S.
1031 meatpacking counties. Food Policy. 2021;101: 102072. doi:10.1016/j.foodpol.2021.102072

1032

1033 **S1 Table. All questions (Q) included in the needs assessment survey, question type, type of**
1034 **analysis (statistical or thematic) and role in statistical analysis of associations (as an**
1035 **outcome of interest (primary or secondary) or independent variable (predictor).** Responses
1036 considered usable for analysis were those in which participants completed at least part 1 of the
1037 needs assessment survey.

1038 **S2 Table. Themes and underlying codes identified in participants' responses to selected**
1039 **open-ended questions in the needs assessment survey, which were intended to provide**
1040 **depth to the corresponding Likert questions.** An example quote is included to illustrate each
1041 of the codes identified.


1042 **S3 Table. Significant associations found in the bivariable analyses ($P \leq 0.05$) using Mann-**
1043 **Whitney U (MW-U) and Spearman's correlation (SC) tests between a specific Likert item**
1044 **(outcome) in a survey question (Q) and independent variables (predictors).**

1045 **S1 Appendix. Copy of the needs assessment survey instrument.**

1046

A


Q5. Regarding control of COVID-19 in your industry sector, how concerning are the items below?

**B**


Q7. Regarding the labor force needed to maintain the production capacity in your industry sector during the COVID-19 pandemic, how challenging are the items below?




A Q9. Regarding needs to successfully combat COVID-19 in your industry sector, how important are the items below?



B Q11. If computational modeling tools were available to predict which COVID-19 mitigation strategies would most likely be successful in a given facility/operation at a given time, how important would the model features below be for your industry sector?




C Q13. Regarding indicators of successful responses to COVID-19 in your industry sector, how important are the items below?






A

Q27. How would you describe the risk of a shutdown in this facility operation due to work absences in each of the specialized job functions below?

**B**

Q29. Regarding potential sources of COVID-19 infection in this facility/operation, how concerning are the items below?



A**Q34. Have any of these social distancing strategies been applied in this facility/operation at any point since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic?****B****Q36. Have any of these biosafety strategies been applied in this facility/operation at any point since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic?****C****Q38. Have any of these surveillance strategies been applied in this facility/operation at any point since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic?**