

Title Page

Title: Combined Infection Control Interventions Protect the Essential Workforce from Occupationally-Acquired SARS-CoV-2 during Produce Production, Harvesting and Processing Activities

Authors: D. Kane Cooper^{1*}, Julia S. Sobolik¹, Jovana Kovacevic², Channah M. Rock³, Elizabeth T. Sajewski¹, Jodie L. Guest¹, Ben A. Lopman¹, Lee-Ann Jaykus⁴, Juan S. Leon¹

Affiliations:

1. Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, 30322, USA
2. Food Innovation Center, Oregon State University, Portland, OR, 97209, USA
3. Department of Soil, Water and Environmental Science, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA
4. Food, Bioprocessing and Nutrition Sciences, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, 27695, USA

*Corresponding Author: D. Kane Cooper; 1518 Clifton Road NE, Atlanta, GA, 30322, USA;
Email: derrick.kane.cooper@emory.edu

Abstract: Essential food workers experience an elevated risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection due to prolonged occupational exposures (e.g., frequent close contact, enclosed spaces) in food production and processing areas, shared transportation (car or bus), and employer-provided shared housing. The purpose of this study was to evaluate the impact of combined food industry interventions and vaccination on reducing the daily cumulative risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection for produce workers. Six linked quantitative microbial risk assessment models were developed in R to simulate daily scenarios experienced by a worker. Standard industry interventions (2 m physical distancing, handwashing, surface disinfection, universal masking, increased ventilation) and two-dose mRNA vaccinations (86–99% efficacy) were modeled individually and jointly to assess risk reductions. The infection risk for an indoor (0.802, 95% Uncertainty Interval [UI]: 0.472–0.984) and outdoor (0.483, 95% UI: 0.255–0.821) worker was reduced to 0.018 (93% reduction) and 0.060 (87.5% reduction) after implementation of combined industry interventions. Upon integration of these interventions with vaccination, the infection risk for indoor (0.001, 95% UI: 0.0001–0.005) and outdoor (0.004, 95% UI: 0.001–0.016) workers was reduced by $\geq 99.1\%$. Food workers face considerable risk of occupationally-acquired SARS-CoV-2 infection without interventions; however, consistent implementation of key infection control measures paired with vaccination effectively mitigates these risks.

Keywords: COVID-19; Quantitative Microbial Risk Assessment (QMRA); Vaccinations; Non-Pharmaceutical Interventions (NPIs); Produce Industry Worker

Synopsis: Bundled interventions, particularly if they include vaccination, produce significant reductions ($>99\%$) in SARS-CoV-2 infection risk for essential food workers.

1. Introduction.

Essential food worker populations have been disproportionately impacted by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) illness and death¹⁻⁵. For instance, Canadian migrant farmworkers experienced a 20-fold higher incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infections relative to the general population (July, 2020)⁶. Similarly, food and agricultural workers in California, USA experienced a 39% increase in excess mortality compared to a 12% increase for workers in non-essential sectors (March – November, 2020)⁷. Workplace practices such as close proximity and long shifts may be contributing factors to this increased infection risk^{1,8}. Additional exposures may also occur among food workers during shared transportation (carpooling, work bus)⁹⁻¹¹ and in employer-provided housing^{12,13} (e.g., crowding¹⁴⁻¹⁷, poor ventilation¹⁶⁻¹⁸). Protecting essential food workers from SARS-CoV-2 is necessary to reduce the burden of disease among this often understudied¹⁹ and marginalized population, and to ensure stability in the global food supply chain^{20,21}.

Global agricultural organizations (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations^{22,23}, U.S. Department of Agriculture²⁴), and food trade associations (Global Cold Chain Alliance²⁵, American Frozen Food Institute²⁶) have recommended integrating SARS-CoV-2 infection control strategies (e.g., distancing, masking, symptom screening, vaccination, ventilation) to protect food workers. Despite the demonstrated effectiveness of these interventions²⁷⁻³⁶, their impact in protecting food worker populations has been poorly characterized³⁷. Implementation of physical barriers and universal masking in 13 Nebraskan meat processing facilities resulted in a significant reduction (62%) in the incidence of COVID-19 among workers²⁸. In an indoor food manufacturing scenario, stochastic quantitative microbial risk assessment (QMRA) modeling³⁸

revealed that after an 8h work exposure, close contact (1 m) transmission yielded the greatest infection risk (0.98) as compared to worker distances of 2 m (0.15) and 3 m (0.09). Our study found that strategies mitigating respiratory particle exposure (e.g., masking, distancing), paired with worker vaccination reduced infection risk below 1.0%. Similar strategies are also effective at protecting food workers from fomite-mediated transmission during cold-chain packaging and transport activities³⁹. While these studies advance the evidence-base of effective risk mitigation strategies in specific food worker scenarios (indoor manufacturing, cold-chain etc.), the unique conditions experienced by much of this workforce (e.g., shared transportation, employer-provided housing) means that daily infection risks may be further impacted by circumstances outside of the production fields or processing plants.

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the impact of combined food industry interventions and vaccination on reducing the daily cumulative risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection among essential produce production and processing workers. This work highlights the elevated risk of infection experienced by this segment of the essential workforce and can inform best practices by the produce industry to maintain the health and wellbeing of their workers.

2. Materials and Methods.

2.1 Model Overview.

The daily cumulative infection risk was modeled for a susceptible produce worker exposed to a symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infected co-worker throughout all representative daily work scenarios (Figure 1). Susceptibility was defined herein as an individual with no underlying health conditions or prior infections altering their level of susceptibility. These daily work scenarios were identified through discussions with industry trade associations, including the American Frozen Food Institute (AFFI) and the Produce Marketing Association (PMA); research and extension experience provided by representatives of the Arizona Cooperative Extension Organization, the Western Regional Center to Enhance Food Safety, and the Emory Farmworker project; and our past research on farms and packing facilities along the United States and Mexico border⁴⁰⁻⁴². Each scenario was modeled as an independent QMRA and expanded from previous modeling work of SARS-CoV-2 transmission in an indoor food manufacturing scenario³⁸. The SARS-CoV-2 exposure dose was combined across each work scenario experienced by the susceptible produce worker to estimate the daily infection risk.

International (World Health Organization) and domestic (U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, U.S. Food and Drug Administration, U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration) guidance for controlling SARS-CoV-2 in the food industry, along with insight from authors (J.K., C.M.R.) and experts at AFFI, was used to inform the interventions applied across each modeled scenario. Interventions included the individual and combined impact of physical distancing, handwashing and surface disinfection, universal masking, increased ventilation, and SARS-CoV-2 vaccination on reducing infection risk for a susceptible worker.

The model outcomes include: 1) the scenario-specific, as well as the daily cumulative SARS-CoV-2 infection risk for a susceptible produce worker quantified across three viral transmission pathways (aerosol, droplet, and fomite-mediated); and 2) the individual and combined impact of recommended infection control strategies on reducing the daily cumulative risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection for a susceptible produce worker.

2.2 Sequential work scenarios for an indoor and outdoor produce workers.

Daily scenarios experienced by produce industry workers were categorized into “indoor” and “outdoor” work scenarios (Figure 1) based on the activity-specific differences and risk profiles of each worker population and industry expert input. For example, while both indoor and outdoor workers engage in shared transportation to and from work^{19,43–45}, the specific mode of transportation (i.e., shared car [indoor] or bus [outdoor]) was determined through conversations with produce industry managers and farmworker extension specialists. For an indoor susceptible worker, we assumed that 2 h would be spent in shared car transportation, followed by a 12 h shift in an indoor produce packaging facility (11 h working, 1 h break), and 10 h in private housing. The indoor worker was assumed to be exposed to an infected worker in all scenarios except for in the private housing. For an outdoor susceptible worker, we assumed that 2 h would be spent in shared bus transportation, followed by a 12 h shift in an outdoor produce harvesting field (11 h working, 1 h break), and 10 h in shared housing. Exposure to an infected worker, for the outdoor worker, was assumed in each of the work scenarios. Details regarding the parameterization of these scenarios can be found in the **Supporting Information**.

2.3 QMRA model framework for each scenario.

Expanding upon our previous SARS-CoV-2 QMRA model, we quantified the risk of infection across three transmission pathways (aerosols, droplets, fomites) for both indoor and outdoor food workers³⁸. Each modeled scenario assumed a single infected worker either coughed (symptomatic) or breathed (asymptomatic) virus-laden respiratory aerosols (particle diameter <50 μm) and droplets (particle diameter 50–750 μm) that could infect a susceptible worker. Aerosols were assumed to travel distances beyond 3 m from their source and were homogeneously distributed in the environment^{46–48}, while droplets were assumed to travel <3 m from their source and fell to adjacent surfaces based on particle size and simulated distance traveled^{49–51}. Fomite contamination occurred through infectious aerosols and droplets falling onto surfaces based on their settling velocities and gravitational trajectories⁵². For each modeled scenario, we incorporated specific dimensions, ventilation rates, fomite surface materials, and viral decay rates as described below.

2.4 SARS-CoV-2 Risk Characterization.

The models were constructed in R (version 4.0.3; R Development Core Team; Vienna, Austria) with 10,000 iterations, using literature-derived specified parameters and probability distributions. Each model parameter used to inform the SARS-CoV-2 viral transmission pathways was grouped into three categories and summarized in **Supporting Table 1A-C**. These classifications include: 1) viral shedding through coughing respiratory events; 2) fomite-mediated transmission and dose-response parameters; and 3) risk mitigation interventions (infection control interventions and vaccinations). Scenario-specific parameters, such as the volume of space

modeled, temperature and relative humidity, baseline air exchange rate (ACH), and fomite-specific viral decay parameters are in **Supporting Table 2**.

The scenario-specific risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection to a susceptible produce worker was calculated by summing the viral dose across each transmission pathway (aerosol, droplet, fomite) for each scenario (shared transportation, work shift, work break, shared housing). The daily cumulative risk of infection to a susceptible produce worker was calculated by summing the dose across scenarios specific to either an indoor or outdoor produce worker. Both the scenario-specific and daily cumulative viral doses were then converted into risk estimates using the SARS-CoV-1 dose-response parameter, as described below.

Aerosol and droplet exposures to the susceptible worker were calculated from the concentration of virus (C_t) at time t , the deposition fraction of particles into the lung mucosa (L_{dep}), the inhalation rate (I_R), and the duration of exposure (E_t) as follows:

$$D_{air}(t) = C_t \cdot L_{dep} \cdot I_R \cdot E_t$$

The fomite-mediated viral exposure was based on the frequency of hand-to-face contacts (H_{face}), the ratio of finger (F_{sa})-to-hand (H_{sa}) surface area, the concentration of virus on the hand at each time t (C_{hand}), the fraction of pathogens transferred from the hand to the facial mucosal membrane (F_{23}), and the exposure duration in hours as follows:

$$D_{hand}(t) = \frac{H_{face} \cdot F_{sa} \cdot C_{hand}(t) \cdot F_{23} \cdot t}{H_{sa}}$$

These viral doses were then combined to generate scenario-specific SARS-CoV-2 exposures. For instance, the viral dose for the 11 h indoor processing facility shift was calculated by:

$$D_{processing}(t) = D_{air,processing}(t) + D_{hand,processing}(t)$$

The daily cumulative viral dose for an indoor (D_{indoor}) or outdoor ($D_{outdoor}$) produce worker was calculated by combining the scenario-specific viral doses (see **Supporting Information**) relevant to each worker as follows:

$$D_{Indoor} = D_{processing} + D_{indoor\ breakroom} + D_{car\ transportation}$$

$$D_{Outdoor} = D_{field} + D_{bus\ breakroom} + D_{bus\ transportation} + D_{housing}$$

The probability of SARS-CoV-2 infection to a susceptible produce worker from an infected worker was calculated using an exponential dose-response model (k_{risk}) based on pooled SARS-CoV-1 laboratory data using the intranasal inoculation of mice models⁵³. For example, the scenario-specific infection risk associated with the shared car transportation scenario ($R_{car\ transportation}$) and daily cumulative risk for an indoor produce worker (R_{Indoor}) were calculated by:

$$R_{car\ transportation} = 1 - \exp[-k_{risk} \cdot D_{car\ transportation}]$$

$$R_{Indoor} = 1 - \exp[-k_{risk} \cdot D_{Indoor}]$$

Results are presented as the median risk values with the 95% uncertainty interval (UI), which is comprised of the 2.5 and 97.5 percentiles.

2.5 Selection of Infection Control Strategies for SARS-CoV-2.

Recommended infection control strategies (e.g., physical distancing, handwashing and surface disinfection, universal mask wearing, increased air exchange rates, and vaccination) were identified from a systematic review of 1,847 United Nations and English-speaking government websites to distill global guidance, guidelines, or recommendations to prevent food workers from acquiring COVID-19⁵⁴. These strategies were then vetted with our trade association partners (AFFI, PMA) and extension co-authors (J.K. and C.M.R.). The impact of interventions

(individually or combined) was evaluated based on the reduction in infection risk (%) relative to the baseline scenario with no interventions.

Increasing the distance (physical distancing) between workers from 1 m to 2 m, based on CDC and OSHA guidance⁵⁵, was analyzed in the indoor packing facility and outdoor harvesting field scenarios. The impact of handwashing and surface disinfection on reducing the risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection was analyzed in the indoor packing facility and outdoor harvesting field scenarios. Here, we assumed hourly handwashing (2- \log_{10} viral removal)⁵⁶ per handwashing event. Surface disinfection (3- \log_{10} viral removal) using EPA N-list of SARS-CoV-2 viral disinfectants⁵⁷ was assumed to occur twice per work shift (4 h, 8 h). The impact of various facemask materials (cloth, surgical) and double masking (surgical mask followed by cloth mask) was assessed across all scenarios except for the indoor and outdoor 1 h breaks to allow for eating, and in the 8 h in the shared residential scenario to allow for sleeping. The range in efficacy for each facemask material can be found in Supporting Table 1C.

Scenario-specific increases in air exchange rate (ACH) based on particulate exposure studies were assessed across each modeled scenario except for the 11 h outdoor harvesting field shift and 1 h bus transportation. For the shared car transportation scenario, the baseline ACH of 2.55 h^{-1} (95% UI: 0.98–4.10) was increased to 29.1 h^{-1} (95% UI: 7.67–50.6), which was representative of a 2005 Ford Taurus mid-size car traveling from 0–50 mph with all windows open⁵⁸. For both the indoor packaging facility and associated breakroom, the ACH was increased from 0.1 h^{-1} to 6.0 h^{-1} based on surveys and conversations with food industry managers (data not shown). For the shared bus transportation scenario, the baseline ACH of 11.1 h^{-1} (95% UI: 8.96–13.4) was

increased to 21.6 h⁻¹ (95% UI: 10.5–37.3), which was representative of a school bus driving under realistic conditions with all windows open⁵⁹. For the shared residential scenario, the baseline ACH of 0.35 h⁻¹ (point estimate) was increased to 3.9 h⁻¹ (95% UI: 2.08–5.72), which representative of opening a window to increase natural ventilation in an apartment-style scenario⁶⁰. Additional information on the scenario-specific parameters can be found in **Supporting Table 2**.

Finally, we evaluated the impact of two vaccination scenarios (sub-optimal and optimal vaccine efficacies) on reducing the daily cumulative risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection for a susceptible worker. We assumed that across all modeled scenarios, only the susceptible worker would be vaccinated. For the sub-optimal vaccine efficacy scenario, the mean vaccine efficacy was 72.0% (95% UI: 64.6–79.6%) and represented either receiving one dose of the Johnson & Johnson vaccine, one of the two-dose vaccine series, a reduced vaccine efficacy to novel variants, or incomplete immunity due to a prior SARS-CoV-2 infection^{29,31,32}. For the full immunity scenario, the mean vaccine efficacy was 92.3% (95% UI: 86.3–98.7%) and represented two doses (≥ 14 days) of Pfizer-BioNTech or Moderna-NIAD mRNA series vaccines^{33,34} by the susceptible worker. The impact of booster vaccinations was not assessed; however, receiving three doses of the mRNA vaccines has been shown to provide a mean vaccine efficacy of 94.0%, aligning with the range represented in the optimal vaccine efficacy scenario⁶¹.

2.6 Sensitivity Analysis.

Sensitivity analyses were conducted for each modeled scenario to determine the most influential parameters in estimating the SARS-CoV-2 viral exposure dose. Parameters identified as being

most influential in the final cumulative dose estimate were reported as Spearman rank correlational coefficients using the “tornado” function in the mc2d R package⁶². To investigate the propagation of variability and uncertainty throughout the models, the “mcratio” function was used to calculate the variability and overall uncertainty ratio for each modeled parameter. More information on the modeled parameters, their distributions, and assessing model stability can be found in the **Supporting Information**.

2.7 Data Availability.

The code developed and utilized throughout this analysis will be available through GitHub upon acceptance.

3. Results.

3.1 Scenario-specific and cumulative daily SARS-CoV-2 infection risks for an indoor produce worker with and without infection control measures.

For an indoor produce worker, we investigated the individual and cumulative SARS-COV-2 infection risk to a susceptible worker across four daily scenarios: shared car transportation (2 h), an indoor facility work shift (11 h), break in the indoor facility breakroom (1 h), and private housing (10 h, Figure 1). With no infection control strategies applied, the lowest risk scenario was the time spent in the indoor breakroom (Risk: 0.021, 95% Uncertainty Interval [UI]: 0.008–0.053) (Table 1), whereas the highest risk scenario was during the 11 h enclosed work shift at 1 m distancing (1.00, 95% UI: 0.977–1.00). Within the 11 h enclosed work shift scenario when distancing increased to 2 m, the risk decreased by 61.3% (0.387, 95% UI: 0.162–0.731). However, the 24 h daily cumulative risk remained elevated for both 1 m (1.00, 95% UI: 0.992–1.00) and 2 m (0.802, 95% UI: 0.472–0.984) distancing. After implementing individual infection control strategies across each modeled scenario, for the 2 m 24 h daily cumulative risk, universal double masking resulted in the greatest reduction to 94.0% (0.048, 95% UI: 0.006–0.316), while surgical masking reduced this risk by 80.3% (0.158, 95% UI: 0.040–0.424), and cloth masking by 71.8% (0.226, 95% UI: 0.075–0.557). For the 2 m 24 h daily cumulative risk, increasing ventilation rates across each modeled scenario resulted in a 77.4% reduction (0.181, 95% UI: 0.078–0.571), while hourly handwashing and surface disinfection twice during the 11 h work shift provided a nominal reduction of 1.25% (0.792, 95% UI: 0.456–0.983). The 24 h daily cumulative risk at 2 m was lower for each intervention assessed when compared to the daily cumulative risk at 1 m.

3.2 Scenario-specific and cumulative daily SARS-CoV-2 infection risks for an outdoor produce worker with and without infection control measures.

Next, we investigated the individual and cumulative risk to a susceptible outdoor food worker exposed to an infected worker across four daily scenarios: shared bus transportation (2 h), an outdoor field work shift (11 h), a rest break in the bus (1 h), and shared housing (10 h, Figure 1) (Table 2). Without infection control measures, the lowest risk scenario was the time spent in the shared bus transportation (0.010, 95% UI: 0.003–0.031) (Table 2), whereas the highest risk scenario was during the 11 h outdoor field work shift at 1 m distancing (0.316, 95% UI: 0.098–0.768). Within the 11 h outdoor work shift scenario when distancing increased to 2 m, the risk decreased by 97.5% (0.008, 95% UI: 0.003–0.019). However, the 24 h daily cumulative risk remained elevated for both 1 m (0.483, 95% UI: 0.255–0.821) and 2 m (0.215, 95% UI: 0.095–0.441). After implementing individual infection control strategies across each modeled scenario, for the 1 m 24 h daily cumulative risk, universal double masking resulted in the greatest reduction to 91.8% (0.039, 95% UI: 0.016–0.140), while surgical masking reduced this risk by 83.4% (0.079, 95% UI: 0.031–0.215), and cloth masking by 76.7% (0.112, 95% UI: 0.048–0.287). For the 1 m 24 h daily cumulative risk, increasing ventilation rates in the shared bus transportation and shared housing scenarios resulted in a 16.2% reduction (0.404, 95% UI: 0.181–0.802) in the 24 h daily cumulative risk at 1 m, while hourly handwashing and surface disinfection twice during the 11 h outdoor work shift provided a nominal reduction in the 24 h cumulative risk at 1 m of 0.15% (0.482, 95% UI: 0.254–0.820). The 24 h daily cumulative risk at 2 m was lower for each intervention assessed when compared to the daily cumulative risk at 1 m.

3.3 Impact of combined infection control strategies and vaccination on the daily cumulative risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection for an indoor produce worker.

We then investigated the impact of combined infection control measures with and without vaccination on the daily cumulative SARS-CoV-2 risk for the indoor produce worker (Figure 2). Without vaccination, combining hand hygiene, surface disinfection, universal surgical mask usage, and increased ventilation strategies across the indoor work scenarios reduced the daily infection risk by 93.0% (0.018, 95% UI: 0.004–0.098). These combined infection control measures were found to be more effective than vaccination alone (sub-optimal or optimal vaccine efficacies). In the absence of infection control measures, daily infection risk was reduced by 73.2% (sub-optimal vaccine efficacy risk: 0.215, 95% UI: 0.120–0.324) and 92.7% (optimal vaccine efficacy risk: 0.059, 95% UI: 0.007–0.132). Combining infection control strategies with vaccination further reduced the daily infection risks by 99.4% (sub-optimal vaccine efficacy: 0.005, 95% UI: 0.001–0.033), and 99.8% (optimal vaccine efficacy: 0.001, 95% UI: 0.0001–0.005).

3.4 Impact of combined infection control strategies and vaccination on the daily cumulative risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection for an outdoor produce worker.

Similarly, we evaluated the impact of combined infection control measures with and without vaccination on the daily cumulative SARS-CoV-2 infection risk for an outdoor produce worker (Figure 3). Without vaccination, combining hand hygiene, surface disinfection, universal surgical mask usage, and increased ventilation strategies during transportation and in shared housing across the outdoor work scenarios reduced the daily infection risk by 87.5% (0.060, 95% UI: 0.022–0.205). These combined infection control measures were found to be more effective than

vaccination with a sub-optimal efficacy, but less effective than vaccination with optimal efficacy. In the absence of infection control measures, daily infection risk was reduced by 72.5% (sub-optimal vaccine efficacy risk: 0.133, 95% UI: 0.065–0.249) and 93.0% (optimal vaccine efficacy risk: 0.034, 95% UI: 0.006–0.087). Combining infection control strategies with vaccination further reduced the daily infection risks by 96.5% (sub-optimal vaccine efficacy: 0.017, 95% UI: 0.006–0.059) and 99.1% (optimal-vaccine efficacy: 0.004, 95% UI: 0.001–0.016).

3.5 Sensitivity analyses.

Spearman rank correlation coefficients were calculated for each scenario to identify the parameters that were the most influential to the final SARS-CoV-2 exposure dose estimate. Across all scenarios, the parameters identified as most influential at increasing virus exposure were the viral shedding rate per hour ($\rho_{\text{avg}} = 0.95$); the infected worker's salivary virus concentration ($\rho_{\text{avg}} = 0.81$); and the coughing frequency ($\rho_{\text{avg}} = 0.33$). The parameters identified as most influential in decreasing virus exposure across all scenarios were the infected worker's double masking ($\rho_{\text{avg}} = -0.73$); the susceptible worker's surgical masking ($\rho_{\text{avg}} = -0.68$); and the susceptible worker's cloth masking ($\rho_{\text{avg}} = -0.53$) (**Supporting Figure 3A-B**). The shared residential and car transportation scenarios were found to be impacted the most by parameter variability, with overall variability ratios calculated to be 6.06 (aerosol transmission) and 4.60 (droplet transmission), respectively (**Supporting Figure 2A-B**). Finally, the overall uncertainty ratio, representing the combined effect of parameter variability and uncertainty, was largest for the viral dose on a susceptible worker's hand (4.72) and the Brownian diffusivity (4.34) calculated for aerosol particle exposure (**Supporting Table 3**).

4. Discussion.

The goal of this study was to estimate the impact of recommended infection control interventions on the daily cumulative SARS-CoV-2 infection risk to produce workers (i.e., working in an indoor facility or open outdoor farm) when exposed to various scenarios (i.e., 1 m or 2 m distancing, shared transportation, with or without shared housing). Among the scenarios assessed for an indoor worker, we found the highest risk to be associated with the 1 m distancing indoor work shift (1.00, 95% UI: 0.977–1.00), followed by shared car transportation (0.664; 95% UI: 0.325–0.943). For an outdoor worker, the highest risk was associated with the 1 m distancing outdoor work shift (0.316, 95% UI: 0.098–0.768), followed by shared housing (0.190, 95% UI: 0.075–0.411). When evaluating the scenario-specific impact of each infection control intervention, we found that double masking provided the greatest protection for the indoor worker, while increased physical distancing between workers provided the greatest protection for outdoor workers. However, the greatest reduction in daily SARS-CoV-2 infection risk was observed when the combined infection control interventions were paired with optimal SARS-CoV-2 vaccinations for both indoor workers (0.001, 99.8% reduction) and outdoor workers (0.004, 99.1% reduction). Despite elevated SARS-CoV-2 exposures throughout daily produce worker activities, this study demonstrates that current risk mitigation strategies when implemented together can effectively protect essential food workers.

Our findings for the indoor packaging facility and outdoor harvesting field are consistent with data from well-documented outbreaks across multiple farms and food processing facilities globally^{1,2,21,44,63}, which have highlighted the increased duration of contact and close proximity of workers on assembly lines as factors contributing to an elevated infection risk. In our study,

one contributing factor for this elevated infection risk is likely the extended exposure durations (11 h work shift and 1 h break) to a coughing infected worker compared to other scenarios for which exposure durations are in the 1-2 h range. We also explored the impact of physical distancing during the work shifts and found that in the indoor facility and outdoor field, increasing the distance between workers from 1 m to 2 m provided a 61.3% (indoor) and 97.5% (outdoor) infection risk reduction. Consistent with modeling work by Wei et al.,⁶⁴ there is an attenuation in distance traveled by respiratory particles with increasing size: small-diameter (<50 μm) respiratory aerosols can travel beyond 4 m after coughing, whereas 99% of large-diameter droplets (>100 μm) fall to adjacent surfaces within 2 m of their point of origin. As demonstrated here and in our previous modeling work³⁸, increasing the distance between workers allows for a shift in the predominant transmission route from close-contact droplets and aerosols to exclusively aerosols (<50 μm ; responsible for 1.3% of expelled viral dose), further exemplifying the importance of physical distancing to reduce infection risk.

The elevated infection risk found in the shared car transportation scenario is consistent with Ng et al.⁶⁵, who found that sharing a vehicle with an individual infected with SARS-CoV-2 was associated with a 3.05-fold increase in the odds of infection. This finding is likely due to the relatively low volume of air space (2.6 m^3) within the car, combined with the elevated persistence of infectious aerosols over multiple hours⁶⁶. For example, after increasing the volume inside of the modeled car by three-fold to 7.8 m^3 and keeping all other parameters constant, we observed a 53.2% reduction in the 2 h infection risk (0.311, 95% UI: 0.130–0.616) attributed to volume alone. Given our assumption of a well-mixed environment in which the persistent aerosol particles are homogeneously distributed, one would expect aerosol exposures and

subsequent infection risks to decrease as the air volume within the scenario increases. Similarly, conditions such as poor ventilation and small and enclosed employer-provided housing have been reported in various outbreaks among outdoor produce workers^{14–18}. For example, in July 2020, a California farmworker housing facility with five workers per room documented a 204-person SARS-CoV-2 outbreak⁶⁷. As others have reported^{68–71}, the smaller the size of the enclosed space and the more individuals in that space, the greater the risk of SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Taken together, these scenarios highlight the interconnected relationship between duration of exposure, distancing between individuals, and the size/volume of the enclosed space, on SARS-CoV-2 infection risk among indoor produce workers.

Increased ventilation, relative to other infection control strategies, resulted in the greatest reduction in daily infection risk for an indoor worker (77.4% reduction at 2 m), while double masking provided the largest protective effect for both indoor (94.0% reduction at 2 m) and outdoor workers (91.8% reduction at 1 m). Our findings are consistent with the increasing evidence that higher ventilation rates, when applied appropriately and without recirculation, can reduce SARS-CoV-2 exposure and subsequent infection risk^{72–75}. Mechanistically, the overall airborne concentration of virus-containing particles can be reduced through natural or mechanical increases in ventilation rates, thereby reducing the viral dose exposure to a susceptible worker³⁶. An important limitation to this intervention has been noted by Lee et al.⁷³, who found that even at high ventilation rates of 20 h⁻¹, this intervention could not overcome the high infection risk associated with an infected and susceptible worker sustaining contact in small, enclosed office spaces (20 m³). This suggests that larger facilities, like the indoor packing facility

modeled here (460 m³), would likely see a greater reduction in SARS-CoV-2 infection risk upon increasing their ventilation rate, when compared to a smaller facility or office spaces.

Consistent with numerous laboratory^{76–78} and empirical^{27,79} studies testing reduction in risk associated with wearing face masks, our findings for individual indoor and outdoor scenarios, along with the cumulative daily risk, demonstrate that masks are an effective tool for reducing SARS-CoV-2 infection risk. Of the masks described above, double masking (surgical mask followed by cloth mask) provided the greatest reduction in daily risk, followed by one surgical and cloth mask, respectively. Given the increased transmissibility of newer SARS-CoV-2 variants (Delta: B.1.617.2⁸⁰; Omicron: B.1.1.159⁸¹), the CDC has recently revised masking recommendations and has transitioned from promoting double masking⁸² to now promoting N95 and KN95 respirators⁸³, while surgical masks continue to be recommended for industry by OSHA⁸⁴. After incorporating the universal usage of optimally-fit N95 respirators⁷⁷ throughout our model (data not shown), the 24 h daily cumulative risk for an indoor (0.004, 95% UI: 0.001–0.009) and outdoor (0.018, 95% UI: 0.009–0.039) produce worker was reduced by 99.6% and 96.2%, respectively. Given the documented facemask accessibility issues faced by produce workers at the onset of the pandemic^{85,86}, the implementation of N95 respirators, though of superior risk reduction, is likely not feasible in this occupational setting. However, our work supports the promotion of double masking in these occupational scenarios to further minimize infection risk beyond the use of cloth or surgical masks alone.

Our work provides novel insight into the effectiveness of combining vaccination with food industry recommended infection control strategies to mitigate daily SARS-CoV-2 infection risk

among essential produce industry workers. As demonstrated with the agent-based modeling studies of Farthing et al.⁸⁷ and Kerr et al.⁸⁸, while individual interventions (e.g., physical distancing, masking, vaccinations, symptomatic testing, etc.) provided modest reductions in the expected number of SARS-CoV-2 infections, implementing multiple interventions simultaneously provided synergistic reductions in expected infections. It is important to note that this multipronged approach assumes absolute compliance with the interventions described; however, the layering of risk reduction practices is not new to the produce industry⁸⁹. As demonstrated by Mogren et al.⁹⁰, the “hurdle-approach” of enforcing multiple risk reduction strategies with variable degrees of compliance can provide greater reductions in risk than a single intervention with poor compliance.

The strengths of our model include: a detailed exposure assessment designed to simulate the daily work scenarios experienced by indoor and outdoor produce workers; model vetting by academic and food industry partners; and a versatile modeling framework that can be leveraged to evaluate scenarios and contexts outside of the food production and processing industry. The design of this model has allowed us to evaluate the impact of global, national, and industry-specific SARS-CoV-2 intervention recommendations within and across multiple scenarios, highlighting their scenario-specific variability and overall effectiveness at reducing infection risk. While these features are not commonly applied to QMRA models and have recently been the focus of expansive agent-based modeling work⁸⁸, this work highlights the capabilities of QMRA modeling to extend beyond one-time interactions between an infectious and susceptible individual.

As for potential limitations, our model relies on the dose-response relationship of SARS-CoV-1 to assess infection risk. Given that the SARS-CoV-2 dose-response parameter(s) have yet to be defined in the literature, this approach has become common practice across multiple SARS-CoV-2 QMRA studies^{47,91–93}. A second limitation to the model is our assumption of a uniform distribution for virus concentration across all respiratory particle size classes. While this assumption has been implemented by the aerosol modeling work of Zhang et al.⁴⁷, it is probably not entirely representative of what is happening in real-world situations. This could have led to an artificially increased risk associated with close proximity (≤ 1 m) exposure to droplets, given their large diameters (100–750 μm) and, by assumption, a higher concentration of infectious SARS-CoV-2 virus. Another limitation is that we assumed discordant vaccination status (e.g., only the susceptible worker had received a vaccination) among the infected and susceptible produce workers modeled. While vaccine hesitancy has been well documented among the food worker population^{94,95}, these findings suggest that promoting a single-dose or two-dose vaccine can reduce daily infection risk by roughly 73.0% or 93.0%, respectively. Future work is needed to understand the SARS-CoV-2 vaccination coverage levels within this essential worker community, the findings of which could then be incorporated into the present model to increase the generalizability of our results.

Our model has demonstrated that the elevated daily SARS-CoV-2 infection risk experienced by indoor and outdoor produce workers can be reduced to $< 1 \times 10^{-2}$ when vaccinations (optimal vaccine efficacy 86–99%) are combined with recommended infection control strategies. Given their consistency in reducing infection risk for both indoor and outdoor produce workers (92.7–93.0% reduction), vaccinations should continue to be prioritized as an effective means by which

to maintain a healthy workforce and reliable global food supply. However, our findings show that vaccinations alone are not sufficient and should be combined with additional infection control interventions (e.g., handwashing, surface disinfection, universal masking, and increased ventilation) implemented by the food industry to further reduce the potential for SARS-CoV-2 transmission. These findings provide additional evidence supporting international (EU OSHA⁹⁶, WHO^{20,97,98}), domestic (CDC⁹⁹⁻¹⁰¹, U.S. OSHA^{84,102}), and industry-specific (FDA¹⁰³, AFFI²⁶) recommendations for preventing SARS-CoV-2 transmission during food production and processing shifts, and across various day-to-day exposure scenarios (e.g., shared transportation, employer-provided housing, etc.). Taken together, these findings highlight the need for produce industry management to continue promoting vaccination uptake in their workforce combined with supporting the use of food industry recommended infection control strategies when managing SARS CoV-2 transmission in this essential workforce.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Dr. Sanjay Gummalla (American Frozen Food Institute), Dr. Lory Reveil (American Frozen Food Institute), and Dr. Max Teplitski (Produce Marketing Association) for their valuable time and input as food and produce production and processing experts and for conducting surveys of facilities.

Funding Sources

This work was partially supported by the National Institutes of Health T32 grant (J.S.S., grant 2T32ES012870-16), the National Institute of Food and Agriculture at the U.S. Department of Agriculture (J.S.L. 2019-67017-29642; J.S.S., grant 2020-67034-31728), the National Institute

General Medical Sciences (B.A.L R01 GM124280; B.A.L. R01 GM124280-03S1), the National Institute Of Allergy And Infectious Diseases of the National Institutes of Health (E.T.S., T32AI138952), and Emory University and the Infectious Disease Across Scales Training Program (IDASTP) (E.T.S). The contents of this paper are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health, or the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

5. References.

1. Dyal JW, Grant MP, Broadwater K, et al. COVID-19 Among Workers in Meat and Poultry Processing Facilities — 19 States, April 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020;69(18):557-561. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6918e3
2. Waltenburg MA, Rose CE, Victoroff T, et al. Coronavirus disease among workers in food processing, food manufacturing, and agriculture workplaces. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2021;27(1):243-249. doi:10.3201/eid2701.203821
3. Kavanagh KT, Pare J, Pontus C. COVID-19: through the eyes through the front line, an international perspective. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control.* 2020;9(1):1-5. doi:10.1186/s13756-020-00850-2
4. National Conference of State Legislature. COVID-19: Essential Workers in the States. National Conference of State Legislature. <https://www.ncsl.org/research/labor-and-employment/covid-19-essential-workers-in-the-states.aspx>. Published 2020. Accessed March 15, 2021.
5. U.S. Department of Homeland Security. *Advisory Memorandum on Identification of Essential Critical Infrastructure Workers during COVID-19 Response.*; 2020. <https://www.cisa.gov/publication/guidance-essential-critical-infrastructure-workforce>.
6. Vosko LF, Spring C. COVID-19 Outbreaks in Canada and the Crisis of Migrant Farmworkers' Social Reproduction: Transnational Labour and the Need for Greater Accountability Among Receiving States. *J Int Migr Integr.* 2021;(0123456789). doi:10.1007/s12134-021-00905-2
7. Chen YH, Glymour M, Riley A, et al. Excess mortality associated with the COVID-19 pandemic among Californians 18-65 years of age, by occupational sector and occupation: March through November 2020. *PLoS One.* 2021;16(6 June):1-10. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0252454
8. Steinberg J, Kennedy ED, Basler C, et al. COVID-19 Outbreak Among Employees at a Meat Processing Facility — South Dakota, March–April 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020;69(31):1015-1019. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6931a2
9. Reid A, Schenker MB. Hired farmworkers in the US: Demographics, work organisation, and services. *Am J Ind Med.* 2016;59(8):644-655. doi:10.1002/ajim.22613
10. Lan FY, Wei CF, Hsu YT, Christiani DC, Kales SN. Work-related COVID-19

- transmission in six Asian countries/areas: A follow-up study. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(5):1-11. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0233588
11. Pongpirul WA, Pongpirul K, Ratnarathon AC, Prasithsirikul W. Journey of a Thai Taxi Driver and Novel Coronavirus. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(11):1067-1068. doi:10.1056/nejmc2001621
 12. Gmehlin C, Munoz-Price LS. COVID-19 in Long Term Care Facilities: A Review of Epidemiology, Clinical Presentations, and Containment Interventions. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2020;2019:1-6. doi:10.1017/ice.2020.1292
 13. Roxby A, Greninger A, Hatfield K, et al. Outbreak Investigation of COVID-19 Among Residents and Staff of an Independent and Assisted Living Community for Older Adults in Seattle, Washington. *JAMA - Intern Med*. 2020;180(8):1101-1105. doi:10.1002/jmv.25748
 14. Gentry AL, Grzywacz JG, Quandt SA, Davis SW, Arcury TA. Housing quality among North Carolina farmworker families. *J Agric Saf Health*. 2007;13(3):323-337.
 15. Arcury TA, Weir M, Chen H, et al. Migrant farmworker housing regulation violations in North Carolina. *Am J Ind Med*. 2012;55(3):191-204. doi:10.1002/ajim.22011
 16. Quandt SA, Brooke C, Fagan K, Howe A, Thornburg TK, McCurdy SA. Farmworker housing in the United States and its impact on health. *New Solut*. 2015;25(3):263-286. doi:10.1177/1048291115601053
 17. Accorsi EK, Samples J, McCauley LA, Shadbeh N. Sleeping Within Six Feet: Challenging Oregon's Labor Housing COVID-19 Guidelines. *J Agromedicine*. 2020;00(00):1-4. doi:10.1080/1059924X.2020.1815622
 18. Quandt SA, Wiggins MF, Chen H, Bischoff WE, Arcury TA. Heat index in migrant farmworker housing: Implications for rest and recovery from work-related heat stress. *Am J Public Health*. 2013;103(8):24-26. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2012.301135
 19. Fan M, Pena AA. How Vulnerable Are U.S. Crop Workers?: Evidence from Representative Worker Data and Implications for COVID-19. *J Agromedicine*. 2021;26(2):256-265. doi:10.1080/1059924X.2021.1890293
 20. World Health Organization (WHO), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. *COVID-19 and Food Safety: Guidance for Food Businesses.*; 2020. <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/331705>.
 21. Lusk JL, Chandra R. Farmer and farm worker illnesses and deaths from COVID-19 and impacts on agricultural output. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(4):e0250621. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0250621
 22. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). *Migrant Workers and the COVID-19 Pandemic*. Rome: FAO; 2020. doi:10.4060/ca8559en
 23. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). *COVID-19: Guidance for Preventing Transmission of COVID-19 within Food Businesses*. Rome: FAO; 2021. doi:10.4060/cb6030en
 24. U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). *USDA COVID-19 Workplace Safety Plan.*; 2021. <https://www.usda.gov/sites/default/files/documents/usda-covid-19-workplace-safety-plan.pdf>.
 25. Global Cold Chain Alliance (GCCA). *GCCA Fact Sheet: OSHA ETS on COVID-19 Vaccination and Testing.*; 2021. [https://www.gcca.org/sites/default/files/OSHA ETS Fact Sheet.pdf](https://www.gcca.org/sites/default/files/OSHA%20ETS%20Fact%20Sheet.pdf).
 26. American Frozen Food Institute (AFFI). *Proper Usage of Face Masks/Coverings to*

- Protect Against COVID-19.*; 2020. https://www.idfa.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/ProperUsageofFaceMasks_6Apr2020_Version2_SIGNED.pdf.
27. Chu DK, Akl EA, Duda S, et al. Physical distancing, face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10242):1973-1987. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31142-9
 28. Herstein JJ, Degarege A, Stover D, et al. Characteristics of SARS-CoV-2 transmission among meat processing workers in Nebraska, USA, and effectiveness of risk mitigation measures. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2021;27(4):1032-1039. doi:10.3201/eid2704.204800
 29. Nasreen S, Chung H, He S, et al. Effectiveness of mRNA and ChAdOx1 COVID-19 vaccines against symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection and severe outcomes with variants of concern in Ontario. *medRxiv*. 2021:1-36. doi:10.1101/2021.06.28.21259420
 30. Prunas O, Warren JL, Crawford FW, et al. Vaccination with BNT162b2 reduces transmission of SARS-CoV-2 to household contacts in Israel. *Science (80-)*. 2022;375(6585):1151-1154. doi:10.1126/science.abl4292
 31. Lopez Bernal J, Andrews N, Gower C, et al. Effectiveness of Covid-19 Vaccines against the B.1.617.2 (Delta) Variant. *N Engl J Med*. 2021;385(7):585-594. doi:10.1056/nejmoa2108891
 32. Corchado-Garcia J, Zemmour D, Hughes T, et al. Analysis of the Effectiveness of the Ad26.COV2.S Adenoviral Vector Vaccine for Preventing COVID-19. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4(11). doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.32540
 33. Polack FP, Thomas SJ, Kitchin N, et al. Safety and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;383(27):2603-2615. doi:10.1056/nejmoa2034577
 34. Baden LR, El Sahly HM, Essink B, et al. Efficacy and Safety of the mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine. *N Engl J Med*. 2021;384(5):403-416. doi:10.1056/nejmoa2035389
 35. Parhizkar H, Dietz L, Olsen-Martinez A, et al. Quantifying environmental mitigation of aerosol viral load in a controlled chamber with participants diagnosed with COVID-19. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2022;0(0):1-14. doi:10.1093/cid/ciac006
 36. Morawska L, Tang JW, Bahnfleth W, Bluysen PM, Boerstra A, Buonanno G, Cao J, Dancer S, Floto A, Franchimon F, Haworth C, Hogeling J, Isaxon C, Jimenez JL, Kurnitski J, Li Y, Loomans M, Marks G, Marr LC, Mazzearella L, Melikov AK, Miller S, Milton DK, Naza YM. How can airborne transmission of COVID-19 indoors be minimised? *Environ Int*. 2020;142. doi:10.1016/s0140-1963(18)31796-8
 37. Ingram C, Downey V, Roe M, et al. COVID-19 Prevention and Control Measures in Workplace Settings: A Rapid Review and Meta-Analysis. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(15). doi:10.3390/ijerph18157847
 38. Sobolik JS, Sajewski ET, Jaykus L-A, et al. Controlling risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection in essential workers of enclosed food manufacturing facilities. *Food Control*. October 2021:108632. doi:10.1016/j.foodcont.2021.108632
 39. Sobolik JS, Sajewski ET, Jaykus L-A, et al. Decontamination of SARS-CoV-2 from cold-chain food packaging provides no marginal benefit in risk reduction to food workers. *Food Control*. 2022:108845. doi:10.1016/j.foodcont.2022.108845
 40. Ailes EC, Leon JS, Jaykus LA, et al. Microbial concentrations on fresh produce are affected by postharvest processing, importation, and season. *J Food Prot*. 2008;71(12):2389-2397. doi:10.4315/0362-028X-71.12.2389
 41. Johnston LM, Jaykus LA, Moll D, Anciso J, Mora B, Moe CL. A field study of the

- microbiological quality of fresh produce of domestic and Mexican origin. *Int J Food Microbiol.* 2006;112(2):83-95. doi:10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2006.05.002
42. Newman KL, Bartz FE, Johnston L, Moe CL, Jaykus LA, Leon JS. Microbial load of fresh produce and paired equipment surfaces in packing facilities near the u.s. and Mexico border. *J Food Prot.* 2017;80(4):582-589. doi:10.4315/0362-028X.JFP-16-365
 43. Mora AM, Lewnard JA, Kogut K, et al. Risk Factors Associated with SARS-CoV-2 Infection among Farmworkers in Monterey County, California. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2021;4(9):1-16. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.24116
 44. Günther T, Czech-Sioli M, Indenbirken D, et al. SARS-CoV-2 outbreak investigation in a German meat processing plant. *EMBO Mol Med.* 2020;12(12):1-10. doi:10.15252/emmm.202013296
 45. Côté D, Durant S, MacEachen E, et al. A rapid scoping review of COVID-19 and vulnerable workers: Intersecting occupational and public health issues. *Am J Ind Med.* 2021;64(7):551-566. doi:10.1002/ajim.23256
 46. Azimi P, Keshavarz Z, Cedeno Laurent JG, Stephens B, Allen JG. Mechanistic transmission modeling of COVID-19 on the Diamond Princess cruise ship demonstrates the importance of aerosol transmission. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2021;118(8). doi:10.1073/pnas.2015482118
 47. Zhang X, Ji Z, Yue Y, Liu H, Wang J. Infection Risk Assessment of COVID-19 through Aerosol Transmission: a Case Study of South China Seafood Market. *Environ Sci Technol.* 2020;1-7. doi:10.1021/acs.est.0c02895
 48. Nicas M, Nazaroff WW, Hubbard A. Toward understanding the risk of secondary airborne infection: Emission of respirable pathogens. *J Occup Environ Hyg.* 2005;2(3):143-154. doi:10.1080/15459620590918466
 49. Han ZY, Weng WG, Huang QY. Characterizations of particle size distribution of the droplets exhaled by sneeze. *J R Soc Interface.* 2013;10(88):20130560. doi:10.1098/rsif.2013.0560
 50. Wang B, Wu H, Wan XF. Transport and fate of human expiratory droplets - A modeling approach. *Phys Fluids.* 2020;32(8). doi:10.1063/5.0021280
 51. Jayaweera M, Perera H, Gunawardana B, Manatunge J. Transmission of COVID-19 virus by droplets and aerosols: A critical review on the unresolved dichotomy. *Environ Res.* 2020;188(May). doi:10.1016/j.envres.2020.109819
 52. Bourouiba L, Dehandschoewercker E, Bush JWM. Violent expiratory events: On coughing and sneezing. *J Fluid Mech.* 2014;745(March 2014):537-563. doi:10.1017/jfm.2014.88
 53. Zhang X, Wang J. Dose-response Relation Deduced for Coronaviruses From Coronavirus Disease 2019, Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome, and Middle East Respiratory Syndrome: Meta-analysis Results and its Application for Infection Risk Assessment of Aerosol Transmission. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2020;73:241-245. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1675
 54. Kawamoto K, Leon JS. Summary of global guidance, guidelines or recommendations to prevent food workers from acquiring COVID-19. 2021. <https://etd.library.emory.edu/concern/etds/3f462661j?locale=en>.
 55. CDC, OSHA. Manufacturing Workers and Employers - Interim Guidance from CDC and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). *US Centers Dis Control Prev.* 2020;1-13. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/guidance-manufacturing-workers-employers.html>.

56. Grove SF, Suriyanarayanan A, Puli B, et al. Norovirus cross-contamination during preparation of fresh produce. *Int J Food Microbiol.* 2015;198:43-49. doi:10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2014.12.023
57. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). List N: Disinfectants for Coronavirus (COVID-19). Pesticide Registration. <https://www.epa.gov/coronavirus/about-list-n-disinfectants-coronavirus-covid-19-0>. Published 2020. Accessed March 15, 2021.
58. Ott W, Klepeis N, Switzer P. Air change rates of motor vehicles and in-vehicle pollutant concentrations from secondhand smoke. *J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol.* 2008;18(3):312-325. doi:10.1038/sj.jes.7500601
59. Chaudhry SK, Elumalai SP. The influence of school bus ventilation scenarios over in-cabin PM number concentration and air exchange rates. *Atmos Pollut Res.* 2020;11(8):1396-1407. doi:10.1016/j.apr.2020.05.021
60. Zhu Y, Hinds WC, Krudysz M, Kuhn T, Froines J, Sioutas C. Penetration of freeway ultrafine particles into indoor environments. *J Aerosol Sci.* 2005;36(3):303-322. doi:10.1016/j.jaerosci.2004.09.007
61. Thompson MG, Natarajan K, Irving SA, et al. Effectiveness of a Third Dose of mRNA Vaccines Against COVID-19–Associated Emergency Department and Urgent Care Encounters and Hospitalizations Among Adults During Periods of Delta and Omicron Variant Predominance. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2022;71(4):139-145. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7104e3
62. Pouillot R, Delignette-Muller ML. Evaluating variability and uncertainty separately in microbial quantitative risk assessment using two R packages. *Int J Food Microbiol.* 2010;142(3):330-340. doi:10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2010.07.011
63. Bade B, Ramirez S, Saxton D. *Always Essential, Perpetually Disposable: California Farmworkers and the COVID-19 Pandemic.*; 2021. <http://covid19farmworkerstudy.org/survey/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/COFS-PHASE-TWO-PRELIMINARY-REPORT-Final-1.pdf>.
64. Wei J, Li Y. Enhanced spread of expiratory droplets by turbulence in a cough jet. *Build Environ.* 2015;93(P2):86-96. doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2015.06.018
65. Ng OT, Marimuthu K, Koh V, et al. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence and transmission risk factors among high-risk close contacts: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2021;21(3):333-343. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30833-1
66. van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, et al. Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with SARS-CoV-1. *N Engl J Med.* 2020;382(16):1564-1567. doi:10.1056/NEJMc2004973
67. Rode E. Farmworker housing outbreak : 154 workers released from isolation Tuesday. Ventura County Star. <https://www.vcstar.com/story/news/local/2020/07/07/oxnard-farmworker-housing-covid-outbreak-coronavirus-recovery-rate/5387928002/>. Published 2020. Accessed July 7, 2021.
68. Qian H, Miao T, Liu L, Zheng X, Luo D, Li Y. Indoor transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *Indoor Air.* 2021;31(3):639-645. doi:10.1111/ina.12766
69. Bazant MZ, Bush JWM. A guideline to limit indoor airborne transmission of COVID-19. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2021;118(17). doi:10.1073/pnas.2018995118
70. Vlacha V, Feketea G, Petropoulou A, Trancá SD. The Significance of Duration of Exposure and Circulation of Fresh Air in SARS-CoV-2 Transmission Among Healthcare Workers. *Front Med.* 2021;8(June):1-7. doi:10.3389/fmed.2021.664297

71. Flocks J. The Potential Impact of COVID-19 on H-2A Agricultural Workers. *J Agromedicine*. 2020;25(4):367-369. doi:10.1080/1059924X.2020.1814922
72. Correia G, Rodrigues L, Gameiro da Silva M, Gonçalves T. Airborne route and bad use of ventilation systems as non-negligible factors in SARS-CoV-2 transmission. *Med Hypotheses*. 2020;141(April). doi:10.1016/j.mehy.2020.109781
73. Lee H, Ahn KH. Estimate of the critical exposure time based on 70 confirmed COVID-19 cases. *J Korean Phys Soc*. 2021;79(5):492-498. doi:10.1007/s40042-021-00225-9
74. Kennedy M, Lee SJ, Epstein M. Modeling aerosol transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in multi-room facility. *J Loss Prev Process Ind*. 2021;69:104336. doi:10.1016/j.jlp.2020.104336
75. Curtius J, Granzin M, Schrod J. Testing mobile air purifiers in a school classroom: Reducing the airborne transmission risk for SARS-CoV-2. *Aerosol Sci Technol*. 2021;55(5):586-599. doi:10.1080/02786826.2021.1877257
76. Fischer EP, Fischer MC, Grass D, Henrion I, Warren WS, Westman E. Low-cost measurement of face mask efficacy for filtering expelled droplets during speech. *Sci Adv*. 2020;6(36):2-7. doi:10.1126/sciadv.abd3083
77. Lindsley WG, Blachere FM, Law BF, Beezhold DH, Noti JD. Efficacy of face masks, neck gaiters and face shields for reducing the expulsion of simulated cough-generated aerosols. *Aerosol Sci Technol*. 2021;55(4):449-457. doi:10.1080/02786826.2020.1862409
78. Ueki H, Furusawa Y, Iwatsuki-Horimoto K, et al. Effectiveness of Face Masks in Preventing Airborne Transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *mSphere*. 2020;5(5):2-6. doi:10.1128/msphere.00637-20
79. Doung-Ngern P, Suphanchaimat R, Panjangampatthana A, et al. Case-Control Study of Use of Personal Protective Measures and Risk for SARS-CoV 2 Infection, Thailand. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020;26(11):2607-2616. doi:10.3201/eid2611.203003
80. Moghaddar M, Radman R, Macreadie I. Severity, pathogenicity and transmissibility of delta and lambda variants of SARS-CoV-2, toxicity of spike protein and possibilities for future prevention of COVID-19. *Microorganisms*. 2021;9(10). doi:10.3390/microorganisms9102167
81. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) COVID-19 Response Team. SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.529 (Omicron) Variant — United States, December 1–8, 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2021;70(50):1731-1734. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7050e1
82. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Improve How Your Mask Protects You. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/your-health/effective-masks.html>. Published 2021. Accessed December 15, 2021.
83. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). COVID-19 Types of Masks and Respirators Key Messages : Choosing a Mask or Respirator for Different Situations. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/types-of-masks.html#print>. Published 2022. Accessed March 16, 2022.
84. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). Protecting Workers: Guidance on Mitigating and Preventing the Spread of COVID-19 in the Workplace. <https://www.osha.gov/coronavirus/safework>. Published 2021. Accessed March 16, 2022.
85. COVID-19 Farmworker Study. *Oregon Fires Exacerbate COVID-19 Impact on Farmworkers' Health, Housing, and Livelihoods.*; 2020. https://cirsinc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Preliminary-Data-Brief_OR_COFS_-9.22.20.pdf.
86. Howard J, Huang A, Li Z, et al. An evidence review of face masks against COVID-19. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2021;118(4):1-12. doi:10.1073/pnas.2014564118

87. Farthing TS, Lanzas C. Assessing the efficacy of interventions to control indoor SARS-Cov-2 transmission: An agent-based modeling approach. *Epidemics*. 2021;37:100524. doi:10.1016/j.epidem.2021.100524
88. Kerr CC, Stuart RM, Mistry D, et al. Covasim: An agent-based model of COVID-19 dynamics and interventions. *PLoS Comput Biol*. 2021;17(7):1-32. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009149
89. Liggans G, Dutilly D, Carrington-Liggans K, et al. Interventions and compliance: How the response to COVID-19 reflects decades of retail food protection efforts. *J Agric Food Syst Community Dev*. 2020;10(1):1-5. doi:10.5304/jafscd.2020.101.007
90. Mogren L, Windstam S, Boqvist S, et al. The hurdle approach-A holistic concept for controlling food safety risks associated with pathogenic bacterial contamination of leafy green vegetables. A review. *Front Microbiol*. 2018;9(AUG):1-20. doi:10.3389/fmicb.2018.01965
91. Shi K-W, Huang Y-H, Quon H, Ou-Yang Z-L, Wang C, Jiang SC. Quantifying the risk of indoor drainage system in multi-unit apartment building as a transmission route of SARS-CoV-2. *Sci Total Environ*. 2021;762:1-11. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.143056
92. Wilson AM, Weir MH, Bloomfield SF, Scott EA, Reynolds KA. Modeling COVID-19 infection risks for a single hand-to-fomite scenario and potential risk reductions offered by surface disinfection. *Am J Infect Control*. 2020;000:1-3. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2020.11.013
93. Dada AC, Gyawali P. Quantitative microbial risk assessment (QMRA) of occupational exposure to SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater treatment plants. *Sci Total Environ*. 2021;763. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.142989
94. King WC, Rubinstein M, Reinhart A, Mejia R. Time trends, factors associated with, and reasons for COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy: A massive online survey of US adults from January-May 2021. Stimpson JP, ed. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(12):e0260731. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0260731
95. Gehlbach D, Vázquez E, Ortiz G, et al. COVID-19 Testing and Vaccine Hesitancy in Latinx Farm-Working Communities in The Eastern Coachella Valley. *Res Sq*. 2021:1-17. doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-587686/v1
96. European Union Occupational Safety and Health Administration (EU-OSHA). COVID-19: Back to the workplace - Adapting workplaces and protecting workers. <https://osha.europa.eu/en/publications/covid-19-back-workplace-adapting-workplaces-and-protecting-workers/view>. Published 2020. Accessed March 15, 2021.
97. World Health Organization (WHO). *Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 : Implications for Infection Prevention Precautions.*; 2020. <https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/transmission-of-sars-cov-2-implications-for-infection-prevention-precautions>.
98. World Health Organization (WHO). Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) advice for the public: When and how to use masks. 2021:2021. <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/advice-for-public/when-and-how-to-use-masks>.
99. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). *Agriculture Workers and Employers: Interim Guidance from CDC and the U.S. Department of Labor.*; 2020. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/guidance-agricultural-workers.html>.
100. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). *Guidance for Organizing Large*

- Events and Gatherings Risk Factors to Consider.*; 2021.
<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/large-events/considerations-for-events-gatherings.html#print>.
101. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). COVID-19 Guidance for Shared or Congregate Housing Review, update, and implement emergency operations plans (EOPs).
 102. Oregon Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). *Temporary Administrative Rule Addressing the COVID- 19 Public Health Emergency in Labor Housing and Agricultural Employment.*; 2020.
<https://osha.oregon.gov/OSHARules/div1/437-001-0749.pdf>.
 103. U.S. Food & Drug Administration (FDA), Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). *Employee Health and Food Safety Checklist for Human and Animal Food Operations During the COVID-19 Pandemic.* Washington, DC; 2020.

6. Tables & Figures.




Figure 1. Scenarios impacting daily cumulative risks of SARS-CoV-2 exposure for an indoor and outdoor produce worker. *Left – Daily Worker Scenarios.* Simulations were conducted in which workers were engaged in three overarching daily scenarios: shared transportation, working shift, and shared housing (see Methods). Simulations were done in which the workers take a 1h break during their work shift in a break room (indoor) or inside their bus transportation (outdoor). ***Right – Scenario QMRA Model.*** Each scenario simulates the risk of SARS-CoV-2 transmission (aerosol-, droplet-, and fomite-mediated), from an infected, coughing co-worker, and the impact of infection control strategies (red lines), adjusted for the context of each scenario (see Methods).

Table 1. Cumulative Risk and Risk Reduction (%) of SARS-CoV-2 Infection for a Susceptible Indoor Produce Worker Exposed to an Infected Co-Worker

Infection Control Strategy	Shared Car Transportation	Work Shift Distancing		Break in Breakroom	Private Housing	Daily Cumulative Risk* Distancing	
		1m	2m			1m	2m
None [†]	0.664 (0.325–0.943)	1.00 (0.977–1.00)	0.387 (0.162–0.731)	0.021 (0.008–0.053)	None	1.00 (0.992–1.00)	0.802 (0.472–0.984)
Handwashing & Surface Disinfection [‡]	No	1.00 (0.00%)	0.361 (6.59%)	No	None	1.00 (0.00%)	0.792 (1.25%)
Cloth Mask [‡]	0.148 (77.7%)	0.845 (15.5%)	0.080 (79.4%)	No	None	0.876 (12.4%)	0.226 (71.8%)
Surgical Mask [‡]	0.099 (85.1%)	0.694 (30.6%)	0.056 (85.5%)	No	None	0.735 (26.5%)	0.158 (80.3%)
Double Mask [‡]	0.023 (96.5%)	0.274 (72.6%)	0.018 (95.4%)	No	None	0.320 (68.0%)	0.048 (94.0%)
Increased Air Exchange [‡]	0.125 (81.2%)	0.896 (10.4%)	0.049 (87.2%)	0.004 (81.0%)	None	0.916 (8.40%)	0.181 (77.4%)

[†] Values represent Median (95% Uncertainty Interval) SARS-CoV-2 infection risk.

[‡] Values represent Median (% Reduction) SARS-CoV-2 infection risk compared to no Infection Control Strategy. “No” indicates the Infection Control Strategy was not applied (see Methods). “None” means that there was no risk of infection in the private housing scenario.

* Assuming there is contact between an infected and susceptible individual in every worker scenario.

Table 2. Cumulative Risk and Risk Reduction (%) of SARS-CoV-2 Infection for a Susceptible Outdoor Produce Worker Exposed to an Infected Co-Worker

Infection Control Strategy	Shared Bus Transportation	Work Shift Distancing		Rest Break in the Bus	Shared Housing	Daily Cumulative Risk* Distancing	
		1m	2m			1m	2m
None [†]	0.010 (0.003–0.031)	0.316 (0.098–0.768)	0.008 (0.003–0.019)	0.012 (0.005–0.027)	0.190 (0.075–0.411)	0.483 (0.255–0.821)	0.215 (0.095–0.441)
Handwashing & Surface Disinfection [‡]	No	0.315 (0.21%)	0.007 (4.47%)	No	No	0.482 (0.15%)	0.2148 (0.11%)
Cloth Mask [‡]	0.001 (85.5%)	0.055 (82.7%)	0.001 (83.4%)	No	0.036 (80.9%)	0.112 (76.7%)	0.052 (76.0%)
Surgical Mask [‡]	9.3x10 ⁻⁴ (90.7%)	0.034 (89.2%)	8.5x10 ⁻⁴ (88.9%)	No	0.026 (86.5%)	0.079 (83.4%)	0.040 (81.4%)
Double Mask [‡]	2.2x10 ⁻⁴ (97.8%)	0.009 (97.2%)	2.7x10 ⁻⁴ (96.5%)	No	0.012 (93.7%)	0.039 (91.8%)	0.026 (88.1%)
Increased Air Exchange [‡]	0.005 (45.2%)	N/A	N/A	No	0.098 (48.6%)	0.404 (16.2%)	0.122 (43.1%)

[†] Values represent Median (95% Uncertainty Interval) SARS-CoV-2 infection risk.

[‡] Values represent Median (% Reduction) SARS-CoV-2 infection risk compared to no Infection Control Strategy. “No” indicates the Infection Control Strategy was not applied (see Methods). “N/A” means that it is not applicable to apply increased air exchange in an outdoor environment.

* Assuming there is contact between an infected and susceptible individual in every worker scenario.




Figure 2. Indoor produce workers experience the greatest reduction in SARS-CoV-2 infection risk when vaccinations are applied in combination with recommended infection control strategies. Combined infection control interventions represent simultaneous surgical mask usage, hourly handwashing, surface disinfection (twice per work shift), and an increased air exchange rate per scenario. For the sub-optimal vaccine efficacy intervention, the susceptible worker was assumed to have a 64–80% reduction (mean: 72.0%, 95% UI: 64.6–79.6%) in infection risk, representative of either receiving one dose of the Johnson & Johnson vaccine, a single dose of the two-dose mRNA vaccine series, or reduced vaccine efficacy against novel SARS-CoV-2 variants^{29,31,32}. For the optimal vaccine efficacy intervention, the susceptible worker was assumed to have an 86–99% reduction (mean: 92.3%, 95% UI: 86.3–98.7%) in infection risk which is representative of receiving both doses in the two-dose mRNA vaccine series and is derived from Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna vaccine effectiveness data^{33,34}. Risk reductions were calculated by comparing the risk estimate per intervention scenario against the baseline (no intervention) risk estimate. The top row represents the baseline (reference) daily cumulative infection risk for an indoor produce worker, across the 2 h shared car transportation and 12 h indoor food manufacturing work shift (at 2 m distance) scenario with no infection control strategies applied. The median risk of infection is denoted by the line within each box plot, with error bars representing the 95% uncertainty interval.




Figure 3. Outdoor produce workers experience the greatest reduction in SARS-CoV-2 infection risk when vaccinations are applied in combination with non-pharmaceutical interventions. Combined infection control interventions represent simultaneous surgical mask usage, hourly handwashing, surface disinfection (twice per work shift), and an increased air exchange rate per scenario. For the sub-optimal vaccine efficacy intervention, the susceptible worker was assumed to have a 64–80% reduction (mean: 72.0%, 95% UI: 64.6–79.6%) in infection risk, representative of either receiving one dose of the Johnson & Johnson vaccine, a single dose of the two-dose mRNA vaccine series, or reduced vaccine efficacy against novel SARS-CoV-2 variants^{29,31,32}. For the optimal vaccine efficacy intervention, the susceptible worker was assumed to have an 86–99% reduction (mean: 92.3%, 95% UI: 86.3–98.7%) in infection risk which is representative of receiving both doses in the two-dose mRNA vaccine series and is derived from Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna vaccine effectiveness data^{33,34}. Risk reductions were calculated by comparing the risk estimate per intervention scenario against the baseline (no intervention) risk estimate. The top row represents the baseline daily cumulative risk of infection for an outdoor produce worker, summed across the 2 h shared bus transportation, 12 h outdoor field harvesting shift (at 1 m distance), and 10 h shared housing scenario with no interventions applied. The median risk of infection is denoted by the line within each box plot, with error bars representing the 95% uncertainty interval.

7. Graphical Abstract.

