At-a-glance: Transportation Survey Results

416 Respondents
8,217 welfare comments

Dominant Concerns
- Stocking density during transport
- Handling
- Feed & water
- Transport times
- Weather conditions

Provinces with highest response rate
- ON 25%
- BC 18%
- AB 17%

A few findings taken from the survey, March 5 - 31, 2019

Other Concerns
- Biosecurity
- Driving conditions
- Emergency preparedness
- Transport fitness
- Trip experience

Top 5 groups of survey-takers
- Livestock producer
- Animal welfare advocate
- General public
- Consumer
- Livestock transporter
Background

Nearly two decades have passed since the Code of practice for the care and handling of farm animals: transportation was drafted in 2001. The intervening years have seen technology evolve and research advance. Regulations have been updated and animal welfare awareness enhanced both industry-wide and amongst the public.

Recently, the National Farm Animal Care Council (NFACC) and numerous stakeholders committed to updating the Code to reflect these advancements. The updated Code of Practice for the Transportation of Livestock and Poultry will follow NFACC’s Code development process, with anticipated completion in the spring of 2023.

The revision process began with a survey open to any and all stakeholders and members of the public interested in sharing their concerns.

Survey Response

NFACC’s online survey was open for three weeks, from March 5th to 31st, 2019. Interested members of the public were invited to contribute their top-of-mind concerns, assisting the Code committee in identifying the most pressing considerations relating to animal transportation practices.

We received responses from 416 survey participants from across Canada. Thank you to everyone who took the time to contribute and offer personal insights on so many significant issues. The data we obtained serves as one of the primary means of incorporating your knowledge and concerns into the Code revision process.

Where do the survey respondents live?

- Ontario 106 (25.48%)
- British Columbia 76 (18.27%)
- Alberta 71 (17.07%)
- Québec 62 (14.90%)
- Saskatchewan 38 (9.13%)
- Manitoba 37 (8.89%)
- Nova Scotia 11 (2.64%)
• United States 7 (1.68%)
• New Brunswick 5 (1.20%)
• Other 2 (0.48%)
• Newfoundland and Labrador 1 (0.24%)

Who took part?

We were pleased to receive responses encompassing a diverse range of perspectives, including those with relevant on-farm and transport experience. Note that respondents were able to identify as belonging to more than one group.

• Producer - livestock 140 (33.65%)
• Animal welfare advocate 134 (32.21%)
• General public 122 (29.33%)
• Consumer 100 (24.04%)
• Transporter - livestock 57 (13.70%)
• Veterinarian 31 (7.45%)
• Allied industry representative 29 (6.97%)
• Animal welfare enforcement 28 (6.73%)
• Producer – poultry 27 (6.49%)
• Researcher/academic 22 (5.29%)
• Government 17 (4.09%)
• Sites where animals are temporarily offloaded 16 (3.85%)
• Processor 15 (3.61%)
• Transporter - poultry 14 (3.37%)
• Retail and food service 11 (2.64%)
• Catcher (poultry) 4 (0.96%)
• Hatchery 2 (0.48%)
What was top-of-mind for survey respondents?

From 416 responses, 8,217 unique welfare comments were extracted. From those comments, five specific welfare concerns were identified.

1 **Stocking density:** Respondents commented on overcrowding, animal comfort including ability to turn around and lie down during transport, specific stocking densities for some species, and stocking density at transition sites with reference to adequate space and overcrowding. Concerns related to all species, whether transported in crates or in trailers.

   “Loading density lowered by 10% if dairy cattle or horned animals are transported longer than 12 hrs.”

   “Overcrowding and preventing them from moving freely is barbaric.”

   “Mammals especially should be able to lie down on long trips.”

   “All assembly points should be large enough for the animals to move about and lie down.”

2 **Handling:** Respondents emphasized the need for appropriate handling practices for both container and trailer loading to avoid animal stress; proper use of tools such as electric prods, with some respondents seeking elimination of such tools; and concern over ramps including the need for non-slip flooring, appropriate slope, and suitable working condition.
“Care should be taken, but loading/unloading should be encouraged to occur in a timely manner.”

“Due care in handling animals – no harm or force inflicted on animals.”

“Stress free loading and handling appropriate for the species transported.”

“Equipment used to load and haul animals must be in good operating condition.”

“Prohibit the use of electric prods and other handling techniques that may cause distress.”

“Good stockmanship being used, clear instructions on use of electric prods.”

“Ramp slope and grip.”

3 Feed and water: Here respondents expressed concerns over access to food and water before, during, and immediately after transport; restricting transport time if food and water are not available; duration of time without water; accessibility to water; dehydration; and feed and water at transition sites.

“I feel transport times are too long without rest and water and feed. However, I understand on the more practical side to offload and load can be hazardous as well to animals and handlers. Is it impossible with environment in Canada to run trucks with feed and water capabilities?”

“Animals should be provided adequate food and water during transport.”

“Long distance hauling with no breaks for water nor food in excess of 12 hours.”

“Trailers for large animals should be equipped with species-specific on-board water drinkers.”

“Have enough waterer and feeder space at stop points.”

4 Transport times: Concerns related to all species and included lack of feed and water during transport, decreased transport times, maximum transport duration when feed and water are limited, delays in transport for various reasons leading to longer transport times, need for more rest facilities and rest stops, unloading and reloading causing increased animal stress, and the importance of avoiding live transport particularly for certain species.
“Clear guidelines on transport length before feed/water is required for each species.”

“It is no longer appropriate to overcrowd, expose to extreme heat or cold, and travel for more than 4 hours without water being available – and 8 hours without food. Their comfort and stress level is IMPORTANT – if not for humane reasons, then because the stress levels produce less than quality meat.”

“Rest areas should be provided.”

“I am a commuter on the 401. I see these livestock trucks every day, and the fact that they have to be confined on those trucks waiting during accidents and traffic jams and all sorts of weather conditions is quite frankly appalling. I am sickened that this is allowed and we can’t do better for them. I think the livestock trucks should at least be able to drive on the shoulder and not be left to have to be forced to sit waiting and be traumatized even more than they already are.”

“Waiting time at abattoirs/accommodation capacity of stables/unloading speed.”

“Ensuring feed, water and rest intervals are being met as per Health of Animals Regulations.”

“Loading and unloading is more stressful, in most cases, than being transported.”

“On-farm slaughter seems much more appropriate than shipping bison, in particular.”

**Weather conditions:** Respondents were concerned about exposure to weather conditions such as wind, rain, and snow as well as exposure to extreme temperatures; establishing species-specific temperature thresholds; adequate and weather-dependent ventilation; and the need for monitoring and adjusting for animal health and comfort by various methods during extreme temperatures.

“Protection from wind/rain/snow during cold or wet weather.”

“Animals being transported in -30 & +30 degree temperatures.”

“Healthy temperatures for the animals – number of animals – being transported.”

“Understanding of trailer microclimate conditions and reduction of related risk factors.”
**Were any other issues identified?**

Respondents listed a variety of other concerns—though with less frequency than the five predominant issues catalogued above—that were grouped within these topics:

- Biosecurity
- Transport fitness
- Driving conditions
- Trip experience
- Emergency preparedness

**How will the survey results be used?**

Your survey input has real and tangible value to the revision process. It assists the Code working groups and committee members in understanding public concerns and priorities as they prepare to update and improve the current Code.

Revisions and updates must progress through a series of rigorous, science-informed steps, as outlined in the Code development process. This process includes a further opportunity for public input: after the committee completes its revisions, the draft Code will be posted for feedback during a 60-day public comment period.

“Trailers equipped for adequate ventilation depending on weather.”
Please consider participating during that time. All comments received are reviewed and considered in the context of improving and finalizing the Code.

**Thank you**

NFACC and all involved in revising this Code thank you for sharing your unique insights. Your participation is vital—your feedback, knowledge, and proposed solutions contribute to an improved and updated Code, one that ensures the transportation of farmed animals in the most humane, safe, and effective manner possible.

For more information on NFACC and the [Code development process](http://www.nfacc.ca), please visit [www.nfacc.ca](http://www.nfacc.ca).

*Funding for this project has been provided through the AgriAssurance Program under the Canadian Agricultural Partnership, a federal–provincial–territorial initiative.*