

---

## Sponsors

---

### **University of Minnesota**

College of Veterinary Medicine

College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences

Extension Service

Swine Center

Thank you to **IDEXX Laboratories** for their financial support to reproduce the conference proceeding book.

### **Production Leader**

Steven Claas

### **Production Assistant**

Steven Claas

Janice Storebo

Sarah Summerbell

### **Layout and CD-ROM**

David Brown

Tina Smith

### **Logo Design**

Ruth Cronje, and Jan Swanson;

based on the original design by Dr. Robert Dunlop

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, or sexual orientation.

**A comparison of selected swine production and management parameter estimates between the  
National Animal Health Monitoring System's (NAHMS)  
Swine 2006 and Swine 2000 national surveys**

**C.A. Haley<sup>1</sup>, G.W. Hill<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Centers for Epidemiology and Animal Health, USDA:APHIS:VS, Fort Collins, CO.

**Abstract**

Roughly every five years the National Animal Health Monitoring System (NAHMS) in cooperation with the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) conducts a study of the national herd and collects information on production measures, management techniques, and swine health data. This is done through three questionnaires given to cooperating producers selected from the NASS national list frame and by collecting biological samples. Results from the first of these questionnaires, the Swine 2006 General Swine Farm Report (GSFR) were recently published. The report-Swine 2006

Part I: Baseline Reference of Swine Health and Management, 2006 contains a series of descriptive tables of population estimates of production measures and management techniques. These estimates were generated after validation and weighting of individual observations in the data set using SAS and SUDANN statistical software. The same methods were followed in the Swine 2000 GSFR report and many of the descriptive analysis tables examined the same variables and were cross classified in the same way. Cross classification involves examining the variables that are in the survey broken out by regions involved in the study (North, East Central, West Central and South), total inventory on the farm (less than 2,000, 2,000 to 4,999, 5,000 or more), or where applicable total breeding inventory on the site (less than 250, 250 to 499, 500 or more).

There was a decline across all regions in 2006 in the percentage of sites that contained a gestation or farrowing facility when compared to 2000. However, the most significant drop was in the West Central states. Sites with gestation phases dropped from 65.9 (3.1)<sup>2</sup> percent to 48.8 (2.8) percent while sites with a farrowing phase dropped from 66.2 (3.1) percent to 47.4 (2.8) percent. Fewer gestating sows and gilts were housed in an open building with outside access

in 2006 (5.6 (0.7) percent) as compared to 2000 (14.7 (1.6) percent) across all sites surveyed.

Breeding herd farrowing and weaning productivity across all sites surveyed have increased in two areas between 2000 and 2006. Total born per litter has increased by over half a piglet (10.9 (0.0) in 2000 to 11.5 (0.1) in 2006) on average and the number weaned per litter has increased by on average by half a pig (8.9 (0.0) in 2000 to 9.4 (0.1) in 2006). Weaning age averaged across all producers has not changed but sites with a larger sow and gilt inventory appear to have shifted their weaning ages to a slightly later age. In 2006, 22.1 (3.6) percent of sites with 500 or more sows and gilts weaned at 21 to 27 days compared to 2000 when only 6.3 (1.3) percent of sites in the same inventory strata did so.

The percentage of sites using certain disease prevention practices has changed in the past five years as well. Among those surveyed the percentage of sites that used any vaccine regularly decreased from 76.0 (1.5) in 2000 to 61.4 (1.3) percent of sites in 2006. The use of PRRS vaccine occurred on 19.2 (1.1) percent of sites in 2006 as compared to 28.3 (1.6) percent of sites in 2000. The use of a local practitioner decreased from 66.9 (1.5) percent of sites in 2000 to 49.5 (1.4) percent of sites in 2006.

<sup>2</sup>Standard Error of Estimate