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Summary and Implications
As part of a pork producer odor survey conducted in 2002, respondents were asked to provide information on things they were doing to improve neighbor relations. The open-ended question provided a wide range of responses. It was evident that many producers are working with neighbors to better inform them about their pork production operation and when they may be doing activities such as applying manure, etc. Primary items producers are doing to improve neighbor relations are communication, treating them with respect, and considering weather before applying manure. This would include wind direction, air temperature, etc. Another grouping of items included manure application timing, providing pork/gifts, keeping facilities and landscaping looking nice, and facility location or siting.

Producers do things to improve neighbor relations. About 30 percent indicated they check the weather before deciding to apply manure; and/or they communicate with the neighbors informing them when manure will be applied. Another one-in-six respondents indicated they use landscaping around the facility to improve its appearance.

Introduction
Pork producers can do things to improve neighbor relations. These can include items such as informing neighbors about the operation, communicating with neighbors and treating them with respect. In 2002 a survey was sent to Iowa pork producers. The survey obtained a wide variety of information ranging from production facility information to things that producers are doing to improve neighbor relations. This report will focus on the neighbor relations information.

Materials and Methods
Surveys were structured to obtain information on items producers are doing to improve neighbor relations, characteristics of Iowa pork producers, and level and use of odor control methods. Information on items done to improved neighbor relations was collected through use of an open-ended question. Responses were then grouped into common areas.

The surveys were sent to Iowa pork producers. The mailing list was coordinated with the Iowa Pork Producers Association. There were 3,249 surveys sent in early August 2002. Of these, 575 were returned; 13 were no longer raising pigs leaving 562 usable surveys. There were 251 producers who responded to the improving neighbor relations question.

Results and Discussion
Table 1 corresponds to the open-ended question that asked producers to indicate other things that they are doing to improve neighbor relations. There were 251 producers who responded to the question and there were 345 responses due to multiple replies by some respondents. The summary and analysis responses were classified into the following categories.

- **Weather (Rain, Wind, and Temp)** – Indicated applying manure after, before, or during one or more weather conditions.
- **Communications/Neighbor Relations/Respect** – Indicated interaction with their neighbors or their community in order to determine suggestions, provide community involvement, friendly interactions with neighbors.
- **Landscaping Upkeep of Facility & Area** – Indicated that they try to improve the appearance of their facilities and area around facilities.
- **Timing of Application** – Indicated that they attempt to spread or avoid spreading manure during certain times such as avoiding holidays, neighbor gatherings, or weekends.
- **Give Pork/Gift/Manure** – Indicated that they tried to provide a gift or service to neighbors. This ranged from gifts of pork; to moving snow; to providing manure.
- **Location of Facility/and Where Manure Applied** – Indicated that they tried to place or avoid placing facilities and manure in certain areas. This ranged from facility placement to avoiding traveling along highways with manure.
- **Limit Exposure/Number of Applications** – This included everything from the number of applications to volume applied to applying as rapidly as possible.
- **Incorporate/Inject** – Indicated incorporation or injections. Ranged from knifing the manure in to injecting and disking the manure.
- **Other** – Indicated a response that does not match a category.
- **Facility Type/Operation Type** – Indicated that a system or facility type reduces the odor or complaints.

Weather and communication with neighbors were the most predominant answers with 30 percent of the
respondents indicating they did each of these. Landscaping, timing of application, gifts, and location of facility or manure application were also very popular with from 10 to 16 percent of the respondents indicating they did these things. Limiting exposure, incorporation or injection, facility type, and all others received numerous responses but each represented less than 10 percent of the respondents.

Table 12. Items that producers are doing to improve neighbor relations (mail survey).\(^{(a)}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weather (Rain, Wind, and Temp)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications/ Neighbor Relations/ Respect</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping Upkeep of Facility &amp; Area</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing of Application</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give Pork/Gift/Manure</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Facility/ and Where Applied</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit Exposure/ Number of Applications</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate/ Inject</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Type / Operation Type</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Responses</td>
<td>345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{(a)}\) There were 251 participants who responded and there were 345 responses.