

Quantification of soy-based feed ingredient entry from ASFV-positive countries to the United States by ocean freight shipping and associated seaports.

Gilbert Patterson¹, Megan Niederwerder², Gordon Spronk³, and Scott Dee⁴

¹VetNOW

²Kansas State University

³Affiliation not available

⁴Pipestone Veterinary Services

September 10, 2020

Abstract

African swine fever virus (ASFV) can survive in soy-based products for 30 days with $T_{1/2}$ ranging from 9.6-12.9 days in soybean meals and soy oil cake. As the US imports soy-based products from several ASFV-positive countries, knowledge of the type and quantity of these specific imports, and their ports of entry (POE), is necessary information to manage risk. Using the data from the International Trade Commission Harmonized Tariff Schedule website in conjunction with pivot tables, we analyzed imports across air, land, and sea POE of soy-based products from 43 ASFV-positive countries to the US during 2018 and 2019. In 2018, 104,366 metric tons (MT) of soy-based products, specifically conventional and organic soybean meal, soybeans, soy oil cake and soy oil were imported from these countries into the US via seaports only. The two largest suppliers were China (52.7 %, 55,034 MT) and the Ukraine (42.9%, 44,775 MT). In 2019, 73,331 MT entered the US and 54.7% (40,143 MT) came from the Ukraine and 8.4% (6,182 MT) from China. Regarding POE, 80.9% to 83.2% of soy-based imports from China entered the US at the seaports of San Francisco, CA and Seattle, WA, while 89.4% to 100% entered from the Ukraine via the seaports of New Orleans, LA and Charlotte, NC. Analysis of five-year trends (2015 to 2019) of the volume of soy imports from China indicated reduction over time (with a noticeably sharp decrease between 2018 and 2019), and seaport utilization was consistent. In contrast, volume remained high for Ukrainian soy imports, and seaport utilization was inconsistent. Overall, this exercise introduced a new approach to collect objective data on an important risk factor, providing researchers, government officials, and industry stakeholders a means to objectively identify and quantify potential channels of foreign animal disease entry into the US.

Short communication

Quantification of soy-based feed ingredient entry from ASFV-positive countries to the United States by ocean freight shipping and associated seaports.

Short running title: Soy-based products and seaports

Patterson, Gilbert^{1*}; Niederwerder, Megan C.²; Spronk, Gordon³; Dee, Scott A.³

¹One Health Solution, VetNOW, Canonsburg, PA. gpatterson@vetnow.com

²Department of Diagnostic Medicine/Pathobiology, College of Veterinary Medicine, Kansas State University Manhattan, KS. mniederwerder@vet.k-state.edu

³Pipestone Applied Research, Pipestone Veterinary Services, Pipestone, MN,

scott.dee@pipestone.com, gordon.spronk@pipestone.com

***Correspondence:** Scott Dee, Pipestone Applied Research, Pipestone Veterinary Services; Pipestone, MN.

scott.dee@pipestone.com

Keywords: swine, feed ingredients, soybean meal, ASFV, seaports

Summary

African swine fever virus (ASFV) can survive in soy-based products for 30 days with $T_{\frac{1}{2}}$ ranging from 9.6-12.9 days in soybean meals and soy oil cake. As the US imports soy-based products from several ASFV-positive countries, knowledge of the type and quantity of these specific imports, and their ports of entry (POE), is necessary information to manage risk. Using the data from the International Trade Commission Harmonized Tariff Schedule website in conjunction with pivot tables, we analyzed imports across air, land, and sea POE of soy-based products from 43 ASFV-positive countries to the US during 2018 and 2019. In 2018, 104,366 metric tons (MT) of soy-based products, specifically conventional and organic soybean meal, soybeans, soy oil cake and soy oil were imported from these countries into the US via seaports only. The two largest suppliers were China (52.7 %, 55,034 MT) and the Ukraine (42.9%, 44,775 MT). In 2019, 73,331 MT entered the US and 54.7% (40,143 MT) came from the Ukraine and 8.4% (6,182 MT) from China. Regarding POE, 80.9% to 83.2% of soy-based imports from China entered the US at the seaports of San Francisco, CA and Seattle, WA, while 89.4% to 100% entered from the Ukraine via the seaports of New Orleans, LA and Charlotte, NC. Analysis of five-year trends (2015 to 2019) of the volume of soy imports from China indicated reduction over time (with a noticeably sharp decrease between 2018 and 2019), and seaport utilization was consistent. In contrast, volume remained high for Ukrainian soy imports, and seaport utilization was inconsistent. Overall, this exercise introduced a new approach to collect objective data on an important risk factor, providing researchers, government officials, and industry stakeholders a means to objectively identify and quantify potential channels of foreign animal disease entry into the US.

Introduction

As African swine fever virus (ASFV) continues to spread across Europe and Asia (Dixon, Sun & Roberts, 2019), the United States Department of Agriculture has worked hard to identify potential risks for viral entry to the country and develop national response plans (USDA, 2020). While the primary focus has been on the risk of illegal entry of pork products, along with travelers from ASFV-positive countries (Taylor et al. 2019, Ito S, Jurado C, Sanchez-Vizcaino JM, & Isoda N, 2020), the possibility of ASFV entry via the importation of contaminated feed ingredients continues to gain recognition, based on a growing body of scientific evidence (Dee et al. 2018, Niederwerder et al. 2019, Stoian A et al. 2019, Dee et al. 2020). Recent publications have described the transmission of ASFV to naïve pigs following consumption of contaminated feed, along with the calculation of the minimum infectious oral dose in feed (Niederwerder et al. 2019). Survival of ASFV in several feed ingredients has been documented out to at least 30 days post-inoculation using shipping models simulating movement of feed ingredients from Eastern Europe to the US (Dee et al. 2018, Stoian et al. 2019). A consistent observation across all these studies was the ability of ASFV to survive in soy-based products, i.e., conventional (high protein/low fat) soybean meal, organic (low protein/high fat), soybean meal and soy oil cake, with reported half-lives of 9.6, 12.9, and 12.4 days, respectively (Dee et al. 2018, Stoian et al. 2019). This information justifies the need to understand the countries of origin of these specific ingredients, the respective volumes imported, and US ports of entry (POE) utilized. Access to these data would allow regulatory agencies to focus efforts and dedicate resources to a subset of critical ports, rather than the 329 US ports of entry (seaports, border crossings, and airports) currently overseen by Customs and Border Protection (United States Customs and Border Protection, 2020). Therefore, the purpose of this short communication was to conduct an analytical exercise to generate this information.

Methods

The exercise focused primarily on the years 2018 and 2019, but also evaluated data from 2015 to 2019. Information on the type and quantity of soy-based feed ingredients and their specific POE was obtained at the International Trade Commission Harmonized Tariff Schedule website (www.hs.usitc.gov), a publicly available website that provides a transaction of specific trade commodities between the US and its international trading partners. In the website database, each trade commodity was identified by a specific 10-digit code known as the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS), which was used for determining tariff classifications for all goods imported into the United States. Each commodity was classified based on the product’s name, use, and the material type, resulting in over 17,000 unique classification code numbers. Importing countries selected for inclusion in the analysis were obtained from the 43 ASFV-positive countries listed on the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) ASFV Watch List (Appendix A). These countries, spread across Asia, Africa, and Europe, have been determined high-risk areas for potential ASFV contamination of feed (Barr 2019). Specific queries on eight specific HTS codes pertaining to soy-based feed ingredients and the 43 countries were designed on the USITC website to create a comprehensive analysis which provided information on country of origin, quantity of product, year of entry, and POE into the US for each HTS code. Data were exported into Microsoft Excel and filtered into pivot tables to answer a series of questions:

1. **What are the types of soy-based products that enter the US from the 43 ASFV-positive countries?**
2. **Across the 43 ASFV-positive countries, where do most of the soy-based products come from?**
3. **What POE receive these high-risk imports?**
4. **Do POE for soy-based products change over time?**

Results

Upon completion of the analysis, answers to the questions were as follows:

Question 1: What are the types of soy-based products that enter the US from the 43 ASFV-positive countries?

The USITC database identified eight HTS codes that pertained to soy-based feed ingredients: various types of soybeans, soybean meal, soy oil cake, and soy oil. These eight specific 10-digit HTS codes were identified as soy-based commodities with the potential to be included in swine diets (Table 1).

Table 1: Categorization of soy-based commodities arriving by US POE

Question 2: Across the 43 ASFV-positive countries, where do most of the soy-based products come from?

The next step was to identify the country of origin and the volume of soy-based products that entered the US. The analysis indicated that in 2018 the US imported a total of 104,707 metric tons (MT) of the eight previously identified commodities from eight of the 43 countries on the CFIA watch list: China, Ukraine, Russia, Uganda, Belgium, Togo, Vietnam, and Thailand (Table 2). Of this total volume, 55,101 MT (52.6%) of these designated soy-based ingredients were imported from China. Ukraine was the second largest exporter of soy-based products into the US with 44,776 MT (42.8%) (Table 2). In contrast, during 2019 the United States imported a total of 73,331 metric tons (MT) of soy-based products with 40,143 MT (54.7%) imported from the Ukraine and 6182 M (6.8%) from China.

Table 2: Total volume and country of origin of soy-based imports in 2018 and 2019

Based on these data, ingredient profiles of China and the Ukraine imports were developed. The primary ingredients imported from China in 2018 were ground or pelletized soy-oil cake (41,998 MT, 76.2%) and organic soybeans (7780 MT, 14.1%), while the primary product imported from the Ukraine were organic soybeans at 44,776 MT (99.9%). Similar results were seen in data from 2019 with 4,449 MT (72.9%) of soy oil cake and 1,482 MT (23.9%) of organic soybeans imported from China and 40,143 MT (100%) of organic soybeans arriving from the Ukraine. (Table 3).

Table 3: Volume analysis of individual soy-based ingredients from China and the Ukraine into the US in 2018 and 2019

Question 3: What POE receive these high-risk imports?

The next step was to identify the US seaports that received soy-based imports from the 43 ASFV-positive countries in 2018 and 2019. Thirty-seven seaports imported 177,697 MT of soy-based imports over this period, with New Orleans, Charlotte, NC, San Francisco, CA, and Seattle, WA accounting for 88.6% of imports (157,574 MT) (Table 4a). Based on data from question 2, POE summaries specific for China (Table 4b) and the Ukraine (Table 4c) were conducted. In 2018, a total of four POE received greater than 88% of all of soy-based imports from China: San Francisco/Oakland, CA (60.36%), Seattle, WA (20.54%), Baltimore, MD (4.13%), and Los Angeles, CA (3.78%). In 2019, 70.4% of soy-based imports entered the port of San Francisco, 12.8% entered the port of Seattle, while 0.8 and 7.3% entered at the ports of Baltimore and Los Angeles, respectively (Table 4b). Regarding the Ukraine, in 2018 and 2019 most soy-based products entered the US via the seaports of New Orleans, LA and Charlotte, NC, with a small amount entering via the port of Baltimore in 2018 (Table 4c).

Table 4a: POE summary across all countries surveyed during 2018-2019

Table 4b: POE summary: China 2018-2019

Table 4c: POE summary: Ukraine 2018-2019

Question 4: Do POE for soy-based products change over time?

The final segment of the analysis focused on whether the volume of soy-based imports and POE changed over time, once again focusing on China (Fig. 1a) and the Ukraine (Fig. 1b). To evaluate trends over time, data were evaluated from 2015 to 2019. Different patterns between countries were observed, with imports from China demonstrating a reduction in volume over time with consistent POE, while data from the Ukraine indicated variability across POE, while the overall volume imported to the US remained high.

Fig1a. POE analysis of soy products imported into the US from China (2015-2019)

Fig1b. POE analysis of soy products imported into the US from Ukraine (2015-2019)

Discussion

As the US feed supply becomes increasingly globalized, the risk of foreign animal diseases entering the country are significantly increased, particularly when dealing with agricultural trade commodities from countries endemically infected with foreign animal diseases. Although expanding international trade allows access to diverse and competitive trade markets, the loss in direct oversight reduces commodity quality control and safety. Therefore, based on the growing body of evidence regarding the ability of foreign animal disease pathogens such as ASFV to survive in feed, it is imperative that swine feed ingredients imported into the US from endemically infected countries be treated with increased scrutiny and caution (Patterson, Niederwerder & Dee, 2019). Obviously, this presents an immeasurable challenge for US CBP due to the sheer volume of imported products and the vast number of seaports in the US. In the absence of unlimited resources, it is important to focus on areas where the risk of disease entry is the highest. In response to this challenge, we conducted this analysis to provide information on the importation of high-risk ingredients from ASFV-positive countries and the corresponding POE. Based on volume of imports, we focused on a country from Asia (China) and one from Eastern Europe (the Ukraine), identified where soy-based products entered the US, and evaluated change in volume and seaport utilization over time. Regarding China, it was interesting to see the consistency of POE utilization and how imports of soy-based products decreased, particularly from 2018 to 2019. When seeking an explanation for this change, the US Soy industry reported that drivers of change were peer-reviewed publications demonstrating the survival of viruses in soy-based products, the resulting swine industry-driven trade press sharing this information and the response from producer stakeholders (P. Lobo, personal communication, July 10, 2020). Of significant impact was a letter written by the National Pork Producers Council to the US Secretary of Agriculture, signed by all major pork-producing states, requested

assistance via the Animal Health Protection Act to prohibit soy-based imports from China (NPPC, 2020). In contrast, seaport utilization involving Ukraine imports was inconsistent and volumes imported remained high, which showcased the ability of our approach to identify new areas of risk which had previously gone unnoticed.

Despite these strengths, this approach was not without limitations. Table 1 describes eight specific 10-digit HTS codes that were selected to be included in this study based on their potential to both harbor viable virus and be fed to pigs; however, each of these products do not share the same amount of risk to the US swine population. For example, of these eight specific products, only soybeans, soy-oil cake, and soybean meal are significant risks in terms of both their likelihood to be fed to pigs, and their documented ability to enhance survival of ASFV for extended periods. These products were also deemed high risk because they are major components of swine rations throughout the industry. Another limitation of the approach was the lack of information on final product destination or intended use; therefore, it was not possible to determine how much of a product ultimately ends up in the domestic swine supply chain. In addition, the numbers presented in this study indicated the total volume of a specific product cleared by US Customs at POE. USITC defines these products as “imports for consumption,” intended for use and distribution across all industries and markets and did not provide any further information on final product destination or intended use; therefore, our methods could not determine how much of a product ultimately ends up in the domestic swine supply chain. Furthermore, given the enormous interconnected web that is the modern global trade network, there remains some speculation of the true origin of trade products as they arrive on US shores. For example, countries may import products from one country, only to repackage them and export to another. Therefore, these data are limited to only the immediate importing country and it is not capable to determine complete travel histories of all products that clear US Customs.

In closing, we felt that the exercise was successful and enhanced the knowledge of the topic. We set out to answer four specific questions using a novel approach which gathered information that is important for the development of science-based feed biosecurity plans. While we focused on soy-based products and ASFV-positive countries, this same approach could be applied to multiple foreign trade commodities, which could assist in the development of both human and animal food safety protocols. It is hoped that these efforts will continue to stimulate communication and collaboration between the feed and livestock industries, resulting in further research into the emerging concept of “global feed biosecurity”. Ideally, current and future information regarding the risk of pathogen spread in feed will enhance the accuracy of risk assessments, drive the continual development of efficacious feed-based mitigation strategies, and ultimately bring the health status in the country of origin into the forefront of philosophies regarding the global trade of feed ingredients.

Acknowledgements: Dr. Dee would like to dedicate this paper to the late Dr. Carlos Pijoan, a beloved teacher, mentor, and scientist who would have thoroughly enjoyed debating this topic!

Conflict of Interest: The authors report no conflicts of interest.

Ethical approval: No animals were used in this project.

Data availability statement: All data from the study were made available in the paper.

References

Barr, D. Order Imposing Conditions in Relation to Secondary Control Zones In Respect of African Swine Fever. Canadian Food Inspection Agency, Government of Canada. 29 Mar. 2019. Retrived from: [Inspection.gc.ca/animal-health/terrestrial-animals/diseases/reportable/african-swine-fever/importers/order-imposing-conditions,eng/1553865378110/1553865480887](https://inspection.gc.ca/animal-health/terrestrial-animals/diseases/reportable/african-swine-fever/importers/order-imposing-conditions,eng/1553865378110/1553865480887).

Dee, S. A., Bauermann, F. V., Niederwerder, M. C., Singrey, A., Clement, T., de Lima, M., . . . Diel, D. G. (2018). Survival of viral pathogens in animal feed ingredients under transboundary shipping models. *PLOS ONE*, 13 (3), e0194509. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0194509>

Dee S.A., Niederwerder M.C., Patterson G., Cochrane R., Jones C., Diel D., Brockhoff E., Nelson E.

(2020). The risk of viral transmission in feed: What do we know, what do we do? *Tranbound Emerg Dis* , doi: 10.1111/tbed.13606.

Dixon L.K., Sun H. & Roberts H. (2019). African swine fever. *Antiviral Res.* 2019 May;165:34-41. doi: 10.1016/J.Antiviral .2019.02.018. Mar 2.PMID: 30836106.

Ito S., Jurado C., Sánchez-Vizcaíno J.M. & Isoda N. (2020). Quantitative risk assessment of African swine fever virus introduction to Japan via pork products brought in air passengers’ luggage. *Transbound Emerg Dis* . Mar;67(2):894-905. doi: 10.1111/tbed.13414. Epub 2019 Nov 17.

National Pork Producers Council. (2020). NPPC asks USDA to stop organic soy imports from ASFV-positive nations.*National Hog Farmer*. Feb 20, 2020.

Niederwerder M.C., Stoian A.M.M., Rowland R.R.R., Dritz S.S., Petrovan V., Constance L.A. . . .Hefley T.J. (2019). Infectious Dose of African Swine Fever Virus When Consumed Naturally in Liquid or Feed. *Emerg Inf Dis*. 2019 May;25(5):891-897. doi: 10.3201/eid2505.181495.

Patterson, G., Niederwerder, M. C., & Dee, S. A. (2019). Risks to animal health associated with imported feed ingredients. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association* , 254 (7), 790–791. <https://doi.org/10.2460/javma.254.7.790>.

Stoian A.M.M., Zimmerman J., Ji J., Hefley T.J., Dee S.,Diel D.G., Rowland R.R.R., & Niederwerder MC. (2019). Half-Life of African Swine Fever Virus in Shipped Feed.*Emerg Infect Dis*. 17;25(12). doi: 10.3201/eid2512.191002.

Taylor R.A., Condoleo R., Simons R.R.L., Gale P., Kelly L.A. & Snary E.L. (2019). The Risk of Infection by African Swine Fever Virus in European Swine Through Boar Movement and Legal Trade of Pigs and Pig Meat. *Front Vet Sci*.9;6:486. doi: 10.3389/fvets.2019.00486. PMID: 31998765.

United States Customs and Border Protection, At Ports of Entry. (2018, April 2). Retrieved August 27, 2020, from <https://www.cbp.gov/border-security/ports-entry>

USDA African swine fever response plan: The Red Book. 2020. https://www.aphis.usda.gov/animal_health/emergency_management/downloads/asf-responseplan.pdf.

Appendix A: CFIA watch list countries

Belgium	Ghana	Romania
Benin	Guinea-Bissau	Russia
Burkina Faso	Hungary	Rwanda
Bulgaria	Italy	Senegal
Burundi	Kenya	Sierra Leone
Cabo Verde	Latvia	South Africa
Cameroon	Lithuania	Tanzania
Central African Republic	Madagascar	Togo
Chad	Malaw	Uganda
China	Moldova	Ukraine
Congo	Mongolia	Vietnam
Cote D’Ivoire	Mozambique	Zambia
Czech Republic	Namibia	Zimbabwe
Estonia	Nigeria	
Gambia	Poland	

Table 1: Categorization of soy-based commodities arriving at US POE

HTS Code	Description
1208.10.0000	FLOURS AND MEALS OF SOYBEANS, NESOI*
1201.90.0005	SOYBEAN OIL AND ITS FRACTIONS, FULLY REFINED, V
1201.90.0010	SOYBEAN OIL AND ITS FRACTIONS, ONCE-REFINED (S
1201.90.0090	SOYBEAN OILCAKE AND OTHER SOLID RESIDUES RES
1208.10.0090	SOYBEAN SEEDS OF A KIND USED AS OIL STOCK, WHE
1507.90.4020	SOYBEAN SEEDS OF A KIND USED FOR SOWING
1507.90.4040	SOYBEANS, CERTIFIED ORGANIC, WHETHER OR NOT I
2304.00.0000	SOYBEANS, WHETHER OR NOT BROKEN, OTHER THAN
NESOI: Refers to “Not Elsewhere Specified or Indicated” *NESOI: Refers to “Not Elsewhere Specified or Indicated”	

Table 2: Total volume and country of origin of soy-based imports in 2018-2019

Country of Origin	Sum of 2018 (MT)	% of Total 2018	Sum of 2019 (MT)	% of Total 2019
Ukraine	44,776	42.9%	40,143	54.7%
Russia	3,396	3.3%	20,661	28.2%
China	55,039	52.7%	6,182	8.4%
Moldova	0	0.0%	5,986	8.2%
Belgium	143	0.1%	244	0.3%
Togo	22	0.0%	113	0.2%
Vietnam	0	0.0%	1	0.0%
Uganda	990	0.9%	0	0.0%
Grand Total	104,366	100.0%	73,331	100.0%

Table 3: Volume analysis of individual soy-based ingredients from China and the Ukraine to the US in 2018 and 2019

China and Ukraine Compared 2018-2019

CHINA

SOYBEAN OILCAKE AND OTHER SOLID RESIDUES RESULTING FROM THE EXTRACTION OF SOYBEAN OIL, SOYBEANS, CERTIFIED ORGANIC, WHETHER OR NOT BROKEN, EXCEPT SEEDS OF A KIND USED FOR SOWING SOYBEANS, WHETHER OR NOT BROKEN, OTHER THAN CERTIFIED ORGANIC, NESOI
 SOYBEAN OIL AND ITS FRACTIONS, ONCE-REFINED (SUBJECT TO ALKALAI OR CAUSTIC WASH BUT NOT I
 FLOURS AND MEALS OF SOYBEANS, NESOI
 SOYBEAN SEEDS OF A KIND USED AS OIL STOCK, WHETHER OR NOT BROKEN
 SOYBEAN OIL AND ITS FRACTIONS, FULLY REFINED, WASHED, BLEACHED OR DEODORIZED BUT NOT CH

UKRAINE

SOYBEANS, CERTIFIED ORGANIC, WHETHER OR NOT BROKEN, EXCEPT SEEDS OF A KIND USED FOR SOWING SOYBEAN OIL AND ITS FRACTIONS, FULLY REFINED, WASHED, BLEACHED OR DEODORIZED BUT NOT CH
 SOYBEANS, WHETHER OR NOT BROKEN, OTHER THAN CERTIFIED ORGANIC, NESOI
 SOYBEAN SEEDS OF A KIND USED AS OIL STOCK, WHETHER OR NOT BROKEN

Grand Total

Table 4a: POE summary across all countries surveyed during 2018-2019

POE	Sum of 2018 (MT)	Sum of 2019 (MT)
New Orleans, LA	36,268	47,065

POE	Sum of 2018 (MT)	Sum of 2019 (MT)
Charlotte, NC	5,261	18,925
San Francisco, CA	33,261	4,469
Ogdensburg, NY	3,166	801
Seattle, WA	11,532	793
Los Angeles, CA	2,085	454
New York, NY	418	352
Cleveland, OH	143	181
Chicago, IL	1,553	112
Norfolk, VA	1,526	64
Baltimore, MD	7,995	51
St. Louis, MO	0	33
Savannah, GA	18	30
Houston-Galveston, TX	637	1
Mobile, AL	0	1
Tampa, FL	0	0
Honolulu, HI	0	0
San Juan, PR	0	0
Buffalo, NY	0	0
Boston, MA	0	0
Great Falls, MT	60	0
Columbia-Snake, OR	433	0
St. Albans, VT	0	0
Philadelphia, PA	0	0
Detroit, MI	0	0
Miami, FL	0	0
Minneapolis, MN	11	0
Grand Total	104,366	73,331

Table 4b: POE summary: China 2018-2019

POE	POE	Sum of 2018 (MT)	Sum of 2018 (MT)	Sum of 2019 (MT)
San Francisco, CA	San Francisco, CA	33,261	33,261	4,355
Seattle, WA	Seattle, WA	11,302	11,302	793
Baltimore, MD	Baltimore, MD	2,275	2,275	51
Los Angeles, CA	Los Angeles, CA	2,085	2,085	454
Chicago, IL	Chicago, IL	1,531	1,531	112
Norfolk, VA	Norfolk, VA	1,526	1,526	1
New Orleans, LA	New Orleans, LA	1,484	1,484	0
Houston-Galveston, TX	Houston-Galveston, TX	637	637	1
Columbia-Snake, OR	Columbia-Snake, OR	433	433	0
New York, NY	New York, NY	417	417	352
Great Falls, MT	Great Falls, MT	60	60	0
Savannah, GA	Savannah, GA	18	18	30
Minneapolis, MN	Minneapolis, MN	11	11	0
Honolulu, HI	Honolulu, HI	0	0	0
Cleveland, OH	Cleveland, OH	0	0	0
Tampa, FL	Tampa, FL	0	0	0
Detroit, MI	Detroit, MI	0	0	0
St. Louis, MO	St. Louis, MO	0	0	33

POE	POE	Sum of 2018 (MT)	Sum of 2018 (MT)	Sum of 2019 (MT)
Boston, MA	Boston, MA	0	0	0
Buffalo, NY	Buffalo, NY	0	0	0
Mobile, AL	Mobile, AL	0	0	1
Grand Total	Grand Total	55,039	55,039	6,182

Table 4c: POE summary: Ukraine 2018-2019

POE	Sum of 2018 (MT)	Sum of 2019 (MT)
New Orleans, LA	34,784	26,218
Charlotte, NC	5,261	13,925
Baltimore, MD	4,729	0
Grand Total	44,775	40,143

Hosted file

Fig 1a.pptx available at <https://authorea.com/users/355387/articles/478639-quantification-of-soy-based-feed-ingredient-entry-from-asfv-positive-countries-to-the-united-states-by-ocean-freight-shipping-and-associated-seaports>

Hosted file

Fig 1b.pptx available at <https://authorea.com/users/355387/articles/478639-quantification-of-soy-based-feed-ingredient-entry-from-asfv-positive-countries-to-the-united-states-by-ocean-freight-shipping-and-associated-seaports>