Appendix E-IATP SARE Project Farmer/Producer Survey Results

In 2012 and 2013, the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy (IATP) conducted three separate farmer/producer surveys as part of its Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education (SARE) project "Connecting Sustainable Farmers to Emerging Health Care Markets." A brief description of each survey is included here. Summary reports of each survey can be viewed online or downloaded using the links provided. Any data that could be used to identify individual survey respondents has been omitted from the reports.

2012 IATP SARE PROJECT SURVEY FOR FARMERS AND PRODUCERS

Purpose

This survey was used to determine how many farmer/producers located within a 200-mile radius of the health care collaborators were interested in selling to hospitals in the near term, what types of products they were interested in selling, growing practices used, food safety protocols, insurance carried, and more. Respondents also included farmers/producers who may or may not have interest in selling again in the future, but who had past experience selling to health care facilities and could provide valuable insight into this market. This data was used to inform the development of the three individualized roadmaps that were prepared for each of the three health care collaborators. In addition, survey responses helped the project team to identify and recruit farmers and producers to participate in the project advisory committee.

Methodology

To help assure that the budget for survey compensation was not exceeded and other project needs were met, only specific farmers/producers were invited to participate in the survey. The following characteristics were used to build the list of invitees:

- Proximity to the participating SARE project health care collaborator facilities (within a 200-mile radius that included most of Minnesota and a significant portion of Wisconsin)
- Past experience or likely interest in and ability to sell wholesale to health care markets
- Grow/produce types of food items commonly purchased by the participating SARE project health care collaborators
- Use or likely use of sustainable production methods and/or avoided use of specific-production practices, such as use of recombinant bovine growth hormones (rBGH)/recombinant bovine somatotropin (rBST) in milk production.

These types of farmers/producers were identified using several internal and external resources including:

- IATP Farm to School surveys
- *IATP's Buying Better Chicken: A Resource to Buying Chicken Raised without Antibiotics and Arsenic for Schools, Hospitals and Other Purchasers*, http://www.iatp.org/files/Buying%20Better%20Chicken042011.pdf
- Minnesota Grown Wholesale Database, http://www3.mda.state.mn.us/whlsale/
- Land Stewardship Project CSA Directory, http://landstewardshipproject.org/stewardshipfood/csa
- Wisconsin's Farm Fresh Atlas, http://www.farmfreshatlas.org/
- Farmers/producers who could be identified as already selling to area distributors
- Members of the former Producers & Buyers Co-op in Wisconsin

SurveyMonkey® software was used to create the survey, as well as all subsequent surveys, and a link to the survey was sent to invited farmers/producers via email. After a period

of time, producers who had not responded, or those without email, were contacted via phone, if available, and encouraged to participate. One survey respondent with limited computer access completed the survey by phone, with responses entered into the survey by IATP staff. Farmers who completed the survey were compensated $15.00 each.

Results

In total, 31 farmers/producers and one grower cooperative completed the survey. Of these, 13 had sold to, attempted to sell to or were currently selling product to at least one health care facility. Eighteen had no prior experience, but were interested in selling to health care facilities in the next three years. One respondent had neither experience nor future interest in selling to hospitals, therefore no further data was collected from this participant.

Twenty three survey participants stated they were from Minnesota and eight were from Wisconsin. Just under half (48.3 percent) were family owned businesses, while 20.7 percent identified as corporations. Respondents were of all ages, from 22 to over 70, with the largest group identifying as 51-60 years old.

NOTE: Results from the cooperative respondent are included in the data here as one producer, even though the cooperative represents multiple producers.

A PDF containing all questions and aggregated responses for the 2012 farmer/producer survey can be viewed or downloaded at www.iatp.org/farm-to-hospital.

Sources Consulted

The following sources were consulted when developing questions for the initial IATP SARE project farmer/producer survey conducted in 2012:

- *Grower Perspectives on Farm to School: A Survey of Interested Farmers, Ranchers and Other Producers*, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy, March 2012, www.iatp.org/files/2012_03_16_F2S_ProducerSurvey.pdf
- *Grower Survey, Southern Wisconsin Food Hub Feasibility Study*, Dane County Planning and Development Department, September 2011, www.ams.usda.gov/AMSv1.0/getfile?dDocName=STELPRDC5097196
- Ohio Distributor Survey, *Scaling-up Connections between Regional Ohio Specialty Crop Producers and Local Markets: Distribution as the Missing Link*, The Ohio State University Department of Agricultural, Environmental and Development Economics, August 2011, www.ams.usda.gov/AMSv1.0/getfile?dDocName=STELPRDC5097255

2013 FOLLOW-UP SURVEY OF FARMERS/PRODUCERS WHO COMPLETED THE 2012 SURVEY

Purpose

This survey was used to capture any significant changes in responses to the 2012 survey, including experiences and interest in selling to hospitals, as well as, to gather additional information on marketing approaches, production volumes, experience with sales to hospitals with contract food service, experience selling their products via distributors, and more.

Methodology

Producers who completed the 2012 survey were contacted in late August 2013 with an invitation to complete this follow up survey. The survey was not sent to the respondents who had specifically stated in 2012 that they had no interest in future sales to hospitals, except for one who also served on the project advisory committee. Additionally, the respondent from the producer cooperative who participated in 2012 was sent the new 2013 survey with a request to share with individual farmer members to complete, versus providing aggregated data for the cooperative. Therefore, a total of 27 producers received the follow up survey. Farmers who responded were compensated $15.00 each.

Results

Participation in the follow up survey was relatively high, with 18 of the 27 invited producers responding. Of those, four indicated that they had had no sales (or attempted sales) to health care facilities and were no longer interested in selling to hospitals. While those four participants were asked to answer some questions about product distribution, marketing and recall procedures, those responses have not been included in the charts in this Appendix, given they were no longer interested in health care sales. The data used in the aggregated charts below therefore represents the remaining 14 producers, depending on how many answered each question.

A PDF containing all questions and aggregated responses for the 2013 follow-up survey of the farmers/producers who completed the 2012 survey can be viewed or downloaded at www.iatp.org/farm-to-hospital.

2013 IATP SARE PROJECT SURVEY FOR FARMERS AND PRODUCERS (NEW)

Purpose

An updated version of the 2012 IATP SARE project survey for farmers and producers was used to gather information from farmers and producers that did not complete the 2012 survey.

Methodology

In late summer/early fall 2013; a revised version of the 2012 survey was opened to producers who had not participated in the 2012 data collection. The invitation was sent via email directly to producers who had been identified in 2012 as potential participants, but who had not completed the survey. Additionally, it was sent out via the SUSTAG listserv inviting producers in the region, specifically Minnesota and Wisconsin, to participate. The project advisory committee was also encouraged to share the survey with producers they knew who might be interested in selling to health care markets. Farmers who completed the survey were compensated $20.00 each.

Results

In total, 15 farmers/producers completed the survey. Of these, four had sold to, attempted to sell to or were currently selling product to a health care facility. Nine had no prior experience, but were interested in selling to health care facilities in the next five years. Two respondents had either experience or future interest in selling to hospitals, therefore no further data was collected from either participant. The 13 remaining respondents all expressed interest in future sales to health care facilities.

Nine survey participants stated they were from Minnesota, three were from Wisconsin and one was from Iowa. Just over half (54.5 percent) were run as a Limited Liability Company (LLC), and 18.2 percent stated they were family owned. Respondents were between the ages of 22 and 70, with 27.3 percent identifying as 51-60 and the same percentage identifying as 61-70.

A PDF containing all questions and aggregated responses for the 2013 survey for farmers/producers (new) can be viewed or downloaded at www.iatp.org/farm-to-hospital.

HIGHLIGHTS FROM ALL SARE PROJECT FARMER/ PRODUCER SURVEY RESULTS

Thirty four respondents to the IATP SARE project farmer/producer surveys are interested in selling to hospitals, including one respondent who represented multiple farmers/producers via a cooperative. Among these respondents, four were already selling to one or more hospitals. The following tables include some of the key data collected from these farmers/producers. If a similar or identical question was not asked in all three surveys, the survey(s) used is/are indicated.

Key demographics

Table E.1.1—Gross Annual Revenue from Agricultural Activities *based on combined results from the two 2013 surveys*

Response Options	Portion of farmer/producer responses	Number among 28 respondents to the question
Noncommercial (<$1,000)	4.5 %	1
Noncommercial ($1,000–$9,999)	13.6 %	4
Small commercial ($10,000–$99,000)	50.0 %	14
Small commercial ($100,000–$249,999)	0.0 %	0
Large commercial ($250,000–$499,999)	18.2 %	5
Large commercial ($500,000–$999,999)	4.5 %	1
Very large commercial (>$1,000,000)	9.1 %	3

Table E.1.2—Ownership Subcategory based on combined results from 2012 survey and 2013 survey (new)

Percentages do not add up to 100 percent, as respondents were asked to select all applicable answers.

Response Options	Portion of farmer/ producer responses	Number among 29 respondents to the question
Woman-owned	44.8 %	13
Veteran-owned	13.8 %	4
Minority-owned	3.4 %	1
None of the above	44.8 %	13

Volume produced by interested farmers/producers

Table E.2.1—Produce, Grains, Maple Syrup, Honey based on combined results from the two 2013 surveys

Product Category	Volume Produced in Most Recent Year	Smallest Volume-Largest Volume Per Farm/Operation	Products Farmers/ Producers Most Interested in Selling
Fruits	3,200,180 lbs.	5–3,200,000 lbs.	Apples
Vegetables	903,450 lbs.	250–750,000 lbs.	Tomatoes, lettuce, cucumbers, peppers, eggplant, squash, zucchini, any
Herbs	10,527 lbs.	2–10,000 lbs.	Rosemary, chives, basil, oregano, mint, any
Grains	11,000 lbs.	2,000–5,000 lbs.	Whole wheat flour, white flour
Legumes	100 lbs.	100 lbs.	None listed
Maple syrup	75 gallons	15–50 gallons	None listed
Honey	24 gallons	24 gallons	None listed

Table E.2.2—Meat, Poultry, and Seafood based on combined results from the two 2013 surveys

Product Category	Volume Produced in Most Recent Year	Smallest Volume-Largest Volume Per Farm/ Operation	Products Farmers/ Producers Most Interested in Selling
Beef	3,040,000 lbs. (processed weight)	15,000–3,000,000 lbs. (processed weight	Any, ground beef, stew meat, roasts
Bison	24,000 lbs. (processed weight)	10,000 lbs.	Trim, grind, rounds, ground, stew roasts
Pork	16,300 lbs. (processed weight)	800–7,500 lbs.	Ground pork, stew meat, whole hog
Chickens	18,900 birds	100 to 16,000 birds	Any, whole birds
Turkey	180,025 birds	25 to 180,000 birds	Any, whole birds
Specialty poultry	1,510 birds	10 to 1,510 birds	Whole birds

Table E.2.2—Meat, Poultry, and Seafood based on combined results from the two 2013 surveys

Product Category	Volume Produced in Most Recent Year	Smallest Volume-Largest Volume Per Farm/ Operation	Products Farmers/ Producers Most Interested in Selling
Fish	60,000 lbs. (processed weight)	Same	Any

Table E.2.3—Dairy and Eggs *based on combined results from the two 2013 surveys*

Product Category	Volume Produced in Most Recent Year	Smallest Volume-Largest Volume Per Farm/Operation
Fluid milk	578,000 gallons	78,000–500,000 gallons
Cream	3,000 gallons	Same
Butter	300 pounds	Same
Cheese	45,000 pounds	Same
Eggs, shell	9,380–10,880 dozen	1,000–5,500 dozen

Growing practices

Table E.3.1–Third-Party Certified (based on combined results from the 2012 and 2013 surveys)

Product Category (number of producers)	Percent certified
Beef and bison (5)	■ 40.0 percent are USDA Process Verified, Never Ever 3 ■ 20.0 percent are USDA Organic ■ 20.0 percent are USDA Process Verified, Grassfed
Dairy (2)	■ 100.0 percent are USDA Organic
Eggs (3)	■ None of the producers had 3rd party certifications
Fish (1)	■ None of the producers had 3rd party certifications
Pork (5)	■ 20.0 percent are Non-GMO Project Verified ■ 20.0 percent are USDA Organic
Poultry (6)	■ 16.7 percent are USDA Process Verified, Never Ever 3
Produce (22)	■ 22.7 percent are USDA Organic ■ 13.6 percent are Food Alliance Certified ■ 4.5 percent are Non-GMO Project Verified ■ 4.5 percent are Protected Harvest Certified

Table E.3.2 – Other, non-certified based on combined results from the 2012 and 2013 surveys

Product Category (number of producers)	Percent
Beef and bison (5)	■ 100.0 percent are raised without antibiotics ■ 100.0 percent are raised without hormones ■ 80.0 percent are Grassfed (not Process Verified)
Dairy (2)	■ 50.0 percent are Grassfed (not Process Verified) ■ 50.0 percent are rBGH/rBST free
Eggs (3)	■ 100.0 percent are cage free ■ 100.0 percent are free range ■ 66.7 percent use non-GMO feed
Fish (1)	■ 100.0 percent are raised without antibiotics
Pork (5)	■ 80.0 percent are raised without antibiotics ■ 80.0 percent are raised without hormones ■ 40.0 percent are pasture raised
Poultry (6)	■ 83.3 percent are pasture raised ■ 66.7 percent are raised without antibiotics ■ 50.0 percent are free range ■ 50.0 percent use no animal byproducts (in feed)
Produce (22)	■ 59.1 percent use Integrated Pest Management (IPM) ■ 50.0 percent are non-GMO, GM/GE free ■ 45.5 percent use no pesticides (e.g. insecticides, herbicides) ■ 45.5 percent use crop rotation ■ 36.4 percent use no chemical fertilizer ■ 18.2 percent use low/reduced chemical fertilizer ■ 18.2 percent use low/reduced pesticide (e.g. insecticides, herbicides)

Table E.3.3—Season Extension Methods in Use based on combined results from 2012 and 2013 survey (new)

Response options	Portion of produce grower responses	Number among 22 respondents to the question
Black plastic ground cover	22.7 %	5
High tunnels/hoop houses	18.2 %	4
Low cover low tunnels	9.1 %	2
Regular low tunnel	4.5 %	1
Row covers	18.2 %	4
Raised beds	13.6 %	3

Table E.3.3—Season Extension Methods in Use based on combined results from 2012 and 2013 survey (new)

Response options	Portion of produce grower responses	Number among 22 respondents to the question
Greenhouses (heated with renewable source solar panels, geothermal, etc.)	9.1 %	2
Greenhouses (heated with fossil fuel))	18.2 %	4
Succession planting	22.7 %	5
Mulching	22.7 %	5
Not applicable	22.7 %	5
Other responses: Hydroponics		

Table E.3.4—Good Agricultural Practices Training and Audit Completion *based on combined results from 2012 and 2013 survey (new)*

Response options	Portion of produce grower responses	Number among 22 respondents to the question
USDA Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) Training Program	40.9 %	9
USDA GAP self-audit	18.2 %	4
Third-party USDA GAP certification	18.2 %	4

Food handling and processing

Table E.4.1—Food Safety Plans *based on combined results from 2012 and 2013 survey (new)*

Response Options	Portion of farmer/producer responses	Number among 32 respondents to the question
Has written food safety plan in place	50.0 %	16
Does not have written food safety plan in place	50.0 %	16

Table E.4.2—Food Handling and Processing *based on combined results from 2012 and 2013 survey (new)*

Product category	Location of Processing
Beef and bison	■ 80.0 percent processed in federally inspected plant ■ 20.0 percent processed in state inspected plant

Table E.4.2—Food Handling and Processing *based on combined results from 2012 and 2013 survey (new)*

Product category	Location of Processing
Dairy	■ 50.0 percent processed in federally inspected plant ■ 50.0 percent processed in state inspected plant
Eggs	■ 33.3 percent processed in state inspected plant ■ 33.3 percent processed on-farm ■ 33.3 percent did not provide this information
Fish	■ 100.0 percent processed on-site
Pork	■ 40.0 percent processed in federally inspected plant ■ 40.0 percent did not provide this information ■ 20.0 percent processed at unin-spected processor (local butcher)
Poultry	■ 66.7 percent processed in federally inspected plant ■ 16.7 percent processed in state inspected plant ■ 16.7 percent processed on-farm
Produce	■ 31.8 percent processed in inspected kitchen or processing facility ■ 27.3 percent processed in unin-spected kitchen or processing facility ■ 22.7 percent did not process beyond limited processing (sorting, washing, etc) ■ 18.2 percent did not answer question or provide enough information to determine

Table E.4.3—Recall Policies and Practices *based on combined results from the two 2013 surveys*

Response Options	Portion of farmer/producer responses	Number among 24 respondents to the question
Has recall policies or practices in place	58.3 %	14
Does not have recall policies or practices in place	41.7 %	10

Ordering and delivery

Table E.5.1—Advance Notice Needed to Assure Adequate Supply *based on combined results from 2012 and 2013 survey (new)*

Product category	Months' notice
Beef and Bison	0 to 6 months; 1 to 9 months for custom slaughter of whole animals
Dairy	0 to 6 months
Eggs	0 to 9 months

Table E.5.1—Advance Notice Needed to Assure Adequate Supply *based on combined results from 2012 and 2013 survey (new)*

Product category	Months' notice
Fish	0 to 12 months
Grains and legumes	0 to 9 months
Honey and maple syrup	0 to 9 months
Pork	3 months
Poultry	0 to 9 months
Produce	Most need 0 to 3 months, but several would need 6 to 9 months or more

Table E.5.2—Use of Refrigerated Vehicles for Delivery *based on combined results from the 2012 and 2013 surveys*

Response Options	Portion of farmer/producer responses	Number among 31 respondents to the question
Vehicle used to deliver products to customers (individual buyers or distributors) is not refrigerated	64.5 %	20
Vehicle used to deliver products to customers (individual buyers or distributors) is refrigerated	35.5 %	11
If not refrigerated, please describe means used to cool and hold product at ideal temperatures for preserving nutritional value:		
Responses included: ■ Coolers, gel ice packs ■ Insulated cooler that plugs into vehicle power plug ■ Travel short distances only (10–20 miles) ■ We hydro cool and then refrigerate; cold items are then transferred in car for less than 25 minutes ■ Produce is transported in enclosed cube truck ■ Walk in cooler and a commercial cooler for storage while produce transitions to customers ■ Meat is taken to a freezer locker and then it is distributed from there ■ Air conditioning ■ Cold towels and ice (vegetables are harvested within 6 hours of delivery) ■ Produce is stored in walk in cooler until delivery; then kept in boxes shaded, with AC up all the way ■ None needed, products do not need to be cooled for delivery		

Table E.5.3—Relationships with Distributors *based on combined results from the 2012 and 2013 surveys*

Response Options	Portion of farmer/ producer responses	Number among 25 respondents to the question
Does not currently sell product through any distributors	64.0 %	16
Bix Produce	16.0 %	4
US Foods	8.0 %	2
Sysco Minnesota	8.0 %	2
Upper Lakes	8.0 %	2
Reinhart FoodService	4.0 %	1
Appert's	4.0 %	1
Sysco Wisconsin	0.0 %	0
Other (please specify)		

Responses included:
- Bon Appetit
- Capital
- Coop Partners
- H Brooks
- J & B
- J & J
- Neesvig's
- Royal

Table E.5.4—Delivery Radius *based on combined results from 2012 and 2013 survey (new)*

Radius ranges	Portion of farmer/producer responses	Number among 30 respondents
Under 25 miles	26.7 %	8
25-50 miles	30.0 %	9
51-100 miles	20.0 %	6
Over 100 miles	13.3 %	4
Depends on order size	10.0 %	3

Comments:
- Also contract freight for high-volume orders through Coop Partners Warehouse
- For large orders willing to travel further
- It's not as simple as delivery radius – would not drive far distance for small order, but if had a large order or multiple orders in same area, it might make sense to go further.

Product marketing

Table E.6.1—Methods Used to Market Products *based on combined results from the two 2013 surveys*

Response Options	Portion of farmer/producer responses	Number among 23 respondents to the question
Website	60.9 %	14
Event participation	56.5 %	13
Social media (Facebook, Twitter, etc.)	56.5 %	13
Printed materials (brochures, flyers, etc.)	47.8 %	11
E-newsletter	26.1 %	6
Print media (newspaper)	26.1 %	6
Posters	13.0 %	3
Other (please specify)		

Responses included:
- Word of mouth/Satisfied customers
- Farmers markets
- Donations to local charity events
- Research
- Phone calls
- Networking
- Email

Table E.6.2—Types of Information Currently on Website *based on combined results from the two 2013 surveys*

Response Options	Portion of farmer/producer responses	Number among 16 respondents to the question
Types of products available	87.5 %	14
Where/how products can be purchased	81.3 %	13
Farm or ranch specific info (history, size, etc)	75 %	12
Staff or employee specific info (bios, photos, etc)	43.8 %	7
Delivery and/or distribution methods	43.8 %	7
Other growing practices (e.g. Integrated Pest Management)	37.5 %	6
Names of any current retail, restaurant, institutional customers	37.5 %	6
Type of processing facility (USDA inspected, state-inspected, etc.)	31.3 %	5
Distributors that carry product	18.8 %	3
Certifications held (USDA Organic, Certified Humane, etc)	18.8 %	3

Table E.6.2—Types of Information Currently on Website *based on combined results from the two 2013 surveys*

Response Options	Portion of farmer/producer responses	Number among 16 respondents to the question
Name of facility where foods are processed, if applicable	18.8 %	3
Specific page/contact info for potential institutional customers	12.5 %	2
Food safety training and audits completed, if applicable	6.3 %	1
Types of insurance carried	0 %	0
Other (please specify)		
Responses included: ■ Program and mission ■ CSA information		

Insurance

Table E.7.1—Types of Insurance Coverage *based on combined results from the two 2013 surveys*

Response Options	Portion of farmer/producer responses	Number among 23 respondents to the question
Carries $1,000,000 in product liability insurance	34.8 %	8
Carries $2,000,000 in product liability insurance	26.1 %	6
Carries $3,000,000 in product liability insurance	4.3 %	1
Carries $5,000,000 or more in product liability insurance	21.7 %	5
Does not have product liability insurance	13.0 %	3
Carries product recall insurance	13.0 %	3
Does not have product recall insurance	78.3 %	18

Farmer/producer perspective on sales to hospitals

Table E.8.1—Reasons interested in selling to health care facilities *based on combined results from 2012 survey and 2013 survey (new)*

Response Options (from highest to lowest response rate)	Portion of farmer/producer responses	Number among 23 respondents to the question
Increase access to healthy, locally grown food	91.3 %	21
Educate others about the food system and where food comes from	82.6 %	19
Build relationships within my community	78.3 %	18
Helps diversify my markets	78.3 %	18
New revenue source for my farm	69.6 %	16
Fair, steady prices	56.5 %	13
Reduce my farm's ecological footprint by selling to buyers close by	56.5 %	13
Large volume orders	47.8 %	11
Reliable customer	47.8 %	11
Provides a market for surplus for variable quantities	47.8 %	11
Provides a market for seconds	26.1 %	6
Other (please specify)		
Responses included: ■ "Educational & Heath Care Institutions expectations for better foods & education leaders for such." ■ "All our meat travels less than 25 miles from birth to plate." ■ "It is intuitive. Health care should have fresh local vegetables." ■ "Strengthen our cooperative."		

Table E.8.2—Challenges faced in selling to health care facilities *based on combined results from 2012 survey and 2013 survey (new)*

Response Options (from highest to lowest response rate)	Portion of farmer/producer responses	Number among 17 respondents to the question
Facilities not willing to pay our prices	58.8 %	10
Lack relationships with health care purchasers	47.1 %	8
Difficulty guaranteeing a specific quantity on a specific date	23.5 %	4
Volume needs are too large for my operation	17.6 %	3
Delivery logistics	11.8 %	2
Facilities approached were not interested	11.8 %	2

Table E.8.2—Challenges faced in selling to health care facilities *based on combined results from 2012 survey and 2013 survey (new)*

Response Options (from highest to lowest response rate)	Portion of farmer/ producer responses	Number among 17 respondents to the question
Product specifications are hard for us to meet	11.8 %	2
Cannot meet liability insurance requirements	5.9 %	1
Food safety requirements	5.9 %	1
Too much paperwork (such as invoices)	5.9 %	1
Volume needs are too small to be of interest	5.9 %	1
Difficulty cleaning product adequately	0.0 %	0
Do not accept credit cards	0.0 %	0
Payment turnaround time too long	0.0 %	0
Other (please specify)		
Responses included: ■ "Most hospitals have contracted food service providers such as Chartwells, Sodexo, etc., Those contracts place undue requirements on "optional" outside food purchases. Many farmers could not compete with the requirements. It became a way for the large "box truck" suppliers to squeeze out the competition from local producers" ■ "None are applicable. They knew from the beginning if they wanted a new product. I need 6 month lead time" ■ "They are hesitant because they are unsure, and they have a system that works now." ■ "Would be nice to get several farmers to go together on product" ■ "Basic understanding farms are not impersonal wholesaling facilities" ■ "Never got to logistics, stuck on price."		

Table E.8.3—Most important characteristics a hospital should consider when preferring locally grown foods *based on combined results from the two 2013 surveys*

Response options (from highest to lowest response rate)	Portion of farmer/ producer responses	Number among 24 respondents to the question
Whether certain practices were avoided or used to produce the food/product (e.g. no synthetic pesticides, fertilizers, hormones, antibiotics or genetically engineered ingredients, integrated pest management, grass fed, pasture-raised, etc.)	75.0 %	18

Table E.8.3—Most important characteristics a hospital should consider when preferring locally grown foods *based on combined results from the two 2013 surveys*

Response options (from highest to lowest response rate)	Portion of farmer/ producer responses	Number among 24 respondents to the question
Whether the food or product is in minimally processed form and does not contain any artificial flavor or flavoring coloring ingredient, chemical preservative or any other artificial or synthetic ingredient	58.3 %	14
Whether the product vendor is a farm, farm cooperative or other farm-based marketing collaborative whose owners grew/raised the product	54.2 %	13
Whether the farm or farms (e.g. farmer co-operative or collaborative) are located within a certain number of miles from the hospital (in air miles)	41.7 %	10
Whether the food/product was grown/raised on a small or mid-scale farm based on annual income (noncommercial, small commercial and some large commercial)	37.5 %	9
Whether the food/product was grown/raised on a farm whose sustainability practices are subject to independent audits/third party certification (USDA Organic, etc.)	33.3 %	8
Distance the food/product traveled from the farm(s) to the hospital (total road miles to processing facilities and/or distribution centers) is within a certain number of miles	29.2 %	7
Presence of farm name or farm co-operative name on product, product packaging, order forms and/or invoices	25.0 %	6
Support preservation of heirloom varieties	8.3 %	2
Other (please specific)		1
Responses included: ■ "Workable price over long term"		

Table E.8.4—Importance of addressing certain factors when working to connect local, sustainable farmers to health care markets *based on combined results from the two 2013 surveys*

Response options (from highest to lowest response rate)	Very Important (portion/ number of respondents)	Important (portion/ number of respondents)
Preservation of freshness	83.3 % (20 of 24)	4.2 % (1 of 24)
Assuring farmers get a fair price	82.6 % (19 of 23)	17.4 % (4 of 23)
Open communication	66.7 % (16 of 24)	29.2 % (7 of 24)
Creation of local jobs (farm, processing, etc.)	62.5 % (15 of 24)	29.2 % (7 of 24)
Create direct relationships between purchasers and farmers	58.3 % (14 of 24)	33.3 % (8 of 24)
Institutional (buyer) commitment	52.2 % (12 of 23)	39.1 % (9 of 23)
Support of farmers who use sustainable practices (no certification)	52.2 % (12 of 23)	30.4 % (7 of 23)
Opportunity for product quality feedback	47.8 % (11 of 23)	43.5 % (10 of 23)
Maintaining the identity of the farmer from farm to plate	36.4 % (8 of 22)	45.5 % (10 of 22)
Support of farmers whose practices are third-party certified	30.4 % (7 of 23)	30.4 % (7 of 23)

Table E.8.5—Kinds of information/learning opportunities farmers/producers would like to have in order to sell to health care facilities *based on combined results from 2012 survey and 2013 survey (new)*

Response options (from highest to lowest response rate)	Portion of farmer/ producer responses	Number among 36 respon-dents to the question
Information about specific product needs and desires	91.7 %	33
Opportunities to meet face-to-face with food service staff	83.3 %	30
Information about delivery and packaging needs	80.6 %	29
Contact information for food service staff in our area	75.0 %	27
Information about grading and other quality needs/preferences	63.9 %	23
Written agreements	33.3 %	12
Ways to adjust production to meet demand	25.0 %	9
Advance payment for products	25.0 %	9

Table E.8.5—Kinds of information/learning opportunities farmers/producers would like to have in order to sell to health care facilities *based on combined results from 2012 survey and 2013 survey (new)*

Response options (from highest to lowest response rate)	Portion of farmer/ producer responses	Number among 36 respon-dents to the question
Having a third party provide potential buyers with information on our products	22.2 %	8
Help with product marketing	19.4 %	7
Other (please specify)		

Responses included:

- "Quantities needed"
- "Volume estimates and frequency of purchase"
- "Mutual willingness to adapt & for institutions to evolve back into food handling & preparing skills... & facilities to do so..."
- "Definitely YES on delivery and packaging; same with marketing, farmers don't have time. Written agreements were one of the stumbling blocks, we need contracts to make it binding, to take it serious. Advance payment sounds nice, not sure if it is realistic."
- "Contracts are something the co-op did not require and, in the end, it was one of the things that ended the co-op. Administration would make verbal agreements and order product. Producers would take on the task to grow the product to hospital specs. Sometimes the process, such as is the case for pork, chickens, etc. would span substantial time periods. Sometimes the Administration/staff would have turnover and the new people would know nothing about the agreements. When the product was ready sometimes it was turned down by new administration. This nearly bankrupted some of our producers who had to foot all of the upfront costs themselves. Trust broke down. Relationships were broken."
- "Meet in the middle with what small scale can do and not set requirements that only large producers can meet as that is what they are used to purchasing"
- "They need to be on board with the concept."

Table E.8.6—Sales Preferences for Volume Versus Number of Hospitals *based on combined results from the two 2013 surveys.*

Response options (from highest to lowest response rate)	Portion of farmer/ producer responses	Number among 22 respondents to the question
Selling larger volumes to one or two hospitals	63.6 %	14
Selling smaller volumes to many hospitals	36.4 %	8

Table E.8.6—Sales Preferences for Volume Versus Number of Hospitals *based on combined results from the two 2013 surveys.*

Response options (from highest to lowest response rate)	Portion of farmer/ producer responses	Number among 22 respondents to the question
Responses included: ■ "If it limited to a mile radius you may only have a few to service." ■ "Indifferent at this point." ■ "We grow many, many types of vegetables. We like working with places that like a variety. If we were working with an institution that wanted vast amounts of one thing, like broccoli, that wouldn't be a good fit for us. I'm sure that another farm that grows just a few items would feel the opposite." ■ "Would do both." ■ "Assuming the hospitals take delivery on different days, this helps us in harvest/production scheduling." ■ "Either way large or small volumes we would make cuts that supply their needs."		