

CALIFORNIA LEAFY GREEN PRODUCTS

2007 SIGNATORY SURVEY

Summary Report of Findings

Presented to:

Mr. Scott Horsfall

Chief Executive Officer

California Leafy Green Products Handler Marketing Agreement

Sacramento, California

Prepared by:

Dennis H. Tootelian, Ph.D.

Tootelian & Associates

Sacramento, California

January 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
METHODOLOGY	5
FINDINGS OF THE STUDY	6
Traceability Processes	6
Food Safety Staffing	7
Annual Investment in Food Safety	7
Acreage Lost Due to Animal Activity	7
Acreage Lost Due to Buffer Zone Requirements	8
Monthly Water Testing	8
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	10
TABLE ONE: TRACEABILITY PROCESS	13
TABLE TWO: FOOD SAFETY STAFF	14
TABLE THREE: ANNUAL INVESTMENT IN FOOD SAFETY	15
TABLE FOUR: ACREAGE LOST DUE TO ANIMAL ACTIVITY	16
TABLE FIVE: ACREAGE LOST DUE TO BUFFER ZONE REQUIREMENTS	17
TABLE SIX: MONTHLY WATER TESTING	18
APPENDIX A: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	19

CALIFORNIA LEAFY GREEN PRODUCTS 2007 SIGNATORY SURVEY

Summary Report of Findings

INTRODUCTION

In November 2007, the California Leafy Green Products Handler Marketing Agreement (LGMA) retained Tootelian and Associates to assist it in conducting a brief member survey regarding traceability processes and related issues. The overall purpose of the study was to assess changes in member operating practices since September 2006.

Specific issues addressed in this study included:

- Whether LGMA members have traceability processes, and if so whether they expanded them after September 2006.
- How many designated food safety employees LGMA members had before September 2006, and how many they have now.
- How much of an annual investment LGMA members made in food safety prior to September 2006, and how much they invest now.
- What losses LGMA members sustained in acreage due to animal activity since September 2006.
- What losses LGMA members sustained in acreage due to buffer zone requirements since September 2006.
- How many monthly water tests LGMA members performed prior to September, how many they perform now, and what is the average cost of conducting a water test.

Tootelian & Associates is a Sacramento-based marketing and management consulting firm. Dr. Dennis H. Tootelian is a Professor of Marketing and Director of the Center for Small Business in the College of Business Administration at California State University, Sacramento. Dennis has published approximately one hundred articles dealing with all facets of business, and has co-authored six texts on marketing and small business management. His academic research has appeared as articles in such journals as the Journal of Marketing, Journal of Retailing, Journal of Business Research, Journal of Health Care Marketing, and Journal of Professional Services Marketing. Results of some of his applied research and writing have appeared in The Congressional Record, The

Wall Street Journal, Forbes, The Kiplinger Report, USA Today, ABC National News website, and even The National Enquirer.

Dr. Tootelian has worked in a consulting capacity with Fortune 500 companies (e.g., McDonald's Corporation, Merck, Johnson & Johnson, 3M, Nestles U.S.A., McKesson Corporation), professional and trade associations (e.g., California Pharmacists Association, California Dental Association), and federal and state governmental agencies (e.g., Centers for Disease Control, California Department of Food and Agriculture, California Environmental Protection Agency, California Department of Parks and Recreation). He also has served on the Board of Directors for a variety of publicly-traded companies and not-for-profit organization

METHODOLOGY

The population for this survey was defined to be the 118 members of the LGMA. Surveys were sent to the members in November 2007, and 49 responses were received by the closing date. This represents a 41.5% response rate, which is quite high for mail surveys.

The questionnaire consisted of a series of thirteen questions. These questions focused on the six issues identified in the Introduction.

Initially, members were asked to provide specific operating data. A subsequent questionnaire was designed and response categories were established to make the form easier for potential respondents. A copy of the questionnaire is contained in Appendix A.

The results of any research should be used with caution and at the reader's own discretion. Every study, no matter how well constructed, contains the possibility of some degree of error. Accordingly, the reader assumes sole responsibility for the use of this information.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The results of the survey are presented in six sections: Traceability Processes, Food Safety Staffing, Annual Investment in Food Safety, Acreage Lost Due to Animal Activity, Acreage Lost Due to Buffer Zone Requirements, and Monthly Water Testing. Data is presented in total and by approximate size of the respondent's operations as measured by shipment volume. Although respondents were not asked to identify themselves, it was possible to identify most by the shipment volume for small (i.e., 100,000 or less), medium (i.e., 100,001 to 999,999), and large (i.e., 1,000,000 or more) operations. However, *caution should be exercised in using these categories due to the small numbers of respondents in each.*

The number of respondents in each shipment volume category is shown below:

Shipment Volume Category	Number	Sample Percent	Actual Membership
1=0 to 100,000	16	32.7%	34.3%
2=100,001 to 999,999	16	32.7%	36.3%
3=More than 1 million	11	22.4%	29.4%
Unknown	6	12.2%	
Total	49	100.0%	100.0%

This respondent group is reasonably representative of the overall LGMA membership. Using these shipment volume categories, the actual membership percentages are shown in the column to the right. Accordingly, it appears that there is no inherent reason to believe that the respondent group is an atypical sample of the LGMA membership.

Traceability Processes

Respondents were asked if they had traceability processes prior to September 2006, and if so, whether they expanded these programs after that date. Their responses are shown in Table One.

The great majority of respondents (89.8%) indicated they had traceability processes in place. This was the case for respondents in all shipment volume categories.

Of those who had traceability processes, 60.5% stated that they expanded their programs after September 2006. Most respondents in the small and large shipment volume categories expanded their traceability processes, while just under half of the medium size respondents did so.

Food Safety Staffing

Respondents were asked how many staff members they had dedicated to food safety before September 2006 and how many they have now. Their responses are presented in Table Two.

Overall, prior to September 2006, 56.3% of the respondents had one person dedicated to food safety and another 14.6% had two or more. While most small volume respondents did not have a food safety staff member, the majority of medium and large volume respondents had at least one person. If the mid-points in the ranges are used, the approximate average number of dedicated food safety staff was 1.06.

Currently, the single largest group of respondents (31.3%) has three to four food safety staff members, and only 6.3% did not have any. In all volume categories, the number of food safety staff increased. If the mid-points in the ranges are used, the approximate average number of dedicated food safety staff is 2.26.

Annual Investment in Food Safety

Respondents were asked how much they invested annually in food safety prior to September 2006, and how much they invest now. Their responses are presented in Table Three.

The single largest group of respondents (28.9%) indicated they invested between \$10,000 and \$50,000 in food safety prior to September 2006, and the next largest group (24.4%) invested less than \$10,000. Therefore, 53.3% of the respondents stated that they spent \$50,000 or less annually for food safety. The majority of respondents in the small and medium shipment volume categories spent no more than \$50,000 annually, while most of those in the large volume category spent between \$100,001 and \$500,000. If the mid-points in the ranges are used, the approximate average investment in food safety was \$210,000.

Currently, the largest groups of respondents (20.5% each) indicated they invest \$50,001 to \$100,000 or \$200,001 to \$500,000 annually. Larger dollar amounts are invested by respondents with greater shipping volumes, and the amounts invested rose in each category when compared to prior to September 2006. If the mid-points in the ranges are used, the approximate average investment in food safety is \$604,545.

Acreage Lost Due to Animal Activity

Respondents were asked how many acres they lost due to animal activity since September 2006 and what percentage of their total acreage that represents. Their responses are presented in Table Four.

The largest group of respondents (35.0%) indicated they have not lost acreage due to animal activity. However, another 35.0% of the respondents have lost one to twenty acres, and 30.0% have lost more than twenty acres. If the mid-points in the ranges are used, the approximate average number of acres lost is 37.08. The number of acres lost appeared to increase with larger volume shipment categories.

The largest group of respondents (33.3%) indicated that the lost acres represented less than 1% of the total, and another 30.8% said it represented 0%. If the mid-points in the ranges are used, the approximate average percent of acres lost is 1.73%. The percent of acres lost appeared to be highest in the medium volume shipment category.

Acreage Lost Due to Buffer Zone Requirements

Respondents were asked how many acres they lost due to buffer zone requirements since September 2006 and what percentage of their total acreage that represents. Their responses are presented in Table Five.

The largest group of respondents (46.2%) indicated they have not lost acreage due to buffer zone requirements. However, 35.9% of the respondents have lost one to twenty acres, and 17.9% have lost more than twenty acres. If the mid-points in the ranges are used, the approximate average number of acres lost is 91.41. The number of acres lost appeared to increase with larger volume shipment categories.

The largest group of respondents (43.6%) indicated that the lost acres represented none of their total, and another 28.2% said it represented less than 1%. If the mid-points in the ranges are used, the approximate average percent of acres lost is 1.12%. The percent of acres lost appeared to be highest in the medium volume shipment category.

Monthly Water Testing

Respondents were asked how many water tests they conducted before September 2006, how many they conduct now, and what is the average cost to conduct a water test. Their responses are presented in Table Six.

The largest group of respondents (33.3%) indicated they conducted between one and five water tests prior to September 2006, and another 23.8% did not conduct tests. Accordingly, 57.1% of the respondents indicated they conducted no more than five water tests per month. If the mid-points in the ranges are used, the approximate average number of tests was 10.68. The number of tests was highest among small shipment volume respondents.

Currently, all respondents indicated they conduct water tests and the largest group of respondents (27.9%) conducts between eleven and twenty-five tests per month. Overall, while 18.6% of the respondents conduct five or fewer tests per month, 39.5% conduct

more than twenty-five. If the mid-points in the ranges are used, the approximate average number of water tests currently conducted is 52.23. The number of tests is highest among large shipment volume respondents, and lowest among medium volume respondents.

The single largest group of respondents (40.5%) indicated that the average cost of a water test is between \$25 and \$50, and the next largest group (21.4%) said it is between \$51 and \$100. If the mid-points in the ranges are used, the approximate average cost of a water test is \$79.07. Because one respondent indicated the cost to be well above the others, if this one is removed, the average cost would be \$70.01. Respondents in the medium shipment volume category indicated that the cost was substantially higher than did respondents in the other categories.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Based on the Findings of the Study, the following conclusions appear to be appropriate. They are presented in bullet form for emphasis:

- While most LGMA members had traceability processes in place prior to September 2006, about three in five of those with processes expanded them subsequent to that date.
- Seven in ten LGMA members had at least one staff member dedicated to food safety prior to September 2006, and the approximate average was 1.06. Currently, more than nine in ten members have at least one staff member dedicated to food safety, and the approximate average is 2.26. This suggests that the average LGMA member may have more than doubled the number of staff dedicated to food safety since September 2006.
- About three in four LGMA members invested \$10,000 or more annually in food safety prior to September 2006, and the approximate average investment was \$210,000. Currently, more than nine in ten members invest \$10,000 or more annually in food safety, and the approximate average is \$604,545. This indicates that the average LGMA member may have nearly tripled its investment in food safety since September 2006.
- Nearly two in three LGMA members indicated they lost at least one acre due to animal activity, and half lost between one and fifty acres, since September 2006. However, more than nine in ten said it amounted to 5% or less of its total acreage.
- Most LGMA members indicated they lost at least one acre due to buffer zone requirements since September 2006, with nearly two in five indicating they lost between one and twenty acres. However, more than nine in ten said it amounted to 5% or less of its total acreage.
- While more than three in four LGMA members indicated they conducted monthly water tests before September 2006, all reported doing so now. Prior to September 2006, the approximate average number of water tests was 10.68 per month, compared to 52.23 per month now. Therefore, it appears that the number of water tests conducted by LGMA members may have increased about five-fold since September 2006.
- About three in five LGMA members reported that the average cost of a water test is \$50 or less. However, more than two in five indicated it costs more than \$50. With an approximate average cost of at least \$70, this could represent a monthly expenditure by a LGMA member of \$3,657 to conduct water tests.

- Given that the sample was reasonably representative of the shipping volume of all LGMA members, it seems reasonable to extrapolate the results of this study to all LGMA members. Accordingly, it appears that the number of staff dedicated to food safety, the investment in food safety, and the investment in water tests have expanded substantially when comparing the time pre- and post-September 2006 time periods. This is shown below:

	Before 9/2006	After 9/2006	Difference
Number of Dedicated Food Safety Staff	125.1	266.7	141.6
Investment in Food Safety	\$23,718,000	\$71,336,310	\$47,618,310
Number of Water Test per Month	1,260	6,163	4,903
Total Cost of Water Tests	\$88,229	\$431,481	\$343,252

Applying the results to all 118 LGMA members, collectively:

- They increased the size of their staff dedicated to food safety to more than 265 people, which expands the staff by nearly 142 people from the pre- to post-September 2006 time period.
 - They expanded their investments in food safety to \$71.3 million, or increased it by more than \$47.6 million from the pre- to post-September 2006 period.
 - They increased the number of water tests to nearly 6,165 per year, which is about 4,900 more tests than conducted in the pre-September 2006 period.
 - They spent nearly \$431,500 for water testing, which is an increase of more than \$343,250 over the pre-September 2006 period.
- If the results by shipping volume are weighted by the actual number of LGMA members, the findings would be quite similar to those found in the sample:

	100,000 or Less	100,000 to 999,999	1,000,000 or More	Weighted Average
Weighting factor	34.31%	36.27%	29.41%	
Number of Dedicated Food Safety Staff--Before	0.60	0.75	1.73	0.99
Number of Dedicated Food Safety Staff--Now	1.30	2.31	3.32	2.26
Investment in Food Safety--Before	\$29,167	\$75,000	\$325,000	\$132,802
Investment in Food Safety--Now	\$113,333	\$282,000	\$1,309,091	\$526,210
Acres Lost Due to Animal Activity	5.65	17.18	104.09	38.8
Acres Lost Due to Buffer Zone Requirements	9.65	12.04	328.90	104.4
Number of Water Test per Month--Before	17.14	8.06	9.27	11.5
Number of Water Test per Month--Now	47.33	25.66	102.55	55.7
Average Cost of a Water Test	\$53.59	\$111.94	\$57.05	\$75.77
Total Cost of Water Tests--Before	\$918	\$902	\$529	\$798
Total Cost of Water Tests--Now	\$2,537	\$2,872	\$5,850	\$3,633

	Before 9/2006	After 9/2006	Wted Avg. After 9/2006
Number of Dedicated Food Safety Staff	125.1	266.7	266.8
Investment in Food Safety	\$23,718,000	\$71,336,310	\$62,092,750
Number of Water Test per Month	1,260	6,163	6,574
Total Cost of Water Tests	\$88,229	\$431,481	\$428,658

Whichever set of numbers are used, it is quite apparent that significant changes occurred in LGMA member operations when comparing the pre-September 2006 to the current period. An average LGMA member already had a substantial investment in food safety with at least one dedicated staff member, a dollar investment of more than \$200,000, and spending nearly \$750 per month on water tests. However, subsequent to September 2006, LGMA members greatly enhanced their activities as shown by the growth in staffing and investments for food safety.

TABLE ONE: TRACEABILITY PROCESS

			100,000 or Less	100,001 to 999,999	1,000,000 or More
	Total	Total			
1. Have traceability before 2006					
1=Yes	44	89.8%	81.3%	93.8%	100.0%
2=No	5	10.2%	18.8%	6.3%	0.0%
Total	49	100.0%	16	16	11
2. Traceability expanded 9/06					
1=Yes	26	60.5%	75.0%	46.7%	63.6%
2=No	17	39.5%	25.0%	53.3%	36.4%
Total	43	100.0%	12	15	11

TABLE TWO: FOOD SAFETY STAFF

			100,000 or Less	100,001 to 999,999	1,000,000 or More
	Total	Total			
3. Number food safety staff before 2006					
1=None	14	29.2%	53.3%	31.3%	0.0%
2=1	27	56.3%	33.3%	62.5%	72.7%
3=2	5	10.4%	13.3%	6.3%	18.2%
4=3 to 4	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5=5 to 6	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6=More than 6	2	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%
Total	48	100.0%	15	16	11
4. Number of food safety staff now					
1=None	3	6.3%	13.3%	0.0%	0.0%
2=1	14	29.2%	53.3%	25.0%	9.1%
3=2	14	29.2%	26.7%	37.5%	18.2%
4=3 to 4	15	31.3%	6.7%	37.5%	63.6%
5=5 to 6	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6=More than 6	2	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%
Total	48	100.0%	15	16	11

TABLE THREE: ANNUAL INVESTMENT IN FOOD SAFETY

			100,000 or Less	100,001 to 999,999	1,000,000 or More
	Total	Total			
5. Annual investment in food safety before 2006					
1=Less than \$10,000	11	24.4%	58.3%	12.5%	0.0%
2=\$10,000 to \$50,000	13	28.9%	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%
3=\$50,001 to \$100,000	6	13.3%	8.3%	12.5%	27.3%
4=\$100,001 to \$200,000	7	15.6%	8.3%	18.8%	27.3%
5=\$200,001 to \$500,000	6	13.3%	0.0%	6.3%	36.4%
6=\$500,001 to \$1 million	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7=\$1 to \$2 million	1	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%
8=\$2 to \$5 million	1	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9=More than \$5 million	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	45	100.0%	12	16	11
6. Annual investment in food safety now					
1=Less than \$10,000	3	6.8%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%
2=\$10,000 to \$50,000	7	15.9%	41.7%	6.7%	0.0%
3=\$50,001 to \$100,000	9	20.5%	16.7%	40.0%	0.0%
4=\$100,001 to \$200,000	7	15.9%	16.7%	20.0%	9.1%
5=\$200,001 to \$500,000	9	20.5%	0.0%	20.0%	45.5%
6=\$500,001 to \$1 million	4	9.1%	8.3%	6.7%	18.2%
7=\$1 to \$2 million	2	4.5%	0.0%	6.7%	9.1%
8=\$2 to \$5 million	1	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%
9=More than \$5 million	2	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%
Total	44	100.0%	12	15	11

**TABLE FOUR: ACREAGE LOST DUE TO ANIMAL
ACTIVITY**

			100,000 or Less	100,001 to 999,999	1,000,000 or More
	Total	Total			
7. Number of acres lost to animal since 2006					
01=None	14	35.0%	70.0%	21.4%	9.1%
02=1 to 10	10	25.0%	10.0%	35.7%	27.3%
03=11 to 20	4	10.0%	10.0%	14.3%	9.1%
04=21 to 50	6	15.0%	10.0%	21.4%	9.1%
05=51 to 100	3	7.5%	0.0%	7.1%	18.2%
06=101 to 250	1	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%
07=251 to 500	2	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	18.2%
08=501 to 1,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
09=1,001 to 1,500	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
10=More than 1,500	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	40	100.0%	10	14	11
8. Percent of fields lost to animal activity					
1=0%	12	30.8%	70.0%	21.4%	10.0%
2=Less than 1%	13	33.3%	0.0%	14.3%	70.0%
3=1% to 5%	11	28.2%	30.0%	42.9%	20.0%
4=6% to 10%	2	5.1%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%
5=11% to 25%	1	2.6%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%
6=26% to 50%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7=51% to 75%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
8=76% to 99%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9=100%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	39	100.0%	10	14	10

TABLE FIVE: ACREAGE LOST DUE TO BUFFER ZONE REQUIREMENTS

			100,000 or Less	100,001 to 999,999	1,000,000 or More
	Total	Total			
9. Number of acres lost to buffer since 2006					
01=None	18	46.2%	70.0%	50.0%	10.0%
02=1 to 10	9	23.1%	10.0%	14.3%	40.0%
03=11 to 20	5	12.8%	10.0%	21.4%	10.0%
04=21 to 50	1	2.6%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%
05=51 to 100	3	7.7%	10.0%	7.1%	10.0%
06=101 to 250	1	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%
07=251 to 500	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
08=501 to 1,000	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
09=1,001 to 1,500	1	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%
10=More than 1,500	1	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%
Total	39	100.0%	10	14	10
10. Percent lost due to buffer zones					
1=None	17	43.6%	70.0%	50.0%	11.1%
2=Less than 1%	11	28.2%	0.0%	21.4%	55.6%
3=1% to 5%	9	23.1%	30.0%	14.3%	33.3%
4=6% to 10%	2	5.1%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%
5=11% to 25%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6=26% to 50%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7=51% to 75%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
8=76% to 99%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9=100%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	39	100.0%	10	14	9

TABLE SIX: MONTHLY WATER TESTING

			100,000 or Less	100,001 to 999,999	1,000,000 or More
	Total	Total			
11. Average number of monthly water tests before 2006					
01=None	10	23.8%	36.4%	18.8%	18.2%
02=1 to 5	14	33.3%	36.4%	31.3%	36.4%
03=6 to 10	9	21.4%	9.1%	31.3%	18.2%
04=11 to 25	6	14.3%	9.1%	12.5%	18.2%
05=26 to 50	2	4.8%	0.0%	6.3%	9.1%
06=51 to 100	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
07=101 to 200	1	2.4%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%
08=201 to 300	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
09=301 to 400	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
10=More than 400	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	42	100.0%	11	16	11
12. Average number of water tests perform now					
01=None	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
02=1 to 5	8	18.6%	50.0%	12.5%	0.0%
03=6 to 10	6	14.0%	8.3%	25.0%	0.0%
04=11 to 25	12	27.9%	25.0%	37.5%	18.2%
05=26 to 50	6	14.0%	8.3%	6.3%	27.3%
06=51 to 100	7	16.3%	0.0%	18.8%	27.3%
07=101 to 200	1	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%
08=201 to 300	1	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%
09=301 to 400	1	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%
10=More than 400	1	2.3%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	43	100.0%	12	16	11
13. Average cost of water test					
1=Less than \$25	8	19.0%	18.2%	12.5%	18.2%
2=\$25 to \$50	17	40.5%	45.5%	43.8%	36.4%
3=\$51 to \$100	9	21.4%	27.3%	12.5%	36.4%
4=\$101 to \$200	3	7.1%	9.1%	6.3%	9.1%
5=\$201 to \$300	4	9.5%	0.0%	18.8%	0.0%
6=\$301 to \$400	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7=\$401 to \$500	1	2.4%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%
8=More than \$500	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	42	100.0%	11	16	11

APPENDIX A: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

2007 Signatory Survey

**Fax Back to
LGMA by
12/14/2007**

General Requirements

The LGMA requires all members to have a traceability process which enables identification of immediate non-transporter source and subsequent recipient.

1. Did you have a traceability process in place prior to September 2006?

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. If you did have a traceability process prior to September 2006, did you expand on that process afterward?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Applicable

In order to comply with the LGMA's requirements, signatory members must maintain extensive records and policies. We know that many signatories have expanded their food safety programs in order to comply with these requirements.

3. Which of the following categories best describes how many designated food safety staff did you employ prior to September 2006?

<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 to 4
<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 to 6
<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> More than 6

4. Which of the following categories best describes how many designated food safety staff do you employ now?

<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 to 4
<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 to 6
<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> More than 6

5. Which of the following categories best describes what was your annual investment in food safety prior to September 2006? (This amount should reflect administrative investments including: personnel, 3rd party audits, assessments and equipment. This amount should not include loss of crops due to buffer zones or other LGMA requirements.)

<input type="checkbox"/> Less than \$10,000	<input type="checkbox"/> \$500,001 to \$1,000,000
<input type="checkbox"/> \$10,000 to \$50,000	<input type="checkbox"/> \$1,000,001 to \$2,000,000
<input type="checkbox"/> \$50,001 to \$100,000	<input type="checkbox"/> \$2,000,001 to \$5,000,000
<input type="checkbox"/> \$100,001 to \$200,000	<input type="checkbox"/> More than \$5,000,000
<input type="checkbox"/> \$200,001 to \$500,000	

5. Which of the following categories best describes your annual investment in food safety now? (This amount should reflect administrative investments including: personnel, 3rd party audits, assessments and equipment. This amount should not include loss of crops due to buffer zones or other LGMA requirements.)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than \$10,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$500,001 to \$1,000,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$10,000 to \$50,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$1,000,001 to \$2,000,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$50,001 to \$100,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$2,000,001 to \$5,000,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$100,001 to \$200,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> More than \$5,000,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$200,001 to \$500,000 | |

Environmental Assessments

LGMA metrics require an animal activity assessment to identify the presence or evidence of animals of significant risk as well as feces of animals of significant risk in the field.

7. Which of the following categories best describes how many total acres of leafy greens have you lost due to animal activity since September 2006?

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> None | <input type="checkbox"/> 101 to 250 acres |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 to 10 acres | <input type="checkbox"/> 251 to 500 acres |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 11 to 20 acres | <input type="checkbox"/> 501 to 1,000 acres |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 21 to 50 acres | <input type="checkbox"/> 1,001 to 1,500 acres |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 51 to 100 acres | <input type="checkbox"/> More than 1,500 acres |

8. Which of the following categories best describes the estimated percentage of fields under your control that have lost acreage due to animal activity?

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 0% | <input type="checkbox"/> 26% to 50% |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 1% | <input type="checkbox"/> 51% to 75% |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1% to 5% | <input type="checkbox"/> 76% to 99% |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6% to 10% | <input type="checkbox"/> 100% |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 11% to 25% | |

LGMA metrics require buffer zones for adjacent land use. Adjacent land use areas of concern include compost operations, confined animal feeding operations, storage of non-synthetic soil amendments, etc.

9. Which of the following categories best describes how many total acres of leafy greens have you lost due to buffer zone requirements since September 2006?

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> None | <input type="checkbox"/> 101 to 250 acres |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 to 10 acres | <input type="checkbox"/> 251 to 500 acres |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 11 to 20 acres | <input type="checkbox"/> 501 to 1,000 acres |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 21 to 50 acres | <input type="checkbox"/> 1,001 to 1,500 acres |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 51 to 100 acres | <input type="checkbox"/> More than 1,500 acres |

10. Which of the following categories best describes the percentage of fields under your control that have lost acreage due to buffer zones?

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 0% | <input type="checkbox"/> 26% to 50% |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 1% | <input type="checkbox"/> 51% to 75% |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1% to 5% | <input type="checkbox"/> 76% to 99% |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6% to 10% | <input type="checkbox"/> 100% |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 11% to 25% | |

Water Use

LGMA metrics require regular testing of water sources.

11. Which of the following categories best describes the average number of monthly water tests you performed prior to September 2006?

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> None | <input type="checkbox"/> 51 to 100 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 to 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 101 to 200 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6 to 10 | <input type="checkbox"/> 201 to 300 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 11 to 25 | <input type="checkbox"/> 301 to 400 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 26 to 50 | <input type="checkbox"/> More than 400 |

12. Which of the following categories best describes the average number of monthly water tests you perform now?

- ☐ None
- ☐ 1 to 5
- ☐ 6 to 10
- ☐ 11 to 25
- ☐ 26 to 50
- ☐ 51 to 100
- ☐ 101 to 200
- ☐ 201 to 300
- ☐ 301 to 400
- ☐ More than 400

13. Which of the following categories best describes your average cost of conducting a water test?

- ☐ Less than \$25
- ☐ \$25 to \$50
- ☐ \$51 to \$100
- ☐ \$101 to \$200
- ☐ \$201 to \$300
- ☐ \$301 to \$400
- ☐ \$401 to \$500
- ☐ More than \$500

Please fax your completed survey to the LGMA at 916-446-1063.