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Executive Summary

Producer Survey Results

The Survey Research Center (SRC) surveyed producers listing in the Farm Fresh Atlas (FFA) during the spring of 2017, 2018, and 2019. Over the years, responses from producers have been fairly robust with 146 completed surveys received in 2017 (41% response rate), 184 (50%) in 2018, and 155 (48%) in 2019 (Figure 1). Because of the relatively high response rate and the consistency of the data over time, the SRC feels the estimates in this report should reflect producer opinions with reasonable accuracy.

Most of those who responded to these producer surveys were the owners of the farms (Figure 2), female (Figure 3), had been farming for several years (Figure 4), about half were 55 or older (Figure 5), and about two-thirds had at least a 4-year college degree (Figure 6).

The most common types of products offered by FFA producers were vegetables, meat, and fruit (Figure 7). The average FFA producer sold things in three product categories in each of the three years.

In terms of production practices, over time, more FFA producers are either certified organic or transitioning to organic and fewer are organic but not certified (Figure 8). The proportion who practice reduced use of chemicals has been steady at a bit more than one-third of the respondents.

Over the three years of this study, roughly 4 out of 5 livestock producers use pasture-based management and about half said they utilize animal-care based management (Figure 9).

Word of mouth advertising is almost universally important to FFA producers (Figure 10). Electronic marketing options (social media and websites) are important or very important to about three-quarters of FFA producers. Slightly more than half of FFA producers said a presence at their farmers market and being listed in the FFA are important or very important marketing channels for them.

Over the 2017–2019 period, an average of 80% or more of the respondents said that none of their output is sold at a roadside stand, a food hub/co-op, to a wholesaler or to a food processor (Figure 11a). About half the FFA producers, on average, sell up to half of their output at farmers markets, on-farm stores, restaurants, or retailers (Figure 11b). About one-in-five FFA producers sell more than half of their output via on-farm stores or at farmers markets (Figure 11c). The average number of marketing channels utilized by FFA producers increased from 3.8 to 4.1 between 2017 and 2019, suggesting increasing diversification of markets being served.

Most of the producers responding to the surveys in 2017, 2018, and 2019 have listed their businesses with FFA for multiple years; in all three surveys, fewer than one-in-five were listing in FFA for the first time (Figure 12).

In terms of satisfaction with FFA, between about two-thirds and three-quarters of the respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the cost to list/advertise in FFA (Figure 13). Roughly one-third of the respondents, on average, were satisfied or very satisfied with the Atlas’ impact on sales and profits, their understanding of marketing options and in terms of opening up new markets. Few producers are
dissatisfied with FFA’s cost of listing and helping them to understand marketing options. Nearly one-in-five, however, were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with FFA’s impact on sales, impact on profits, and opening up new markets. Older farmers, those with more years of experience, and fruit growers tend to be more satisfied with FFA.

Over the three years, an average of 21% said participation in the FFA had no impact on their total sales (Figure 14a). Nearly half the respondents said the FFA had increased sales by 5% or less. An average of 21% said participation in the FFA boosted sales by between 6% and 10%. There is a strong positive correlation between a respondent’s estimate of how much FFA has increased sales on their farm and their satisfaction with the Atlas.

Producers, on average, said the impact of the FFA on their profits was smaller than its impact on sales (Figure 14b). On average, one-quarter of the respondents said the FFA had no impact on profits, slightly more than half said the Atlas increased profits by 5% or less, 17% said their profits were 6% - 10% higher because of the Atlas. There were strongly positive correlations between the FFA’s estimated impact on profit and satisfaction with the Atlas.

In each of the three years during which producers were surveyed, they were asked to rate the prior year in terms of production, sales, and profitability. These results cover production and marketing in 2016, 2017, and 2018. When asked to rate the previous growing season in terms of production as below average, average, or above average, slightly more than half said the previous growing season had been about average (Figure 15a). A slightly higher proportion of producers said production in the prior year had been above average (26% on average over the three years) than said it was worse than average (18%).

Slightly more than half the respondents (an average of 55%) said the previous year had been about average in terms of sales (Figure 15b). Slightly more (an average of 24%) said the previous year’s sales had been above average than said sales had been below average (21%).

The proportion rating the prior year’s profitability as “average” has been falling while those saying it was below average has been on the rise (Figure 15c). Substantially higher proportions of producers rated the prior year as below average with respect to income than rated it above average and that gap has increased over time.

Median sales for FFA producers were $40,000 in 2016, $36,000 in 2017 and $60,000 in 2018 (Figure 16a). The higher median sales in 2018 is the result of conspicuously more FFA producers reporting sales of $50,000 - $100,000 and over $250,000.

Substantial proportions of FFA producers pay no salaries to family members (Figure 16b). Median amounts of salaries paid to family members were all quite low: $1,250 in 2016, $0 in 2017, and $3,000 in 2018.

On average, a bit more than one-third of the FFA respondents said they broke even or lost money in the previous year (Figure 16c). Median net income/profits were $3,000 in 2016, $2,500 in 2017, and $5,700 in 2018.
The average number of full-time workers per farm fell slightly over time; from 1.83 in 2016, to 1.76 in 2017, to 1.64 in 2018. About one-in-five FFA producers have no full-time employees (Figure 17a).

The average number of part-time workers in FTEs was 2.8 in 2016, 1.7 in 2017, and 1.9 in 2018. There seems to be an increasing number of FFA producers who have no part-time workers; 27% of respondents in 2017 said they had zero FTE of part-time workers and this increased to 40% in 2018 (Figure 17b).

On average, FFA producer households had 1.2 people employed off-farm in 2016, 1.1 people in 2017 and 1.3 people in 2018. Slightly less than one-third of the respondents had no one with off-farm employment, a bit more than one-third had one person working off the farm, and the remaining producers had two or more people with off-farm employment (Figure 17c).

The SRC worked with Dave Marcouiller of the UW-Madison, Natural Resource Institute who used the IMPLAN regional economic model to estimate the impact of the Atlas on the Wisconsin state economy (Table 1). Based on an assumed increase of 10% in total sales attributable to the FFA, the IMPLAN model estimates that the Atlas created 38 additional jobs for the Wisconsin economy, nearly a million dollars of additional labor income, $1.4 million in total net income and $2.9 million in additional economic activity each year (Table 2).

In sum, producers seem to feel that the FFA is an important marketing mechanism and most say their participation has increased their sales and profits. The IMPLAN results suggest the statewide impacts are relatively modest in terms of job creation, but more significant in terms of total economic activity.

Consumer Survey Results

Between late March and mid-June of 2018, 162 people completed an on-line survey asking about their awareness of the Farm Fresh Atlas (FFA), its impact on their purchase decisions, and on their future purchases.

Respondents said they found out about the survey from FFA social media, emails, and other related publications. Because they self-selected to complete the survey, it is likely that these consumers have a higher level of interest in locally produced food products than the average Wisconsin consumer.

Respondents were mostly female (80%), between 35 and 64 years of age (64%), and from households of one or two people (60%) (Table 3).

A majority of the respondents (56%), said they spend $100 or less per week on groceries (Figure 18).

The consumers who responded to the Farm Fresh Atlas survey live throughout Wisconsin, though there is a concentration who live in the Madison to Milwaukee corridor and a handful with home addresses outside the state (Map 1).
Nearly 80% of these consumers said they’d heard of the FFA prior to participating in the survey (Figure 19). Again, because of how they were invited to take the survey and because the SRC believes these consumers likely have a higher-than-average level of interest in local food, this result is not surprising. Social media and farmers markets were the two most common means by which consumers came to be aware of the Atlas (Figure 20).

The most influential source of information regarding local food purchases, by a substantial margin, was “friends and family,” nearly two-thirds of respondents said this information source influenced their food purchase choices (Figure 21). This result aligns with other research on local food purchases with which the SRC has been involved. Social media, which might be viewed as an extension of the influence of friends and family, was influential for nearly half the respondents.

Nearly four of every five said they’d visited a farm in the past year, nine of ten had eaten at a restaurant whose menu included locally produced food, and all but 3% had visited a farmers market (Figure 22). Again, this is consistent with a set of people who are more interested in local foods than the average consumer. Many also reported multiple visits per year to farms, farmers markets and restaurants featuring local foods.

Substantial majorities of respondents agreed that because of the FFA they would buy more local foods (67%), will buy from a local food supplier they’d not patronized before (84%), and their local food knowledge had increased (94%) (Figure 23). More than half said they knew where to buy local foods before viewing the FFA. At least with respect to this set of consumers, the Atlas is producing the desired outcomes.

Roughly two-thirds of these consumers said that, because they had viewed the Atlas, they are likely to increase their purchases at farmers markets and to talk with friends and family about local foods (Figure 24). In contrast, only 6% of the 127 people who responded to this question said that viewing the Atlas would not affect any of their decisions regarding local foods (e.g. attending local food events, shopping at grocers with local foods, posting on social media about local foods, etc.). The average respondent said they were likely to increase their engagement in three local food activities.

Nearly three quarters of the respondents said they expect to buy more locally-produced vegetables and almost half to buy more locally produced dairy products in the future (Figure 25). The distribution of products consumers anticipate buying in greater quantities aligns reasonably well with the products offered most often by FFA growers.

In sum, for the consumers who completed this survey, these data strongly support the conclusions that the Farm Fresh Atlas increased their intention to buy more local foods, to buy from a local food vendor they had not previously patronized, and that the Atlas had increased their knowledge about where to buy local foods. Further, the types of locally produced foods these consumers expect to buy in the coming year, tend to align well with the types of products Farm Fresh Atlas producers offer to consumers.
Description and Analysis of Producer Surveys

The Data

The Survey Research Center (SRC) sent surveys to producers listed in the Farm Fresh Atlas (FFA) in 2017, 2018, and 2019.

- In 2017, 329 FFA producers were invited to participate in an online survey and 24 via a paper survey sent to their home address.
- In 2018, 346 producers were invited to participate in the survey online and 22 via a paper survey.
- In 2019, 315 producers were invited to participate online and only 7 via a paper survey.

Figure 1 shows the number of completed surveys in each of the three years.

![Figure 1: Farm Fresh Atlas Producer Survey Sample Size, 2017 - 2019](image)

The response rate in 2017 was 41%, it was 50% in 2018, and 48% in 2019. In 2017, surveys were not mailed until the end of March, the start of producers’ busy season. The earlier mailing date in 2018 and 2019, when surveys were sent in February, probably improved the response rate. Based on these response rates, estimates for 2017 are expected to have a margin of error of +/- 6.2%, +/- 5.1% for 2018, and +/- 5.7% for 2019. However, numerous respondents did not complete the section of the questionnaire asking about the financial experiences of respondents in terms of their sales and income. As a result, the confidence intervals for these questions will be quite a bit wider (about +/- 10.5% for 2017, +/- 7.6% for 2018 and, +/- 8.7% for 2019). Despite this, the SRC feels the estimates in this report should reflect producer opinions with reasonable accuracy.

A numeric summary of producers’ responses to the survey in the three years is included as Appendix B1.
Producer Demographic Information

A limited amount of demographic information about the producers who completed the survey was gathered.

As Figure 2 indicates, most of the respondents were owners and the proportion of owners increased slightly from 80% in 2017 (blue bar) to 81% in 2018 (red bar) and 83% in 2019 (green bar). Slightly more than one-in-ten surveys was completed by a farm manager. In the “Other” category, many respondents said they filled all of the roles listed in Figure 2 (See Appendix A1).

In Figure 3, showing the gender with which respondents most identify, we see that there were about 50% more women (red segments) than men (blue segments) represented in the sample in all three years – men comprised about 40% of respondents and women 60%.
On average, slightly less than 10% of the respondents had been in business for 3 years or fewer, about one-third for between 4 and 10 years, slightly less than one-in-five for 11 – 20 years and about 40% for 21+ years. Though it appears in Figure 4, that there were somewhat more less experienced producers in the 2019 sample (green bars), the difference is not statistically significant.

There has been some variation in the age of respondents over the three years of collecting data, but in all years, there were notable peaks in the number of respondents in the 35 – 44 age group, with about one-quarter of the responses, and 55 – 64 age group, with about one-third of the responses (Figure 5). A healthy and growing proportion of respondents were in the 25 – 34 age category, suggesting an ongoing injection of new entrants.
FFA producers have, on average, a significant amount of formal education (Figure 6). For Wisconsin as a whole, less than 30% of adults 25 and older have at least a 4-year college degree. In contrast, an average of 66% of FFA producers have at least a bachelor’s degree. Fewer than 10% of respondents have a high school degree or less.

In the analysis to follow, the SRC will compare the opinions of different demographic subgroups of producers (men vs. women, those who’ve farmed for 10 years or fewer vs those with more experience, etc.) and some key types of production (meat, poultry, fruit, and vegetables). Response patterns that vary at statistically significant levels ($p < .05$) will be noted in the report. In statistics, a result is statistically significant if observed differences, usually in average values, in two groups are unlikely to have occurred by chance. Statistical significance is expressed as a probability that the real average values are the same. A commonly used probability standard is .05 (5%). Statistical significance at the .05 level indicates there is only a 5 in 100 probability that the average values in two groups are equal. It does not mean the difference is necessarily large, important, or significant in the common meaning of the word.

**Products Sold by Farm Fresh Atlas Producers**

Figure 7 (next page) shows the percentage of FFA producers who said they sold items in 16 specific product categories plus an “other” product category. The top (green) bar is for 2019, the middle (red) bar is for 2018, and the bottom (blue) bar is for 2017. In all three years, vegetables, meat and fruit were the most common types of products offered by FFA producers. There have been no significant changes in the mix of products offered over these three years.

There was a wide diversity of products listed in the “other” category, including: wine, wool, yarn, hides, flour, mushrooms, sunflower oil, garlic, fish, rabbits, popcorn, nuts, beeswax candles, candy, classes, hemp, dog treats, dry beans, fruit trees, and bird seed (See Appendix A1).
The number of product categories offered in each year by a given producer ranged from a single category up to 10 or 11 product categories. The average FFA producer sold things in three product categories in each of the three years. There were also a few clusters of offerings. If a producer said they sell:

- meat, there was a better than 50% probability that they also sold poultry
- poultry, there was a better than 50% probability that they also sold eggs and meat
- vegetables, there was a better than 50% probability that they sold herbs and plants (and vice versa)
Production Practices

Producers were asked if any of four production practices applied to their operation. Figure 8 summarizes their responses for each year with the first (blue) bar for 2017, the middle (red) bar for 2018, and third (green) bar for 2019. The data suggest that, over time, more FFA producers are either certified organic or transitioning to organic and fewer are organic but not certified. The proportion who practice reduced use of chemicals has been steady at a bit more than one-third of the respondents.

![Figure 8: Farm Fresh Atlas Production Practices 2017 - 2019](image)

Vegetable producers were significantly more likely to report they used all the production practices shown in Figure 8. Meat, poultry, egg, pumpkin, and herb/flower/plant producers were more likely to be transitioning to organic. Those selling eggs were more likely to be certified organic. Meat producers were more likely to report using less chemicals.

The proportion of FFA producers involved in livestock production who use pasture-based management, animal-care based management or have other certifications are shown in Figure 9 (next page). As in Figure 8, the first (blue) bar is for 2017, middle (red) bar for 2018, and third (green) bar for 2019. Over the three years of this study, roughly 4 out of 5 livestock producers use pasture-based management and about half said they utilize animal-care based management. Other certifications noted by respondents included: grass/pasture fed, animal welfare, disease free, all natural, farmer-veteran coalition, HCCP, export certified, and hormone free (See Appendix A1).
Farm Fresh Atlas Producers’ Marketing Practices

Advertising

In each of the three years that FFA producers were surveyed, they were asked how important a variety of advertising options were for their operation. There was relatively little variation across the three surveys so the SRC chose to present the average percent of respondents saying a given option was important or very important to their farm (Figure 10, next page).

The importance of the options considered appear to fall into fairly distinct strata:

- word of mouth advertising is almost universally important to FFA producers (98% said it was important or very important)
- electronic marketing options (social media and websites) are important or very important to about three-quarters of FFA producers
- slightly more than half said a presence at their farmers market and being listed in the FFA are important or very important
- slightly less than half said brochures, sponsoring local events and other advertising options were important or very important; other advertising options included radio ads, participation in festivals, cold calls on potential buyers, farm tours, chefs’ recommendations, awards, workshops, roadside billboards, and teaching classes (See Appendix A1).
- Between about one-in-five and one-in-ten respondents said that Something Special in Wisconsin, Wisconsin Foodie, FairShare CSA Coalition, or Print ads were important advertising mechanisms for them.
There is at least a 33% chance that if a producer said:

- the FFA was an important advertising outlet, they also said Something Special in WI was important
- social media is important, they also said their website was important
- Something Special in Wisconsin is important, they also said print ads and the Wisconsin Foodie (and FFA) were important
- Print ads are important, they also said brochures and WI Foodie (and Something Special in WI) were important
- The Wisconsin Foodie is important, they also said the Fair Share program, brochures and sponsoring events (and print ads and Something Special in WI) were important
- Brochures are important, they also said sponsoring local events (and print ads and WI Foodie) were important
Marketing Channels Used

FFA Producers were asked what proportion of their output they market via a dozen potential marketing channels. In Figures 11a to 11c, the top (green) bar in each set shows the percent for 2019, middle (red) for 2018, and bottom (blue) for 2017.

Figure 11a: Marketing Channels Not Used for Any Sales, FFA Producers, 2017 - 2019

Figure 11a shows the proportion of respondents who said they sold none of their output via these channels. Over the 2017 – 2019 period an average of 80% or more of the respondents said they don’t sell any of their output at a roadside stand, a food hub/co-op, to a wholesaler or to a food processor. Between two-thirds and three-quarters don’t sell any output through a CSA, online, to institutions (e.g. schools), or a U-pick operation. Only between one-quarter and half sell nothing at an on-farm store, farmers market, restaurants, or retailers (e.g. grocery stores).
Figure 11b shows the percentage of respondents who use a marketing channel for up to half of their output. About half the FFA producers, on average, sell up to half of their output at farmers markets, on-farm stores, restaurants, or retailers. About one-quarter of FFA producers sell up to half their output to institutions, via CSAs, or online. The other marketing channels (food processors, wholesalers, U-pick, food hub/co-op and roadside stands) are used to market up to half of output by relatively few FFA producers.
Figure 11c shows that, by far, FFA producers are most likely to sell a majority of their products via on-farm stores or at farmers markets; about one-in-five FFA producers sell at least half their output via these channels. About one in ten sell half or more of their output via a CSA. None of the other marketing channels account for a majority of the output for as much as 10% of FFA producers.

The average number of marketing channels utilized has been increasing slightly over the three years of this study, suggesting increasing diversification of marketing venues:

- 2017 = 3.79 marketing channels used
- 2018 = 3.90 marketing channels used
- 2019 = 4.08 marketing channels used
There are at least a couple of clusters of marketing options utilized by FFA producers. At least 25% of FFA producers who sell output via a CSA also sell product at farm stores and to restaurants. Similarly, at least 25% of those who sell to retailers also sell via on-farm stores, to restaurants, institutions, food processors and wholesalers.

Producers Actions/Opinions about the Farm Fresh Atlas

Most of the producers responding to the surveys in 2017, 2018, and 2019 have listed their businesses with FFA for multiple years (Figure 12). As in previous graphs, the first (blue) bar represents 2017, the middle (red) bar 2018, and the third (green) bar 2019. Fewer than one-in-five respondents said that this was their first year in which they were listed in FFA, 40% or more had listed for 2 – 5 years, and one-in-five had listed for between 6 and 10 years and for more than 10 years. Year to year results are fairly consistent.

Based on the responses over the 2017 – 2019 surveys, producers selling meat and poultry have been listing in the FFA for significantly fewer years than those selling fruit. Producers 45 or younger tend to have listed with FFA for significantly fewer years than producers older than that and, not surprisingly, the longer a producer has been in business, the more years they are likely to have listed in the FFA.

Producers were asked how satisfied they were with various aspects of FFA: its impact on their farm’s profits, on opening new markets, in helping them to understand effective new marketing options, on sales and the cost of listing/advertising. Answer options were unsure, very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, neutral, satisfied and very satisfied. In Figure 13 (next page), the SRC excluded the “unsure” responses and present the percent of respondents who had an opinion and were either satisfied or very satisfied with a given aspect of FFA. As usual, the first (blue) bar is for 2017, the middle (red) bar for 2018, and the third (green) bar for 2019.
Between about two-thirds and three-quarters of the respondents over the 2017 – 2019 surveys were satisfied or very satisfied with the cost to list/advertise in FFA. Roughly one-third of the respondents, on average, were satisfied or very satisfied with the other aspects of FFA shown in Figure 13.

There is relatively little dissatisfaction with FFA in terms of cost (an average of 4% were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied) and understanding marketing options (7%). There was more dissatisfaction with FFA’s impact on sales (17% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied), impact on profits (17%), and opening up new markets (17%).

About half the respondents said they were neutral in terms of their satisfaction with all factors shown in Figure 13 other than cost (25% neutral).

We found that:

- Meat and poultry producers are less satisfied with some features of the FFA (impact on sales, opening new markets, impact on profits (poultry only).
- Fruit producers are more satisfied with the FFA’s impact on sales and profitability.
- Newer and younger producers are more unsure of the impact of FFA (on sales, profits, opening new markets), while those who are older and with more than ten years of farming are more satisfied with those aspects of the Atlas.
- Women are more unsure about the impact of the FFA (on sales and profits), men are more satisfied with the Atlas’ impact on these outcomes.

Respondents were asked to estimate the percentage by which participation in the FFA has increased total sales and new income/profits. Answer options for both questions were 0%, 5% or less, 6% - 10%, 11% - 20%, and more than 20%. In each column of Figures 14a and 14b, the bottom (blue) segment
measures the proportion of respondents saying the FFA had no impact, the second (red) segment is for those saying the FFA improved things by up to 5%, the third (green) segment up to 10%, the fourth (purple) segment up to 20% and the thin (yellow) segment more than 20%.

Over the three years, an average of 21% said participation in the FFA had no impact on their total sales (Figure 14a). Nearly half the respondents said the FFA had a relatively minor impact; sales increased by 5% or less. An average of 21% said participation in the FFA boosted sales by between 6% and 10% and another 10% said the FFA had increased sales by at least 11%.

In terms of key subsets of respondents:

- Meat producers were significantly more likely to say listing in FFA had no impact on their sales.
- Fruit producers were significantly more likely to say that the FFA had increased their sales by more than 5%.
- Those with less than 10 years of farming experience and those under 45 years of age were significantly more likely to say FFA has not affected their sales, while those with more than 10 years and those older than 45 were more likely to say the Atlas has increased their sales by more than 5%.

It is probably not surprising that there is a strong positive correlation between a respondent’s estimate of how much FFA has increased sales on their farm and their satisfaction with all elements of the Atlas (cost to list, impact on sales, impact on profits, understanding marketing options, and opening new markets).
Producers, on average, said the impact of the FFA on their profits was smaller than its impact on sales (Figure 14b). On average, one-quarter of the respondents said the FFA had no impact on profits, slightly more than half said the Atlas increased profits by 5% or less, 17% said their profits were 6% - 10% higher because of the FFA, and only 7% said profits were up by more than 10%.

The results at the subgroup level for income align with the results for sales discussed above. Meat producers said the FFA impact in income was significantly less than average and fruit producer just the opposite. Newer/younger farmers felt that the FFA had a smaller impact on income than farmers with more experience and who were older.

Similarly, there were strongly positive correlations between the FFA’s estimated impact on income and satisfaction with the cost of listing in the FFA, the Atlas’ impact on sales and income, its ability to open new markets, and to explain effective new marketing strategies.

**Production and Business Factors**

Producers were asked to think back to the previous year and rate the growing season in terms of their farm’s production, sales, and net income/profitability. Responses in 2017 referenced the 2016 growing season, those in 2018 referenced 2017, and the 2019 survey responses referred to the 2018 season (Figures 15a – 15c). Again, the first (blue) bar is for responses gathered in 2017, the middle (red) bar for 2018, and the third (green) bar for 2019.

Comparing responses across the three years, there were no significant differences in how producers rated the previous year with respect to production, sales, or income. In other words, none of the years stood out as particularly good or poor with respect to production, sales or income.

**Production.** In each year, slightly more than half said the previous growing season had been about average in terms of production (Figure 15a). A slightly higher proportion of producers said production in the prior year had been above average (26%) than said it was worse than average (18%). But, that gap
narrowed considerably in producers’ assessment of 2018, with only 2% more saying 2018 had been an above average production year than said the year was worse than average.

![Production Rating for 2016 - 2018, Farm Fresh Atlas Producers](image)

Meat producers were significantly more likely to say production in the previous year had been average, but fruit producers were more likely to say the previous year had been poor in terms of production.

**Sales.** As was the case with production, slightly more than half the respondents (an average of 55%) said the previous year had been about average in terms of sales (Figure 15b, next page). Slightly more (an average of 24%) said the previous year’s sales had been above average than said sales had been below average (21%).

It may seem contradictory that, for the 2018 growing season, the gap between below and above average sales increased, even though Figure 10a indicated that production in that year was below average. Economic theory and evidence suggest that demand for foodstuffs tends to be “inelastic.” This means that consumers generally want a somewhat fixed amount of food products. The practical effect of “inelastic demand” is that if production declines, prices rise by more than enough to off-set the lower volume of products farmers have to sell and total revenues (sales) actually increase.

Meat producers were more likely to rate sales over the past three production cycles as average. In contrast, higher proportions of fruit producers were in both the below (25% of fruit producers vs. 18% of those producing other products) and above (28% of fruit producers vs. 21% of those growing other things) average sales ratings.
Income. Figure 15c shows the ratings FFA producers gave to income generated by their operations during 2016 – 2018. Pretty clearly, the proportion rating profitability as “average” has been falling while whose saying it was below average has been on the rise. In contrast to production (Figure 15a) and sales (Figure 15b), substantially higher proportions of producers rated profitability the prior year as below average than rated it above average and that gap has increased.
The only statistically significant difference across key subgroups in terms of their rating of profits in prior years was for fruit producers, where higher proportions said the prior year was both below and above average, indicating greater variability of profit experiences for fruit producers.

**Dollar Value of Sales**

Each year, producers were asked to indicate the total dollar value of sales from their farm (Figure 16a), the amount of salaries paid to family members (Figure 16b), and total annual profits (Figure 16c) for the prior year. The usual pattern pertains with the top/green bar for 2018, middle/red bar for 2017, and bottom/blue bar for 2016).

Across the 3 years, only between one-half and two-thirds of the respondents provided a sales figure. Figure 16a shows that there was a very wide variation in sales across FFA producers in all three years. Each year there were some respondents who reported no sales in the prior year and some that said they sold in excess of $1,000,000. When data are skewed in this way, the median (half the respondents reported sales less than the median amount and half reported sales greater than the median) is a better measure of the central tendency of the data. The median sales for FFA producers were:

- $40,000 in 2016
- $36,000 in 2017
- $60,000 in 2018
The higher median sales in 2018 is the result of conspicuously more FFA producers reporting sales of $50,000 - $100,000 and over $250,000 (Figure 16a). The average differences across the three years are not statistically significant.

Poultry producers and those in business for 10 years or less reported significantly lower sales than those producing things other than poultry and those who’d been in business for more than 10 years.

Salaries Paid to Family

Figure 16b shows the amount paid as salaries to family members by FFA producers for 2016 - 2018. Again, only between half and two-thirds of the respondents provided data on salaries paid to family members. As with sales, there is a very skewed distribution with many FFA producers paying family members no salaries and a handful paying six-figure amounts of salaries to their families.

The median salaries paid to family members in the three years are:

- $1,250 in 2016
- $0 in 2017
- $3,000 in 2018
The year to year differences in salaries paid to family members is not statistically significant. But, there were significant differences among key subgroups of respondents:

- Meat producers paid significantly more and poultry producers significantly less to family members than producers of other products
- Those in business for less than 10 years paid less than older businesses
- Male respondents reported higher family salary levels than female producers did

Net Income/Profits Earned

Slightly lower proportions (49% - 60%) provided an answer to the question, “What was the profit/net income from your farm in the previous year?” than did so for sales and salaries for family members. Figure 16c indicates that, on average, a bit more than one-third of the FFA respondents said they broke even or lost money in the previous year. In all three years there was more than a $200,000 difference in between the FFA respondent with the highest and lowest net income/profit. The median net income/profit levels were:

- $3,000 in 2016
- $2,500 in 2017
- $5,700 in 2018
Nearly twice the proportion of respondents reported net income/profits in the $25,001 to $50,000 range for 2018 as in the two previous years. That bulge and a slightly smaller one in the $10,001 - $25,000 range accounts for the higher median net income/profit in 2018. The year to year differences in net farm income/profit is not significant.

Compared to other types of production, meat and poultry producers had significantly lower annual net incomes/profits.

**Employment on FFA Farms**

In each of the three years of the FFA producer survey, respondents were asked to indicate how many full-time workers and full-time equivalent part-time workers were employed on their farm in the prior year and how many family members had off-farm jobs in the previous year. As usual, the top/green bar in Figures 17a and 17b is for 2018, the middle/red bar for 2017, and the bottom/blue for 2016.

![Figure 17a: Farm Fresh Atlas Producers, Full-Time Employees, 2016 - 2018](image)

Slightly less than three-quarters of the FFA producers each year told us how many full-time workers were employed on their farms in the previous year. The average number of full-time workers fell slightly over time; from 1.83 in 2016, to 1.76 in 2017, to 1.64 in 2018. About one-in-five FFA producers have no full-time employees.

Producers who’ve been in business for more than 10 years had significantly more full-time employees than newer farms (an average 2.6 for older farms vs. 1.3 on newer ones).
Producers were asked, “If you added up your part-time workers, how many full-time equivalent workers did you employ in the prior year (=estimated total part-time hours paid/2,000 hours per year)?” The blue/bottom bar, therefore, references employment in 2016, the red/middle bar 2017, and the green/top bar 2018.

The average number of part-time workers in FTEs was 2.8 in 2016, 1.7 in 2017, and 1.9 in 2018. Figure 17b suggests that an increasing number of FFA producers have no part-time workers; 27% of respondents in 2017 said they had zero FTE of part-time workers and this increased to 40% in 2019.

Figure 17b: Farm Fresh Atlas Producers, Number FTE Part-Time Employees, 2016 - 2018

FFA producers who’ve been in business for more than 10 years and those selling fruit hire significantly more part-time workers and those selling meat or poultry hire significantly fewer part-time workers than their counterparts.

Finally, again referencing the prior year, FFA producers were asked how many people in their family also have off-farm employment. The blue/bottom bar is for 2017 and represents off-farm employment in 2016, the red/middle bar is the 2018 response for 2017, and the green/top bar is the 2019 response for 2018.

On average, there were 1.2 people in FFA households employed off-farm in 2016, 1.1 people in 2017 and 1.3 people in 2018. As Figure 17c indicates, slightly less than one-third of the respondents had no
one with off-farm employment, a bit more than one-third had one person working off the farm, and the remaining producers had two or more people with off-farm employment.

The only statistically significant difference across sub-groups is that FFA producers in business for 10 or fewer years had significantly more people with off-farm employment (1.4 people) than those who’ve been in business longer (1.1 people).

Statewide Impact of the Farm Fresh Atlas

The SRC noted in discussing Figures 14a and 14b that FFA producers, on average, think the Atlas has increased their sales and profits by between 5% and 10%. Based on the median sales, employment, and income data discussed in Figures 16a – 16c and 17a – 17c, Dave Marcouiller of the UW-Madison, Natural Resource Institute used the IMPLAN regional economic model to estimate the impact of the Atlas on the Wisconsin state economy. This input-output modeling estimates changes in overall economic activity based upon the application of a demand shock. In this case, the demand shock is an assumed increase of 10% in FFA producers’ total sales attributed to the Farm Fresh Atlas.

To populate the IMPLAN model with a demand shock, the SRC had to first estimate the average sales per product category included in the producer survey (e.g. fruits, vegetables, poultry, pumpkins, etc.). Because there were a handful of FFA producers with sales volumes that were ten times, or more, greater than all other producers of that product, the SRC did not include those producers in our calculations. Further, FFA producers reported their total sales but not their sales by product category and, as noted above, the average FFA producer reported selling things out of three categories. The SRC assumed that total sales for a given producer were equal across the product categories in which they
had sales. The SRC also had to translate the product categories included in the FFA questionnaire to the product categories used by IMPLAN (Table 1). Many of the FFA product categories (canned/baked goods, beverages, prepared foods, health and beauty aids, pumpkins, honey and syrup, and other) went into the “Other crop farming” category in IMPLAN. Other FFA product categories fit more easily into the IMPLAN set.

The estimated percentage of total FFA producer sales by IMPLAN product category, the estimated total sales value that would be generated by the 350 or so producers involved in the FFA producers, and the 10% sales increase that FFA producers estimated to be the impact associated with participation in the Atlas is outlined in Table 1. Note that estimates suggest that FFA producers generated a total of $15.8 million in sales. If the FFA is responsible for 10% of those sales, that represents an increase of $1.58 million.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPLAN Agricultural Production Sector</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total Sales Value*</th>
<th>FFA Shock 10%**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grain farming</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>$1,956,000</td>
<td>$196,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable and melon farming</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>$953,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit farming</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>$1,001,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture production</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>$721,000</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other crop farming</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>$5,316,000</td>
<td>$532,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef cattle ranching and farming, including feedlots and dual-purpose ranching and farming</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>$507,000</td>
<td>$51,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy cattle and milk production</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>$4,030,000</td>
<td>$403,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry and egg production</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>$934,000</td>
<td>$93,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal production, except cattle and poultry and eggs</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>$344,000</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total***</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$15,761,000</td>
<td>$1,576,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimated using reported sales by producer with sales of multiple product producers adjusted assuming equal proportions of product rounded to nearest thousand.
** Total sales value of Farm Fresh Atlas producers placed within IMPLAN sectors assuming that FFA marketing created increased sales of 10%.
*** May not sum to 100.0 due to rounding.

The total economic impact of FFA producers includes “direct,” “indirect,” and “induced” economic impacts. Direct impacts measure effects on FFA producers based on a 10% increase in sales used as a demand shock. Indirect and induced economic impacts measure the additional economic stimulus that results from inter-industry and consumption effects respectively. These economy-wide effects represent the round-by-round multiplier effects of an increase in FFA producer sales of 10 percent.

Indirect economic impacts are business-to-business transactions. For example, increased purchases of FFA producers’ output might cause them to need to purchase more packaging supplies from their suppliers. This creates additional economic activity in the form of more hired labor, more transportation services, and so on. Some of these economic activities stimulate the local economy (e.g. the wages paid to the local person who delivers the supplies) and some leaks out into the national or
international economy (e.g. the purchase of the diesel fuel used in the delivery). Indirect impacts measure the total additional “local” economic activity generated by these types of business-to-business transactions. “Local” in this case is Wisconsin, since FFA producers are scattered around the state.

Induced impacts are the additional economic activity generated by the way workers and owners spend the incomes they earned from consumer purchases of their goods and services. To illustrate, consider the part-time worker on a FFA farm. When he/she receives a paycheck, the money is likely to be used to pay for rent/mortgage, groceries, utilities, fuel for a car, and so on. As the paycheck is spent, some of it “leaks” out of the local economy (e.g. to pay for food shipped to the local grocery store from an out-of-state wholesaler), but some of it remains in the local economy (e.g. to pay the wages for the cashier at the grocery store). Likewise, some of the cashier’s wages remain in the local economy and some of it pays for products coming from outside the local economy. Induced impacts measure the total local economic value of these expenditures.

The total estimated economic impact (direct + indirect + induced effects) of the IMPLAN model are summarized in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Type</th>
<th>Employment*</th>
<th>Labor Income**</th>
<th>Total Value Added***</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Effect</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$541,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$1,576,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effect</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$201,000</td>
<td>$326,000</td>
<td>$686,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induced Effect</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$198,000</td>
<td>$361,000</td>
<td>$625,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Effect</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$940,000</td>
<td>$1,387,000</td>
<td>$2,887,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: IMPLAN results for 2019 calendar year based on 10% shock by agricultural production sector
* In total jobs rounded to whole numbers.
** In 2019, USD of employee compensation rounded to nearest thousand.
*** In 2019, USD of total income including employee compensation, proprietor’s income, other property income, and indirect business taxes rounded to nearest thousand.
**** May not sum to total due to rounding.

The model estimates that increased sales generated by the FFA generate about 38 additional jobs for the Wisconsin economy and nearly a million dollars of additional labor income. The total value added to the Wisconsin economy, roughly equal to net income, is about $1.4 million because of the Atlas. Output measures total economic activity in Wisconsin resulting from the FFA and is similar to gross state product. Output includes income from intermediate purchased inputs, labor, land and capital plus business taxes, and net exports. In effect, output measures the amount of additional money (mainly wages and profits) that stays in Wisconsin’s economy from spending by FFA users. The economic impact of a 10% increase in FFA producers’ sales because of the Atlas is estimated to create roughly $2.9 million of total economic activity in Wisconsin each year.
Producer Survey Conclusions

Focusing on producers’ feedback about the Farm Fresh Atlas, there are a number of key take-aways from these surveys:

- More than half the respondents said that the FFA is an important or very important vehicle for advertising their business and only 3% said it was not important. This is a relatively strong endorsement of the Atlas.
- Slightly more than 80% of the respondents have listed their business in the FFA for multiple years. The fact that they generally list for multiple years suggests that the value they receive from the Atlas exceeds the cost of participating.
- Between two-thirds and three-quarters of respondents are satisfied or very satisfied with the cost of listing in the FFA. While only about one-third are satisfied or very satisfied with the Atlas in terms of its impact on sales, profits, their understanding of effective marketing strategies, and opening new markets for them, most of the rest were neutral with respect to the impact of the FFA on these factors.
- About 80% of the respondents said the FFA had increased their sales and 75% said it had increased their profits. Though most felt the increase in their sales and profits attributable to the FFA were relatively modest, these producer opinions are quite positive for the Atlas. There is a strong positive association between the degree to which a producer feels the FFA has increased his/her sales and profits and their satisfaction with the Atlas. The more the FFA can demonstrate a link between participation in the Atlas and producers’ bottom line, the more support it will get from producers.
- The IMPLAN results indicate that the state-wide impact of the FFA is relatively modest in terms of job creation, but more significant in terms of total economic activity.
Description and Analysis of Consumer Survey

The Data

From late March through mid-June of 2018, consumers were invited to complete a survey about their awareness of the Farm Fresh Atlas, the impact the Atlas has had on their purchase decisions, likely future purchases, and a limited amount of demographic information. Feedback was received from 162 people.

The survey was shared with consumers via the Farm Fresh Atlas’ social media and e-newsletter. In addition, invitations to participate were issued via the social media and email networks of the regional Atlas print publications and the Wisconsin Farm to School newsletter. Because they follow Farm Fresh Atlas on social media, these respondents are likely to be more invested in the Atlas and are not a random sample of Atlas users. Further, the SRC does not know how many people, in total, use the Atlas. Because of these factors, the Survey Research Center (SRC) is unable to estimate how well or accurately these responses reflect the opinions of Wisconsin consumers more generally. Because they self-selected to complete the survey, it is likely that these consumers have a higher level of interest in locally produced food products than the average Wisconsin consumer.

A summary of consumers’ numeric responses is included as Appendix B2.

The Respondents

Table 3 summarizes the demographic profile of the 162 respondents. With respect to gender, respondents overwhelmingly identified as female. In terms of age, there were few younger than 25, but similar proportions in the other age categories. Most respondents in the dataset come from households of 1 – 2 people (60%), but household size ranged up to seven people. There is a slight negative correlation between age and size of household, which means that the older the respondent, the smaller the household size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>18 - 24</th>
<th>25 - 34</th>
<th>35 - 44</th>
<th>45 - 54</th>
<th>55 - 64</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number in Household</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Don’t Identify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Demographic Profile of Farm Fresh Atlas Consumer Respondents, 2018
Similar to the analysis of the producer data, the SRC will note statistically significant differences based on the gender, age, and household size of respondents.

Respondents were asked to estimate how much their household spends on groceries in an average week. Figure 18 shows that 56% spend less than $100 per week and 44% spend more than that. The SRC has an on-going project working with food cooperatives around the country and one of the questions we ask co-op shoppers is to estimate their weekly grocery budget. Based on more than 17,000 responses, 51% spend more than $100/week. So, respondents to the Farm Fresh Atlas survey appear to have slightly smaller than average grocery budgets.

![Figure 18: Estimated Weekly Grocery Budget, Farm Fresh Atlas Consumers, 2018](image)

While there was no difference in the weekly grocery budgets of men vs. women or younger vs. older respondents, there was, not surprisingly, a significant difference based on the number of people in a household. Sixty-seven percent of households with three or more people spend at least $100/week on groceries compared to only 30% of households with one or two people.

Map 1 on the following page shows the geographic distribution of the home zip codes of the consumers who responded to the Farm Fresh Atlas questionnaire. In the map, the dot is randomly placed in a given respondent’s home zip code and does not represent the actual address of that person. While the map shows that there were a substantial number of respondents who live in the Madison to Milwaukee corridor, all parts of the state were represented. There were a handful of respondents whose home address was outside of Wisconsin, most were from northern Illinois, but one was from Nebraska.
Map 1: Zip Code of Farm Fresh Atlas Consumer Respondents

1 dot = 1 participant
Consumer Awareness

There was an exceptionally high level of awareness of the Farm Fresh Atlas by respondents, as shown in Figure 19. Again, because these consumers self-selected to complete the survey, suggesting a higher-than-average level of interest in local food, it is probably not surprising that nearly 80% said they had heard of the Atlas.

There were no statistically significant differences in awareness of Farm Fresh Atlas across gender, age, or household size.

The 127 people who said they were aware of Farm Fresh Atlas were asked how or where they had heard about it. Respondents could select as many sources of information as applied. The average number of information sources selected was 1.6 but ranged from one to seven. As Figure 20 (next page) indicates, social media and farmers markets were the two most common means by which consumers came to be aware of the Atlas. About one-quarter of respondents said they had heard about the Atlas while in another store or business or via word of mouth. Nearly one-in-five said they’d found out about the Farm Fresh Atlas at the public library or via some other means. Among these “other” places were food cooperatives, an Internet search, University of Wisconsin Extension, and at a school/college. A complete list of “other” responses is included in Appendix A2.
There were only two statistically significant differences in the source of information about the Farm Fresh Atlas:

- younger respondents were more likely to have heard about it in a restaurant; 15% of those under 45 said they’d heard about the Atlas in a restaurant versus only 5% of older respondents
- word of mouth was much more important to those from households with 1-2 people (28% had heard of the Atlas this way vs. 5% of those from larger households)

Later in the survey, respondents were asked to identify up to two sources of information that are most influential in their decision to buy local foods. While 86% of the respondents followed directions and
identified two or fewer information sources, several identified three (18), four (4) or even five (1) influential sources of information. Figure 21 summarizes these responses.

The most influential source of information regarding local food purchases, by a substantial margin, was “friends and family;” nearly two-thirds of respondents said this information source as influential. This aligns with other work with which the SRC has been involved (Witzling, Shaw, and Trechter, https://fyi.uwex.edu/localfoodmarketing/files/2016/08/wi_consumers_local_food.pdf), which found that “social exposure” or the degree to which your friends and family are interested in local foods has a strong influence on your interest level.

Social media, which might be viewed as an extension of the influence of friends and family, was the second-most influential factor in local food purchase decisions for this group of consumers. Nearly half the respondents said social media influenced their local food purchase decisions. About one-third said printed guides, such as the Farm Fresh Atlas, and websites were influential. The complete list of “Other” information sources is shown in Appendix A2; they included local newspapers and vendors at farmers markets.

**Consumer Behavior**

The survey asked consumers about past experiences with respect to local foods, the impact of the Farm Fresh Atlas and expected future practices with respect to buying local food.

**Past Behavior**

Respondents were asked to indicate the number of times during the past year they had visited a farmers market, a farm, or ate at a restaurant featuring local foods. Figure 22 summarizes these behaviors for the 162 respondents. The first (blue) segment of each bar is for those who never visited the specific venue, the second/red for those who went 1-2 times in the past year, the third/green bar for those visiting 3 – 6 times per year, the yellow for those visiting 7 – 12 times and the purple for those going more than 12 times in a year.
Figure 22 supports the hypothesis that this set of consumers is probably more interested in local food than the typical Wisconsin consumer. Nearly four of every five said they’d visited a farm in the past year, nine of ten had eaten at a restaurant whose menu included locally produced food, and all but 3% had visited a farmers market. Interestingly, just less than one-third said they had visited farmers markets, farms and restaurants featuring local foods between three and six times in the previous year. This means that, on average, they were going to each of these venues every two to three months. One-third of the respondents said they visited farmers markets more than 12 times in the previous year, which, given Wisconsin’s short growing season, means they likely went almost every week these markets were open. Finally, all of these behaviors are highly and significantly correlated with each other. This means that those who said they often visit farmers markets are also likely to say they often visited farms and restaurants with local foods in the menu.

Those from smaller households (1 – 2 people), compared to those from larger households (3+ people):

- visited farmers markets more often (55% visited more than 6 times compared to only 40% of those from larger households)
- visited farms less often (10% visited more than 6 farms compared to 19% of those from larger households)
- visited restaurants with locally-produced products more often (39% had dined at such restaurants more than 6 times compared to only 24% of those from larger households)

There are no significant differences in the frequency with which men and women or younger versus older respondents go to farmers markets, farms or restaurants with local food offerings.

**Impact of Farm Fresh Atlas**

Two questions asked respondents to indicate the impact that the Farm Fresh Atlas has had on them. The first question asked the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the following statements:

- Prior to viewing the Farm Fresh Atlas, I knew where to buy local food
- After viewing the Farm Fresh Atlas, I increased my knowledge about where to buy local food
- Because of the Farm Fresh Atlas, I will buy local food from a business, farm, or market that I have never purchased from before
- After using the Farm Fresh Atlas, I increased the amount of local food I purchased

Respondents had five answer options for these questions: strongly disagree, disagree, neutral/no opinion, agree, and strongly agree. For ease of exposition, the SRC combined strongly disagree and disagree into a single “disagreement” category, and the agree and strongly agree options into “agreement.”
Figure 23 shows that slightly more than half the respondents said they knew where to buy local foods prior to viewing the Atlas, but one-quarter said they did not. Two-thirds of the respondents said that the Atlas will induce them to buy more local products, more than eight in ten plan to buy from a new local product vendor, and more than nine in ten said the Atlas increased their knowledge about where to buy local foods. Figure 23 indicates that, at least with respect to this set of consumers, the Atlas is producing the desired outcomes.

There was only one significant difference in the impact of the Atlas on different demographic groupings. Compared to respondents from households with three or more people, those from households of one or two people were more likely to say the Atlas increased their knowledge of where to buy local food (71% from small families said they strongly agree the Atlas increased this knowledge compared to only 50% of those from larger households). The lack of significance across demographic groups is a positive outcome in that it suggests that the Atlas is no less effective with men vs. women, young vs. old, etc.

In a second question that focused on the impact of the Farm Fresh Atlas, consumers were asked what actions they expect to take because of the printed guide or website.

Figure 24 (next page) shows that only 6% of the 127 people who responded to this question said that viewing the Atlas would not affect any of these actions. In contrast, roughly two-thirds said that, because they had viewed the Atlas, they are likely to increase their purchases at farmers markets and to talk with friends and family about local foods. As noted above, the “social exposure” of talking with friends and family is a particularly powerful factor in building demand for local food. Roughly half the respondents said they are likely to attend more local food events, do more of their grocery shopping at stores that carry local food products, eat at farm to table restaurants more often, and post items focused on local foods on their social media accounts. About a third said they are more likely to join a CSA or community supported agriculture service.
The average respondent said they were likely to increase their engagement in three of the activities shown in Figure 24.

In terms of demographic differences in expected consumer response to having viewed the Atlas, women and older respondents were more strongly influenced.

- **Respondents older than 45** were, compared to younger respondents, more likely to say they will buy more products at farmers markets (62% of older respondents vs. 45% of younger ones), eat more frequently at farm to table restaurants (50% vs 31%), shop at grocery stores that carry more local products (52% vs 27%), and less likely to say they will do none of the above (1% vs. 11%)
- **Women**, compared to men, were twice as likely to say they will shop more at grocery stores featuring locally-produced foods (46% of women vs. 23% of men) and were more likely to engage in significantly more of these actions (31% of women said they’d engage in five or more activities vs. only 11% of men)

These results indicate that, at least for these consumers, the Farm Fresh Atlas has both increased awareness of local foods and inclined users of the Atlas toward more local food purchases.

**Future Behavior**

Respondents were asked to rank the three product categories from which they were most likely to increase their purchases from local Wisconsin producers during the coming year. Many respondents listed more than three items, so the SRC simply noted if a given product category had been selected by a respondent.
Figure 25 shows that:

- nearly three quarters of the respondents said they expect to buy more locally-produced vegetables
- slightly less than half expect to buy more locally produced meat
- roughly one-third expect to buy more eggs or cheese
- about one-quarter expect to buy more fruit and honey or syrup
- one-fifth expect to buy more herbs/flowers/plants, dairy products, and poultry
- one in ten or fewer expect to increase purchases of grains, canned/baked goods, prepared goods, fish, pumpkins, health or beauty products, beverages or other products

The distribution of products consumer anticipate buying in greater quantities aligns reasonably well with the products offered most often by FFA growers (Figure 7). The sole exception is cheese; consumers expect to buy more local cheese, but relatively few FFA producers offer it. The other top items in Figure 7 (for FFA producers) are also the top items in Figure 25 (for consumers).

There were few statistically significant differences across demographic groups with respect to expected future purchases of the product categories shown in Figure 25 and most of those were weakly significant (at the 10% level rather than the more rigorous 5% level):
● **Dairy** – there was a weakly significant difference between larger and smaller households; larger households were more likely to say they will buy more local dairy products in the future (29% of respondents from households of 3 or more vs. 17% of smaller households)

● **Fruit** – there was a weakly significant difference between younger and older respondents; younger respondents were more likely than older ones to plan on buying more locally-produced fruit (36% of those under 45 vs. 22% of older respondents)

● **Vegetables** – there was a weakly significant difference between larger and smaller households; larger households were more likely than smaller ones to expect to buy more local vegetables (81% vs 69%)

● **Canned/Baked Products** – Younger respondents were significantly more likely to expect to buy more locally produced canned or baked goods (15% vs 4%)

● **Beverages** – men were more likely than women to expect to buy more beverages from local producers (7% vs. 2%)

● **Pumpkins** – Younger compared to older respondents (7% vs. 1%) and larger vs. smaller households (6% vs. 1%) were weakly more likely to expect to buy more pumpkins in the coming year

● **Honey/Syrup** – larger households were significantly more likely to expect to buy more of these products in the coming year than smaller households (37% vs. 15%)

**Open-Ended Comments**

The final question in the survey asked if the respondent had any general comments or feedback about the on-line or print versions of the Farm Fresh Atlas. Appendix A2 includes all of the responses to this question (Question 13). Some comments included more than one theme. In such cases, the SRC copied the comment and placed it in all of the relevant comment categories and bolded the text relevant to a given category. With these “double-counts” there were 49 comments and Table 4 shows the number of comments in each of the five categories.

More than half the comments were positive feedback about the Atlas. Typical of these types of comments were:

“**Table 4: Summary of Open-Ended Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Comments</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions/Concerns</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Atlas is Used</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Seen Atlas</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggestions/Concerns included two observations that the respondents found the online version challenging to use, two that wanted more or differently formatted information on the website (e.g. the ability to search for vendors that accept SNAP), and greater promotion of the Atlas (at libraries and on social media).

The reader is encouraged to read all of the comments in Appendix A2.
Consumer Conclusions

The feedback from the 162 consumers who participated in the Farm Fresh Atlas survey should probably be viewed as, at most, representative of the opinions of Wisconsin consumers who have a higher than average level of interest in local food.

There are several reasons for this conclusion:

- They volunteered to take the survey rather than being randomly selected to do so
- An exceptionally high proportion of respondents (nearly 8 out of every 10) said they knew about the Farm Fresh Atlas
- High proportions reported they had visited a farm, eaten at restaurants that included locally produced food, and visited a farmers market in the past year

As a result, their opinions and behaviors may not represent the average Wisconsin consumer very well. But, given this caveat, the results of these data strongly support the idea that the Farm Fresh Atlas increased consumers intention to buy more local foods, to buy from a local food vendor they had not previously patronized, and increased their knowledge about where to buy local foods.

The types of locally produced foods these consumers expect to buy in the coming year (vegetables and meats), tend to align well with the types of products Farm Fresh Atlas producers offer to consumers.

Overall Conclusions

With respect to producers, there are several stated and implied results that should hearten those involved in producing the FFA. A majority of producers identified the FFA as an important element of their marketing efforts and most are satisfied with the cost of participating in the Atlas. Most felt that their participation in the FFA had boosted their sales and profits. The fact that most also have listed their business in the FFA for multiple years is an implied endorsement of the Atlas. Further, the input-output model results indicate that the FFA may contribute up to nearly $3 million in additional economic activity in the state each year.

The results suggest that future efforts by the FFA organization should be focused on helping producers open new markets for their products. Success in this effort could address the other two areas of at least slight dissatisfaction – the perception by some producers, particularly those who’ve been involved with the Atlas for shorter periods of time, that their sales and profits have not been improved significantly because of their participation in the Atlas.

Further, though the sample is almost certainly biased toward consumers who are more interested than average in local foods, users of the Atlas report outcomes that endorse the underlying purpose of the FFA. They report that they buy more local foods, know more about where to buy such products, and have patronized a local food producer they’d not previously used because of the Atlas. Most also indicated that they would likely purchase even more locally-produced vegetables in the future. And, finally, the type of products consumers anticipate buying more of in the future align pretty well with the mix of products FFA farmers currently produce.

Question 1. What does your farm produce? (Other)

Responses in 2017 (21 Responses)
- Garlic (2X)
- Wool products (2X)
- Woolen dryer balls (2x)
- Annual & perennial plants, certified organic vegetable & herb plants
- CSA
- Fish, Trout
- Flour
- Fungus
- Grape powder
- Lamb
- Micro-greens
- Mushrooms
- Popcorn
- Rabbit
- Raw wool and wool products
- Sunflower Oil
- We sell honey and syrups do not produce
- Wine

Responses in 2018 (30 Responses)
- Wool (2X)
- Agritourism- cheese making classes
- Apples
- Bison meat and by products.
- Breeding stock and sheepskins
- Candy bars
- Cider, caramel apples, applesauce, apple cider syrup
- Coffee, niche poultry
- Confectionery
- Currants, gooseberry
- Fiber
- Fiber (yarn, roving, pelts)
- Fleece
- Garlic and horse hay
- Grapes
- Homemade lard candles
- Mushrooms
- Natural goats milk soap
- Nuts, flours, beeswax candles
- On-farm events
- Popcorn
- Potatoes
- Pure beeswax candles; honey comb
- Sweet corn, potatoes and onions
- Tours, fiber
- USDA certified organic herb & vegetable plants
- Wine
- Wool yarn
- Woolen dryer balls

Responses in 2019 (25 Responses)
- Fiber (2X)
- Potatoes and sweet potatoes (2x)
- Alpaca fiber and tours
- Alpaca fiber goods. Socks, scarves, yarn roving, hides, etc.
- Bird seed
- Dog treats
- Dried Beans
- Fiber/yarn
- Fruit trees
- Hay
- Hemp
- Hides and skulls
- Maple cotton candy maple cream, maple candy, maple nut pop corn
- Maple syrup products
- Microgreens
- Mushrooms
- Organic concentrated hydrolysate fish fertilizer
- Sheepskins / pelts
- Sunflower Oil
- We are not a farm. We produce confectionery products
- Wine
- Wool products
- Wool yarn
Question 3. If you produce livestock or livestock products, are you certified as: (Other)

**Responses in 2017 (7 Responses)**
- All natural
- Certified Naturally Grown
- Disease Free Certification
- Grass-fed Finished
- Raised grass fed and organic but not certified
- We farm with nature

**Responses in 2018 (19 Responses)**
- 100% grass fed (2X)
- Certified Naturally Grown (2X)
- Organic (2x)
- Animal welfare approved
- Animal welfare association by a greener world
- As my grandfather did when I was a kid in both feeding, raising our feed and handling our animals
- Best aquaculture certification
- Certified scrapie free flock 2012, export certified flock 2016
- Farmer veteran coalition
- Grass-fed beef
- Humane
- NA
- Practicing, but not certified
- Seeking grass-fed and naturally raised certification.
- USDA Certified Organic Herb & Vegetable Plants
- We're not certified, but use do cages and the chickens are in our orchard in the summer.

**Responses in 2019 (15 Responses)**
- Certified organic (2X)
- Although we're not certified, pasture-based and animal care based describe our management
- Animal welfare approved
- Certified disease-free, FDA HCCP certified
- Certified grass fed, animal welfare approved
- Certified naturally grown
- Grass fed
- Hormone free / pasture raised.
- No vaccinations
- Not certified
- Not certified, but pasture based. I grade animals in frequent rotation during grazing season. Re: above question: I grow vegetables organically. I use wormers, medicines and non-organic feed on my livestock.
- Organic feed
- Regenerative (soil building; rotationally grazed
- USDA grass fed
Question 5. How important are each of the following advertising options to your farm? (Other)

**Responses in 2017 (7 Responses)**
- Ads in local publications like “2nd Opinion” magazine
- Direct mail
- Direct sales
- Email advertising
- Festivals
- Highway recognition
- Home sales
- Local food store
- Local health food stores
- On farm mountain bike race
- Point of purchase
- Publicity
- Signs on roadways
- We have several farm open houses that are open to our customers & the public. We also do educational programs for children groups.

**Responses in 2018 (19 Responses)**
- Around the farm table!
- Awards
- Direct mail, Constant Contact email
- Direct sales to restaurants
- Farm store
- Farm tours
- Farm visits are by appointment, people want to know where their food is coming from....I will show them how we raise our sheep.
- NNA
- Networking
- Offering product at the farm
- On farm sales
- On-site store
- Participation in school fundraiser
- Radio
- Radio, TV
- Selling at unique locations, i.e. senior living apartment
- Selling space at other events
- Tabletop add
- Teaching workshops

**Responses in 2019 (17 Responses)**
- Arts & crafts fairs, pop up shops, etc.
- Chef word of mouth
- Cold calls
- Community collaborations on special events
- CSA program
- Earned media
- Farm cooperative membership
- Online listings i.e. Eat Wild, Local Harvest
- Packaging
- Partnering with other local businesses
- Posters
- Promote at Wisconsin Sheep & Wool Festival
- Radio advertising
- Retail store sales
- Three Rivers Fibershed and Ravelry
- Visitation on farm for produce
- We do an open house/multi-farm tour in the spring and fall which invites city folks to check out what’s in their "backyard"
Question 6. How much of what you produce is sold via: (Other)

Responses in 2017 (15 Responses)
- All of our veggies are sold through Turner's Market on Hwy 54 in Waupaca
- Direct delivery precall
- Direct market - individual customers
- Direct market our beef
- Direct market to customers
- Direct to individuals, primarily via email and social media
- Friends/word of mouth
- Home delivery/bulk meat orders
- Household deliveries
- Network
- Part animals, direct
- Retail farm operation
- Wedding work
- You order
- Your categories above do not sub categorize enough. We sell about 25% at off farm farmers mkts., 65% at our on-farm store, and about 5% Wholesale to restaurants & 5% wholesale to schools & others

Responses in 2018 (21 Responses)
- Direct market/Sales (3x)
- 2018 Trying driveway stand on farm hoping for:
- Canned and sold ourselves
- Direct market/delivery
- Friends/neighbors
- I included on-farm events in c
- On-site at local business
- Other local events
- Other orchards
- Out of my car
- Roadside advertising
- Sales events
- Seed potato sales
- We sell our animals directly to our customers. The animals are inspected and processed according to how the customers want the lamb cut at a USDA inspected plant. The customers pick up their lamb from the butcher when it is ready. We do not deliver.
- Wedding design work
- Weddings
- Wineries
- Word of mouth direct sale
- You order when I have a beef you can get 1/4 or 1/2 or a while

Responses in 2019 (15 Responses)
- Animals sold primarily to individuals
- Arts & crafts fairs, pop-up shops, etc.
- Direct market
- Direct to customer via custom beef
- Direct to end customers
- Events & festivals
- Friends/family
- Holiday craft sales
- Indoor year-round market
- Off-farm farm store
- On-farm restaurant
- Our winery
- Self
- Special events (e.g., festivals)
- Word of mouth
Question 12. What is your primary role on your farm? (Other)

Responses in 2017 (7 Responses)
- All of these
- Co-owner
- EVERYTHING
- My family owns and farms it all
- Office
- Retail manager
- Yes, all of the above

Responses in 2018 (7 Responses)
- All of the above (3X)
- Anything that needs to be done I do it.
- Co-owner
- Everything
- Family of owner
- Farmer, milker, cheesemaker, sales...
- I do it all!
- Marketing director
- Office manager
- Owner/operator
- Sales

Responses in 2019 (8 Responses)
- All roles (2X)
- Bookkeeping
- Co-owner (cooperative)
- False choices I am all of those things
- Marketing and outreach
- Owner/partner
- Tribal
Appendix A2 – Open-Ended Comments – Consumers, 2018

Question 2 – How/Where did you hear of the Farm Fresh Atlas? Other

Food Co-op (5 responses)
- Grocery store – Outpost (2X)
- Local food co-op (2X)
- I picked up a copy at the Willy St Co-op

Educational Institution (3 responses)
- At Gateway College
- UW classes
- School wellness summit

Farmshed Office (3 responses)
- Central Rivers Farmshed
- Farmshed office
- Farmshed!

UW-Extension (2 responses)
- UW-Extension
- Along with UW Extension agents and MFAI I helped start the FFA of SE Wisconsin

Miscellaneous (11 responses)
- Chamber of Commerce
- Church (Unitarian Universalist)
- Facebook
- Greeting center
- I've seen one lying around.
- Print Editions
- See it out in front of grocery stores and restaurants
- County Courthouse
- Internet search
- Mother Earth News Fair
- My dad started it

Question 4 – Because I viewed the Farm Fresh Atlas printed guide or website, I am most likely to:

Other

Visit Local Farms (3 responses)
- Check out more local farms in my area.
- Go out to visit and buy from local farms
- Go to a Pick-your-own farm and harvest fresh fruit

Not Influenced by Farm Fresh Atlas (2 responses)
- I do these things but not because of FFA.
- I have been working on local food initiatives since 2001

Miscellaneous (2 responses)
- Know more specific information about Farmers’ Markets
- Have a printed reminder
Question 5 – Which of the following two sources of information are most influential in your decision to buy local foods. Other

Farmers’ Market (5 responses)
- Farmers market
- In person knowledge at market
- Local markets
- Vendors at farmers market
- Farmer presence at local markets and events

Newspapers (4 responses)
- Local newspaper (2x)
- News articles
- Newspaper

Farmers (3 responses)
- Getting to know the families behind the produce.
- The farmer/producer
- The farmers/producers of the food

Miscellaneous (9 responses)
- Availability
- Events
- I've been doing it for over 10 years
- Restaurant info/menus
- None
- Raised on a farm!!
- Sorta unfair question since my nonprofit’s mission is connected to local food
- Education
- Look for organic/organic methods

Question 8 – As you think about buying food for your household in the coming year, please rank the three product categories from which you are most likely to increase your purchases from local Wisconsin producers? Other

- ALL my purchases are as local as possible. I grow, raise, and make my own everything possible.
- I already buy almost everything from local producers
- I already buy as much locally as I can in every category
- None-live in NE
- I already buy as much locally as I can in every category
12. What is your home Zip code?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP Code 1</th>
<th>ZIP Code 2</th>
<th>ZIP Code 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53704 (7X)</td>
<td>53182</td>
<td>54411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53190 (5X)</td>
<td>53185</td>
<td>54412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54481 (5X)</td>
<td>53189</td>
<td>54449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53105 (4X)</td>
<td>53201</td>
<td>54451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53115 (4X)</td>
<td>53215</td>
<td>54470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53703 (4X)</td>
<td>53219</td>
<td>54490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53711 (4X)</td>
<td>53220</td>
<td>54548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54703 (4X)</td>
<td>53222</td>
<td>54612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53072 (3X)</td>
<td>53223</td>
<td>54615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53095 (3X)</td>
<td>53225</td>
<td>54619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53593 (3X)</td>
<td>53244</td>
<td>54630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54457 (3X)</td>
<td>53406</td>
<td>54650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54901 (3X)</td>
<td>53508</td>
<td>54665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53119 (2X)</td>
<td>53511</td>
<td>54666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53121 (2X)</td>
<td>53523</td>
<td>54667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53132 (2X)</td>
<td>53532</td>
<td>54730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53142 (2X)</td>
<td>53534</td>
<td>54732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53211 (2X)</td>
<td>53548</td>
<td>54822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53562 (2X)</td>
<td>53551</td>
<td>54840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53572 (2X)</td>
<td>53559</td>
<td>54914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53705 (2X)</td>
<td>53575</td>
<td>54915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53716 (2X)</td>
<td>53578</td>
<td>54940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54220 (2X)</td>
<td>53587</td>
<td>54961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54403 (2X)</td>
<td>53719</td>
<td>54981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54701 (2X)</td>
<td>53818</td>
<td>60002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53011</td>
<td>53913</td>
<td>60045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53027</td>
<td>53916</td>
<td>60073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53033</td>
<td>53925</td>
<td>68371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53045</td>
<td>54001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53051</td>
<td>54007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53065</td>
<td>54022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53089</td>
<td>54025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53114</td>
<td>54115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53118</td>
<td>54162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53127</td>
<td>54201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53128</td>
<td>54217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53153</td>
<td>54227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53156</td>
<td>54235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53158</td>
<td>54301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53172</td>
<td>54311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53178</td>
<td>54313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 13 – General feedback/comments on farmfreshatlas.org or your region’s printed publication?

[Note: when a comment had more than one theme, it was copied and will appear in more than one category. The portion of the comment relevant to the given category will be in bold text.]

Positive Comments (25 responses)

- Excellent resource!
- Great publication, wish they would do more to connect farmers with people
- I ❤️ Farm Fresh Food!
- I appreciate having this publication to refer to.
- I have shared it with friends and family. The town we reside in has little to offer farm to table or local in stores. Our farmers’ mkt is more craft than farm. We don't mind driving to support farmers in WI. Keep up the great resource thanks
- I love the Atlas and have used the print version for years. I find the online version very cumbersome and slow!
- I love the Farm Fresh Atlas but don't like the new website layout. Preferred having the atlas as a PDF that can be paged through online.
- I love your printed materials. I use them to shop farmers markets all over Wisconsin!
- I'm a health practitioner and share your Farm Fresh Atlas with my clients all the time! I love it, thank you for your efforts.
- it's a great resource
- Keep it up! I appreciate printed guides that I can use and not be tied to an electronic device. I keep my atlas in my vehicle for whenever we travel in the state as well!
- Keep up the good work!
- Like
- Like the new website that aggregates information from regional atlases
- love it but would like it to connect more with local families
- Love the detailed info.
- Love the website! Can you search for markets that accept SNAP benefits and/or have incentive programs (like Double Dollars)? That would be great.
- Love what you do! Thank you!!
- Printed booklet is great. Like getting stuff on social media.
- Thank you for making it available.
- Thank you for your hard work putting together the Atlas. It is one of my favorite food publications and hope you can continue it.
- Thank you! Keep up the awesome work. Including ebt and on farm store/ stand info more prominently would be awesome, as well as indicating which markets and stores use double dollars or other nutrition incentives for snap recipients.
- Thanks for doing the research! I support local organic dairy farms and organic growers, and grow some of our own fruits, berries and greens.
- The Farm Fresh Atlas and its website are incredible guides that quickly guide you to local sources for any and all of your questions and requests!
- Very informative.
Suggestions/Concerns (8 responses)

- I love the Atlas and have used the print version for years. I find the online version very cumbersome and slow!
- I love the Farm Fresh Atlas but don’t like the new website layout. Preferred having the atlas as a PDF that can be paged through online.
- Love the website! Can you search for markets that accept SNAP benefits and/or have incentive programs (like Double Dollars)? That would be great.
- Thank you! Keep up the awesome work. Including ebt and on farm store/stand info more prominently would be awesome, as well as indicating which markets and stores use double dollars or other nutrition incentives for SNAP recipients.
- I am interested in buying meat from local farms, but don’t really know much about what to look for or what I’m getting myself into... Maybe some Info Guides on subjects like that? Like what does it mean to buy a quarter cow?
- They are hard to find. Wish they were still in libraries.
- Wish I saw the website featured/promoted more on social media
- Still haven’t received 2018–the 2017 edition, I didn’t receive until I think it was October?

How Atlas Used (6 responses)

- I discovered the Farm Fresh Atlas probably at a restaurant maybe a decade ago. I had been reading Michael Pollan, Marion Nestle, and Nina Planke and decided to buy produce locally through a CSA. I used the Atlas as my starting point in picking a CSA. Since then, our eating has become even more local, as we source meat, cheese, grain and more locally either via Willy Street Co-op or directly from the producers. We’ve even gone as far as to start farming recently, so that we could supply local food too.
- I tend to visit more because of knowing of them through the Atlas. It is a great publication and I look forward to mine each year. But, I wonder why you do not in close one in the newspaper early each spring. Or place in Tractor Supply, at Walgreens, etc.? Thanks
- It helped me be aware of markets I did not know about and contact information.
- It helps us to connect with local farmers
- It was essential when I was looking to start buying locally almost a decade ago. I used it to find a veggie CSA back then (and my family has been a member since), as well as sources for other local groceries and restaurants. Since then we’ve been sourcing more and more of our food and other items locally, to the point that we know the people who grow and raise almost all we eat/use and we’ve even started farming, so a few items we now grow/raise ourselves. Farm Fresh Atlas was a huge help in the beginning and we aspire to grow enough to list our farm in the atlas soon!
- 1st time checking this out. Found one market close to me. Would need to check out this site more.

Not Seen Atlas (4 responses)

- Had one in past, not yet seen current issue!
- Haven't seen it
- I haven’t seen any.
- I wasn't aware there was/is a farm fresh atlas!
Miscellaneous (6 responses)

- Farm Fresh Atlas
- I what it js [sic]
- I’m already a vendor for farmers markets selling my produce, fruit and canned products. But I try to buy from local vendors goods that I do not have.
- It’s very important with all the GMO products out there that we need farm fresh foods more than ever. I’d like to see more in the grocery stores.
- None
- Shopping news and the flash

1. What does your farm produce? Mark all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheese</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canned/Baked Goods</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverages</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared Goods</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HABA</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumpkins</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbs/Flowers/Plants</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey/Syrup</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grains</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (See Appendix A1)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Which of the following best describes your farm's production practices? Mark one only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Chemical Use</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitioning to Organic</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic, not Certified</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic, Certified</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. If you produce livestock or livestock products, are you certified as: Mark all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasture-based Management</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal-care based Management</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Certification (See Appendix A1)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Farm Fresh Atlas was first published in 2002 in Southern Wisconsin. Including 2017, how many years have you listed your operation in the Farm Fresh Atlas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5 Years</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 Years</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ Years</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How important are each of the following advertising options to your farm?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of Mouth</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Fresh Atlas</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something Special in WI</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Ads</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FairShare CSA Coalition</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Foodie</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Local Events</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers' Market</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (See Appendix A1)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. How much of what you produce is sold via:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-pick</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers' Market</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Farm Store</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadside Stand</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailers</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Processing</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Hub/Co-op</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (See Appendix A1)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How satisfied are you with Farm Fresh Atlas in terms of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Impact</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on profits</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing options</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open new markets</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Please estimate the amount by which your participation in Farm Fresh Atlas has:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≤5%</td>
<td>≤5%</td>
<td>≤5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sales</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>profits</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Thinking back to last year, how would you rate that year in terms of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>16% 55% 29%</td>
<td>18% 58% 25%</td>
<td>22% 54% 24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>19% 58% 23%</td>
<td>22% 56% 22%</td>
<td>22% 51% 27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profitability</td>
<td>20% 64% 15%</td>
<td>29% 57% 15%</td>
<td>32% 50% 18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. For the prior calendar year, what were your farm’s:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2017 Average</th>
<th>2017 Median</th>
<th>2018 Average</th>
<th>2018 Median</th>
<th>2019 Average</th>
<th>2019 Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>$138,582</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$171,886</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$130,342</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Salary</td>
<td>$30,262</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$21,837</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$27,448</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income</td>
<td>$14,275</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$15,055</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$10,390</td>
<td>$5,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. In terms of workers on your farm in the prior year (including yourself/family members), how many were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time equivalent part-time workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family with off-farm employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. What is your primary role on your farm?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Manager</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Supervisor</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Worker</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. What is the gender with which you most identify?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. How many years have you been farming?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Years or less</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 10 years</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 20 years</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ years</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. What is your current age?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. What is the highest level of education that you completed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School or GED</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College or Tech Degree</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional or Graduate Degree</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B2 – Summary of Quantitative Responses, Consumers 2018

1. Have you heard of Farm Fresh Atlas?  
   - Yes  
   - No if no, skip to question 5  
   - 127 35

2. How/Where did you hear of the Farm Fresh Atlas? (select all that apply)  
   - Farmers’ Market 49  
   - Radio 1  
   - Billboard 0  
   - Other Store/Business 32  
   - Farm 12  
   - Word of Mouth (e.g. from friends or family) 30  
   - Restaurant 14  
   - Magazine 9  
   - Health Care Facility/Clinic 4  
   - Social Media 55  
   - Public Library 23  
   - Newspaper 2  
   - Other (please specify) 24

3. State your level of agreement with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral/ No Opinion</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Prior to viewing the Farm Fresh Atlas, I knew where to buy local food.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. After viewing the Farm Fresh Atlas, I increased my knowledge about where to buy local food.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Because of the Farm Fresh Atlas, I will buy local food from a business, farm or market that I have never purchased from before</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. After using the Farm Fresh Atlas, I increased the amount of local food that I purchase.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Because I viewed the Farm Fresh Atlas printed guide or website, I am most likely to:
Mark all that apply

a. Buy more products at a farmers’ market 89
b. Eat at farm to table restaurants more often 68
c. Join a CSA 41
d. Attend more local food events 71
e. Shop more often at a grocery store that stocks local food 68
f. Talk to my friends or family about local food more often 81
g. Share more things about local food on social media 58
h. Other: write-in 7
i. None of the above 8

5. Which of the following two sources of information are most influential in your decision to buy local foods?
Select up to two.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Printed Guides</th>
<th>Billboard/Outdoor Signage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends/Family</td>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. How many people (including yourself) are in your household? _____

7. Roughly how much does your household spend in an average week on groceries?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under $50</th>
<th>$50 - $75</th>
<th>$76 - $100</th>
<th>$101 - $125</th>
<th>$126 - $150</th>
<th>$151+</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. As you think about buying food for your household in the coming year, please rank the three product categories from which you are most likely to increase your purchases from local Wisconsin producers?
Select up to 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meat</th>
<th>Fruit</th>
<th>Pumpkins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Herbs/Flowers/Plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheese</td>
<td>Canned/Baked Goods</td>
<td>Honey/Syrup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>Beverages</td>
<td>Grains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>Prepared Goods</td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health and Beauty Products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. In the past year, how many times have you done each of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-6</th>
<th>7-12</th>
<th>More than 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Visited a farmers’ market</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Visited a farm</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Ate at a restaurant featuring local foods</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographics

10. With which of the following do you most identify:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Choose Not to Identify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. What is your home Zip code? _____ See Appendix A