

EFFECT OF MARKET CHANNEL, FARM SCALE, AND YEARS IN PRODUCTION ON MID-ATLANTIC VEGETABLE PRODUCERS' KNOWLEDGE AND IMPLEMENTATION OF GOOD AGRICULTURAL PRACTICES

Sasha C. Marine*

Department of Plant Science and Landscape Architecture
University of Maryland
Lower Eastern Shore Research and Education Center
Salisbury, MD

**Corresponding author.*

E-mail address: scmarine@umd.edu

David A. Martin

University of Maryland Extension
Baltimore County
Cockeysville, MD,

Aaron Adalja

Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics
University of Maryland
College Park, MD

Sudeep Mathew

University of Maryland Extension
Dorchester County
Cambridge, MD

Kathryne L. Everts

Carvel Research and Education Center
University of Delaware
Georgetown, DE

April 30, 2015

Abstract

1
2
3 Foodborne illnesses associated with fresh produce have dramatically increased within the last decade.
4 Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) were developed to address potential sources of pre-harvest microbial
5 contamination, but certification remains low. The majority of mid-Atlantic vegetable farms are fresh
6 market, but limited information is available about what on-farm production practices are being utilized to
7 mitigate food safety risks. Our goal was to assess Maryland and Delaware vegetable producers'
8 understanding and implementation of GAP. An electronic survey on pre-harvest production practices was
9 administered at commercial grower meetings in 2010 and 2013. A total of 313 surveys were analyzed,
10 and Probit regression was used to estimate the average marginal effects of farm scale, years in production
11 and market channel on the probability of using different on-farm food safety practices. Generally, food
12 safety practices did not differ across farm scale or years in production. However, market channel did
13 influence a grower's decision to implement some food safety practices. Growers who marketed their
14 produce primarily through wholesale channels were more likely to: have written policies for how they
15 grew and handled their produce, test their irrigation water at least once a year for microbial
16 contamination, or be GAP-certified. Economic constraints were not reported as the primary obstacle for
17 GAP implementation in either survey. While more research is needed to better understand how market
18 channel influences decision-making activities including on-farm food safety practices, this study
19 highlights the complexity of the issue and the need for GAP educational programs to expand beyond a
20 one- size-fits-all approach.

21

22 **Keywords:** Good Agricultural Practices Mid-Atlantic Vegetable producers

23

24 **Effect of market channel, farm scale, and years in production on mid-Atlantic vegetable producers'**
25 **knowledge and implementation of Good Agricultural Practices**

26

27 **1. Introduction**

28 In 1998, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) published *The Guide to Minimize Microbial*
29 *Food Safety Hazards for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables*, which outlined production practices and
30 intervention strategies that could be implemented on farms for use in the production of unprocessed or
31 minimally processed fresh fruits and vegetables (U.S. FDA, 1998). The 1998 guide also sought to
32 increase awareness of potential food safety hazards among growers, packers, and shippers of fresh
33 produce. Growers were advised to focus on risk reduction strategies, not risk elimination, as elimination
34 of all potential food safety hazards associated with fresh produce that would be eaten raw is not
35 technologically or economically feasible (Gravani, 2009).

36 However, in the years following release of the *Guide*, outbreaks associated with enteric pathogens
37 (such as *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 and *Salmonella enterica*) and on-farm contamination events have been
38 steadily increasing (DeWaal, Tian, & Bhuiya, 2008). Between 1998 and 2008, the consumption of fresh
39 fruits and vegetables was implicated in 46% of foodborne illnesses and resulted in an estimated 21,000
40 hospitalizations and 334 deaths (Painter et al., 2013). Although research has identified several microbial
41 risk factors (reviewed in Mandrell, 2009; Olaimat & Holley, 2012), eliminating enteric pathogens from
42 fresh produce remains difficult due to microbial adhesion (reviewed in Berger et al., 2010) and their
43 ability to persist as epiphytes or endophytes within the plant microbiota (reviewed in Critzer & Doyle,
44 2010). In 2002, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) developed a voluntary audit/
45 certification program known as "Good Agricultural Practices" (GAP) to verify conformance to the 1998
46 guide. This program seeks to minimize fresh produce contamination by recommending science- based
47 "best practices" in areas such as irrigation water quality, manure management, wildlife management,
48 worker health and hygiene, and post-harvest handling (USDA, 2014b). University of Maryland Extension
49 programming has traditionally relied on the knowledge-deficit approach for GAP education, which

50 emphasizes a one-way model of communication and attributes noncompliance to lack of information
51 (Parker, Wilson, LeJeune, Rivers, & Doohan, 2012). Full-day trainings include presentations on the four
52 W's (water, waste, wildlife and workers), sanitation, auditing programs, and writing a food safety plan (D.
53 Pahl, personal communication). Following training, the GAP audit is conducted by a public or private
54 third-party certifier, and a grower must score 80% or better on each of the seven sections to become
55 certified. Growers are also responsible for bearing the costs of the training and audit.

56 In 2011, the Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA) was signed into law. FSMA directs the
57 FDA to establish a uniform set of produce safety standards and aims to ensure a safe U.S. food supply
58 through prevention of microbial contamination (U.S. FDA, 2013). The proposed produce safety standards
59 have received substantial input from scientists, industry stakeholders and consumers, and tens of
60 thousands of comments have been submitted during the public comment periods. As a consequence of
61 this widespread media attention, most growers and packers are now aware of their obligation to reduce
62 the microbial hazards and risks associated with the production of fresh produce. Although FSMA
63 represents the minimum requirements, compliance is mandated by law, and implementation is expected to
64 begin in 2016. In contrast, GAP certification remains voluntary, so rates remain low and implementation
65 remains inconsistent (Gravani, 2009). In a recent survey of diversified fruit and vegetable growers in
66 Oregon, more than half indicated GAP certification resulted in competitive market benefits, but only 25%
67 (4 of 16) of surveyed growers had active GAP certification (Preguber & Gilroy, 2013). A study in
68 Vermont also found 22% of surveyed produce farms had active GAP certification, but that GAP
69 compliant farms were generally larger in terms of acreage than non-certified farms (Becot, Nickerson,
70 Conner, & Kolodinsky, 2012). In a Minnesota survey, more than 65% of vegetable growers — the
71 majority (230 of 237) of whom were small-scale — reported compliance with GAPs (Hultberg,
72 Schermann, & Tong, 2012). However, the authors did not provide data on the number of respondents with
73 active GAP certification. And in the Midwest, the majority of surveyed vegetable growers agreed GAP
74 could reduce the risk of fresh produce contamination, but only 40% implemented GAP at a level of
75 consistency to do so (Ivey, LeJeune, & Miller, 2012).

76 Since GAP certification is not codified regulation, growers reported buyer expectations and
77 maintaining sales and customer accounts as the primary incentives for GAP certification (Becot et al.,
78 2012; Bihn & Gravani, 2006; Prenguber & Gilroy, 2013). Wholesale buyers, such as supermarket chains,
79 have used their purchasing power to exert pressure on growers to adopt more stringent food safety
80 standards (Fulponi, 2006) even designating which third-party certifier should be used in some cases
81 (Hatanaka, Bain, & Busch, 2005). Although small-scale growers (defined as those less than 4 ha in size
82 (Newton, 2014) or with gross cash farm income less than \$349,999 (Hoppe & MacDonald, 2013)) rarely
83 reported barriers to GAP implementation when asked directly about economic feasibility (Ivey et al.,
84 2012), they were less supportive of the program than large-scale growers and indicated they would side
85 step GAP certification by avoiding wholesale market channels or retailers that required certification
86 (Prenguber & Gilroy, 2013). Small-scale growers also tend to rely on direct-to-consumer marketing
87 channels (Low & Vogel, 2011; Martinez et al., 2010), such as selling produce through Community
88 Supported Agriculture programs (CSAs), which allow them to establish a direct relationship with their
89 customers. Within the local food system, direct-to-consumer produce farms generate almost half of all
90 local food sales (Low et al., 2015). Farmers markets in the mid-Atlantic are also some of the most
91 profitable in the U.S., as 15.4% of vendors have annual sales of \$25,000 or more (USDA, 2009).
92 However, these direct-to-consumer channels may also differ substantially in terms of fresh produce food
93 safety standards. For example, less than 12% of farmers market managers surveyed in Georgia, Virginia
94 and South Carolina asked participating vendors about on-farm food safety practices, such as manure use
95 or worker hygiene (Harrison et al., 2013). Taken together, the data suggest a grower's primary market
96 channel may be an important factor in on-farm food safety decision-making.

97 Previous research also indicates that grower response to food safety risks is influenced by the
98 extent they perceive the risks to be within their control (Parker, Wilson, LeJeune, & Doohan, 2012). The
99 role of irrigation water quality in produce food safety has been well documented in recent reviews
100 (Beuchat et al., 2006; Suslow et al., 2003), but agricultural water testing remains low. Growers often
101 indicate that preventing aerial wildlife from accessing (and potentially contaminating) irrigation water

102 sources is not feasible (Ivey et al., 2012; Parker, Wilson, LeJeune, Rivers, et al., 2012), but growers may
103 lack access to municipal or groundwater irrigation sources. In a 1998 survey of fruit and vegetable
104 growers in New York, 72% (118 of 163) reported using surface water (including streams, ponds, lakes, or
105 open canals) as an irrigation source, but only 15% reported testing the water in any way (Rangarajan,
106 Pritts, Reiners, & Pedersen, 2002). In a more recent survey, more than half (48 of 84) of New York fruit
107 and vegetable growers reported using surface water to irrigate their crops, but less than 19% of those who
108 applied surface water overhead reported testing the water for any indicators of fecal contamination (such
109 as generic *E. coli*) (Bihn, Smart, Hoepting, & Worobo, 2013). For growers who do have access to
110 groundwater irrigation sources, the percentage that routinely test for fecal contamination is also low. In a
111 survey of fruit and vegetable growers in six New England states, 73% (217 of 297) used wells as a
112 primary source for irrigation water but only 18% reported testing the water annually (Cohen,
113 Hollingsworth, Brennan Olson, Laus, & Coli, 2005). The discrepancy between knowledge and behavior
114 may be further explained by the low percentage of producers (19%) who believe contamination is likely
115 to occur on the farm (Ivey et al., 2012).

116 In Maryland, there are 789 vegetable farms, which produce a wide range of crops including:
117 cantaloupe, cucumbers, potatoes, pumpkins, snap beans, sweet corn, tomatoes and watermelons (USDA,
118 2014a). The majority of vegetable farms (708 of 789) are fresh market, and more than half of those (391
119 of 708) are less than 2 ha in size. Surprisingly, only 8 vegetable farms currently have completed a USDA
120 GAP or Produce GAPs Harmonized audit (USDA AMS, 2013). The Maryland Department of Agriculture
121 (MDA) has also offered a state GAP certification program for direct marketers since 2011 (also referred
122 to as "Maryland GAP") (D. Baldwin, personal communication), and 11 vegetable farms currently have
123 MD GAP certification (MDA, 2013). In Delaware, the situation is similar, as the majority of vegetable
124 farms (163 of 222) are fresh market, more than a third are small-scale (72 of 163) (USDA, 2014a), and
125 very few (4 farms) currently have USDA or Produce GAP certification (USDA AMS, 2013). Since the
126 cost of implementing food safety programs is often farm scale-dependent, the smaller operations may lack
127 the capital resources required and elect to forgo GAP certification. However, for mid-Atlantic vegetable

128 farms not involved in GAP, there is limited information available about what on-farm production
129 practices, if any, are being utilized to mitigate food safety risks for their fresh market crop(s).

130 Our goal was to assess Maryland and Delaware vegetable producers' understanding and
131 implementation of GAP. To do so, we designed a survey to assess pre-harvest production practices
132 (including manure and compost application and irrigation water source management) as well as food
133 safety training. The objectives of our survey were to: 1) establish growers' baseline GAP knowledge and
134 utilization, and 2) assess changes in growers' implementation of GAP following targeted workshops and
135 distribution of GAP-related training materials. We hypothesized that production practices and food safety
136 perspectives would differ across market channel, farm scale and years in production. Survey results were
137 used to guide GAP training and continue to be incorporated into University of Maryland Extension
138 educational programs for growers.

139

140 **2. Materials and methods**

141 *2.1. Questionnaire development*

142 In 2010, we developed a survey on farm demographics and fresh produce food safety. Growers
143 were asked about fruit and vegetable acreage, years in operation, and produce marketing channels.
144 Growers were also asked about GAP certification, pre-harvest production practices including: GAP
145 training, irrigation and pesticide spray water management, manure use and livestock management, and
146 wildlife management; and harvest production practices including: harvest container and produce
147 sanitation (Supplemental Table 1). The 2010 survey also included questions on nutrition grant programs
148 and U-pick operations, which are not discussed in this manuscript. In 2013, the survey was revised:
149 questions that did not pertain to food safety were removed, and questions related FSMA were added. The
150 revised survey addressed the same topics as before and had a similar survey completion time. Despite
151 these changes, the questions related to farm demographics and on-farm food safety practices that
152 comprise the data for the analysis remained consistent between survey years. Based on the intended
153 audience, units of measurement within the survey were presented in the U.S. customary, non-metric

154 system. All survey questions were non-weighted and discrete (yes or no, "select one response" or "select
155 up to 3 responses"). Both surveys were pretested by Extension specialists and researchers, and reviewed
156 by the University of Maryland Institutional Review Board and deemed exempt (project #413818-1).

157

158 *2.2. Questionnaire delivery*

159 The survey was administered at six commercial fruit and vegetable grower meetings in Maryland
160 between January and April in 2010, and at seven commercial fruit and vegetable grower meetings in
161 Maryland and Delaware between January and February in 2013. Responses were recorded anonymously
162 using Response- Card RF electronic clickers (Turning Technologies, Youngstown, OH). Participation in
163 the survey was completely voluntary; no compensation was provided. Meeting registration lists were used
164 to determine the percentage of attendees present at both the 2010 and 2013 meetings, among the total
165 number of attendees present.

166

167 *2.3. Data analysis*

168 Probit regression was used to estimate the average marginal effects of farm scale, years in
169 production and market channel on the probability of using different on-farm food safety practices. Some
170 levels of each aforementioned independent variable were aggregated to reduce the frequency of errors due
171 to collinearity (which occurs when one or more independent variables in the model is a perfect linear
172 combination of the others), but levels were chosen that maintained distinctions meaningful to the data.
173 Probit regression is commonly applied to survey data, as the model analyzes qualitative binomial
174 response variables based on the cumulative normal probability distribution (Finney, 1971). Descriptive
175 statistics were also calculated for the demographic data. Chi-square tests were used to compare the
176 frequency of a particular response across the two surveys. All cross-tabs, probit regressions and other
177 statistical tests were conducted using Stata v. 13.1 for Windows 7 (StataCorp, College Station, TX). Data
178 were considered to be statistically significant at a 95% confidence level ($\alpha = 0.05$) unless otherwise noted.

179

180 3. Results

181 3.1. Survey response and grower demographics

182 A total of 415 surveys were completed, and 313 surveys were analyzed (130 surveys from 2010,
183 to 183 surveys from 2013). A total of 102 surveys were excluded from analysis because respondents
184 either lacked vegetable acreage (65 surveys) or had vegetable acreage but failed to answer at least 60% of
185 questions discussed in this manuscript (37 surveys). Overall, the greatest percentage of respondents
186 produced vegetables on less than 2 ha of land (52.9%) and had been in production 20 years or more
187 (53.6%) (Table 1). When asked about market strategy, 7.2% of all growers sold their produce primarily
188 through wholesale channels (such as supermarkets), while 40.9% of all growers sold their produce
189 primarily through direct channels (such as farmer's markets). Interestingly, more than a third (38.8%) of
190 all growers reported using a combination of wholesale and direct market channels. Although only 13.5%
191 of attendees were present at both the 2010 and 2013 Maryland meetings, no statistically significant
192 differences exist in grower demographics between the 2010 and 2013 samples (vegetable acreage, $p =$
193 0.164; years in production, $p = 0.416$; market channel: wholesale, $p = 0.746$; market channel: direct, $p =$
194 0.436). In the 2013 survey, growers were also asked to classify their farm system. The majority (66.7%)
195 reported use of conventional farming practices, with only 1.6% of growers being certified organic. The
196 remaining growers reported use of "other" farming practices, including 24.0% who employed primarily
197 organic or sustainable farming practices (such as excluding use of synthetic pesticides and intentionally
198 improving soil quality) but were not certified.

199

200 3.2. GAP preparation and implementation

201 Specific survey questions were included to determine growers' compliance with GAP. The
202 majority of all growers (72.2%) surveyed reported they did not have written policies for how they grew
203 and handled their produce. However, there was a significant increase ($\chi^2 (1) = 13.28, p < 0.001$) in the
204 percentage of growers who reported having written policies, from 16.4% in 2010 to 35.6% in 2013.
205 Interestingly, growers who marketed their produce primarily through wholesale channels were 26.7%

206 more likely to have written policies for how they grew and handled their produce ($p < 0.001$), as
207 compared to growers who marketed their produce primarily through other channels in the 2013 survey
208 (Table 2).²

209 Growers were also asked if they had obtained third-party GAP certification. Although the
210 majority of all respondents (90.6%) were not GAP-certified, there was a significant increase ($\chi^2 (1) =$
211 12.04, $p < 0.001$) in the percentage of growers who reported having successfully completed a third-party
212 audit, from 2.4% in 2010 to 14.3% in 2013. Growers who produced vegetables on 2-20 ha or who
213 marketed their produce primarily through direct channels were less likely to be GAP-certified ($p = 0.014$
214 for both) than those with larger acreage or growers who marketed wholesale or through other channels in
215 the 2013 survey (Table 3). When asked if buyers (such as retailers, processors, customers, etc.) had asked
216 for GAP certification, significantly more growers answered in the affirmative in 2013 as compared to
217 2010 ($\chi^2 (1) = 15.60$, $p < 0.001$). Growers who marketed their produce primarily through wholesale
218 channels were 23.4% more likely to have been asked by their buyers to obtain GAP certification ($p =$
219 0.003), as compared to growers who marketed their produce through other channels in the 2013 survey
220 (Table 4). Larger vegetable operations (i.e. more than 20 ha) were also more likely to have pressure from
221 buyers, but the effect was only marginally significant ($p = 0.076$).

222 Growers were also asked about the primary obstacle hindering them from developing written
223 policies for how they grew and handled their produce. About a quarter of all growers did not believe GAP
224 applied to their size farm operation (25.6%) or did not believe they had enough knowledge about GAP to
225 develop a food safety plan (24.3%) (Table 5). Concerns about economic feasibility appeared to be
226 relatively minor, as only 8.6% of all growers reported cost as their primary obstacle. In the 2010 survey,
227 the greatest percentage of growers reported lack of knowledge as their primary obstacle (43.1%);
228 however, in the 2013 survey, significantly less growers reported this as their primary obstacle (10.9%; χ^2

² For ease of exposition, average marginal effects are presented within the text and tables for the probit models for each of the food safety practices. The average marginal effect of a regressor is the amount by which the conditional probability of the outcome variable changes due to a one-unit increase in the regressor. The underlying probit regression coefficients are available upon request.

229 (1) = 42.73, $p < 0.001$). Surprisingly, in the 2013 survey, not being required to have written policies was
230 the major reason (27.3%) growers selected for why they had not developed a food safety plan.

231

232 ***3.3. Pre-harvest production practices: irrigation and pesticide spray water management***

233 When asked about their source of irrigation water, 48.5% of 2010 growers and 23.4% of 2013
234 growers indicated they used surface water (including ponds, rivers and streams) at least some of the time.
235 Groundwater (including shallow and deep wells and municipal) was used for irrigation at least some of
236 the time by the majority of all growers. More than 76% of all growers did not test their irrigation water at
237 least once a year for indicators of fecal contamination. However, there was a significant increase (χ^2 (1)
238 = 16.48, $p < 0.001$) in the percentage of growers who reported testing their irrigation water at least once
239 per year, from 11.5% in 2010 to 31.9% in 2013. Growers who marketed their produce primarily through
240 wholesale channels were 23.5% more likely to test their irrigation water at least once a year ($p = 0.001$)
241 relative to growers marketing through other channels in the 2013 survey (Table 6). Growers were also
242 asked about their source of pesticide spray water. More than 91% of all growers used groundwater for
243 pesticide applications — the majority of which originated from deep wells - with only 6.4% of growers
244 indicating they used surface water.

245 When asked how their vegetable acreage is irrigated, the majority (70.6%) of all growers reported
246 using trickle (drip) irrigation at least some of the time. Interestingly, there was a significant decrease (χ^2
247 (1) = 4.73, $p = 0.030$) in the percentage of growers who reported using trickle (drip) irrigation for more
248 than half of their vegetable acreage, from 52.3% in 2010 to 39.9% in 2013. Growers were also asked what
249 other types of irrigation they use on their fresh produce. Overhead or sprinkler irrigation was used by
250 23.5% of growers in the 2013 survey, followed by furrow and flood irrigation (1.1% each).

251

252 ***3.4. Pre-harvest production practices: manure use, livestock on farm and access to crop fields***

253 The majority of all growers (60.4%) reported applying manure, compost or bio-solids to their
254 vegetable acreage. However, not all growers had on-farm sources of manure or compost. In the 2013

255 survey, more than half of growers (56.8%) indicated they did not have livestock or poultry on their farm.
256 Of those with domestic animals, poultry (free range and confined; 21.3%) and cattle (beef and dairy;
257 18.0%) were most frequently reported. Some growers did report raising small ruminants (sheep and goats;
258 8.2%) and swine (4.4%) on their farm. When asked if their livestock or poultry had access to their crop
259 fields during the year, the majority of growers (70.3%) answered “no”. More than 14% of growers
260 allowed domestic animals to enter crop fields after harvest, and two growers allowed domestic animals to
261 enter crop fields during the growing season.

262

263 ***3.5. Pre-harvest production practices: wildlife access to crop fields***

264 The majority of all growers (80.9%) reported that wildlife accessed their production fields daily
265 during the growing season. However, a significantly lower percentage of growers answered in the
266 affirmative in the 2013 survey (76.6%), as compared to the 2010 survey (86.7%) ($\chi^2 (1) = 4.85, p =$
267 0.028). Growers who marketed their produce primarily through wholesale channels were more likely
268 report daily wildlife access in their fields ($p = 0.013$) as compared to growers who marketed their produce
269 primarily through other channels in the 2010 survey (Table 7), while growers who produced vegetables
270 on more than 2 ha were more likely to report daily wildlife access in their fields in the 2013 survey (Table
271 7). Growers were also asked what preventative measures they use to control wildlife access. In the 2013
272 survey, the greatest percentage of growers reported using crop damage permits or hunting (50.8%),
273 followed by fencing (36.1%), chemical repellents (16.4%), domestic guard dogs (15.9%) and netting
274 (12.6%). Interestingly, 18.0% of growers reported not employing any preventative measures to control
275 wildlife access to their production fields.

276

277 ***3.6. Pre-harvest production practices: GAP training for self and workers***

278 In the 2010 survey, more than half of growers (59.3%) indicated they had not received any food
279 safety or GAP training in the last 3 years. However, growers who had been in operation more than 20
280 years were more likely to report having attended a training session within the last three years ($p < 0.001$),

281 as compared to those who had been in operation less than five years (Table 8A). Of those who reported
282 attending a food safety or GAP training in the 2010 survey, the largest percentage had done so within the
283 last year (21.5%). In the 2013 survey, the percentage of growers without recent food safety or GAP
284 training was significantly less (27.6%; $\chi^2 (1) = 29.66, p < 0.001$), and almost half of all growers reported
285 attending a training session within the last year (45.4%). Growers were also asked if their hired workers
286 had received any food safety or GAP training in the last three years. Half of all growers reported that their
287 employees had not attended a recent training session. However, the percentage of hired workers without
288 any recent food safety or GAP training was significantly less ($\chi^2 (1) = 4.04, p = 0.045$) in the 2013
289 survey (43.2%) as compared to the 2010 survey (60.0%). Again, growers who had been in operation more
290 than 20 years were more likely report that their employees attended a training session within the last 3
291 years ($p < 0.001$) in the 2013 survey (Table 8B). Although growers who produced vegetables on 2-20 ha
292 were 21.5% less likely to report any recent food safety or GAP training for their hired workers, this effect
293 was only marginally significant ($p = 0.106$).

294

295 ***3.7. Harvest production practices: field packing activities***

296 Growers were also asked about field harvest production practices related to sanitization of
297 containers and cleaning of vegetables. The majority of all growers (84.2%) surveyed reported they did
298 sanitize their harvest containers at least once during the season. There was also a significant increase (χ^2
299 $(1) = 10.85, p < 0.001$) in the percentage of growers who reported sanitizing their harvest containers,
300 from 75.4% in 2010 to 90.0% in 2013. No independent variable (i.e. farm scale, years in production or
301 market channel) significantly impacted the likelihood of this on-farm production practice (Table 9).
302 Growers were also asked what cleaning method(s) and sanitizer(s) they used on their crop prior to sale or
303 storage. In the 2010 survey, the largest percentage of growers reported washing their produce by hand
304 (39.2%), followed by use of spray washers (6.9%) and flumes (5.4%). In the 2013 survey - which
305 included additional response options - the largest percentage of growers reported washing their produce
306 with plain water (47.0%), followed by wiping with a cloth (29.5%), and cleaning with chlorinated water

307 (18.6%) or water containing another disinfectant (such as soap) (3.8%). About one quarter (24.9%) of all
308 growers reported not cleaning their crop prior to sale or storage.

309

310 ***3.8. Modifications to production practices since 2010***

311 In the 2013 survey, growers were asked what on-farm production practices they had modified or
312 implemented in the last three years in response to concerns about food safety. About a quarter of growers
313 reported improving their record keeping (24.6%), improving the food safety or GAP training their hired
314 workers received (24.0%), or implementing preventative measures to restrict wildlife access to their
315 production fields (26.8%). More than one-third of growers reported increasing their use of trickle (drip)
316 irrigation (38.8%) or increasing how often they cleaned their harvest containers (39.3%). Additionally,
317 29.5% of growers indicated they had started testing their irrigation water source(s) for indicators of fecal
318 contamination.

319

320 **4. Discussion**

321 This report on vegetable growers' knowledge and on-farm implementation of GAP is, to our
322 knowledge, the most extensive survey of its kind carried out in the mid-Atlantic region to date. For the
323 most part, production practices and food safety perspectives did not differ across farm scale or years in
324 production. This finding is similar to previous GAP research in Pennsylvania that found no significant
325 relationship between farm scale and a grower's likelihood to write a food safety plan or apply for third-
326 party certification (Tobin, Thomson, LaBorde, & Radhakrishna, 2013). However, we found market
327 channel did influence a grower's decision to implement some food safety practices. Less than 10% of all
328 surveyed growers reported marketing their produce primarily through wholesale channels, but in our 2013
329 survey, this group was significantly more likely to: have written policies for how they grew and handled
330 their produce, test their irrigation water at least once a year, or be GAP-certified. In contrast, the largest
331 proportion of all surveyed growers reported marketing their produce primarily through direct channels,
332 and this group was significantly less likely to be GAP-certified. Although direct-to-consumer sales in the

333 U.S. currently account for less than 2% of total fresh produce sales (Cook, 2011), they are a fast-growing
334 segment of agricultural sales (Low et al., 2015) and a focus of current U.S. policy (Johnson, Aussenberg,
335 & Cowan, 2013), due in part to consumer demand for locally produced foods (reviewed in Martinez et al.,
336 2010). With its densely populated urban areas, the mid-Atlantic region has some of the most successful
337 farmers markets, in terms of sales and number of customers per week (USDA, 2009). Previous studies
338 have found consumers' willingness to pay is greater for local versus non-local fresh produce (Adams &
339 Adams, 2011) but similar for organic versus locally grown tomatoes (Yue & Tong, 2009). There is also
340 evidence that local food systems support regional economic growth, as Brown, Goetz, Ahearn, and Liang
341 (2014) found a positive financial association between the level of direct sales in community-focused
342 agriculture and growth in total farm sales in certain regions including Maryland.

343 Unfortunately, few publications have investigated the impact of market channel on growers'
344 certification decisions and implementation of produce safety practices. When asked about potential
345 solutions to marketing challenges, organic produce growers in California ranked "food safety regulations
346 accounting for marketing methods" as one of the top recommendations (Cantor & Strohlic, 2009), yet
347 surprisingly, research has shown that fruit and vegetable growers who reported direct marketing as the
348 most economically important channel had significantly less certified organic acreage (Monson, Mainville,
349 & Kuminoff, 2008; Veldstra, Alexander, & Marshall, 2014). Market channel was correlated with produce
350 safety measures in a recent survey by Lichtenberg and Tselepidakis (unpublished data), who found the
351 share of fresh vegetables sold to retail or foodservice establishments was positively, albeit marginally,
352 associated with the probability of testing water, soil amendments or crop samples for indicators of fecal
353 contamination. In our survey, very few growers who sold their produce exclusively through direct
354 channels had been asked by their buyers (such as farm market managers or CSA members) to obtain GAP
355 certification. In contrast, growers who sell their produce through wholesale supermarket chains are
356 increasingly required to provide evidence of compliance with food safety standards through third-party
357 certification (Hatanaka et al., 2005) or GAP (Tobin, Thomson, LaBorde, & Bagdonis, 2011) in order to
358 maintain the business relationship. This de facto mandatory practice is appealing to wholesale operations,

359 which account for an estimated 57% of total fresh produce sales (Cook, 2011), as it shifts the
360 responsibility and liability for produce safety from wholesale operations onto third-party certifiers and
361 suppliers (Hatanaka et al., 2005). Further data is needed to assess the impact of direct-to-consumer
362 marketing on on-farm food safety practices, as a production decision to implement GAP and a marketing
363 decision to certify are likely interrelated, but separate, business decisions.

364 In this survey, only a quarter of all growers tested their irrigation water at least once a year for
365 generic *E. coli*, an indicator of fecal contamination. Previous surveys in other regions have reported
366 similarly low routine testing of irrigation water, both from groundwater sources (18% in Cohen et al.,
367 2005) and surface water sources (19% in Bihn et al., 2013). Growers may decide not to test an irrigation
368 water source for a myriad of reasons including concerns about cost and limited control over the water
369 source. Adjacent land use (such as grazing cattle or applying animal manure) and runoff from nearby
370 livestock or poultry operations have been shown to impact the prevalence and concentration of bacteria in
371 the aquatic environment (Chen & Jiang, 2014; Harmel, Karthikeyan, Gentry, & Srinivasan, 2010;
372 Thurston-Enriquez, Gilley, & Eghball, 2005). Growers may also lack alternative water sources. In the
373 mid-Atlantic region, vegetable growers primarily reported irrigating their crops with groundwater, but
374 about 30% reported irrigating with surface water some of the time. Surface water has been identified as a
375 predominant *Salmonella* reservoir in the eastern U.S. (Micallef et al., 2012; Strawn et al., 2013), and in
376 2005, a *Salmonella* Newport strain isolated from a pond used to irrigate tomatoes on the eastern shore of
377 Virginia was matched to the outbreak strain (Greene et al., 2008). This is of particular concern for
378 growers who use overhead or sprinkler irrigation systems, as non-pathogenic *E. coli* strains have been
379 consistently recovered from field-grown leafy greens following overhead irrigation with contaminated
380 water (Wood, Bezanson, Gordon, & Jamieson, 2010; Fonesca, Fallon, Sanchez, & Nolte, 2011).
381 However, the absence of generic *E. coli* does not mean the water is free of foodborne pathogens, and the
382 lack of the predictive correlation between this indicator and pathogenic *E. coli* (and other human
383 pathogens) in fresh produce has been well documented (reviewed in Busta et al., 2003). Since agricultural
384 water is an important potential source of pre-harvest microbial contamination, the proposed produce

385 safety standards within FSMA do include requirements related to routine water testing. However, the
386 Tester-Hagen Amendment exempts small- scale and local food growers, and other growers may be
387 exempt from the regulation due to their water source, irrigation system used or the crop(s) grown (U.S.
388 FDA, 2013). Since fresh market vegetable production within Maryland and Delaware is predominantly
389 small-scale and qualifies for the statutory exemption, routine testing of irrigation water in the mid-
390 Atlantic is likely to remain low.

391 The potential role of wildlife in pre-harvest contamination of fresh produce also remains unclear.
392 Although migratory birds (such as geese, ducks and gulls) are thought to be involved in the dispersal of
393 human pathogens (reviewed in Hubalek, 2004), several studies examining the prevalence of *E. coli*
394 O157:H7 in Canadian geese failed to identify the pathogen (reviewed in Langholz & Jay- Russell, 2013).
395 This is fortuitous for the mid-Atlantic, which lies within a major bird migration route known as the
396 Atlantic Flyway (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2012). In the rare case where a direct link between
397 wildlife and a foodborne illness outbreak could be established, *E. coli* O157:H7 isolated from feral pigs
398 was matched to the outbreak strain associated with spinach in 2006 (Jay et al., 2007), *Campylobacter*
399 *jejuni* isolated from Sandhill cranes was matched to the outbreak strain associated with peas in 2008
400 (Gardner et al., 2011), and *E. coli* O157:H7 isolated from deer was matched to the outbreak strain
401 associated with strawberries in 2011 (Laidler et al., 2013). In this survey, the majority of our surveyed
402 growers reported daily intrusion of wildlife into production fields during the growing season, but
403 approximately one-fifth of growers did not employ any preventative measures to minimize or prevent
404 access. Previous studies have documented growers' concerns that the food safety risk(s) posed by wildlife
405 are beyond their control (Parker et al., 2012b), or that preventative strategies are not economically
406 feasible (Ivey et al., 2012) or contradict environmental regulation designed to protect wildlife and
407 growers' desire to be responsible "stewards of the land" (Beretti & Stuart, 2008; Lowell, Langholz, &
408 Stuart, 2010). Concerns about the impact of food safety practices on land-use are supported by a recent
409 study in California, which documented the degradation and/or elimination of more than 13% of riparian
410 habitat in a major produce-growing region in the 5-year period following the 2006 *E. coli* O157:H7

411 outbreak associated with spinach (Gennet et al., 2013). The FDA has also responded to public concern
412 that the produce safety standards may promote practices that adversely affect wildlife and animal habitat
413 by proposing a new provision that clarifies FSMA's compliance with the Endangered Species Act and
414 encouragement of environmental stewardship (U.S. FDA, 2014). However, growers may also have a more
415 *laissez-faire* attitude regarding wildlife as they believe most fresh produce contamination occurs within
416 the home (Ivey et al., 2012; Parker et al., 2012a), and the consumer has greater responsibility for ensuring
417 raw meat food safety than they do (Erdem, Rigby, & Wossink, 2012). A national survey of U.S.
418 consumers found only 53% of respondents always wash their hands before they handle produce and only
419 28% of respondents separated fresh produce from raw meat within a shopping bag (Li-Cohen & Bruhn,
420 2002), which helps explain why growers across all farm scales expressed concerns about consumer
421 behavior and in-home food preparation (Parker et al., 2012b).

422 In this survey, less than 10% of all growers indicated that financial constraints were the primary
423 obstacle for GAP implementation. This finding is similar to what Ivey et al. (2012) reported for
424 Midwestern vegetable growers, who agreed on-farm food safety practices were generally economically
425 feasible. However, the cost of implementing these preventative measures is often scale- dependent, and
426 growers may underestimate the total expenditures required for GAP certification. Larger operations also
427 tend to have lower production costs per pound, whereas smaller operations may be capital and/or labor
428 poor. A study looking at fresh market strawberry production and the adoption of five food safety practices
429 (including routine irrigation water testing) across different farm scales estimated that the additional cost
430 per hectare for smaller growers would be four times more than that for larger ones (\$720 per hectare
431 versus \$165 per hectare; Woods & Thornsby, 2005). More recently, Becot et al. (2012) used data
432 obtained from online surveys and in-depth interviews to analyze the costs of GAP certification (i.e.
433 infrastructure, equipment and labor) for diversified, small- and medium-scaled farms in Vermont. They
434 estimated the average cost for GAP certification per farm ranged between \$2599 and \$3983, but found no
435 significant difference in spending based on primary market strategy (<50% of produce sold through
436 wholesale channels versus >50%; Becot et al., 2012). Produce food safety costs also occupy a greater

437 percentage of gross farm cash income for growers with lower sales. Among GAP-certified fruit and
438 vegetable growers in Oregon, for example, those with gross farm cash incomes of \$2758 per hectare spent
439 about 12% on food safety, whereas those with gross farm cash incomes of \$23,718 per hectare spent less
440 than 2% (Prenguber & Gilroy, 2013). Interestingly, a recent survey on the cost of on-farm produce safety
441 measures in the mid-Atlantic found only a handful of practices (such as employee training and sanitizing
442 harvest containers) were likely to be financially burdensome for smaller operations (Lichtenberg and
443 Tselepidakis, unpublished data). One possible explanation for the low rate of GAP implementation,
444 despite the perceived low economic burden, is the lack of evidence that the financial investment for GAP
445 results in sustained profits, access to new markets or other benefits (Parker et al., 2012a; Tobin, Thomson,
446 & LaBorde, 2012). Furthermore, economic incentives (such as higher prices or reduced storage costs) are
447 dependent on the ability of the marketing system to segregate GAP-certified from non-certified produce
448 (Hobbs, 2003). Hardesty and Kusunose (2009) found that California leafy greens growers did not receive
449 a price premium for implementing the compliance requirements of the Leafy Greens Marketing
450 Agreement (LGMA), but LGMA does differ from other food safety programs as it has nearly 100%
451 grower adoption. And although Ribera, Palma, Paggi, Knutson, and Masabn (2012) found that the
452 compliance costs incurred by growers to demonstrate food safety assurance are much lower than the costs
453 incurred during a produce-associated outbreak (i.e. declining sales and unsaleable product), it is unlikely
454 that the growers with GAP certification are buffered from the volatile market during an outbreak.

455

456 **5. Conclusions**

457 Overall, mid-Atlantic vegetable growers' knowledge and on-farm implementation of GAP
458 appears to be improving, as evident by the increased percentage of growers who reported microbial
459 testing of irrigation water, attending a GAP training, having hired workers attend a GAP training, and
460 sanitizing harvest containers. Between 2010 and 2013, University of Maryland Extension offered eleven
461 educational workshops on food safety that were attended by more than 250 produce growers. It is
462 probable the increase we observed for some on-farm GAP activities is connected to the extension

463 programming. However, the effectiveness of the knowledge-deficit model (which attributes non-
464 compliance to lack of information) in the context of food safety remains uncertain (Webster, Jardine,
465 Cash, & McMullen, 2010; Parker et al., 2012a). For example, while pre- and post-evaluations from
466 growers who attended GAP trainings offered by Penn State Extension did indicate an overall increase in
467 technical knowledge, changes in on-farm food safety practices were largely absent, as only a minority of
468 growers had written policies, conducted a self-audit, or applied for third-party certification six months
469 later (Tobin et al., 2013). Additionally, food safety training has not generally been targeted at the farm
470 level, but a previous study on hand hygiene among hired produce workers did show that perceived
471 behavioral control (i.e. fewer barriers) was a significant predictor of handwashing intention (Soon &
472 Baines, 2012). Consequently, field days focused on food safety and held at agricultural experiment
473 stations or volunteer farms could be a valuable educational tool, facilitating discussion and peer-learning
474 through demonstrations, mock GAP inspections and hands-on activities. In this study, we did not find a
475 significant influence of farm scale or years in production on food safety practices, and economic
476 feasibility does not appear to be the primary driver for growers who forgo GAP certification. However,
477 market channel did impact a grower's likelihood to have written policies, test irrigation water, and obtain
478 GAP certification, and strong differences were observed between wholesale and direct-to- consumer
479 growers. While extension programming should continue to focus on supporting the needs of growers who
480 elect to implement GAP, food safety outreach may benefit from expanding to involve farm market
481 managers and personnel in intermediate market channels such as local food hubs. More research is needed
482 to better understand how market channel works with other grower characteristics to influence decision-
483 making activities including on-farm food safety practices. However, this new information further
484 highlights the complexity of the issue at hand and the need for GAP educational programs to expand
485 beyond a one-size-fits-all approach.

486 **6. Study limitations**

487 As in similar survey-based research, the main limitations included: coverage errors, non-response
488 and measurement errors, and selection bias. The failure to track individual responses across the surveys
489 was also a major limitation.

490 **Acknowledgments**

491 The 2010 survey was funded by University of Maryland Extension. The 2013 survey was funded
492 from USDA-NIFA Specialty Crop Research Initiative grant number: 2011-51181-30767. The sponsor
493 played no role in the study design and implementation. Any opinions, findings and conclusions expressed
494 in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the USDA-NIFA.

495 **Appendix A. Supplementary data**496 **Supplemental Table 1. Analyzed questions from 2010 and 2013 surveys.**

Topic	Question
Farm demographics	How long have you been growing vegetables and fruit? How many acres of vegetables do you produce? How is your produce marketed? How would you classify your farming operation? *
GAP implementation	Do you have written procedures and policies for how you grow and handle your produce? Have you completed a GAP third party certification? Have your buyers asked you to have a third party GAP certification? What obstacles are keeping you from developing a GAP plan for your operation? When was the last time you attended a GAP training? If you have hired workers, when was the last time your workers attended a GAP training?
Irrigation and spray water	If you use irrigation, what is/are the source(s) of the water? How often do you have all of your water sources tested for bacterial contamination? What is the source of water for pesticide spray applications? If you use irrigation, what percentage of your acreage is trickle or drip irrigated? If you irrigate your fruit or vegetables, what type(s) of irrigation do you use? *
Livestock and manure	What percentage of your fruit or vegetable acreage is fertilized with compost or manure? If you have livestock on your farm, what is/are the main animal type(s)? * Do you allow livestock animals to have access to your produce fields at any time during the year? *
Wildlife access and control	How frequently do domestic animals and wildlife access your crop fields during the growing season? If you use preventative measures to control wildlife access or damage to your produce crops, what types of measures do you use? *
Harvest practices	How often are harvest containers washed or sanitized? If you clean your vegetables prior to sale, what is the main cleaning method?
Other	Since 2010, what production practices have you changed or started? *

497 * Indicates question was only asked in 2013 survey.

498 **Table 1. Descriptive summary of mid-Atlantic vegetable grower demographics.**

Variable	Level	Distribution of responses (%)			
		2010	2013	Total	Census data for MD and DE ^c
Vegetable acreage ^a	<2 ha	54.5	51.8	52.9	46.5
	2–20 ha	34.1	28.8	31.1	32.9
	>20 ha	11.4	19.4	16.0	20.6
Years in production	<5 years	16.8	11.4	13.7	11.4
	5–20 years	32.0	33.1	32.6	–
	>20 years	51.2	55.4	53.6	–
Marketing channel ^b	Wholesale	7.1	7.3	7.2	
	Direct	42.5	39.9	40.9	
	Combination	39.8	38.2	38.8	
	Processing	10.6	14.6	13.5	

499 a. Acreage in hectares.

500 b. Respondents allowed to select “primarily wholesale”, “primarily direct”, “combination or
501 wholesale and direct” or “processing”.502 c. Combined USDA-NASS Census of Agriculture acreage data and principal operator tenure data
503 for vegetable farms in Maryland (N = 789) and Delaware (N = 222) presented for farm scale and
504 years in production comparisons. Due to differences in response scale between this survey and
505 the USDA-NASS census, only <5 years is included in the table. Data not available for primary
506 market channel of vegetable farms by individual state.

507 **Table 2. Marginal effects of farm scale, years in production and market channel on the probability**
 508 **of having written policies for the growing and handling of produce by survey year.**

Variable ^a	2010 probit results		2013 probit results	
	Average marginal effect ^b	Significance level ^c	Average marginal effect	Significance level
	Vegetable acreage (<2 ha)			
2–20 ha	0.043		–0.015	
>20 ha	0.127		0.114	
	Production years (<5 years)			
5–20 years	0.078		0.050	
>20 years	0.123		0.005	
	Market channel (other)			
Wholesale market	0.045		0.267	****
Direct market	0.109		–0.075	

- 509 a. Reference categories are in boldface and shown in parentheses. Responses were significantly
 510 different ($p < 0.001$) by survey year.
- 511 b. Average marginal effects calculated from the probit regression coefficients.
- 512 c. * $P \leq 0.10$; ** $P \leq 0.05$; *** $P \leq 0.01$; **** $P \leq 0.001$.

513 **Table 3. Marginal effects of farm scale, years in production and market channel on the probability**
 514 **of having completed a GAP third party certification by survey year.**

Variable ^a	2010 probit results ^d		2013 probit results	
	Average marginal effect ^b	Significance level ^c	Average marginal effect	Significance level
	Vegetable acreage (<2 ha)			
2–20 ha	.		–0.154	***
>20 ha	.		–0.023	
	Production years (<5 years)			
5–20 years	.		(not estimable) ^e	
>20 years	.		(not estimable)	
	Market channel (other)			
Wholesale market	.		0.286	****
Direct market	.		–0.150	***

- 515 a. Reference categories are in boldface and shown in parentheses. Responses were significantly
 516 different ($p < 0.001$) by survey year.
- 517 b. Average marginal effects calculated from the probit regression coefficients.
- 518 c. * $P \leq 0.10$; ** $P \leq 0.05$; *** $P \leq 0.01$; **** $P \leq 0.001$.
- 519 d. Probit model for 2010 survey data not estimable due to collinearity.
- 520 e. Production years omitted from the model due to collinearity.

521 **Table 4. Marginal effects of farm scale, years in production and market channel on the probability**
 522 **of having been asked by buyers for GAP certification by survey year.**

Variable ^a	2010 probit results ^d		2013 probit results	
	Average marginal effect ^b	Significance level ^c	Average marginal effect	Significance level
	Vegetable acreage (<2 ha)			
2–20 ha	.		–0.065	
>20 ha	.		0.195	*
	Production years (<5 years)			
5–20 years	.		(not estimable) ^e	
>20 years	.		(not estimable)	
	Market channel (other)			
Wholesale market	.		0.234	***
Direct market	.		–0.087	

523

524 a. Reference categories are in boldface and shown in parentheses. Responses were
 525 significantly different ($p < 0.001$) by survey year.

526 b. Average marginal effects calculated from the probit regression coefficients.

527 c. * $P \leq 0.10$; ** $P \leq 0.05$; *** $P \leq 0.01$; **** $P \leq 0.001$.

528 d. Probit model for 2010 survey data not estimable due to collinearity.

529 e. Production years omitted from the model due to collinearity.

530 **Table 5. Primary obstacles hindering growers from developing a food safety plan for their farm.**

Response	Distribution (%) and number of responses		
	2010	2013	Total
Lack of knowledge	43.1 (56)	10.9 (20)	24.3
Lack of assistance/personnel	16.9 (22)	8.7 (16)	12.1
Lack GAP training	22.3 (29)	–	22.3
Doesn't apply to my size operation	33.1 (43)	20.2 (37)	25.6
Requires too much time	16.2 (21)	7.1 (13)	10.9
Costs too much	10.8 (14)	7.1 (13)	8.6
I'm not required to do so	–	27.3 (50)	27.3

531 Data analyzed from 130 growers in 2010 survey and 183 growers in 2013 survey. Growers were allowed
532 to select up to 3 answers. All responses except “costs too much” ($p = 0.255$) were significantly different
533 between survey years ($p < 0.05$). – indicates response was not an option for that survey year.

534 **Table 6. Marginal effects of farm scale, years in production and market channel on the probability**
 535 **of testing irrigation water annually for indicators of fecal contamination by survey year.**

Variable ^a	2010 probit results		2013 probit results	
	Average marginal effect ^b	Significance level ^c	Average marginal effect	Significance level
	Vegetable acreage (<2 ha)			
2–20 ha	–0.038		–0.107	
>20 ha	–0.015		0.033	
	Production years (<5 years)			
5–20 years	0.077		0.072	
>20 years	0.079		0.184	
	Market channel (other)			
Wholesale market	0.035		0.235	****
Direct market	–0.049		–0.402	

536 a. Reference categories are in boldface and shown in parentheses. Responses were significantly
 537 different ($p < 0.001$) by survey year.

538 b. Average marginal effects calculated from the probit regression coefficients.

539 c. * $P \leq 0.10$; ** $P \leq 0.05$; *** $P \leq 0.01$; **** $P \leq 0.001$.

540 **Table 7. Marginal effects of farm scale, years in production and market channel on the probability**
 541 **of daily wildlife access to production fields during growing season by survey year.**

Variable ^a	2010 probit results		2013 probit results	
	Average marginal effect ^b	Significance level ^c	Average marginal effect	Significance level
	Vegetable acreage (<2 ha)			
2–20 ha	0.056		0.178	**
>20 ha	0.047		0.306	****
	Production years (<5 years)			
5–20 years	0.094		0.086	
>20 years	0.021		0.119	
	Market channel (other)			
Wholesale market	0.197	***	–0.019	
Direct market	–0.028		0.022	

542 a. Reference categories are in boldface and shown in parentheses. Responses were
 543 significantly different ($p < 0.001$) by survey year.

544 b. Average marginal effects calculated from the probit regression coefficients.

545 c. * $P \leq 0.10$; ** $P \leq 0.05$; *** $P \leq 0.01$; **** $P \leq 0.001$.

546 **Table 8. Marginal effects of farm scale, years in production and market channel on the probability**
 547 **of food safety or GAP training of self (A) and workers (B) by survey year.**

A) Variable ^a	2010 probit results		2013 probit results	
	Average marginal effect ^b	Significance level ^c	Average marginal effect	Significance level
Vegetable acreage (<2 ha)				
2–20 ha	–0.132		–0.087	
>20 ha	–0.097		–0.081	
Production years (<5 years)				
5–20 years	0.142		0.048	
>20 years	0.274	**	0.049	
Market channel (other)				
Wholesale market	–0.107		0.094	
Direct market	0.127		0.107	
B) Variable ^a	2010 probit results		2013 probit results	
	Average marginal effect	Significance level ^b	Average marginal effect	Significance level
Vegetable acreage (<2 ha)				
2–20 ha	0.109		–0.215	*
>20 ha	0.159		–0.109	
Production years (<5 years)				
5–20 years	0.038		0.289	*
>20 years	0.113		0.524	****
Market channel (other)				
Wholesale market	0.095		–0.035	
Direct market	0.240		–0.039	

548 a. Reference categories are in boldface and shown in parentheses. Responses were
 549 significantly different ($p < 0.05$) by survey year.

550 b. Average marginal effects calculated from the probit regression coefficients.

551 c. * $P \leq 0.10$; ** $P \leq 0.05$; *** $P \leq 0.01$; **** $P \leq 0.001$.

552 **Table 9. Marginal effects of farm scale, years in production and market channel on the probability**
 553 **of yearly sanitization of harvest containers by survey year.**

Variable ^a	2010 probit results		2013 probit results	
	Average marginal effect ^b	Significance level ^c	Average marginal effect	Significance level
	Vegetable acreage (<2 ha)			
2–20 ha	–0.029		–0.013	
>20 ha	–0.234		–0.038	
	Production years (<5 years)			
5–20 years	0.018		0.138	
>20 years	–0.056		0.121	
	Market channel (other)			
Wholesale market	0.011		–0.009	
Direct market	0.001		–0.063	

554 a. Reference categories are in boldface and shown in parentheses. Responses were significantly
 555 different ($p = 0.001$) by survey year.

556 b. Average marginal effects calculated from the probit regression coefficients.

557 c. $*P \leq 0.10$; $**P \leq 0.05$; $***P \leq 0.01$; $****P \leq 0.001$.

References

- 558
- 559 Adams, D. C., & Adams, A. E. (2011). De-placing local at the farmers' market: consumer conceptions of
560 local foods. *Journal of Rural Social Sciences*, 26, 74-100.
- 561 Becot, F. A., Nickerson, V., Conner, D. S., & Kolodinsky, J. M. (2012). Costs of food safety certification
562 on fresh produce farms in Vermont. *HortTechnology*, 22, 705-714.
- 563 Beretti, M., & Stuart, D. (2008). Food safety and environmental quality impose conflicting demands on
564 Central Coast growers. *California Agriculture*, 62, 68-73
- 565 Berger, C. N., Sodha, S. V., Shaw, R. K., Griffin, P. M., Pink, D., Hand, P., et al. (2010). Fresh fruit and
566 vegetables as vehicles for the transmission of human pathogens. *Environmental Microbiology*, 12,
567 2385-2397.
- 568 Beuchat, L. R. (2006). Vectors and conditions for preharvest contamination of fruits and vegetables with
569 pathogens capable of causing enteric diseases. *British Food Journal*, 108, 38-53.
- 570 Bihn, E. A., & Gravani, R. B. (2006). Role of Good Agricultural Practices in fruit and vegetable safety. In
571 K. R. Matthews (Ed.), *Microbiology of fresh produce* (pp. 21-53). Washington D.C: ASM Press.
- 572 Bihn, E. A., Smart, C. D., Hoepting, C. A., & Worobo, R. W. (2013). Use of surface water in the
573 production of fresh fruits and vegetables: a survey of fresh produce growers and their water
574 management practices. *Food Protection Trends*, 33, 307-314.
- 575 Brown, J. P., Goetz, S. J., Ahearn, M. C., & Liang, C. (2014). Linkages between community- focused
576 agriculture, farm sales, and regional growth. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 28, 5-16.
- 577 Busta, F. F., Suslow, T. V., Parish, M. E., Beuchat, L. R., Farber, J. N., Garrett, E. H., et al. (2003). The
578 use of indicators and surrogate microorganisms for the evaluation of pathogens in fresh and fresh-
579 cut produce. *Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety*, 2, 179-185.
- 580 Cantor, A., & Strohlic, R. (2009). *Breaking down market barriers for small- and midsized organic*
581 *growers*. California Institute for Rural Studies. Available at [http://](http://www.ams.usda.gov/AMSV1.0/getfile?dDocName=STELPRDC5081306)
582 www.ams.usda.gov/AMSV1.0/getfile?dDocName=STELPRDC5081306.

- 583 Chen, Z., & Jiang, X. (2014). Microbiological safety of chicken litter or chicken litter- based organic
584 fertilizer: a review. *Agriculture*, 4, 1-29.
- 585 Cohen, N., Hollingsworth, C. S., Brennan Olson, R., Laus, M. J., & Coli, W. M. (2005). Farm food safety
586 practices: a survey of New England growers. *Food Protection Trends*, 25, 363-370.
- 587 Cook, R. L. (2011). Fundamental forces affecting U.S. fresh produce growers and marketers. *Choices*, 26.
588 Available at [http://www.choicesmagazine.org/choices-
589 forces-affecting-us-fresh-produce-growers-and-marketers](http://www.choicesmagazine.org/choices-magazine/submitted-articles/fundamental-
589 forces-affecting-us-fresh-produce-growers-and-marketers).
- 590 Critzer, F. J., & Doyle, M. P. (2010). Microbial ecology of foodborne pathogens associated with produce.
591 *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, 21, 125-130.
- 592 DeWaal, C. S., Tian, X. A., & Bhuiya, F. (2008). *Outbreak alert! 2008: Closing the gaps in our federal*
593 *food-safety net*. Final Report. Center for Science in the Public Interest. Available at
594 http://cspinet.org/new/pdf/outbreak_alert_2008_report_final.pdf.
- 595 Erdem, S., Rigby, D., & Wossink, A. (2012). Using best-worst scaling to explore perceptions of relative
596 responsibility for ensuring food safety. *Food Policy*, 37, 661-670.
- 597 Finney, D.J. (1971). *Probit analysis* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 598 Fonesca, J. M., Fallon, S. D., Sanchez, C. A., & Nolte, K. D. (2011). *Escherichia coli* survival in lettuce
599 fields following its introduction through different irrigation systems. *Journal of Applied*
600 *Microbiology*, 110, 893-902.
- 601 Fulponi, L. (2006). Private voluntary standards in the food system: the perspective of major food retailers
602 in OECD countries. *Food Policy*, 31, 1-13.
- 603 Gardner, T. J., Fitzgerald, C., Xavier, C., Klein, R., Pruckler, J., Stroika, S., et al. (2011). Outbreak of
604 Campylobacteriosis associated with consumption of raw peas. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 53,
605 26-32.
- 606 Gennet, S., Howard, J., Langholz, J., Andrews, K., Reynolds, M. D., & Morrison, S. A. (2013). Farm
607 practices for food safety: an emerging threat to floodplain and riparian ecosystems. *Frontiers in*
608 *Ecology and the Environment*, 11, 236-242.

- 609 Gravani, R. B. (2009). The role of Good Agricultural Practices in produce safety. In F. Xuotong, B. A.
610 Niemira, C. J. Doona, F. E. Feeherry, & R. B. Gravani (Eds.), *Microbial safety of fresh produce*
611 (pp. 101-118). Ames, Iowa: Wiley-Blackwell.
- 612 Greene, S. K., Daly, E. R., Talbot, E. A., Demma, L. J., Holzbauer, S., Patel, N. J., et al. (2008).
613 Recurrent multistate outbreak of *Salmonella* Newport associated with tomatoes from
614 contaminated fields, 2005. *Epidemiology & Infection*, *136*, 157-165.
- 615 Hardesty, S. D., & Kusunose, Y. (2009). Grower compliance costs for the leafy greens marketing
616 agreement and other food safety programs. *UC Small Farm Program Research Brief*. Available at
617 <http://sfp.ucdavis.edu/files/143911.pdf>.
- 618 Harmel, R. D., Karthikeyan, R., Gentry, T., & Srinivasan, S. (2010). Effects of agricultural management,
619 land use, and watershed scale on *E. coli* concentrations in runoff and streamflow. *Transactions of*
620 *the ASABE*, *53*, 1833-1841.
- 621 Harrison, J. A., Gaskin, J. W., Harrison, M. A., Cannon, J. L., Boyer, R. R., & Zehnder, G. W. (2013).
622 Survey of food safety practices on small to medium-sized farms and in farmers markets. *Journal*
623 *of Food Protection*, *76*, 1989-1993.
- 624 Hatanaka, M., Bain, C., & Busch, L. (2005). Third-party certification in the global agrifood system. *Food*
625 *Policy*, *30*, 354-369.
- 626 Hobbs, J. E. (2003). *Incentives for the adoption of Good Agricultural Practices (GAPs)*. Working Paper
627 Series. Rome, Italy: United Nations FAO Expert Consultation on Good Agricultural Practices.
628 Committee in Agriculture. Available at: [http://www.fao.org/prods/gap/DOCS/PDF/3-](http://www.fao.org/prods/gap/DOCS/PDF/3-IncentiveAdoptionGoodAgrEXTERNAL.pdf)
629 [IncentiveAdoptionGoodAgrEXTERNAL.pdf](http://www.fao.org/prods/gap/DOCS/PDF/3-IncentiveAdoptionGoodAgrEXTERNAL.pdf).
- 630 Hoppe, R. A., & MacDonald, J. M. (2013). *Updating the ERS farm typology*. USDA ERS. Available at
631 <http://www.ers.usda.gov/media/1070858/eib110.pdf>. Report EIB- 110.
- 632 Hubalek, Z. (2004). An annotated checklist of pathogenic microorganisms associated with migratory
633 birds. *Journal of Wildlife Diseases*, *40*, 639-659.

- 634 Hultberg, A., Schermann, M., & Tong, C. (2012). Results from a mail survey to assess Minnesota
635 vegetable growers' adherence to Good Agricultural Practices. *HortTechnology*, 22, 83-88.
- 636 Ivey, M. L., LeJeune, J. T., & Miller, S. A. (2012). Vegetable producers' perceptions of food safety
637 hazard in the Midwestern USA. *Food Control*, 26, 453-465.
- 638 Jay, M. T., Cooley, M., Carychao, D., Wiscomb, G. W., Sweitzer, R. A., Crawford-Mikszta, L., et al.
639 (2007). *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 in feral swine near spinach fields and cattle, Central California
640 Coast. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 13, 1908-1911.
- 641 Johnson, R., Aussenberg, R. A., & Cowan, T. (2013). *The role of local food systems in U.S. farm policy*.
642 Congressional Research Service. Available at <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R42155.pdf>.
643 Report R42155.
- 644 Laidler, M. R., Tourdjman, M., Buser, G. L., Hostetler, T., Repp, K. K., Leman, R., et al. (2013).
645 *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 infections associated with consumption of locally grown strawberries
646 contaminated by deer. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 57, 1129-1134.
- 647 Langholz, J. A., & Jay-Russell, M. T. (2013). Potential role of wildlife in pathogenic contamination of
648 fresh produce. *Human-Wildlife Interactions*, 7, 140-157.
- 649 Li-Cohen, A. E., & Bruhn, C. M. (2002). Safety of consumer handling of fresh produce from the time of
650 purchase to the plate: a comprehensive consumer survey. *Journal of Food Protection*, 65, 1287-
651 1296.
- 652 Low, S. A., Adalja, A., Beaulieu, E., Key, N., Martinez, S., Melton, A., et al. (2015). *Trends in U.S. local
653 and regional food systems*. USDA ERS. Available at [http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/ap-
654 administrative-publication/ap-068](http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/ap-administrative-publication/ap-068). Report AP-068.
- 655 Low, S. A., & Vogel, S. (2011). *Direct and intermediated marketing of local foods in the United States*.
656 USDA ERS. Available at
657 <http://www.ams.usda.gov/AMSV1.0/getfile?dDocName=STELPRDC5097250>. Report ERR-128.
- 658 Lowell, K., Langholz, J., & Stuart, D. (2010). *Safe and sustainable: Co-managing for food safety and
659 ecological health in California's Central Coast Region*. San Francisco, CA, and Washington D.C:

- 660 The Nature Conservancy of California and the Georgetown University Produce Safety Project.
661 Available at <http://www.pewtrusts.org/~media/Assets/2009/PSPwildlifepdf.pdf>.
- 662 Mandrell, R. E. (2009). Enteric human pathogens associated with fresh produce: sources, transport, and
663 ecology. In F. Xuotong, B. A. Niemira, C. J. Doona, F. E. Feeherry, & R. B. Gravani (Eds.),
664 *Microbial safety of fresh produce* (pp. 5-42). Ames, Iowa: Wiley-Blackwell.
- 665 Martinez, S., Hand, M., Da Pra, M., Pollack, S., Ralston, K., Smith, T., et al. (2010). *Local food systems:*
666 *Concepts, impacts, and issues*. USDA ERS. Available at [http://www.](http://www.ers.usda.gov/media/122868/err97_1_.pdf)
667 [ers.usda.gov/media/122868/err97_1_.pdf](http://www.ers.usda.gov/media/122868/err97_1_.pdf). Report ERR-97.
- 668 Maryland Department of Agriculture. (2013). *Food and feed quality: MDA GAP certified producers*.
669 Available at [http://mda.maryland.gov/foodfeedquality/](http://mda.maryland.gov/foodfeedquality/Documents/mdagapcertifiedproducer.12.29.13.pdf)
670 [Documents/mdagapcertifiedproducer.12.29.13.pdf](http://mda.maryland.gov/foodfeedquality/Documents/mdagapcertifiedproducer.12.29.13.pdf).
- 671 Micallef, S. A., Rosenberg Goldstein, R. E., George, A., Kleinfelter, L., Boyer, M. S., McLaughlin, C. R.,
672 et al. (2012). Occurrence and antibiotic resistance of multiple *Salmonella* serotypes recovered
673 from water, sediment and soil on mid-Atlantic tomato farms. *Environmental Research*, 114, 31-
674 39.
- 675 Monson, J., Mainville, D., & Kuminoff, N. (2008). The decision to direct market: an analysis of small
676 fruit and specialty-product markets in Virginia. *Journal of Food Distribution Research*, 39, 1-11.
- 677 Newton, D. J. (2014). *Working with land with 10 acres: Small acreage farming in the United States*.
678 USDA ERS. Available at [http://www.ers.usda.gov/media/1391688/](http://www.ers.usda.gov/media/1391688/eib123.pdf)
679 [eib123.pdf](http://www.ers.usda.gov/media/1391688/eib123.pdf). Report EIB-123.
- 679 Olaimat, A. N., & Holley, R. A. (2012). Factors influencing the microbial safety of fresh produce: a
680 review. *Food Microbiology*, 32, 1-19.
- 681 Painter, J. A., Hoekstra, R. M., Ayers, T., Tauxe, R. V., Braden, C. R., Angulo, F. J., et al. (2013).
682 Attribution of foodborne illnesses, hospitalizations, and deaths to food commodities by using
683 outbreak data, United States, 1998-2008. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 19, 407-415.
- 684 Parker, J. S., Wilson, R. S., LeJeune, J. T., & Doohan, D. (2012). Including growers in the "food safety"
685 conversation: enhancing the design and implementation of food safety programming based on

- 686 farm and marketing needs of fresh fruit and vegetable producers. *Agriculture and Human Values*,
687 29, 303-319.
- 688 Parker, J. S., Wilson, R. S., LeJeune, J. T., Rivers, L., III, & Doohan, D. (2012). An expert guide to
689 understanding grower decisions related to fresh fruit and vegetable contamination prevention and
690 control. *Food Control*, 26,107-116.
- 691 Prenguber, B., & Gilroy, A. (2013). *A first look at produce safety costs on Oregon's small and medium*
692 *fresh fruit and vegetable farms*. Portland: Oregon Public Health Institute.
- 693 Rangarajan, A., Pritts, M. P., Reiners, S., & Pedersen, L. H. (2002). Focusing food safety training based
694 on current grower practices and farm scale. *HortTechnology*, 12, 126-131.
- 695 Ribera, L. A., Palma, M. A., Paggi, M., Knutson, R., & Masabn, J. G. (2012). Economic analysis of food
696 safety compliance costs and foodborne illness outbreaks in the United States. *HortTechnology*,
697 22,150-156.
- 698 Soon, J. M., & Baines, R. N. (2012). Food safety training and evaluation of handwashing intention among
699 fresh produce farm workers. *Food Control*, 23, 437-448.
- 700 Strawn, L. K., Fortes, E. D., Bihn, E. A., Nightingale, K. K., Grohn, Y. T., Worobo, R. W., et al. (2013).
701 Landscape and meteorological factors affecting prevalence of three food-borne pathogens in fruit
702 and vegetable farms. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 79, 588-600.
- 703 Suslow, T. V., Oria, M. P., Beuchat, L. R., Garrett, E. H., Parish, M. E., Harris, L. J., et al. (2003).
704 Production practices as risk factors in microbial food safety of fresh and fresh-cut produce.
705 *Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety*, 2(Suppl.), 38-77.
- 706 Thurston-Enriquez, J. A., Gilley, J. E., & Eghball, B. (2005). Microbial quality of runoff following land
707 application of cattle manure and swine slurry. *Journal of Water Health*, 3, 151-171.
- 708 Tobin, D., Thomson, J., & LaBorde, L. (2012). Consumer perceptions of produce safety: a study of
709 Pennsylvania. *Food Control*, 26, 305-312.

- 710 Tobin, D., Thomson, J., LaBorde, L., & Bagdonis, J. (2011). Developing GAP training for growers:
711 perspectives from Pennsylvania supermarkets. *Journal of Extension*, 49. Available at
712 http://www.joe.org/joe/2011october/pdf/JOE_v49_5rb7.pdf. Article 5RIB7.
- 713 Tobin, D., Thomson, J., LaBorde, L., & Radhakrishna, R. (2013). Factors affecting growers' on- farm
714 food safety practices: evaluation findings from Penn State Extension programming. *Food*
715 *Control*, 33, 73-80.
- 716 U.S. Department of Agriculture. (2009). *National farmers market manager survey, 2006*. USDA-AMS.
717 Available at <http://www.ams.usda.gov/AMSV1.0/getfile?dDocName=STELPRDC5077203>.
- 718 U.S. Department of Agriculture. (2014a). *Census of agriculture, 2012: Summary and state data*. USDA-
719 NASS. Available at http://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2012/#full_report. Report AC-
720 12-A-51.
- 721 U.S. Department of Agriculture. (2014b). *USDA Good Agricultural Practices and Good Handling*
722 *Practices audit verification checklist. Version 1.2*. USDA. Available at
723 <http://www.ams.usda.gov/AMSV1.0/getfile?dDocName=STELPRDC5091326>.
- 724 U.S. Department of Agriculture Agricultural Marketing Service. (2013). *List of participating companies*
725 *with acceptable audits: Maryland and Delaware*. USDA- AMS. Available at
726 <http://www.ams.usda.gov/AMSV1.0/gapghp>.
- 727 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2012). *Migratory bird flyways*. US-FWS. Available at
728 <http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/Flyways.html>.
- 729 U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (1998). *Guidance for industry: Guide to minimize microbial food*
730 *safety hazards for fresh fruits and vegetables*. USDA. Available at
731 <http://www.fda.gov/Food/GuidanceRegulation/GuidanceDocumentsRegulatoryInformation/ProducePlantProducts/ucm064574.htm>.
732
- 733 U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2013). *Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA): Standards for the*
734 *growing, harvesting, and holding of produce for human consumption*. Proposed rule. USDA.

- 735 Available at <http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Food/GuidanceRegulation/FSMA/UCM360734.pdf>.
- 736 Docket #FDA-2011-N-0921.
- 737 U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2014). *Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA): Standards for the*
- 738 *growing, harvesting, and holding of produce for human consumption*. Proposed rule:
- 739 Supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking. USDA. Available at
- 740 <http://www.regulations.gov/#!documentDetail;D=FDA-2011-N-0921-0973>. Docket #FDA-2011-
- 741 N-0921-0973.
- 742 Veldstra, M. D., Alexander, C. E., & Marshall, M. I. (2014). To certify or not to certify? Separating the
- 743 organic production and certification decisions. *Food Policy*, 49, 429-436.
- 744 Webster, K., Jardine, C., Cash, S. B., & McMullen, L. M. (2010). Risk ranking: Investigating expert and
- 745 public differences in evaluating food safety hazards. *Journal of Food Protection*, 73, 1875-1885.
- 746 Wood, J. D., Bezanson, G. S., Gordon, R. J., & Jamieson, R. (2010). Population dynamics of *Escherichia*
- 747 *coli* inoculated by irrigation into the phyllosphere of spinach grown under commercial production
- 748 conditions. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 143, 198-204.
- 749 Woods, M., & Thornsbury, S. (2005). *Costs of adopting Good Agricultural Practices (GAPs) to ensure*
- 750 *food safety in fresh strawberries*. Michigan State University: Department of Agricultural
- 751 Economics. Available at [http://www.gaps.cornell.edu/fsi/lessons/6-Module2/Lesson2-](http://www.gaps.cornell.edu/fsi/lessons/6-Module2/Lesson2-3/GAPsfreshstrawberries.pdf)
- 752 [3/GAPsfreshstrawberries.pdf](http://www.gaps.cornell.edu/fsi/lessons/6-Module2/Lesson2-3/GAPsfreshstrawberries.pdf). Report AER- 624.
- 753 Yue, C., & Tong, C. (2009). Organic or local? Investigating consumer preference for fresh produce using
- 754 a choice experiment with real economic incentives. *HortScience*, 44, 366-371.