

**U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
NUTRITION LABELING / SAFE HANDLING
INFORMATION STUDY**

OCTOBER 1999

RAW MEAT AND POULTRY

CONTRACT # 53-3A94-99-09

**Retail Diagnostics, Inc.
Oradell, New Jersey
Final Report
January 2000**

**REPORT ON PARTICIPATION BY FOOD RETAILERS IN
PROVIDING NUTRITION LABELING / SAFE HANDLING
INSTRUCTIONS INFORMATION
FOR RAW MEAT/POULTRY**

OCTOBER 1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
PART 1 BACKGROUND	3
PART II METHODOLOGY	4 - 7
PART III RESULTS	8 - 10
PART IV SAFE HANDLING RESULTS	11 - 12
PART V APPENDECIES	13 - 44

REPORT ON PARTICIPATION BY FOOD RETAILERS IN PROVDING NUTRITION LABELING / SAFE HANDLING INSTRUCTION/INFORMATION FOR RAW MEAT/POULTRY

OCTOBER 1999

I. BACKGROUND

The U. S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) has responsibility for the appropriate labeling of raw meat/poultry products as mandated under the Federal Meat Inspection Act and Poultry Products Inspection Act.

Regulations published in January 1993 established a voluntary nutrition labeling program for single ingredient raw meat and poultry products, and allowed quantitative nutrition information to be supplied by means of point-of-purchase materials. Every two years, FSIS must survey retailers to determine if there is significant participation in the Voluntary Nutrition Program. A total of 45 major cuts of meat and poultry have been identified to measure voluntary nutrition labeling participation. (See pp. 40 for a listing of the 45 items and for an example of “new” format vehicle.)

Regulations published in 1994 made safe handling instructions mandatory on all raw meat and poultry product labeling. The scope and design of the nutrition labeling survey includes data which estimates the prevalence of stores that are providing safe handling instructions for raw meat and poultry items packaged at the retail level.

A nationally projectable survey was conducted in June 1995 to measure compliance with labeling requirements. On the nutrition labeling portion of the study, participation by retailers was determined to be significant. At that time, survey criteria encompassed both “new” and “old” formats for nutrition information at the point-of-purchase. As in the 1996 survey, the current survey considers only “new” materials at the point-of-purchase as the basis for compliance. Presence of “old” format materials, however, was recorded for the current survey.

With regard to safe handling, both the 1995 and 1996 studies reported less than the mandatory 100% compliance.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Sampling of Retail Food Stores

The store sample for this survey was designed to be representative of the retail population consisting of all supermarkets with annual dollar volume of \$2,000,000 or more and smaller grocery stores with annual dollar volume over \$500,000 but under \$2,000,000. (Convenience stores were excluded from the retail population.)

The United States Department of Agriculture/Food Safety and Inspection Service (USDA/FSIS) determined that a scientifically drawn, nationally representative sample of approximately 2,000 retail food stores should be selected to obtain the information necessary to properly assess compliance with the guidelines for the voluntary nutrition labeling of raw meat and poultry. A sample of that size provides a relatively narrow margin of sampling error (the extent to which sample estimates are likely to deviate from the “true” parameters). Conservatively, the margin of error based on 2,000 stores is approximately +/- 4%. For example, for a sample estimate of compliance of 50%, the researcher could be reasonably sure (95% Confidence Level) that the “true” parameter ranged between 46% and 54%. For estimates of compliance in the 60% magnitude, the “true” parameter could be expected to range from the estimate by no more than +/- 3.5%, an even narrower margin of sampling error.

While sample size determines the overall precision of survey estimates, a sample design that addresses relevant store population characteristics helps produce a sample which is highly representative of the store population. In order to assure the representative nature of the sample and to help minimize biases, USDA/FSIS included four characteristics to be used in sample selection. These are:

- **Store Size**
 - Large Food Stores (\$2 million or more annual sales)
 - Small Food Stores (annual sales between \$500,000 and \$2 million)
- **Store Type**
 - Chain (four or more stores under common ownership)
 - Independent (three or less stores under common ownership and single unit stores)
- **County Size**
 - **A Counties** - All counties belonging to the 25 largest Consolidated Statistical Metropolitan Areas (CSMAs) or Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs)

II. METHODOLOGY (Continued)

A. Sampling of Retail Food Stores (Continued)

- **B Counties** - All counties not included in A that are either over 150,000 population or in CMSAs or MSAs with population of at least 150,000
 - **C Counties** - All counties not included in A or B that are either over 40,000 population or in MSAs with over 40,000 population
 - **D Counties** - All other counties
- **State** - each of the 48 continental states

The 2,000-store sample is allocated to the Store Size segments such that the probability of selecting a Large Store (sales volume of \$2,000,000 or over) is twice the probability of selecting a small store. This is done since larger stores are deemed more significant than small stores in reaching customers with Nutrition/Safe Handling information.

Within each Store Size segment, sample stores were further allocated to Store Type segments (Chains versus Independents), States, and County Size. All allocations are made proportional to the relative size of each store population segment. Allocating in this manner assures that all significant segments of the population will be fairly represented in the sample, including major cities, urban and suburban areas, and rural segments of the country.

Because over 75% of the more than 3,000 counties are rural (C and D counties), budgetary considerations mandate that a 2-Stage Cluster Sample design be utilized for this survey. Within each state a first stage sample of C and D counties was selected. The likelihood of selecting a particular county is proportional to its size (number of stores in the population). The number of C and D counties selected in each state is a function of the number of such counties in the state as well as the number of sample stores that have been allocated to them. Although Cluster Samples may be less efficient than other sampling processes, the loss in efficiency in this survey is minimal since the incidence of Nutrition/Safe Handling compliance has been historically consistent with respect to geographic considerations.

Individual sample stores were selected objectively using a variety of sources including RDI's own listing of supermarkets, as well as *Select Phone ProCD* telephone listings. Additional data sources such as *Progressive Grocer Marketing Guidebook*, *Progressive Grocer MarketScope*, *Chain Store Guide Directory of Supermarkets & Convenience Store Chains*, and the latest US Economic Census were also applied.

II. METHODOLOGY (Continued)

A. Sampling of Retail Food Stores (Continued)

In order to develop volume weighted estimates of compliance, sample store weights are determined separately based on aggregate sales volume for each outlet type/size and county size within each state.

B. Data Collection

Data collection for the assessment of the prevalence of nutrition labeling information compliance was completed by Retail Diagnostics, Inc., an independent market research contracting firm located in Oradell, New Jersey.

RDI conducts a monthly syndicated observation service in a sample of food stores. The retail food store listings used by RDI are comprehensive and subject to a continual updating process reflecting store openings, closings, take-overs, and other developments.

For the purpose of this survey, RDI's syndicated sample was sub-sampled as needed. Additional sample stores were selected for store population segments not ordinarily covered by RDI's monthly syndicated survey. By combining sample stores drawn from RDI's monthly sample with additional stores sampled, a scientifically drawn, nationally representative sample of grocery stores (each with annual sales of at least \$500,000) results. (See Table 1 and Table 2 for a breakdown of the sample stores by outlet type, size and county size. In addition, a breakdown of the sample by state and county size can be found at pp. 35.)

After receiving training in the contract requirements and data collection, RDI's field representatives were asked to visit each of the 2,000 sample grocery stores. Data were collected during a two-week period beginning in mid October 1999. Field representatives inspected raw meat and raw poultry departments to determine the on-site status of nutrition labeling information. Vehicles displaying information (e.g., signs, posters, brochures, notebooks, pamphlets, etc.) were studied and relevant data were recorded on a field form that was custom designed by RDI for use in this survey.

Data were reviewed for accuracy and completeness, input to a data processor, tabulated, summarized and delivered to USDA/FSIS.

II. METHODOLOGY (Continued)

C. Basis of Reporting

Data descriptive of compliance are reported on two bases: Store Count and Store Volume Weighted. Estimates of compliance based on store count reflect the actual number of sampled stores complying. Volume weighted estimates represent compliance in terms of exposure in the marketplace. That is, since larger stores receive more weight than smaller stores because they have greater sales volumes and therefore more shoppers, the volume weighted estimate reflects the proportion of shoppers exposed to nutrition information.

To illustrate, a store count compliance estimate of 60% is interpreted as “nutrition information is available in 60% of stores visited”. Those stores, however, may account for 70% of the sales volume. The volume weighted compliance estimate of 70% is interpreted to mean that “nutrition information is available to 70% of shoppers since 70% of grocery sales are accounted for by these stores”.

While USDA/FSIS determined that substantial compliance would be met if at least 60% of the stores sampled provided nutrition labeling information for at least 90% of the foods they sell, the agency strongly believes the volume weighted results provide valuable information and should also be reported.

III. RESULTS

The resulting compliance estimates made on previous Nutrition Labeling Information Surveys were as follow:

<u>Survey Year</u>	<u>Store Count Basis</u>	<u>Volume Weighted Basis</u>
1996	57.7 %	60.9 %
1995	66.5 %	72.2 %

At the time of the 1995 survey, “new” format nutrition information vehicles had just been made available to retailers. It was felt that not enough time had been given to retailers to install them. Fair credit, therefore, was given to retailers if they were found to have either the “new” or the “old” nutrition vehicles. In 1996 however, only the presence of “new” vehicles contributed to a compliance designation since the “new” versions had been distributed well in advance of the survey.

In the current survey, only the presence of the “new” nutrition vehicles was used as the basis for compliance. However, the presence of “old” format vehicles was also recorded.

A summary of the survey results follows.

Nutrition Labeling Compliance

In order for a store to be deemed compliant, at least 90% of the up to 45 major cuts of raw meat and poultry stocked within the store had to somehow be covered by “new” format nutrition labeling information. Such information could be supplied by (1) Food Marketing Institute nutrition posters, brochures, pamphlets, etc., (2) generic nutrition posters, brochures, pamphlets, etc. (prepared by the stores themselves or other organizations), or (3) on-pack Nutrition Facts labels.

If a store had the Food Marketing Institute “new” format nutrition vehicles, then all of the up to 45 major meat and poultry items stocked would be deemed to comply and the store would be counted as compliant. The same can be said if the store had a generic vehicle, with the following exceptions:

- a. The generic vehicle failed to include all 45 major meat/poultry items,
- b. The generic vehicle (poster) was in three or more parts consisting of a separate poster for each meat type (a situation which occurred in numerous instances). In these cases, it is conceivable that a store could have an acceptable nutrition poster for a particular meat type(s) but the store not be compliant because no vehicle(s) were present for other meat types.

III. RESULTS

(Continued)

Table 5: Summary of Compliance: Results By Store Type/Size

The results for the current survey show that 1,095 of the 2,000 stores sampled (54.8%) were compliant with respect to Nutrition Labeling Information. This compares unfavorably with the 1996 results when 57.7% of the stores were compliant.

With respect to the volume weighted estimates, the current results show compliance to be at 62.8%, while in 1996, volume weighted compliance was 60.9%.

When viewed by outlet type, there is a wide differential in voluntary compliance rates. Chain stores show a 65.5% rate (compared with 64.2% in the 1996 survey), while Large Independents currently reflect 46.5% compliance. Medium/Small stores show an incidence rate of only 26.3%. Comparing these with the 1996 survey results, a sharp decline is in evidence, especially in the Medium/Small store segment (39.7% in 1996).

Table 6: Summary of Compliance: Results By County Size

The results for the current survey show A/B counties outperforming C/D counties slightly (55.4% versus 53.4%). This relationship is similar to the 1996 study results when A/B counties slightly outpaced C/D counties, 57.9% to 57.1%.

A similar result occurred for the volume weighted estimates.

Table 7: Compliance Range: Results By Store Type/Size and Results By County Size

This table shows compliance percentage ranges. Of the 2,000 stores surveyed, 761 (38%) had no appropriate nutrition information labeling of any kind (although some had “old” format materials). In the 1996 survey, 32.3% of stores failed to provide appropriated nutrition information labeling.

Table 9: Compliance By Meat Category

Compliance by meat category is determined by applying the 90% criterion to each category. The results show a range in compliance incidence when viewed by meat category. Beef/Veal showed the highest compliance rate (58.3%). Pork/Lamb and Chicken/Turkey followed with 58% and 57.2% respectively. All rates were down from the 1996 survey by considerable amounts. The worst comparison is the Chicken/Turkey category which reflected 63.1% compliance in the last survey.

III. RESULTS (Continued)

Table 10: Compliance By Type of Meat

Compliance by meat type is determined by applying the 90% criterion to each type. Ground Beef showed the highest compliance rate at slightly over 60%. Chicken reflected the lowest compliance rate at 57.6%. In addition, Chicken showed the greatest relative decrease in compliance rate (from 64.2% in 1996 to 57.6% in the current survey). All other compliance rates were lower than in the 1996 survey.

Tables 12 & 13: Summary of Vehicle Type: By Store Type/Size, By County Size

Nutrition posters were the most common vehicle used to display nutrition information. In stores that had any “new” format vehicles, posters were present in 94.4% of stores while pamphlets, brochures, notebooks, etc. were found in 8.1% of stores. (Both vehicle types were found in 30 stores.)

Pamphlets, brochures, notebooks were most popular in the larger stores and least popular in the medium/small stores.

Tables 14: Summary of New and Old Vehicle Type: By Store Type/Size & By County Size

“Old” format nutrition information was found in a number of stores: “Old” posters were in 10.4% of sampled stores; “old” format brochures, pamphlets, notebooks were found in 0.9% of sampled stores. A few stores (23 stores) had both “new” and “old” format vehicles. For the most part, the basis for this condition was due to a “new” generic poster applicable to a particular meat category while an “old” format vehicle was also present but applicable to another meat category.

Tables 15, 16, 17 & 18: Number of Meat Items Stocked: By Outlet Type/Size, By County Size: All Meat Items Combined, Beef/Veal Items, Pork/Lamb Items, Chicken/Turkey Items

This table reports the number of items of the 45 major items (19 Beef/Veal, 16 Pork/Lamb, and 10 Chicken/Turkey).

IV. SAFE HANDLING INSTRUCTIONS COMPLIANCE

The measure for compliance for Safe Handling Instruction labeling required that the store have appropriate labels affixed to each and every item made available for sale within the meat/poultry category. This applied to all meat/poultry items and was not restricted to the 45 major items covered elsewhere in the survey.

Tables 20: Summary of Safe Handling Compliance By Meat Category: All Stores Combined

At the aggregate level, the current survey found 93.2% of store complying with proper Safe Handling Instructions labeling. In 1996, the survey found 93.3% complying.

By meat category, compliance ranged from a low of 94.5% (Ground Beef) to 99.5% (Other Poultry). Comparing with the 1996 survey, slight improvements was seen for Veal, Lamb, Other Meat and Other Poultry. Ground Beef, Pork, Chicken, and Turkey showed slight decreases in compliance. Other Beef remained unchanged.

Tables 22: Summary of Safe Handling Compliance By Meat Category: Chain Stores

Compliance rates for meat categories were all over 94.3%, and ranged to a high of 99.5% for Other Poultry.

Aggregate compliance was slightly improved for chain stores from the 1996 survey (96.1% to 96.7%). Improvements were seen for the following categories: Veal, Pork, Lamb, Chicken, Other Meat, and Other Poultry. Ground Beef and Other Beef showed slight declines in compliance. Turkey items reflected a sharp decline from 98.5% to 94.3%.

Tables 23: Summary of Safe Handling Compliance By Meat Category: Large Independents

Compliance rates ranged from 92.1% (Ground Beef) to 100.0% (Other Meat).

Aggregate compliance decreased from 91.1% to 90.5%. Decreases were noted for Ground Beef, Veal, Pork, Chicken, and Turkey. Other Beef, Lamb, Other Meat, and Other Poultry improved their compliance rates. (Other Meat was at 100.0% in the current survey.)

Tables 24: Summary of Safe Handling Compliance By Meat Category: Medium/Small Independents

Aggregate compliance dropped from 85.1% in 1996 to 84.1% in the current survey.

IV. SAFE HANDLING INSTRUCTIONS COMPLIANCE (Continued)

Five of the nine categories showed improvement from the 1996 survey. These were: Other Beef, Veal, Lamb, Other Meat, and Other Poultry. Sharp decreases were seen for Ground Beef, Pork, Chicken, and Turkey.

Table 1

**NUMBER OF STORES SAMPLED BY
STORE SALES VOLUME AND STORE TYPE**

	Chain Stores	Independents	Total (Volume Class)
Large Stores (\$2 Million or More Annual Sales)	1262	368	1630
Small Stores (Between \$500,000 & \$2 Million in Annual Sales)	-	370	370
Total (Store Type)	1262	738	2000

Table 2

**NUMBER OF STORES SAMPLED
BY COUNTY SIZE**

County Size	Number of Stores Sampled
A	764
B	579
C	335
D	322
Total	2000

Table 5

**USDA NUTRITION LABELING/SAFE HANDLING
INFORMATION STUDY OCTOBER 1999**

**NUTRITION LABELING INFORMATION
SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE
RESULTS BY STORE TYPE/SIZE**

Total Stores Sampled

	Chains	Independents	Total
Large	1262	368	1630
Medium/Small	-	370	370
Total	1262	738	2000

Total Qualifying Stores

	Chains	Independents	Total
Large	1262	368	1630
Medium/Small	-	370	370
Total	1262	738	2000

Total Complying Stores

	Chains	Independents	Total
Large	826	171	997
Medium/Small	-	98	98
Total	826	269	1095

Complying Stores Percent of Qualifying Stores - By Cell

	Chains	Independents	Total
Large	65.5%	46.5%	61.2%
Medium/Small	-	26.3%	26.3%
Total	65.5%	36.0%	54.8%

Complying Stores Percent Volume of Qualifying Stores - By Cell

	Chains	Independents	Total
Large	66.5%	46.9%	64.4%
Medium/Small	-	25.8%	25.8%
Total	66.5%	41.0%	62.8%

**USDA NUTRITION LABELING/SAFE HANDLING
INFORMATION STUDY OCTOBER 1999**

**NUTRITION LABELING INFORMATION
SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE
RESULTS BY COUNTY SIZE**

Total Stores Sampled

	Total
A/B Counties	1343
C/D Counties	657
Total	2000

Total Qualifying Stores

	Total
A/B Counties	1343
C/D Counties	657
Total	2000

Total Complying Stores

	Total
A/B Counties	744
C/D Counties	351
Total	1067

Complying Stores Percent of Qualifying Stores - By Cell

	Total
A/B Counties	55.4%
C/D Counties	53.4%
Total	54.8%

Complying Stores Percent Volume of Qualifying Stores - By Cell

	Total
A/B Counties	63.7%
C/D Counties	60.3%
Total	62.8%

Table 7

**USDA NUTRITION LABELING/SAFE HANDLING
INFORMATION STUDY OCTOBER 1999**

**NUTRITION LABELING INFORMATION COMPLIANCE
COMPLIANCE RANGE DETAIL**

BY STORE TYPE/SIZE - STORE COUNT -NEW VEHICLES

Percent Range	Large Chain	Large Independents	Medium/Small Independents	Total Stores	%
90% or more	826	171	98	1095	54.8
80% -89.9%	10	3	-	13	0.6
70% -79.9%	12	1	1	14	0.7
60% -69.9%	17	7	2	26	1.3
50% -59.9%	16	-	1	17	0.9
under 50%	53	10	11	74	3.7
None	328	176	257	761	38.0
Total	1262	368	370	2000	100.0

**COMPLIANCE RANGE DETAIL
BY COUNTY SIZE - STORE COUNT -NEW VEHICLES**

Percent Range	A/B Counties	C/D Counties	Total Stores	%
90% or more	744	351	1095	54.8
80% -89.9%	8	5	13	0.6
70% -79.9%	11	3	14	0.7
60% -69.9%	17	9	26	1.3
50% -59.9%	12	5	17	0.9
under 50%	55	19	74	3.7
None	496	265	761	38.0
Total	1343	657	2000	100.0

Table 9

**USDA NUTRITION LABELING/SAFE HANDLING
INFORMATION STUDY OCTOBER 1999**

NUTRITION LABELING INFORMATION

SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE BY MEAT CATEGORY

Meat Category	Total Stores Carrying	# Stores Complying	% Compliance
All Meat Items	2000	1095	54.8
Beef / Veal	1993	1161	58.3
Pork/Lamb	1898	1100	58.0
Chicken/Turkey	1627	931	57.2

Table 10**USDA NUTRITION LABELING/SAFE HANDLING
INFORMATION STUDY OCTOBER 1999****NUTRITION LABELING INFORMATION****SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE BY TYPE OF MEAT**

Type of Meat	Stores Carrying	Stores Complying	% Compliance
Ground Beef	1941	1171	60.3
Other Beef	1981	1159	58.5
Veal	938	617	65.8
Beef/Veal	1993	1161	58.3
Pork	1880	1089	57.9
Lamb	1084	712	65.7
Pork/Lamb	1898	1100	58.0
Chicken	1563	900	57.6
Turkey	921	573	62.2
Chicken/Turkey	1627	931	57.2
All Raw Meat & Poultry	2000	1095	54.8

Table 12
USDA NUTRITION LABELING/SAFE HANDLING
INFORMATION STUDY OCTOBER 1999

NUTRITION LABELING INFORMATION

SUMMARY OF VEHICLE TYPE - RESULTS BY STORE TYPE/SIZE

STORE COUNT

Vehicle Type	Large Chain	Large Independents	Medium/Small Independents	Total
Posters	843	180	98	1121
Pamphlets, Brochures, Notebooks	82	11	3	96
Net	899	187	101	1187

% OF STORES

Vehicle Type	Large Chain	Large Independents	Medium/Small Independents	Total
Posters	71.0	15.2	8.2	94.4
Pamphlets, Brochures, Notebooks	6.9	0.9	0.3	8.1
Net	75.7	15.8	8.5	100.0

Table 13

**USDA NUTRITION LABELING/SAFE HANDLING
INFORMATION STUDY OCTOBER 1999**

NUTRITION LABELING INFORMATION

SUMMARY OF VEHICLE TYPE - RESULTS BY COUNTY SIZE

STORE COUNT

Vehicle Type	A/B Counties	C/D Counties	Total
Posters	762	359	1121
Pamphlets, Brochures, Notebooks	67	29	96
Net	810	377	1187

% OF STORES

Vehicle Type	A/B Counties	C/D Counties	Total
Posters	64.2	30.2	94.4
Pamphlets, Brochures, Notebooks	5.7	2.4	8.1
Net	68.2	31.8	100.0

Table 14

**USDA NUTRITION LABELING/SAFE HANDLING
INFORMATION STUDY OCTOBER 1999**

NUTRITION LABELING INFORMATION

**SUMMARY OF NEW AND OLD VEHICLE TYPE
RESULTS BY STORE TYPE & COUNTY SIZE
PERCENT OF QUALIFYING STORES**

	OUTLET TYPE			COUNTY SIZE		TOTAL
	CHAINS	INDEPENDENTS		A & B	C & D	
		LARGE	MEDIUM			
BASE: QUALIFYING STORES	1262	368	370	1343	657	2000
POSTER / PANEL FORMAT						
NEW FORMAT	66.8	48.9	26.5	56.7	54.6	56.1
OLD FORMAT	10.5	11.4	8.9	9.5	12.3	10.4
EITHER FORMAT	76.2	59.5	34.3	65.2	65.8	65.4
BROCHURE/ PAMPHLET, ETC.						
NEW FORMAT	6.5	3.0	0.8	5.0	4.4	4.8
OLD FORMAT	1.0	0.3	1.1	1.1	0.3	0.9
EITHER FORMAT	7.3	3.3	1.9	6.0	4.6	5.6

Table 16
USDA NUTRITION LABELING/SAFE HANDLING
INFORMATION STUDY OCTOBER 1999

NUTRITION LABELING INFORMATION

NUMBER OF MEAT ITEMS STOCKED - RESULTS BY STORE TYPE/SIZE

Number of Items	Large Chains	Large Independents	Medium/Small Independents	Total Stores	
				#	%
1-5	4	9	39	52	2.6
6-10	54	22	58	134	6.7
11-15	132	68	83	283	14.2
16-20	227	87	70	384	19.2
21-25	290	86	55	431	21.5
26-30	255	50	38	343	17.2
31-35	167	25	17	209	10.4
36-40	71	12	3	86	4.3
41-45	62	9	7	78	3.9
Total	1262	368	370	2000	100.0

NUMBER OF MEAT ITEMS STOCKED - RESULTS BY COUNTY SIZE

Number of Items	A/B Counties	C/D Counties	Total Stores	
			#	%
1-5	31	31	52	2.6
6-10	86	48	134	6.7
11-15	161	122	283	14.2
16-20	221	163	384	19.2
21-25	294	137	431	21.5
26-30	136	107	343	17.2
31-35	169	40	209	10.4
36-40	73	13	86	4.3
41-45	72	6	78	3.9
Total	1343	657	2000	100.0

Table 17

**USDA NUTRITION LABELING/SAFE HANDLING
INFORMATION STUDY OCTOBER 1999**

BEEF & VEAL CATEGORY

NUMBER OF ITEMS STOCKED - RESULTS BY STORE TYPE/SIZE

Number of Items	Large Chains	Large Independents	Medium/Small Independents	Total Stores	
				#	%
1-5	42	42	115	199	10.0
6-10	402	172	172	746	37.4
11-15	649	132	66	847	42.5
16-19	169	22	10	201	10.1
Total	1262	368	363	1993	100.0

NUMBER OF ITEMS STOCKED - RESULTS BY COUNTY SIZE

Number of Items	A/B Counties	C/D Counties	Total Stores	
			#	%
1-5	114	85	199	10.0
6-10	453	293	746	37.4
11-15	602	245	847	42.5
16-19	168	33	201	10.1
Total	1337	656	1993	100.0

Table 18

**USDA NUTRITION LABELING/SAFE HANDLING
INFORMATION STUDY OCTOBER 1999**

PORK & LAMB CATEGORY

NUMBER OF ITEMS STOCKED - RESULTS BY STORE TYPE/SIZE

Number of Items	Large Chains	Large Independents	Medium/Small Independents	Total Stores	
				#	%
1-5	238	125	172	535	28.2
6-10	617	182	118	917	48.3
11-16	362	47	37	446	23.5
Total	1217	354	327	1898	100.0

NUMBER OF ITEMS STOCKED - RESULTS BY COUNTY SIZE

Number of Items	A/B Counties	C/D Counties	Total Stores	
			#	%
1-5	310	225	535	28.2
6-10	610	307	917	48.3
11-16	355	91	446	23.5
Total	1275	623	1898	100.0

Table 19

**USDA NUTRITION LABELING/SAFE HANDLING
INFORMATION STUDY OCTOBER 1999**

CHICKEN & TURKEY CATEGORY

NUMBER OF ITEMS STOCKED - RESULTS BY STORE TYPE/SIZE

Number of Items	Large Chains	Large Independents	Medium/Small Independents	Total Stores	
				#	%
1-5	554	208	226	988	60.7
6-10	442	111	86	639	39.3
Total	996	319	312	1627	100.0

NUMBER OF ITEMS STOCKED - RESULTS BY COUNTY SIZE

Number of Items	A/B Counties	C/D Counties	Total Stores	
			#	%
1-5	631	357	988	60.7
6-10	485	154	639	39.3
Total	1116	511	1847	100.0

Table 21**USDA NUTRITION LABELING/SAFE HANDLING
INFORMATION STUDY OCTOBER 1999****SUMMARY OF SAFE HANDLING LABELING COMPLIANCE
BY MEAT CATEGORY****ALL STORES**

Meat Category	# Stores Carrying	# Stores Complying	% Compliance
Ground Beef	1941	1839	94.7
Other Beef	1981	1894	95.6
Veal	938	917	97.8
Pork	1880	1798	95.6
Lamb	1084	1062	98.0
Chicken	1563	1478	94.6
Turkey	921	895	97.2
Other Meat	826	815	98.7
Other Poultry	553	550	99.5
Aggregate	2000	1864	93.2

Table 23**USDA NUTRITION LABELING/SAFE HANDLING
INFORMATION STUDY OCTOBER 1999****SUMMARY OF SAFE HANDLING LABELING COMPLIANCE
BY MEAT CATEGORY****LARGE CHAIN**

Meat Category	# Stores Carrying	# Stores Complying	% Compliance
Ground Beef	1241	1216	98.0
Other Beef	1260	1233	97.9
Veal	722	713	98.8
Pork	1200	1180	98.3
Lamb	834	829	99.4
Chicken	952	934	98.1
Turkey	633	597	94.3
Other Meat	589	581	98.6
Other Poultry	382	380	99.5
Aggregate	1262	1220	96.7

**USDA NUTRITION LABELING/SAFE HANDLING
INFORMATION STUDY OCTOBER 1999**

**SUMMARY OF SAFE HANDLING LABELING COMPLIANCE
BY MEAT CATEGORY**

LARGE INDEPENDENT

Meat Category	# Stores Carrying	# Stores Complying	% Compliance
Ground Beef	356	328	92.1
Other Beef	366	343	93.7
Veal	115	109	94.8
Pork	354	332	93.8
Lamb	146	136	93.2
Chicken	302	283	93.7
Turkey	167	159	97.4
Other Meat	157	157	100.0
Other Poultry	104	103	99.0
Aggregate	368	333	90.5

Table 25**USDA NUTRITION LABELING/SAFE HANDLING
INFORMATION STUDY OCTOBER 1999****SUMMARY OF SAFE HANDLING LABELING COMPLIANCE
BY MEAT CATEGORY****MEDIUM/SMALL INDEPENDENT**

Meat Category	# Stores Carrying	# Stores Complying	% Compliance
Ground Beef	344	295	85.8
Other Beef	355	318	89.6
Veal	101	95	94.1
Pork	326	286	87.7
Lamb	104	97	93.3
Chicken	309	261	84.5
Turkey	121	106	87.6
Other Meat	80	77	96.3
Other Poultry	67	67	100.0
Aggregate	370	311	84.1

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

**USDA NUTRITION LABELING/SAFE HANDLING
INFORMATION STUDY OCTOBER 1999**

SAMPLE COMPOSITION BY COUNTY SIZE WITHIN STATE

<u>STATE</u>	<u>PERCENT OF STATE SAMPLE</u>				<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>SAMPLE SIZE</u>
	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>		
ALL STATES	38.2	29.0	16.7	16.1	100.0	2000
ALABAMA	.	54.5	27.3	18.2	100.0	33
ARKANSAS	.	29.2	16.7	54.2	100.0	24
ARIZONA	51.5	18.2	21.2	9.1	100.0	33
CALIFORNIA	73.7	18.2	7.1	1.0	100.0	198
COLORADO	40.0	8.0	16.0	36.0	100.0	25
CONNECTICUT	25.0	62.5	12.5	.	100.0	24
DC	100.0	.	.	.	100.0	4
DELAWARE	57.1	.	42.9	.	100.0	7
FLORIDA	43.9	40.8	11.2	4.1	100.0	98
GEORGIA	46.4	16.1	14.3	23.2	100.0	56
IOWA	.	28.0	24.0	48.0	100.0	25
IDAHO	.	23.1	30.8	46.2	100.0	13
ILLINOIS	52.8	11.2	20.2	15.7	100.0	89
INDIANA	4.4	51.1	22.2	22.2	100.0	45
KANSAS	37.5	18.8	25.0	18.8	100.0	16
KENTUCKY	7.9	31.6	21.1	39.5	100.0	38
LOUISIANA	.	64.9	18.9	16.2	100.0	37
MASSACHUSETTES	64.1	17.9	10.3	7.7	100.0	39
MARYLAND	82.4	.	8.8	8.8	100.0	34
MAINE	.	25.0	50.0	25.0	100.0	12
MICHIGAN	40.3	29.9	14.9	14.9	100.0	67
MINNESOTA	44.8	10.3	10.3	34.5	100.0	29
MISSOURI	46.4	5.4	10.7	37.5	100.0	56
MISSISSIPPI	.	33.3	22.2	44.4	100.0	27
MONTANA	.	.	50.0	50.0	100.0	8
NORTH CAROLINA	.	53.4	32.9	13.7	100.0	73
NORTH DAKOTA	.	.	57.1	42.9	100.0	7
NEBRASKA	.	27.3	27.3	45.5	100.0	11
NEW HAMPSHIRE	50.0	.	25.0	25.0	100.0	12
NEW JERSEY	94.3	.	5.7	.	100.0	53
NEW MEXICO	28.6	21.4	28.6	21.4	100.0	14
NEVADA	.	53.8	23.1	23.1	100.0	13
NEW YORK	69.4	19.4	9.0	2.2	100.0	134
OHIO	38.8	35.0	18.8	7.5	100.0	80
OKLAHOMA	.	50.0	20.0	30.0	100.0	30

<u>STATE</u>	<u>PERCENT OF STATE SAMPLE</u>				<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>SAMPLE SIZE</u>
	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>		
OREGON	.	65.6	25.0	9.4	100.0	32
PENNSYLVANIA	50.5	27.4	17.9	4.2	100.0	95
RHODE ISLAND	.	57.1	42.9	.	100.0	7
SOUTH CAROLINA	.	59.0	25.6	15.4	100.0	39
SOUTH DAKOTA	.	.	42.9	57.1	100.0	7
TENNESSEE	.	55.3	17.0	27.7	100.0	47
TEXAS	45.2	28.2	8.9	17.7	100.0	124
UTAH	.	57.1	21.4	21.4	100.0	14
VIRGINIA	18.9	47.2	7.5	26.4	100.0	53
VERMONT	.	.	57.1	42.9	100.0	7
WASHINGTON	47.7	29.5	13.6	9.1	100.0	44
WISCONSIN	28.6	23.8	26.2	21.4	100.0	42
WEST VIRGINIA	.	38.9	27.8	33.3	100.0	18
WYOMING	.	.	42.9	57.1	100.0	7

**USDA NUTRITION LABELING / SAFE HANDLING
INFORMATION STUDY OCTOBER 1999**

45 Major Meat/Poultry Items

The following meat/poultry items were used as the basis for determining if a store was in compliance with Nutrition Information Labeling.

Beef & Veal

Beef Items

Ground Beef (81% or more Lean)

Ground Beef (70% - 77% Lean)

Brisket, Whole

Chuck, Arm Pot Roast

Chuck, Blade Roast

Rib Roast, Large End

Rib Steak, Small End

Top Loin, Steak

Loin, Tenderloin Steak

Loin, Sirloin Steak

Eye Round, Roast

Bottom Round Steak

Round, Tip Roast

Top Round, Steak

Veal Items

Shoulder, Arm Steak

Shoulder, Blade Steak

Rib Roast

Loin Chops

Cutlets

Pork & Lamb

Pork Items

Ground Pork
Shoulder, Blade Steak
Loin, Country Style Ribs
Loin, Rib Chop
Center Chop, Loin
Top Loin, Chop
Top Loin, Roast
Loin, Tenderloin Roast
Loin, Sirloin Roast
Spareribs

Lamb Items

Shoulder, Arm Chop
Shoulder, Blade Chop
Shank
Rib Roast
Loin Chop
Leg, Whole

Chicken & Turkey

Chicken Items

Whole
Breast
Wing
Drumstick
Thigh

Turkey Items

Whole
Breast
Wing
Drumstick
Thigh