

# **FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH DEREGISTRATION AMONG ORGANIC FARMERS IN CALIFORNIA**

**Luis Sierra<sup>1</sup>, Karen Klonsky<sup>2</sup>, Ron Strohlic<sup>3</sup>, Sonja Brodt<sup>4</sup>, and Richard Molinar<sup>5</sup>**

**March 2008**

<sup>1, 3</sup> California Institute for Rural Studies

<sup>2, 4</sup> Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, UC Davis

<sup>5</sup> University of California Cooperative Extension



**CALIFORNIA  
INSTITUTE FOR  
RURAL STUDIES**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

---

We are grateful to the following individuals for their support in completing this research: Ray Green and Raymond Luong, California Department of Food and Agriculture, for preparing organic registration data, Christie Getz, University of California Berkeley and Julie McNamara, Dept. of Agricultural and Resource Economics, University of California Davis, for editing, Elizabeth Sachs, University of California Davis, International Agricultural Development, for survey design and data management, Sarah Wiedeker, Greg House, Danielle Fodor, and Monica Stolt for feedback on the survey design, and Neil Willits and Qiuyan Xu, University of California, Davis Statistics Dept. for their advice on data management and analysis.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

|  |                                     |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| Acknowledgements.....                                      | ii                                  |
| Table of Figures .....                                     | iv                                  |
| Executive Summary .....                                    | v                                   |
| Introduction.....  | 1                                   |
| Research Methods.....                                      | 2                                   |
| Characteristics of Respondents .....                       | 3                                   |
| Motivations for Adopting Organic Production Practices..... | 8                                   |
| Reasons for Discontinuing Organic Registration .....       | 9                                   |
| Principal Challenges in Organic Farming.....               | 13                                  |
| Technical Assistance Needs.....                            | 20                                  |
| Conclusions.....   | 23                                  |
| Recommendations.....                                       | 23                                  |
| References Cited .....                                     | <b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |

## TABLE OF FIGURES

---

### FIGURES

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Figure 1: Registration Status for All Respondents .....   | 3  |
| Figure 2: Current Farming Status of Actual Deregistered Grower.....                                   | 4  |
| Figure 3: Growers with More/Less than Half of Total Acreage in Organic Production .....               | 5  |
| Figure 4: Main Reasons for Discontinuing Organic Farming or Organic Registration.....                 | 10 |
| Figure 5: What Types of Technical Assistance Would Have Helped You Continue to Farm Organically?..... | 21 |

### TABLES

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table 1: Factors Associated with the Adoption of Organic Farming Techniques.....  | 6  |
| Table 2: Literature Review: Issues Facing Organic Farmers .....   | 6  |
| Table 3: Commodity Group in Terms of Sales by Region .....  | 6  |
| Table 4: Commodity Group Within Top Three According to Sales.....   | 6  |
| Table 5: Farm Revenue .....   | 7  |
| Table 6: Marketing Channels.....  | 7  |
| Table 7: Reasons for Adopting Organic Practices .....   | 8  |
| Table 8: Reasons for Discontinuing Organic Registration by Farming Status .....   | 11 |
| Table 9: Sample of Responses to “What Are the Main Reasons You Stopped Farming Organically?” .....                                  | 11 |
| Table 10: Sample of Responses to “What Are the Main Reasons You Stopped Farming Organically?” .....                                 | 12 |
| Table 11: Principal Challenges .....  | 14 |
| Table 12: Specific Issues Across All Categories .....   | 15 |
| Table 13: Principal Production Issues.....  | 16 |
| Table 14: Top Two Production Problems.....  | 16 |
| Table 15: Principal Market Access Issues .....  | 17 |
| Table 16: Top Two Market Access Problems.....   | 17 |
| Table 17: Principal Price Issues.....   | 18 |
| Table 18: Top Two Price Problems .....  | 18 |
| Table 19: Principal Regulatory Issues .....   | 18 |
| Table 20: Top Two Regulatory Problems.....  | 19 |
| Table 21: Management Issues.....  | 20 |
| Table 22: Top Two Management Problems.....  | 20 |
| Table 23: Sample of Responses to “Are There Any Types of Assistance That Would Have Helped You Continue to Farm Organically?” ..... | 22 |

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

With increasing consumer awareness of its health, environmental, and social benefits, the U.S. organic sector has been growing by a vigorous 15-20% annually in recent years. Nonetheless, organic food represents only 2% of total retail food sales in the United States. Consequently, despite being one of the leading producers of organic commodities in the United States, organic agriculture plays an extremely small role in California's overall agricultural landscape. There were only 1,795 registered organic farms in 2005, representing just over 2% of all farms. Similarly, California's 195,000 acres reporting organic sales represent a mere 0.63% of all farmland.

California is one of a few states with a state-run organic program. The California Organic Products Act, signed into law in 2003, requires all producers, handlers, processors, and retailers of commodities labeled as organic to register with the California Department of Food and Agriculture Organic Program. This registration requirement is different from and, in addition to, the federally mandated certification requirements for marketing products with the USDA organic seal under the USDA National Organic Program. Additionally, whereas registration with the CDFA Organic Program is required for anyone selling product using the word "organic," USDA organic certification is only required for those with annual sales of over \$5,000. It is important to note registration and certification are only required when the word "organic" is used in a market transaction. Neither state nor federal regulations require any action from growers who are using organic methods but are not marketing their product as organic. Therefore, the set of growers registered with the CDFA Organic Program includes only growers marketing their product as organic; it undoubtedly does not include all farmers using organic methods. Nonetheless, although not designed for this purpose, California's unique registration process provides a database of organic producers operating within the state that can be used to analyze trends in the organic sector. These registration data indicate an approximate 20% turnover rate among registered organic producers each year. However, the numbers of new registrants and deregistrants are similar, signifying little, if any, overall growth in the numbers of registered organic producers.

The aforementioned trends raise important questions, with broad and critical implications regarding California's capacity to transition to a more sustainable food system. The approximately 20% annual rate of deregistration among organic producers is particularly perplexing. Who are these growers and what do these numbers signify? Do growers discontinuing Organic Program registration leave farming altogether or do they revert to conventional production? What are the main challenges they face and what sort of assistance would allow them to continue farming organically?

Answers to these questions were sought via mail surveys and in-depth telephone interviews with deregistered producers. We received 104 responses to the mail survey of deregistered growers. A total of 21 growers were interviewed by phone to help frame the mail survey. Key findings follow.

## Interpretation of CDFA Registration Data

The findings reveal that CDFA deregistration figures do not accurately reflect actual numbers of producers who have stopped farming using organic methods.

- Only 77 of 104 (74%) respondents identified by CDFA as having discontinued organic registration were actually deregistered. The other 27 were mistakenly identified as such. Of those, 15 respondents stated that they were never registered to the best of their knowledge while 12 were listed as deregistered for a variety of reasons, including late submissions, being listed under another grower's name, or changing farm name. Eight respondents did not know why they were listed as deregistered. This result lowers the expected turnover rate to 15% from the observed rate of 20%.
- Of the 77 "true" deregistrants, 27 (35%) had stopped farming altogether while 48 (63%) were still farming.
- Of the 48 respondents still farming, 29 (60%) reverted to conventional production practices, while 19 (40%) were either still using organic methods (n=12) or farming using methods they described as "beyond organic" (n=7).

In summary, of 104 respondents identified as deregistered organic producers by the CDFA Organic Program, 27 were mistakenly categorized as deregistered, while 19 reported they were still farming using organic methods. Two deregistered producers did not state their current farming status. Therefore, only 56 (54%) of those identified as deregistered by the CDFA Organic Program were, in fact no longer farming using organic methods, either because they had reverted to conventional production or because they had discontinued farming altogether.

## Farm and Farmer Characteristics of Respondents

### *Age and Gender*

Consistent with the demographics of U.S. farmers in general, the respondents reported a mean age of 57 years, with a range of 28 to 82 years. The majority (70%) are between the ages of 45-65. Among the respondents, 61% are male while 22% are female. Members of both genders jointly responded to two surveys (3%), while 11 (14%) respondents did not specify gender.

### *Years farming*

At the time they deregistered, the respondents had farmed a mean of 19.8 years (median=18), with a minimum of three and a maximum of 50 years. Two "true" deregistrants did not state whether or not they were still farming.

### *Years farming organically*

The respondents reported farming organically for a mean of 9.8 years (median=8), with a range of 1-34 years, representing an average of 58% (median=67%) of their farming career.

### *Farm Size and Organic Acreage*

Respondents reported farming a median of 8.5 total acres during the last year they farmed organically. Respondents who stopped farming entirely were smaller (median=5 acres) than respondents who had deregistered but continued to farm (median=14 acres).

At the time they deregistered, two-thirds farmed 100% of their acreage organically. The percentage of land in organic production at the time of deregistration varied by farm size, with larger farms more likely to report mixed organic and conventional acreage.

#### *Geographic Location and Principal Crops*

The majority of respondents (68%) are located in the Central Coast, South Coast, and San Joaquin regions of California. The Desert, Mountain, and North Coast regions represent the remaining respondents. The majority of growers produced fruit and nut crops (88%) and vegetables (80%) during the last year they were registered as organic. Significantly smaller numbers produced field crops (6%), nursery plants (3%), and livestock (2%).

#### *Revenue*

Most of the growers in our sample were very small, with 43% reporting \$0-\$4,999 in total farm revenues the last year they farmed organically. The second largest group, representing 25% of respondents, reported farm revenues of \$10,000-\$49,999. The respondents reported a mean of 27% (median=10%) of total household income from farming with a range of 0 to 100%.

#### *Marketing Channels*

Close to half (48%) of respondents reported marketing their organic products exclusively through wholesale or other intermediary marketing channels. Slightly over one-fourth of respondents engaged in direct marketing.

### **Motivations for Adopting Organic Production Practices**

The principal motivations cited for adopting or transitioning to organic farming were organic market potential (39%), environmental concerns (17%), and the fact that the land was already in organic production (17%). Environmental and personal health concerns topped the list of non-economic reasons that farmers started farming organically.

Several survey questions were included to assess the degree of philosophical or pragmatic attitudes toward organic farming: 40% of respondents rated as ‘philosophical’ in their outlook, while 17% were primarily ‘pragmatic.’ The remaining 43% were balanced between the two attitudes. Small-scale (less than 50 acres) farm operators tended to be more philosophical in their attitude toward organic farming. Almost 50% of these farmers fell in the “philosophical” category, with just 8% in the “pragmatic” category and the remainder in the “balanced” category. Conversely, there were no farm operators over 50 acres that could be categorized as predominantly “philosophical.”

## **Reasons for Discontinuing CDFA Organic Program Registration**

The main reasons offered for discontinuing organic registration or production were organic regulatory issues (45%); issues unrelated to organic production (26%); production issues (16%); market issues (16%); management issues (8%); and price issues (8%).

The majority (63%) of respondents still farming cited regulatory issues related to organic production as one of the main reasons for discontinuing organic registration. In contrast, of those no longer farming, only five (19 %) cited reasons specifically related to organic production as a reason for leaving farming.

Half of the respondents that stopped farming entirely did so for reasons unrelated to organic farming or marketing, such as changes in land tenure (lease or land sale) or personal issues. In contrast, almost all (87%) of deregistered respondents that were still farming cited reasons related to organic farming for discontinuing organic registration, with regulatory issues being the single most important factor (63%). Regulatory problems were an issue for 74% growers still farming using organic methods, compared to 55% of those who had reverted to conventional production.

## **Principal Challenges in Organic Agriculture**

The respondents were asked to rank the main issues they faced as organic farmers by broad categories. Regulatory problems (i.e. paperwork, certification, etc.) were ranked as the main issue by 30% of all respondents. That was followed by price issues (27%), production problems (22%), market access problems (17%), and management issues (5%).

When asked to rank specific challenges within those broad categories on a scale of 1 to 5 (where 5 = “serious problem”), the main issue ranked as 4 or 5 was “paperwork and record-keeping,” as reported by half (50%) of all respondents. That was followed by certification costs (44%), the high cost of organic inputs (38%), and time requirements associated with organic farming (36%).

## **Technical Assistance Needs**

Respondents were asked to describe types of assistance that would have helped them continue farming organically. Regulatory-related assistance was the most frequently cited form of assistance as cited by 41% of respondents. Specific types of assistance cited include certification cost-share programs, paperwork reduction, and help with the application process, registration simplification, and more trained and experienced organic certifiers. Other areas of assistance cited included production (21%), market (21%), and management (17%) related assistance.

## **Conclusions and Recommendations**

The findings indicate that regulatory issues presented significant challenges to organic producers and were cited as the principal reason for reverting to conventional production among deregistered producers that are still farming.

Recommendations based on the research findings include the following:

- Programs and policies to help organic farmers continue farming organically should include efforts to reduce the paperwork and regulatory burdens associated with organic farming, as well as efforts to help farmers deal with the high cost of organic inputs and certification costs.
- Farmers considering adopting organic methods should be made fully aware of the challenges involved with doing so, particularly in terms of paperwork and record-keeping, certification costs, the high cost of organic inputs, and greater time requirements associated with organic production.
- CDFA Organic Program data should be adjusted to reflect deregistration that does not represent exit from the Organic Program (i.e., registration under a different entity, changing business name, etc.).

## INTRODUCTION

---

With increasing consumer awareness of its health, environmental, and social benefits, the U.S. organic sector has been growing by a vigorous 15-20% annually in recent years (Faber 2006, Greene 2006). Nonetheless, organic food represents only 2% of total retail food sales in the United States. Consequently, despite being one of the leading producers of organic commodities in the United States, organic agriculture plays an extremely small role in California's overall agricultural landscape. There were only 1,795 registered organic farms in 2005, representing just over 2% of all farms. Similarly, California's 195,000 acres reporting organic sales represent a mere 0.63% of all farmland.

California is one of the only states with a state-run organic program. The California Organic Products Act, signed into law in 2003, requires all producers, handlers, processors, and retailers of commodities labeled as organic to register with the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) Organic Program. This registration requirement is different from, and in addition to, certification requirements for marketing products with the USDA organic seal, as mandated by federal law and overseen by the USDA National Organic Program. It is important to note registration and certification are only required when the word "organic" is used in a market transaction. Neither state nor federal regulations require any action from growers who are using organic methods but are not marketing their product as organic. Therefore, the set of growers registered with the CDFA Organic Program includes only growers marketing their product as organic; it undoubtedly does not include all farmers using organic methods. Nonetheless, although not designed for this purpose, California's unique registration process provides a database of organic producers operating within the state, allowing for analysis of trends in the organic sector. These registration data indicate an approximate 20% turnover rate among registered organic producers each year. However, the numbers of new registrants and deregistrants are comparable, signifying little if any growth in overall numbers of registered organic producers.

The number of organic farms in California reporting sales actually declined by 5% between 2000 and 2005 (Klonsky and Richter 2007). A decrease in the number of organic farms, coupled with an increase in organic acreage and sales, suggests a trend toward consolidation and expansion in the California organic sector. These figures also give the impression that no new growers are entering the industry.

However, closer inspection of CDFA Organic Program registration data reveals that many growers enter the Organic Program every year while a comparable number leave the program or "deregister." CDFA Organic Program registration data indicate that approximately 20% of organic growers discontinue their registration each year. For example, 358 farms discontinued Organic Program registration in 2002, of a total 1,847 registered growers. That same year witnessed the entry of only 303 new organic growers, representing a net decrease of 55 organic farmers in California (Klonsky and Richter 2005).

The above trends raise a number of important questions, with broad and critical implications regarding California's capacity to transition to a more sustainable food system. The 20% deregistration rate among organic growers is particularly perplexing. Who are these growers and

what do these numbers signify? Do growers discontinuing Organic Program registration leave farming altogether, or do they revert to conventional production or do they continue farming organically under different registration status? What are the main challenges they face and what sort of assistance would allow those discontinuing organic production to continue farming organically?

## **RESEARCH METHODS**

---

The research was conducting using the following methods:

- 1) Semi-structured telephone interviews were conducted with 21 growers who had discontinued registration with the CDFA Organic Program during the period January 2003-December 2005. The purpose of those interviews was to obtain information regarding these farmers' reasons for discontinuing organic registration, and recommendations regarding forms of assistance that would help current organic farmers continue to farm organically. The telephone interviews also provided formative data that contributed to the formulation of the survey questions and response categories. Interviews were conducted with randomly selected individuals representing the following categories: small (<10 acres) vegetable farmers; large ( $\geq 10$  acres) vegetable farmers; small (<10 acres) non-vegetable farmers; large ( $\geq 10$  acres) non-vegetable farmers; livestock farmers, Latino farmers, and Asian farmers. All interviews received a letter explaining the purpose of the study, which was followed up with a telephone call.
- 2) A mail survey was sent to 501 producers who had discontinued organic registration during the period January 2003-December 2005 (based on CDFA Organic Program records). This represents all of the known deregistered farmers minus individuals contacted for semi-structured telephone interviews. The survey included questions regarding current registration status, reasons for discontinuing organic production or registration status, challenges faced as an organic farmer, and farm and farmer characteristics. The survey was sent in February 2007. Two follow-up postcards were sent at two-week intervals. Fifty-six surveys were returned as undeliverable. We received 107 completed surveys, representing a response rate of 24%. Three surveys were not included in the analysis because of a lack of sufficient responses or inconsistent answers. The final analysis therefore consists of 104 surveys.
- 3) The survey data were entered, coded and analyzed using SPSS. Data analysis included frequencies and cross-tabs.

Note: For a review of the literature on organic transitions, see Strohlic and Sierra (2007) *Conventional, Mixed and 'Deregistered' Organic Farmers: Entry Barriers and Reasons for Exiting Organic Production in California*. Davis, CA: California Institute for Rural Studies (<http://cirsinc.org/Documents/Pub0207.1.PDF>).

# RESULTS

---


## Respondent Characteristics

### Organic Registration Status

Out of 104 respondents, 77 (74%) were actually deregistered, while 27 were mistakenly interpreted as deregistered. Of those, 15 stated that they were never registered as organic producers while 12 were listed deregistered for a variety of reasons, including a late submission, being listed under another grower’s name, or changing the farm’s name. (Figure 1)

Figure 1: Registration Status for All Respondents (N=104)

---



These findings indicate that CDFA Organic Program data overestimate deregistration rates among organic producers by approximately 5%. Based on a 95% confidence interval calculation, we can estimate the true percent of deregistered organic farmers as being between 66% and 82% of the reported numbers. This translates to an expected “dropout” rate of organic farmers of between 13% and 16% a year compared with the 20% rate previously assumed.

This rate of error is supported and further explained by responses we received from telephone interviews. Three out of 21 respondents who were listed as deregistered stated that they should not be categorized as a “deregistered producer” for the following reasons:

- One farmer believed he was listed as deregistered because he switched farmland location. He lost a lease on one parcel and found another one, and had no gap in production.
- One farmer believed he was listed as deregistered because he was late in registering, but intended to re-register.

- A processor claimed he had mistakenly registered as a producer. Having learned of this option, he is now registered as a processor.


### Farming Status and Practices

In examining the registration and farming practices of the 77 respondents who were accurately recorded as deregistered producers, 27 (35%) had stopped farming altogether while 48 (63%) were still farming<sup>1</sup> (Figure 2).

Of deregistered growers no longer farming, 22% (n=6) cited reasons specifically related to organic production, marketing, or regulatory problems as reasons for leaving farming. The majority of those no longer farming (78%, n=19) cited issues not related to organic farming, such as retirement, poor health, or changes in land tenure as reasons for leaving agriculture. Of the 48 respondents still farming, 29 (65%) reverted to conventional production practices, while 19 (35%) were either still using organic methods or farming “beyond organic.” Farmers using organic practices stated that they had discontinued organic registration because they did not require organic certification (and consequently CDFA Organic Program registration) for marketing purposes.<sup>2</sup> Of these, seven identified themselves as “beyond organic.” Additionally, some of the “beyond organic” farmers noted that they were using systems such as biodynamic, which are not recognized by the USDA National Organic Standards.

As such, of the 77 respondents accurately identified as deregistered organic producers 56 (73%) exited organic farming either because they stopped farming altogether (n=27) or because they reverted to conventional production practices (n=29). Nineteen (25%) claimed to be still farming organically but are no longer registered with the CDFA Organic Program.

Figure 2: Current Farming Status of Actual Deregistered Growers (N=77)



<sup>1</sup> Two actual deregistrants did not state whether or not they were still farming.

<sup>2</sup> A number of farmers may be confusing CDFA Organic Program registration with certification by an USDA certification agency, despite the fact that these are two entirely different processes. Whereas registration with the CDFA Organic Program is required by state law, certification is required by federal law.

Eighteen (62%) of the 29 farmers who have reverted to conventional production reported that they now farm more sustainably as a result of their experiences farming organically, while only three (11%) reported not retaining any of the “sustainable” practices adopted as organic farmers.

## Impacts of Farm Characteristics on Organic Production and Registration Status

### Age and Gender


Consistent with the demographics of U.S. farmers in general, the respondents report a mean age of 57 years, with a range of 28 to 82 years. The majority (70%) are between the ages of 45-65. Of the respondents, 61% are male while 22% are female. Members of both genders jointly responded to two surveys (3%), while 11 (14%) respondents did not specify a gender.

### Farm Size, Tenure, and Organic Acreage

The respondents reported farming a median of 8.5 acres during the last year they farmed organically, with a range of 0.2 to 4,660 acres. Smaller scale is associated with increased likelihood of leaving agriculture altogether. Respondents who stopped farming entirely had a median of five acres, while deregistered respondents who continue to farm reported a median of 14 acres.

The percentage of land in organic production at the time of deregistration varied by farm size as well, with larger farms more likely to report mixed organic and conventional acreage than smaller farms. Eighty four percent of farms below 50 acres in size farmed more than half of their land organically compared with only 29% of farms over 50 acres in size (Figure 3).

Figure 3: Growers with More/Less than Half of Total Acreage in Organic Production by Farm Size



At the time they deregistered, the respondents farmed a mean of 19.8 years (median=18), with a minimum of three and a maximum of 50 years.

The respondents report farming organically for a mean of 9.8 years (median=8), with a range of 1-34 years. This represents an average of 58% (median=67%) of their farming career. Overall, 30% of deregistrants had less than 10 years of total farming experience. Small farm operators tended to have less farming experience than larger farm operators. Of the respondents, 85% started their careers as conventional growers and transitioned to organic production. Only 15% began their careers as organic. Almost two thirds (61%) had spent the majority of their time farming organically. Among the deregistrants with more than 20 years total farming experience, 81% had farmed less than half that time as organic farmers.

### Geographic Location and Principal Crops

The respondents are located in every region defined by CDFA. Most are from the Central Coast, South Coast, and San Joaquin Valley (Table 3). Almost two thirds of the respondents primarily sold fruits or nuts and another third primarily grew vegetables. Only two respondents listed something other than produce as their primary source of organic sales.

Table 1: Primary Commodity Group, Number of Growers by Region\*

| Top Commodity Group in Sales | North Coast |      | Central Coast |      | South Coast |      | Desert |      | San Joaquin |      | Sacramento Valley |      | Mountain |      | Total |      |
|------------------------------|-------------|------|---------------|------|-------------|------|--------|------|-------------|------|-------------------|------|----------|------|-------|------|
|                              | N           | %    | N             | %    | N           | %    | N      | %    | N           | %    | N                 | %    | N        | %    | N     | %    |
| Vegetable                    | 5           | 71%  | 7             | 44%  | 3           | 21%  | 0      | 0%   | 4           | 33%  | 0                 | 0%   | 1        | 25%  | 20    | 32%  |
| Fruit or nut                 | 2           | 29%  | 8             | 50%  | 11          | 79%  | 2      | 100% | 8           | 67%  | 6                 | 86%  | 3        | 75%  | 40    | 65%  |
| Livestock                    | 0           | 0%   | 0             | 0%   | 0           | 0%   | 0      | 0%   | 0           | 0%   | 1                 | 14%  | 0        | 0%   | 1     | 2%   |
| Other                        | 0           | 0%   | 1             | 6%   | 0           | 0%   | 0      | 0%   | 0           | 0%   | 0                 | 0%   | 0        | 0%   | 1     | 2%   |
| Total %                      | 7           | 100% | 16            | 100% | 14          | 100% | 2      | 100% | 12          | 100% | 7                 | 100% | 4        | 100% | 62    | 100% |

\* Number of respondents and percent within region

Most of the respondents had sold either fruit and nut crops (88%), vegetables (80%) or both during the last year respondents were registered as organic (Table 4). Significantly smaller numbers produced field crops (6%), nursery plants (3%), or livestock (2%).

Table 2: Commodity Groups, Number of Growers with Any Sales

| Commodity Group | N  | %*  |
|-----------------|----|-----|
| Fruit or nut    | 56 | 88% |
| Vegetable       | 51 | 80% |
| Field crops     | 4  | 6%  |
| Nursery         | 2  | 3%  |
| Livestock       | 1  | 2%  |

\* Total percent is greater than 100 because respondents could provide more than one response

The survey respondents produced a variety of different crops. However, they reported low levels of crop diversity with a median of only one organic crop during the last year they farmed organically. Mixed operations reported somewhat higher levels of diversity, with a mean of one conventional crop and two organic crops.

## Revenue

Most of the growers in our sample are very small, with 43% reporting \$0-\$4,999 in total farm revenues the last year they farmed organically (Table 5). The second largest group, representing a quarter of respondents, reported farm revenues of \$10,000-\$49,999.

Table 3: Farm Revenue

| Revenue             | N  | %    |
|---------------------|----|------|
| \$0-4,999           | 27 | 43%  |
| \$5,000-9,999       | 6  | 10%  |
| \$10,000-49,999     | 15 | 24%  |
| \$50,000-99,999     | 8  | 13%  |
| \$100,000-249,999   | 2  | 3%   |
| \$250,000-499,999   | 1  | 1.5% |
| \$500,000-1 million | 1  | 1.5% |
| \$Over 1million     | 3  | 5%   |
| Total               | 63 | 100% |

The majority of respondents (63%) reported between 81% and 100% of farm revenues from organic sales. The respondents reported a mean of 27% (median=10%) of total household income from farming. As would be expected for farms with less than \$10,000 in income, 89% stated that farm revenue comprised less than 50% of their total household income.

## Marketing Channels

Close to half (48%) of respondents marketed their organic products exclusively through wholesale or other intermediary marketing channels, while 11% reported exclusive reliance on direct marketing. The remaining 41% reported a mix of marketing channels (Table 6).

Table 4: Marketing Channels

| Marketing Channels            | N  | %    |
|-------------------------------|----|------|
| Wholesale (WS) only           | 29 | 48%  |
| Direct retail (DR) only       | 2  | 3%   |
| Direct to consumers (DC) only | 5  | 8%   |
| WS and DR                     | 8  | 13%  |
| WS and DC                     | 6  | 10%  |
| DR and DC                     | 9  | 15%  |
| WS, DR and DC                 | 1  | 2%   |
| Total                         | 60 | 100% |

## Motivations for Adopting Organic Production Practices

Fifty-nine respondents provided answers to an open-ended question eliciting reasons for adopting organic farming practices (Table 7). These were coded into 10 different categories. The principal motivations cited were organic market potential (39%), environmental concerns (17%), and the fact that the land was already in organic production (17%).

Table 5: Reasons for Adopting Organic Practices

| Reasons  | N  | %*  |
|--|----|-----|
| Organic market potential                       | 23 | 39% |
| Environmental concerns                         | 10 | 17% |
| Land already organic                           | 10 | 17% |
| Personal or family health                      | 7  | 12% |
| Tradition                                      | 6  | 10% |
| Belief system or ethics                        | 6  | 10% |
| Organic practices are 'good farming' practices | 4  | 7%  |
| Organic improves product quality               | 3  | 5%  |
| General health                                 | 3  | 5%  |
| Diversify farming operation                    | 1  | 2%  |

\* Total percent is greater than 100 because respondents could provide more than one response.

The survey also included questions attempting to gauge whether the respondents' primary motivation for adopting organic methods was "pragmatic" (i.e., economic motivations), "philosophical" (i.e., commitment to organic farming as better for the environment and human health), or a combination of the two.<sup>3</sup> Based on that typology, 40% of all respondents were identified as having adopted organic practices primarily based on a philosophical commitment to organic farming, while only 17% were identified as having primarily economic or "pragmatic" motivations. Nonetheless, many (43%) respondents were identified as having a balance of both philosophical and pragmatic motivations for adopting organic farming.

Only small-scale (less than 50 acres) farm operators were found to be more philosophical in their attitude toward organic farming. Half of these farmers fell in the "philosophical" category, with 42% in the "balanced" category and just 8% identified as "pragmatic." Conversely, there were no farm operators over 50 acres that could be categorized as "philosophical."

Responses to the open-ended question, "Please describe the main reasons you started farming organically," illuminate the differences between responses in each of these categories.

### Pragmatic

- Higher price for produce
- Better prices in bad times
- The price was supposed to be much higher; never happened
- In order to fill a market and take advantage of a profitable 'niche' market.

<sup>3</sup> This typology represents a spectrum rather than a dichotomy, since farming is an inherently economic enterprise and all farmers are interested in the economic viability of their farm operations.

- Older trees with low production could be farmed economically with high organic prices at the time

### **Balanced**

- Favorable market price; compatible with existing practices; improve and build soil
- I worked for a big company for about 14 years, and the last year that I worked for them I got sick from the pesticides. It was when I first started learning how to farm organically
- Good stewardship demands some organic practices, polyculture, and organic material. We are doing most of it but when it comes to pests, some weeds, and diseases, I need technology.
- Location and lack of use of pesticide history
- Ethics and product money
- To supply market with specialty; didn't want to spray on homestead
- To obtain price premiums while being good stewards of the earth
- Prices, Mother Nature

### **Philosophical**


- (I'd) rather not destroy beneficial insects, but rather create a climate of mother nature working as she was meant to - not upsetting the ecosystems
- Use of poisons and commercial products depletes nature's balance. Reflects negatively on those who apply them, work with them and consume the produce. Extremely high cancer rate among farm workers and their children.
- I was a lifetime follower of Robert Rodale's principles. I found that high quality produce could be grown easily without significant losses to pests or diseases.
- I have always been a steward of the land and sensitive to microorganisms. I don't believe it is good to till the soil
- Better for my family and earth
- Since I was a young kid in the 60s, I was taught this farming style
- Best way to treat the land and food supply

### **Reasons for Discontinuing Organic Registration**

We attempted to elicit reasons for discontinuing Organic Program registration through open and closed-ended questions. More than 90% of respondents provided answers to the open ended question “Please describe the main reasons you stopped farming organically or why you are no longer registered with the California Organic program.” Their responses were categorized into six broad issues: management, organic regulations, price, market, production, or some other reason not related to organic farming. Many respondents provided more than one reason. The principal reasons were based on the predominance of issues or by the order of the responses. These principal reasons are displayed in Figure 4. An analysis of principal reasons for deregistering by current farming status reveals different factors at play between (a) respondents no longer farming; those who have (b) respondents who have reverted to conventional production, and (c) respondents still farming organically. Half of the respondents who stopped farming entirely did so for reasons unrelated to organic farming or marketing, such as changes in land tenure (lease or land sale) or personal issues, which included retirement or health problems. The remainder cited a mix of reasons related to organic farming, including management, regulatory, and production problems (Figure 4).

In contrast, the majority of deregistered respondents still farming cited reasons related to organic production for discontinuing organic registration, with regulatory issues being the single most important factor. Regulatory problems were the primary issue for more growers currently using organic methods than respondents who had reverted to conventional production. In contrast, farmers reverting to conventional production were most likely to cite market and production issues with respect to their decision to discontinue organic farming practices. Those issues did not weigh heavily for growers currently using organic methods but no longer marketing their products with an organic label nor with respondents no longer farming.

Figure 4: Main Reasons for Discontinuing Organic Farming or Organic Registration by Current Farming Status



When accounting for all of the stated reasons for deregistering, we see that regulatory issues remain as the dominant issue for deregistrants who continue to farm (Table 8). Deregistered growers who currently farm conventionally cited market issues 8 times and production issues six times, compared with only once each among deregistered growers farming using organic methods. This may indicate that farmers who deregister and revert to using conventional production methods have problems implementing organic production methods or working in the organic markets. Farmers that claim to still use organic methods seem to have successfully implemented organic production methods and find enough markets for their production. Some of the specific market and price issues referred to consolidation at the retail level and large growers entering organic production resulting in lower organic premiums and market saturation (Tables 9 and 10).

Table 8: Reasons for Discontinuing Organic Registration by Farming Status

|                           | No Longer Farming |     | Continue to Farm          |     |                              |     |                  |     | Total*  |     |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-----|---------------------------|-----|------------------------------|-----|------------------|-----|---------|-----|
|                           | N=27              |     | Organic Methods**<br>N=19 |     | Conventional Methods<br>N=29 |     | Subtotal<br>N=48 |     | N=75*** |     |
|                           | N                 | %   | N                         | %   | N                            | %   | N                | %   | N       | %   |
| Organic regulatory issues | 4                 | 15% | 14                        | 74% | 16                           | 55% | 30               | 63% | 34      | 45% |
| Not related to organic    | 13                | 48% | 4                         | 21% | 2                            | 13% | 6                | 13% | 19      | 26% |
| Production issues         | 5                 | 19% | 1                         | 5%  | 6                            | 13% | 7                | 15% | 12      | 16% |
| Market issues             | 3                 | 11% | 1                         | 5%  | 8                            | 28% | 9                | 15% | 12      | 16% |
| Management issues         | 5                 | 19% | 0                         | 0%  | 1                            | 3%  | 1                | 4%  | 6       | 8%  |
| Price issues              | 1                 | 4%  | 1                         | 5%  | 4                            | 14% | 5                | 10% | 6       | 8%  |
| No response               | 3                 | 11% | 2                         | 11% | 0                            | 0%  | 2                | 4%  | 5       | 7%  |

\* Total percent is greater than 100 because respondents could provide multiple responses.

\*\* No longer registered with the CDFA Organic Program.

\*\*\*The current farming status of two respondents could not be determined from their responses.

Table 9: Sample of Responses to Question “What Are the Main Reasons You Stopped Farming Organically?” by Respondents No Longer Farming

|                                      |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Regulatory</b>                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I had no avenue to sell nuts. The dryers would NOT accept registered nuts, only certified ones. I did not want to sell at farmers' markets or roadside stands, hence no market.</li> <li>▪ We are no longer in the business as it was not profitable as organic or non-organic. It didn't help to be certified organic; it was just more expense and time consuming.</li> </ul>                             |
| <b>Production</b>                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Too difficult to grow organic; also market was bad. As an example, the cost of fertilizing with organic fertilizer for my orange grove was far more than I could hope to get in harvest. So no fertilizing - as a result, the health of the grove declined.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Management</b>                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Could not do it economically</li> <li>▪ We are no longer in the business as it was not profitable as organic or non-organic. It didn't help to be certified organic; it was just more expense and time consuming</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Other, not related to organic</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We couldn't get financially stable and knowledgeable organic farmers interested in renting our farm. We rented the farm to conventional grower.</li> <li>▪ Leased land and orchard to (farm name) - they went out of business.</li> <li>▪ Lost lease. We are negotiating to get a new lease.</li> <li>▪ Farming was not profitable and it created a huge amount of stress for myself and family.</li> </ul> |

Table 10: Sample of Responses to Question “What Are the Main Reasons You Stopped Farming Organically?” by Respondents Currently Farming

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Regulatory</b>                           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I am still farming organically. However, I don't see any reason to register and then have to get certified to sell my product as organic.</li> <li>▪ There was a lot of paperwork involved and we started to, but realized our customers know we are organic and use organic practices. So we never certified. We are also downsizing to local markets as well.</li> <li>▪ The cost (time, money, energy) was far greater than the return of being 'certified organic" for my small farm. One has to be 'registered' organic before becoming certified organic, but if one believes it is not cost effective to become certified then there is no need to be registered. Also, produce buyers will not buy produce that is only "registered' organic. However I may 'register' once more because our proceeds are less than \$5000/year.</li> <li>▪ Operation too small for amount of work it requires.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Production</b>                           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Soil condition and terrain made it not cost effective to follow many of the practices necessary for a healthy orchard, i.e. steep hillsides prevented and fertilizing; everything had to be distributed by hand and labor costs too high to be viable. Soil is thin and poor quality, which exacerbated the problems.</li> <li>▪ Was farming apricots and couldn't do it profitable (sic), even organically. Removed apricots and planted almonds. Developed serious squirrel problem which was seriously affecting neighbor's crop. The only way to control them effectively was with poison.</li> <li>▪ Too much hand work. Couldn't afford labor cost. Certification got too expensive for the amount of fruit I sold.</li> <li>▪ Growing cost too high, especially fertilizer. We were getting gouged with very limited products available.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Other, Not Related to Organic Issues</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I have a small grove and simply forgot to keep up my paperwork and donated the fruit to friends and charities.</li> <li>▪ Because of a very busy schedule, I am usually late registering.</li> <li>▪ I was diagnosed with illness and had to slow down.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Price Issues</b>                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ One large grower in northern CA decided to enter the organic market when conventional prunes were in oversupply. He single handedly in one year drove the supply of organic prunes and lowered his prices to near conventional levels to sell his crop. After years of successful marketing at high prices, it collapsed in six months never to return to the price points of 1998 or 99 again.</li> <li>▪ Organic sales not economically viable for large production. The premium is not enough to justify the length of time it takes to market the crop. That was the case when we discontinued about three years ago.</li> <li>▪ Market prices too low.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Market Access Issues</b>                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Massive consolidation on the retail buying end. My main crop was fresh market tomatoes. The 'new' consolidated had unrealistic grade expectations (US #1) but they were unwilling to pay a premium for the new higher grading standards that caused my cull rates to increase by 30% or more.</li> <li>▪ I am no longer farming organically because I had no one interested in buying my Valencia (orange) crop.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Management Issues</b>                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Unable to keep up with my business and do all the paperwork. I was in transition to a new crop (bamboo) and it was a stressful period of time (mother's care).</li> </ul>  |

The 21 telephone interview responses also support the survey findings, with most farmers citing more than one reason for discontinuing organic registration. Some growers discontinued organic practices altogether, while others continued farming using organic methods, albeit without registration or certification. Seven of these farmers discontinued organic registration because of paperwork burden and costs. Most discussed certification and registration as synonymous, despite the fact that they are separate processes. A grower farming 490 acres in Lake County cited “massive and ridiculous registration and inspection fees,” while others cited a lack of need for organic certification. As one grower explained, “the fees and bureaucracy aren’t worth it to me. My customers don’t care if I’m certified because they trust me.” Similarly, enough explained that “there was a lot of paperwork involved and we started to certify, but realized our customers know we are organic and use organic practices. So we never certified.”

Another seven (33%) telephone respondents cited combinations of production problems, the high cost of inputs, and low price premiums behind their decision to stop farming organically. In terms of production, a grower explained that, “We developed serious squirrel problems which were affecting our neighbor’s crop as well. The only way to control them effectively was with poison.” Another grower cited the high cost of organic inputs: “It was too difficult to grow organic. The cost of fertilizing my orange grove with organic fertilizer was far more than I could hope to get in harvest.” Another grower cited the lack of profitability of farming in general. He explained that, “We are no longer in the farming business as it was not profitable, as organic or non-organic. It didn’t help to be certified organic. It was just more expensive and time consuming.”

Three farmers cited price premium issues that they traced to competition from foreign imports and wholesale buyer pressure. Finally, eight respondents cited issues unrelated to organic farming, including changes in land tenure (losing a lease, losing a tenant, or changing farm sites), retirement or natural disasters.

## **Principal Challenges in Organic Farming**

The survey elicited information regarding the principal challenges the respondents faced as organic farmers, in the areas of production, market access, price, regulatory issues, and management. The survey asked respondents to rank these broad categories of problems and also to rate specific challenges within each category on a scale of 1-5, where 1 was “not a problem” and 5 was a “severe problem.” The respondents were then asked to identify the two greatest challenges within each category.

### **Primary Challenges**

When asked to rank the main challenges they faced as organic farmers by broad category, regulatory problems were ranked as the main issue. That was followed by price issues, production problems, market access, and management concerns (Table 11).

Table 11: Principal Challenges

| Issues Ranked<br>#1 or #2 | N  | %    |
|---------------------------|----|------|
| Regulatory                | 18 | 30%  |
| Price                     | 16 | 27%  |
| Production                | 13 | 22%  |
| Market access             | 10 | 17%  |
| Management                | 3  | 5%   |
| Total                     | 60 | 100% |

We examined the principal challenges with respect to the amount of time farming, to better understand how farming experience plays a role in determining the types of challenges. Twice as many (35%) farmers with less than 10 years total farming experience listed ‘production’ as their main challenge, compared with only 16% of farmers with more than 15 years experience. In a similar trend, 24% of farmers with less than 10 years total farming experience cited ‘market access’ as a main challenge, compared with 13% of farmers with more than 15 years experience. Obtaining organic price premiums was the principal challenge for a third of farmers with more than 10 years farming experience, and the case for 12% of farmers with less than 10 years farming experience. Production and market access were less likely to be cited by experienced farmers, who were more likely to complain about being able to receive price premiums.

An analysis of the specific problems respondents ranked as 4 or 5 (serious or severe problem) across all categories indicates that paperwork/record keeping is the most significant concern, as reported by half of all respondents (Table 12). That concern is followed by certification costs (44%), the high cost of organic inputs (38%), and the time requirements associated with organic farming (36%). Conversely, at the low end of the scale, respondents reported relatively few problems in terms of issues including learning about organic production practices (8%), finding organic inputs (6%), and access to production information (5%).

Table 12: Specific Challenges Across All Categories

| Issues                                      | Category      | Cases Rated 4 or 5 | N* | %   |
|---|---------------|--------------------|----|-----|
| Too much paperwork/record keeping           | Regulatory    | 31                 | 62 | 50% |
| Certification costs                         | Regulatory    | 28                 | 64 | 44% |
| Cost of inputs                              | Production    | 24                 | 63 | 38% |
| Overall time requirements                   | Management    | 22                 | 61 | 36% |
| Marketing                                   | Management    | 19                 | 60 | 32% |
| Premiums too low                            | Price         | 17                 | 62 | 27% |
| Low yields                                  | Production    | 17                 | 66 | 26% |
| Lack of price information                   | Price         | 15                 | 59 | 25% |
| Competition w/ farmers or imports           | Market Access | 16                 | 63 | 25% |
| Lack of transition price premium            | Price         | 13                 | 58 | 22% |
| Interpreting standards                      | Regulatory    | 13                 | 61 | 21% |
| Insufficient capital                        | Management    | 13                 | 61 | 21% |
| Pest/disease related losses                 | Production    | 14                 | 67 | 21% |
| Problems w/ wholesalers                     | Market Access | 13                 | 63 | 21% |
| Fertility                                   | Production    | 12                 | 66 | 18% |
| Prices inconsistent                         | Price         | 10                 | 59 | 17% |
| Poor product quality                        | Production    | 11                 | 66 | 17% |
| Meeting regulatory requirements             | Regulatory    | 10                 | 62 | 16% |
| Couldn't supply volume                      | Market Access | 10                 | 64 | 16% |
| Weed-related losses                         | Production    | 10                 | 66 | 15% |
| Not enough customers                        | Market Access | 9                  | 64 | 14% |
| Labor management                            | Management    | 8                  | 59 | 14% |
| Access to labor                             | Production    | 8                  | 66 | 12% |
| Access to credit                            | Management    | 7                  | 60 | 12% |
| Identifying crops to grow                   | Production    | 7                  | 66 | 11% |
| Production management                       | Management    | 6                  | 60 | 10% |
| Financial management                        | Management    | 5                  | 59 | 9%  |
| Could not find any markets                  | Market Access | 5                  | 64 | 8%  |
| Learning about organic production practices | Production    | 5                  | 66 | 8%  |
| Finding inputs                              | Production    | 4                  | 63 | 6%  |
| Access to production Information            | Production    | 3                  | 66 | 5%  |

\*Number of respondents ranking the issue

## Production Challenges

Respondents ranked the high cost of organic inputs as the production issue of greatest concern. This issue was ranked 4 or 5 on the above scale by 38% of respondents (Table 13). That was followed by low yields (26%), losses related to pests and/or disease (21%), and fertility problems (18%). Nonetheless, when all yield-related questions are combined, 28 (42%) respondents rated at least one yield-related issue as a serious concern. Finding inputs and access to production information were ranked as less serious problems.

Table 13: Principal Production Issues

| Production Issues                           | Cases Rated 4 or 5 | N  | %   |
|---|--------------------|----|-----|
| Cost of inputs                              | 24                 | 63 | 38% |
| Low yields                                  | 17                 | 66 | 26% |
| Pest/disease related losses                 | 14                 | 67 | 21% |
| Fertility                                   | 12                 | 66 | 18% |
| Poor product quality                        | 11                 | 66 | 17% |
| Weed related losses                         | 10                 | 66 | 15% |
| Access to Labor                             | 8                  | 66 | 12% |
| Identifying crops to grow                   | 7                  | 66 | 11% |
| Learning about organic production practices | 5                  | 66 | 8%  |
| Finding inputs                              | 4                  | 63 | 6%  |
| Access to production Information            | 3                  | 66 | 5%  |

\* Total percent is greater than 100 because respondents could provide more than one response.

When asked to rank the top two production problems, three-fourths of the respondents selected at least one yield-related issue as one of their top two production problems (Table 14). One third (30%) identified pests as their first or second most challenging production problem, followed by low yields (28%), and the high cost of organic inputs (26%). Of note is the fact all of the top five challenges, except input costs, had to do with yield. Poor product quality was a high concern for only 17% of respondents.

Table 14: Top Two Production Problems

| Production Problems                                | N  | %*  |
|--|----|-----|
| Pest/disease related yield losses                  | 18 | 30% |
| Low yields   | 17 | 28% |
| Cost of inputs                                     | 16 | 26% |
| Weed related yield losses                          | 15 | 25% |
| Fertility related yield losses                     | 15 | 25% |
| Insufficient access to labor                       | 12 | 20% |
| Learning about organic production methods          | 8  | 13% |
| Poor quality or high rates of unmarketable product | 7  | 12% |
| Difficulty finding organic inputs                  | 6  | 10% |
| Insufficient access to production information      | 1  | 2%  |
| Identifying which crops to grow                    | 0  | 0%  |

\* Total percent is greater than 100 because respondents could provide more than one response.

### Market Access Challenges

The survey also elicited information regarding market access issues. The market issue most frequently cited was competition from other farmers and/or cheap imports (25%), followed by problems with wholesalers (21%). Thirty-five respondents cited at least one of the specific market issues as a serious or severe (ranked 4 or 5). Nonetheless, in light of the many market

access problems cited by organic farmers in general, the fact that only 25% or less of respondents rated these problems as serious challenges was somewhat surprising (Table 15).

Volume is an important issue as well. The number of respondents who could not supply enough volume was approximately the same as the number who could not find enough customers for their product. This points to the fact that the market for organic products can be highly variable, depending on the commodity and/or location.

Table 15: Principal Market Access Issues

| Market Access Issues              | Cases Rated 4 or 5 | N  | %*  |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----|
| Competition w/ farmers or imports | 16                 | 63 | 25% |
| Problems w/ wholesalers           | 13                 | 63 | 21% |
| Couldn't supply volume            | 10                 | 64 | 16% |
| Not enough customers              | 9                  | 64 | 14% |
| Could not find any markets        | 5                  | 64 | 8%  |

\* Total percent is greater than 100 because respondents could provide more than one response.

When asked to rank their top two market access problems, half (50%) of all respondents cited competition from other farmers or cheaper imports as one of their top two market access problems, followed by inability to supply enough volume for customers (37%) (Table 16).

Table 16: Top Two Market Access Problems

| Market Access Problems                               | N  | %*  |
|--|----|-----|
| Competition from other farmers or imports            | 26 | 50% |
| Could not supply enough volume for customers         | 19 | 37% |
| Problems with handler/wholesalers                    | 18 | 35% |
| Could not find any markets for organic product       | 14 | 27% |
| Could not find enough customers to absorb production | 14 | 27% |

\* Total percent is greater than 100 because respondents could provide more than one response.

## Price Challenges

Price was the second most cited principal challenge, as cited by 27 percent of respondents (Table 11). When asked to rate the severity of specific price challenges, the responses were fairly evenly distributed. Low organic premiums and lack of price information were rated as serious or severe problems by 27% and 25% of respondents, respectively (Table 17).

Table 17: Principal Price Issues

| Price Issues                     | Cases Rated 4 or 5 | N  | %   |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----|
| Premiums too low                 | 17                 | 62 | 27% |
| Lack of price information        | 15                 | 59 | 25% |
| Lack of transition price premium | 13                 | 58 | 22% |
| Prices inconsistent              | 10                 | 59 | 17% |

\* Total percent is greater than 100 because respondents could provide more than one response.

When asked to rank the two most important price-related problems they faced as organic farmers, low organic price premiums was by far the main concern (69%), followed by a lack of organic price information (46%). Twenty-eight respondents rated at least one of the specific price issues as serious or severe (ranked 4 or 5) (Table 18).

Table 18: Top Two Price Problems

| Price Problems                           | N  | %*  |
|--|----|-----|
| Organic price premiums too low           | 33 | 69% |
| Lack of organic price information        | 22 | 46% |
| Organic prices too inconsistent          | 18 | 38% |
| Lack of price premiums during transition | 14 | 29% |

\* Total percent is greater than 100 because respondents could provide more than one response.

## Regulatory Challenges

Based on the percentage of respondents citing these issues as serious or severe problems, regulatory concerns are clearly the most challenging set of issues among the survey respondents (Table 19). Fully 50% of all respondents cited paperwork and record keeping as severe concerns, followed by certification costs (44%).

Table 19: Principal Regulatory Issues

| Regulatory Issues                | Cases Rated 4 or 5 | N  | %*  |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|----|-----|
| Too much paperwork/recordkeeping | 31                 | 62 | 50% |
| Certification costs              | 28                 | 64 | 44% |
| Interpreting standards           | 13                 | 61 | 21% |
| Meeting regulatory requirements  | 10                 | 62 | 16% |

\*Total percent is greater than 100 because respondents could provide more than one response.

A ranking of the top two regulatory problems reveals a similar pattern, with 75% of respondents citing too much paperwork and record keeping as one of the top two regulatory problems, followed by certification costs (71%). As seen in Table 20, difficulties interpreting the USDA organic standards and meeting regulatory requirements rank significantly lower in importance. Forty-three respondents marked at least one of the specific regulatory issues as serious or severe (ranked 4 or 5).

Table 20: Top Two Regulatory Problems

| Regulatory Problems                        | N  | % * |
|--|----|-----|
| Too much paperwork/record-keeping          | 41 | 75% |
| Certification costs                        | 39 | 71% |
| Difficulty interpreting organic standards  | 13 | 24% |
| Difficulty meeting regulatory requirements | 11 | 20% |

\*Total percent is greater than 100 because respondents could provide more than one response.

In response to the open-ended question “Please describe the main reasons you stopped farming organically or why you are no longer registered with the CA Organic Program,” several respondents described concerns with the registration process:

- Didn’t want to continue with paperwork or fees. I know we are 100% organic and that's good enough for me.
- You had people inspecting us who have never farmed. The rules have changed so much I did not feel I was keeping up, nor cared to. The worst was when your inspector told us what to do, when they had never farmed.
- Organic registration fee was expensive and customers do not require organic certification.
- I would like to have kept my certification, but the price for renewing when you plant both conventional and organic rice was expensive and we are not planting organic at this time. We did dry and storage organic rice but decided to let it go because of cost.
- After making 5K we are required to certify with an independent agency. The fees and bureaucracy aren't worth it to me. My customers don't care if I'm certified because they trust me. My practices exceed the standards of other agencies and they are set up for (agribusiness) rather than the small farmer.
- Too much paperwork. Farmers hardly ever even have time to eat and use the bathroom. Yet the certification agency wanted/needed me to keep track of every single detail of what I grow, harvested, sold, threw away and it was burdensome- actually it would require a full-time bookkeeper to do all this paperwork.
- The first year I became un-registered, I sent the (registration) form back labeled ‘NO-CHANGES,’ with the advice of the local Farm Advisor, and this was not accepted, so I got discouraged and ran out of time also.

## Management Challenges

The percentage of respondents citing management challenges as serious concerns was higher than market access, price, and even production problems. Overall time requirements associated with organic farming ranked as a 4 or 5 by 36% of respondents, followed by managing marketing processes<sup>4</sup> (32%). Nonetheless, 25 respondents ranked one of the categories associated with access to capital, credit, or financial management as a serious concern, representing approximately 40% of all respondents (Table 21).

Table 21: Management Issues

| Management Issues         | Cases Rated<br>4 or 5 | N  | % * |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|----|-----|
| Overall time requirements | 22                    | 61 | 36% |
| Marketing                 | 19                    | 60 | 32% |
| Insufficient capital      | 13                    | 61 | 22% |
| Labor management          | 8                     | 59 | 14% |
| Access to credit          | 7                     | 60 | 12% |
| Production management     | 6                     | 60 | 10% |
| Financial management      | 5                     | 59 | 9%  |

\*Total percent is greater than 100 because respondents could provide more than one response.

Overall time requirements is by far the greatest management challenge facing deregistered organic producers, as cited by over half (56%) of respondents. Marketing management follows at 42% (Table 22). The other concerns were cited as top issues by 27% or less of the respondents.

Table 22: Top Two Management Problems

| Management Problems       | N  | %*  |
|---------------------------|----|-----|
| Overall time requirements | 31 | 56% |
| Marketing                 | 23 | 42% |
| Production management     | 15 | 27% |
| Labor management          | 14 | 26% |
| Insufficient capital      | 10 | 18% |
| Access to credit          | 4  | 7%  |
| Financial management      | 3  | 6%  |

\* Total percent is greater than 100 because respondents could provide more than one response.


## Technical Assistance Needs

Thirty four individuals responded to an open-ended question eliciting information regarding the types of assistance that would have helped them continue farming organically. Because this was an open-ended question, the responses included a range of ideas. The principal forms of technical

<sup>4</sup> As distinguished from market access, management issues associated with marketing include customer relations, billing, invoicing, supply chain management, etc.

assistance cited were coded into one of four types of primary responses. In keeping with the percentage of respondents citing regulatory issues, the main form of technical assistance identified was related to regulatory issues (41%). That was followed by production (21%), market (21%) and management (17%) related assistance (Figure 5).

Figure 5: What Types of Technical Assistance Would Have Helped You Continue to Farm Organically? (N=34)



Specific types of organic regulatory-related assistance include cost-share programs, paperwork reduction, and help with the application process, registration simplification, and more trained and experienced organic certifiers. Production-related assistance includes direct technical assistance, information and greater organic inputs effectiveness, such as for fertilizer and pest or disease control. Market-related assistance includes price and buyer information, and market interventions such as price controls and policies for restricting imports of organic products. Management-related assistance refers to access to skilled and unskilled labor, and access to credit (Table 23).

Table 23: Sample of Responses to Question “Are There Any Types of Assistance That Would Have Helped You Continue to Farm Organically?”

---

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| <b>Regulatory</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More efficient processes for maintaining organic status</li> <li>• Organic certification fees subsidy</li> <li>• Need better inspectors</li> <li>• Lower-cost regulatory process/inspections. Easier regulatory system</li> <li>• Form co-op for small farmers to get certified together</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Production</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial assistance to buy equipment that I need to do my work easily, effectively, and faster</li> <li>• More effective weed control. Could not pay laborers enough to combat weed problems</li> <li>• Organic seed starting dirt mix is our highest expense</li> <li>• Consideration could be given to using controlled amounts of cheaper, more effective fertilizers</li> </ul> |
| <b>Management</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Having an organic farmer as a foreman</li> <li>• Better management and help</li> <li>• Responsible help</li> <li>• If my children were interested and had helped to maintain the place I'd have been greatly relieved. You cannot support your life solely on a small ordinary farm.</li> <li>• Labor issues</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Market</b>     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More wholesalers willing to work with smaller growing operations</li> <li>• Limiting fruit from Mexico, Chile</li> <li>• Need winery to buy my grapes</li> <li>• Buyers for only 'registered' organic products</li> </ul>  |

---

Farming experience appears to be related to the types of assistance identified. Thirty-nine percent of farmers with less than 10 years of organic farming experience chose production-related assistance, compared with virtually no farmers with over 10 years of organic farming experience. In contrast, half of all farmers with more than 10 years of organic experience expressed a need for regulatory types of assistance.

The telephone interview respondents offered a number of recommendations regarding ways to help organic growers continue farming organically. These included assistance in identifying viable crops and alternative farming methods, having certifiers computerize their paperwork, more clarity among certifiers regarding allowed inputs and incentives for organic feed companies to address the under-supply of organic feed. Additional recommendations from the producer survey include: fewer agencies to deal with; relaxing regulations to make it easier to establish farmworker housing; and better enforcement of USDA organic standards on large farms. One respondent noted that the CDFR Organic Program cost-share assistance for reimbursement of certification costs was “a good deal” and provided an incentive to obtain organic certification.

## CONCLUSIONS

---

The findings indicate that CDFA figures regarding the numbers of producers that have discontinued organic registration overestimate the actual number of deregistrants. Only 77 (74%) of the 104 respondents identified as having discontinued organic registration were in fact no longer registered. Additionally, of the 77 who had discontinued organic registration, 19 were still farming using organic or “beyond organic” methods. In sum, of the 104 respondents identified as deregistered organic producers by the CDFA Organic Program, 27 were incorrectly categorized as deregistered, while 19 were still farming using organic methods. Therefore, only 56<sup>5</sup> (73%) of those identified as deregistered were in fact no longer farming using organic methods.

An analysis of the main problems the respondents faced while farming organically confirms the importance of regulatory issues, which were cited as the principal challenge by 30% of all respondents, followed by price (27%), production (22%), market access (17%), and management (5%) concerns.

The most frequently cited reason for discontinuing organic registration was concern with regulatory issues, including paperwork, record keeping, and certification costs. Among those still farming, regulatory concerns appear to figure even more highly among growers who are still farming using organic methods, compared with those who have reverted to conventional production.

An analysis of the specific issues respondents ranked as serious concerns (4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5) indicates that paperwork/record-keeping are the top concern, as cited by half (50%) of all respondents. That is followed by certification costs (44%), the high cost of organic inputs (38%), the time requirements associated with organic farming (36%), and challenges with respect to managing marketing (32%). The respondents reported a range of technical assistance needs, particularly with respect to regulatory issues, the certification process, production, marketing, labor management, and economic assistance.

It appears that production and management related issues precede market and price issues as factors as the primary reasons farmers stop farming organically. Farmers who stopped farming entirely did not cite market or price issues as a principal reason for stopping farming and cited them the fewest times (11% and 4% respectively) among all issues that played a factor for stopping farming. Farmers who reverted to conventional farming practices cited production issues, while their counterparts who continue to farm using organic methods focused on regulatory issues.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

---

The findings indicate that regulatory issues present significant challenges to organic producers and were cited as the principal reason for reverting to conventional production among

---

<sup>5</sup> Two respondents did not state their current farming status.

deregistered producers who are still farming. Recommendations based on the research findings include the following:

- Programs and policies to help organic farmers continue farming organically should include efforts to reduce the paperwork burden associated with organic farming and assistance to help farmers pay for certification costs. USDA cost-share programs are key to the maintenance and growth of organic agriculture, especially for small farmers. The California Organic Program (COP) should consider a state-run cost share program to assist farmers in paying COP registration fees. The COP should consider restructuring its fee schedule to assist low-income farmers.
- Technical assistance to farmers considering adopting organic methods should include explanations of paperwork and record-keeping, certification costs, the higher cost of organic inputs, and greater time requirements associated with organic production.
- Technical and financial assistance for organic farmers should target growers grossing under \$100,000 per year and farming less than 50 acres.
- CDFA Organic Program data should be adjusted to reflect deregistration that does not represent exit from the Organic Program (i.e., registration under a different entity, changing business name, etc.). To more accurately measure changes in organic acreage, farms, and sales the registration process could be adjusted to track the history of operators on organic land and changes in ownership.