



Oregon Small Farms Technical Report

Beaverton Farmers' Market Rapid Market Assessment

By Larry Lev, Garry Stephenson, and Linda Brewer

Oregon Small Farms
Technical Report
Number 12

August 2002

Oregon State University
Extension Service

**Beaverton Farmers' Market
Rapid Market Assessment
August 10, 2002**

Market Name: Beaverton Saturday Farmers' Market
Date of Assessment: August 10, 2002
Market Hours: Saturday 8 AM - 1:30 PM
Location: Public Parking lot and some street closure
Market staff: Manager, manager assistant, paid workers and volunteers
Began: 1988
Fees: Basic, \$30 - \$40/week, discounts for advanced payment
Vendors: 100, including agriculture and food
Market sales: \$125,000, approximate sales for this day
Market attendance: 10,200 estimated adults
Team members: Larry Lev, Agricultural and Resource Economics, OSU
Garry Stephenson, Benton County Extension, OSU
Linda Brewer, AREc, OSU
Vance Corum, Northwest Direct, WSU
Rebecca Landis, Corvallis-Albany Farmers' Markets
Suzanne Briggs, Hollywood Farmers' Market
Hallie Mittleman, Hillsdale Farmers' Market
Annalisa Bandalera, Master Food Preservers
Chris Coles, Coos Bay Farmers' Market
Ted Snider, Portland Farmers' Market
Ruth Lane, Community Food Matters
Will Wiebe, Oregon Food Bank & Community Food Matters
Karen Fergusson, Beaverton Farmers' Market

Part 1: Consumer Information

Estimated Total Attendance: 10,182 adults

Question 1: *How much did you spend in the market today?*

<i>Overall market average</i>	\$24.60
Early shoppers (before 10:45)	\$26.60
Late shoppers (after 10:45)	\$22.45

Comment: This is the highest average purchase figure that we have collected among Oregon markets (note that we have never collected average purchase data at the Portland Saturday market or the Lake

Oswego Saturday market). Higher sales to early shoppers is a pattern seen in many markets.

Total market sales can be estimated as follows:

- ❖ 10,182 shoppers/2.0 adults per shopping group = 5091 shopping groups.
 - ❖ 5091 shopping groups * \$24.60 = **\$125,000**
- Sales per vendor: \$125,000/100 vendors = \$1,250

Note that these calculations are estimates based on a variety of assumptions. The most important is the assumption of an average of 2.0 adults per shopping group. With a lower number of adults per shopping group (which is likely), total sales in the market would be higher.

Question 2: Will you shop or eat at surrounding businesses or restaurants on this trip? If YES, estimate the amount that you will spend.

No	67%
Yes	33%

Across all shoppers, the amount spent in neighboring businesses averaged \$7.54. The average calculated for only those who answered YES is: \$22.69

The total value of sales to surrounding businesses is:

- ❖ \$38,386 using the estimate of 2.0 adults per shopping group

Question 3: Where do you live?

Beaverton	41%
Portland	25%
Tigard, Lake Oswego	13%
Aloha, Hillsboro, Forest Grove	11%
Other, less than 50 miles	4%
Other, more than 50 miles	6%

Comment: This question was only asked in the first half of the market (until 10:45). In the second half there may be a bit better representation from further away (although the differences are likely to be quite small). The “ Other (more than 50 miles)” category can be seen as representing tourists.

Question 4: *How did you find out about the market? If you have been shopping here for more than 2 years classify yourself as an “old-timer”.*

We phrase the question this way because people who have shopped at a market for a long time have a difficult time remembering how they found out about it. This phrasing also allows the market to discover how many new customers are being attracted and how effective current advertising methods are.

<i>Old timers</i>	69%
<i>Word of mouth</i>	20%
<i>Saw it and shopped</i>	5%
<i>Newspaper article</i>	3%
<i>Newspaper ad</i>	1%
<i>Radio/TV</i>	1%
<i>Flyer</i>	1%
<i>Not sure</i>	1%

Eliminating old-timer responses and analyzing responses for the remaining 31% of respondents provides these results:

<i>Word of mouth</i>	65%
<i>Saw it and shopped</i>	16%
<i>Newspaper article</i>	9%
<i>Newspaper ad</i>	3%
<i>Radio/TV</i>	2%
<i>Flyer</i>	2%
<i>Not sure</i>	3%

Comments: Since 69% indicated that they were “old-timers, 31% of the shoppers started shopping at Beaverton within the last 2 years. For comparison purposes, a similar question found 76% old-timers at Corvallis Wednesday, 67% old-timers at Hollywood and 60% old-timers at Ashland. 72% of the early shoppers were old-timers versus 66% of those who answered the survey after 10:45 AM.

The vast majority of the new Beaverton shoppers found out about the market as a result of word of mouth (65%) with an additional 16% who simply saw it and shopped. The small number who found out about the market via other means is consistent with what we have discovered in other markets.

Question 5: What, if anything, stopped you from buying more at the market?

<i>Nothing stopped me</i>	45%
<i>Ran out of money</i>	17%
<i>Couldn't carry anymore</i>	15%
<i>Prices too high</i>	10%
<i>Ran out of time</i>	7%
<i>Couldn't find what I wanted</i>	6%

Comments: The Board may want to take a close look at the factors that shoppers cited in answer to this question. “Ran out of money”(17%) may be related to access to an ATM machine. “ Couldn't carry anymore” could indicate a lack of familiarity with the pick up service or a potential demand for wagons in the market. The “Prices too high” percentage is only slightly higher than the level we have observed in other markets (where it has been in the 6-8% range).

Part 2: RMA Team Member Comments/Suggestions/Questions

The purpose of this section of the report is NOT to provide an overall grade to this market or rank it against any other market. Rather the team of outsiders used their “fresh eyes” to provide feedback about the individual market elements that they observed. They noted what they liked, what they thought could be changed or improved and questions that they had. The RMA process is about sharing – both the market being observed and the markets that sent the observers should gain new insights and ideas.

Physical site

What team members appreciated about the physical site:

- The fountain & park are of great benefit. Customers made good use of the shade.
- Beautiful, orderly layout. Very wide aisles handle the crowds well (including the wagons, strollers, and shopping carts). Even when crowded it is possible to hurry through the market if needed.
- Covered bike parking is very nice.
- Loading zone & disabled block(s) are both good features
- Plenty of trash cans and staff regularly empties them.
- Good placement of trashcans, hazard cones, parking and information signs.
- Ginger and staff seemed in control throughout.
- Walkie-Talkies were well used to manage the large site and avoid problems. Information provided to customers and vendors was consistent and coordinated.

Improvements and Questions:

- Shoppers were unequally distributed in the market with the library end having more shoppers and more congestion – can something be done to help the other end?
- Set up would be easier if the city allowed at least the corners of the vendor spaces to be marked (although vendors did a good job at lining up booths)
- Could a walkway be included mid-aisle? Might help consumers in navigating the market.
- In the long run will the city provide any enhancements at the North end of the lot (permanent rest room and drinking fountain)
- Is there a possibility for having seating at other end?
- Could something be worked out with the church to free up the block that it is on?
- Will the city allow additional off-site signs directing people to the market?

Vendors and Products**What team member appreciated about the vendors and products:**

- Great, intense competition – price and quality variation among vendors
- Could do almost all of your food shopping for the week in the market (and just skip the supermarket)
- Market was well-organized with diverse vendors scattered throughout the market
- Good niche marketing displayed – large market size allows niche players to flourish
 - Many single product vendors seemed to be doing well (such as plums)
 - Impressive level of specialization among plant sellers
- Good representation of organic produce.
- Good number of value-added vendors.
- Low stall fees appears to be supportive of having farms of diverse size represented in the market
- Quite a bit of sampling in the market.
- Some vendors provided excellent customer service (such as the extensive set of lamb recipes)

Improvements and questions:

- Signage varied a lot among vendors -- some vendors had limited signage. The market should keep working to improve signage among all vendors.
- Use of generic plant signs by some vendors was better than nothing but don't allow grower personality to be highlighted
- While some vendors identified resale items many others either didn't or the signs were confusing – can this be improved / encouraged / required?

- Some vendors expressed concern about enforcement of 75% rule and at least one vendor expressed concern about vendor input to board decisions.
- Attention needs to paid to:
 - Separation of cash handling and food handling,
 - Hand washing and sampling procedures,
 - Use of thermometers by those selling “potentially hazardous” products.
- Some vendors had too little product for the frontage displayed. Is there a way for multispace vendors to give up a space when they are low on product?
- Could use more bread and hot food in the market
- Many vendors had fruit stored on ground without protection
- Some vendors were breaking down early (1:15). Could the market end at 1:00 rather than 1:30?
- Not clear to what extent value added people are using products they grew themselves.
- What are the market rules for jams, jellies, oil, vinegars
- As a result of the crowds, at certain times consumers couldn't really talk to vendors (a downside to the success of the market)

Atmosphere

What the team members appreciated about the market atmosphere:

- Has the feeling of a large mall (this is meant to be a positive comment)
- Music great as was the clown – some thought location was good while others felt there should be an additional acoustic music site in the market.
- Good representation of different ethnic groups (especially Asians and Hispanics, not very many African-Americans). Good age distribution, which indicates that the good times should keep rolling
- Later crowd a bit different/more relaxed. Plenty of kids – especially later on (many in swim suits)
- Overall customers seemed happy, approachable
- Good diversity of on-site eating possibilities
- Active volunteer booth – good sales of bags and shirts
- Only a percentage of customers bring their own bags – those who do bring good sized ones and hauling devices
- Good interaction with library (people visiting both market and library on the same trip).
- Printouts of article on vendor at info booth is an excellent addition
- Relatively few tourists
- Given how crowded the market, have probably taken the right approach by prohibiting dogs.

Improvements and questions:

- The signs that the market puts up are functional rather than educational. Market does not focus on seeking opportunities to educate people about local food system issues
- Are there CSA deliveries here?
- Smoke and smell from Fetzer and Kettle corn (they are already placed to minimize impact on the market)
- Have they considered cooking demos?
- Size of crowds appears to reduce chances for conversation.
- Has the market considered providing pull carts?
- Could use a drinking fountain.

Discussion Questions:

- Can the resale issue be dealt with more effectively?
- What can/should the market do to encourage better vendor signage?
- How can the vendor food safety issues be dealt with most effectively?
- Should the market place a greater emphasis on educational issues?
- Can the market use the data generated by this and other research to negotiate more successfully with the city and others?