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A. Use of Frozen Processed Sea Food (Tables 1, 2)

More than two tbirds of all the establishments in Denver said they bought sea food in the previous twelve months. Among buyers of sea food, the great majority said they made purchases of sea food in the frozen processed form.

Forty-three per cent of all the establishments said they had bougbt frozen processed fish in November, 1958; 33 per cent said they had bought frozen processed shellfish; and 16 per cent said they had bought portions.

Of the ten cities in the survey, Denver ranked third, in terms of the percentage of all establishments buying frozen processed sea food.
B. Frozen Processed Fish - Purchases, Attitudes, and Practices

1. Purchases: Species and Amount of Prepreparation (Tables 3, 4)

Among Denver users of frozen processed fish, two fifths bought halibut steaks during November, 1958. This item was also the leader, in terms of total pounds parchased.

Halibut steaks were also bought widely in
Chicago, Los Angeles, Omaha, and Springfield.
Frozen raw halibut was bought in large quan-
tities by many establishments in Denver.
Other items frequently purchased in the city
were ocean perch fillets, sole fillets, and salmon steaks. Red snapper fillets, while bought by fewer establishments, were purchased in large quantities.
2. Attitudes Toward Prepreparation and Quality

A great majority of Denver purchasers were satisfied with the quality and condition of the fish.

There was more dissatisfaction with the prepreparation of fish in Denver than in other cities. Dissatisfaction was expressed by 14 per cent of the purchasers of halibut, by 14 per cent of the purchasers of ocean perch, and by 12 per cent of salmon purchasers.
3. Packaging of Fish (Tables 7, 8)

Denver establishments most typically bought frozen fillets and steaks in 5 pound packages. Frozen raw halibut and frozen raw salmon were bought in larger packages, of varying weights.
4. Methods of Preparing and Serving Fish (Table 7)

Frying was the most popular method of preparing fish among Denver establishments. The average
establighment served 68 ner cent of its fish fried. Frying was the leading method in all ten cities of the study.

Ixyling was also a common method of preparation in Imenver. The average establishment served 2? per cent baked. Baking was also popular in other Western cities.
C. Frozen Processed Shellfish - Purchases,

Attitudes, and Practices

1. Purchases: Species and TyFe of Prepreparation (Tables 10, 11)

Half of the shellfisb users in Denver bought breaded shrimp in November, 1958. Almost as many bougbt raw shrimp, while a substantial number bought raw scallows.

Frozen lobster tails led in Denver in terms of total pounds purchased, owing to quantity purchases.

Breaded shrimp and raw sbrimp were both bought widely and in large quantities in all of the other cities included in the study.
2. Attitudes Toward Prepreparation; Toward Quality and Candition of Shelleist
(Tables 12, 13)
The great majority of purchasers were satisfied with the quality and condition of the sbellfish whicb they bought, and with the prepreparation of most species of shellfish.

In the case of lobster, one fifth of the purchasers said they were not satisfied with the prepreparation.
3. Favaging of Shellfist Tables 14, 15)

Leaci.. shellfish items were most often bought in 5 pon í packages in Denver.
4. Methods of Preparing and Serving Shellfish (Table 16)

Frying was the most usual way of preparing shellpish in Denver. The typical establishment served four fifths of its shellfish fried.

As with fish, frying was the leading method of preparing shellfish in all ten cities of the study.
D. Portion Controlled Sea Food - Purchases, Attitudes, and Practices

1. Purchases: Type of Prepreparation (Tables 1, 17, 18, 19)

One sixth of all the establi shments in Denver bought portions during November, 1958.

Denver ranked sixth among the ten cities, in percentage of establishments buying portions.

In Denver, portions were most widely bought uncooked and breaded; and the quantity purchased was greater than tbat of any other type of prepreparation.

Almost half of the Denver purcbasers said that they were currently buying more portions than the year before. Forty-one per cent said they were buying about the same amount, wbile 7 per cent said they were buying less.

This trend towards an increasing use of por-
tions was not so strong in most cities. The trend was also notable in Springfield.
2. Attitudes Toward Portions (Tables 20, 21, 22, 23, 24)

Nearly all establishments said they were satisfied with the quality and condition of portions that they bought.

However, one sixth of the users of portions said they thought the quality of portions was poorer than that of other frozen processed fish. More than two thirds rated the quality as about the same, while 9 per cent considered the quality better.

While three fifths of the users specified no disadvantage to using portions, 25 per cent said portions were not economical; and 18 per cent said the quality was not as good.

Major advantages cited for portions included.

| $\%$ of <br> Users <br> Citing |
| :---: |
| 69 |
| 23 |
| 20 |
| 16 |
| 16 |

Users of portions generally thought their customers liked portions the same as other types of frozen processed fish. Fewer than 6 per cent said that their customers liked portions

## less than other types * frozen processed sed

 forn.3. Packaging of Portions (Tables 25, 26)

Denver purchasers tended to buy portions in smaller packages than purchasers in other cities. The average weight of a package of portions for the city was 4.7 pounds.

They also tended to buy individual portions of smaller size. The average weight of an individual portion was 3.8 ounces.

A large majority of establishments, in Denver and the other nine cities, said they were satisfied with the size of portions in the packages.
4. Methods of Preparing and Serving Portions (Tables 27, 28)

Frying was the most widely used method of preparing and serving portions in Denver, with 79 per cent of the establishments serving them this way. The average establishment served 61 per cent of its portions fried.

Frying was the leading method in nine of the ten cities of the study. The exception was Springfield, Massachusetts, where baking was the most popular method.

In Denver, the average establishment served 30 per cent baked.

Two thirds of the Denver establishments using portions cooked them while frozen.

5 Cost of Using Portions (Ta: 1e 29)
One third of the establishments usine portions suit they were more expensive than other forms of frozen processed fisn. Another third eonsidered them less expensive, while a third rated them about -re same.

Miscellaneous Find ngs About Portions
(Tables 30, 31)
Virtually all Denver establishments said they specified the kind of fist when ordering portions.

Only $S$ per cent of the users suggested any new portion items, not now available, which the: would like to have.
7. Nonusers of Portions (Table 32)

Establishments which used frozen processed sea food, but not portions, gave a number of reasons for not buying portions: they solu comparatively little fish, portions were too expensive, they served other types of fish.

Price also figured as a reason for not buying portions in Atlanta, Los Angeles. and Portland.
E. Supliers of Frozen Processed Sea Food (Tables $3 \hat{3}, 34,35,36$ )

Establishments in Denver tended to buy frozen processed sea food from sea food wholesalers, usually less than ten miles away, to have it delivered once a week, and to be satisfied with the services of the suppliers.

Sea food wholesalers supyl i \& per cent of the estak lishmets. while frozei food distributors accounted for another 12 per cent.

Main suppliers i: Denver wewe locatei less than $\mathbf{l}^{\text {r }}$ miles from the establishment, 83 per cent of the cases.

In 43 per cent of the cases, deliveries were made once a week, while deliveries were male from two to four times a week. in another 18 per cent of the establishments.

Only a small fraction of the purehasers said they could think of ways in which the suppliers could improve their services.
F. Expenditures for Frozen Processed Sea Food; Its Profitability (Tables 37, 38)

More than a third of the establishments reporting in Denver said that tbey spent less than $\$ 250$ for frozen processed sea food during the preceding twelve months. The highest figure reported fell between $\$ 30,000$ and $\$ 49,999$. Other establishments were between these two extremes, with the median coming at $\$ 500$.

More than two thirds of the profit-making establishments which expressed an opinion, considered frozen processed sea food more profitable than other high protein foods.
G. Government Inspection of Frozen Processed Sea Food - Awareness, Effect, and Attitudes
(Tables 39, 40, 41, 42)
Three fourths of the establishments in Denver were aware that they could buy frozen processed sea food, which had been inspeeted or graded by the United States Government.

Of those who were unaware, the majority said they would buy about the same amount, if Government inspected sea food were available.

Of the establishments aware that they could buy
Government inspected or graded sea food, almost all had bought some. When purchasers were asked if the inspection had affected the mount of frozen processed sea food which they bought, 9 per cent said the inspection had caused them to buy more.
H. Nonusers of Frozen Processed Sea Food; Cold Storage Facilities (Tables 43, 44, 45)

Most nonisers in Denver said they had never bought frozen processed sea food, the main reason given being that they sold little or no fish

Findings regarding cold storage facilities among nonusers in Denver may be summarized as follows:

Total Nonusers of Frozen Frocessed Sea Food 100

Have cold storage facilities $\quad \underline{0}$
Don't use sea food at all 41

Use sea food, but not frozen processed sea food 19

No cold storage facilities 40

## DETAILED FINDINGS

## Table 1

DID THE ESTABLISHMENT BUY SEA FOOD IN THE PRECEDING TWELVE MONT＇HS？
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Eating Places | Institutions | Less <br> Than <br> \＄10，000 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 100,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Over } \end{aligned}$ |
| Total Establishments | （216） | （130） | （86） | （87） | （56） | （33） | （40） |
|  | 中 | 早 | \％ | \％ | \％ | 中 | 里 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes，bought sea food | 69.6 | 63.8 | 93.0 | 52.3 | 826 | 76.2 | 93.8 |
| Bought frozen processed sea food | 58.8 | 53.4 | 80.2 | 39，6 | 65.1 | 71.4 | 93.8 |
| Bought frozen processed fish | 43.1 | 40.2 | 54.7 | 294 | 42.2 | 60．3 | 69.2 |
| Bought frozen processed shellfish | 32.5 | 37.9 | 10.5 | 18.3 | 29.4 | 49.2 | 64.6 |
| Bought portions | 16.4 | 13.2 | 29.1 | 8.6 | 26.6 | 17.5 | 21.5 |
| No，did not buy sea food | 30.4 | 36.2 | 7.0 | 47.7 | 17.4 | 23.8 | 6.2 |

Table 2

DID THE ESTABLISHMENT BUY FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD IN THE PRECEDING TWELVE MONTHS?
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Institutions | Less Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100.000 \\ \text { ard } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishments Purchasing Sea Food in Preceding 12 Months | (166) | (86) | (80) | (52) | (48) | (28) | (38) |
|  | \% | 号 | \% | \% | \% | \% | 呂 |
|  | $\underline{100.0}$ | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, bought frozen processed sea food | 84.4 | 83.8 | 86.3 | 75.7 | 78.9 | 93.8 | 100.0 |
| No, did not buy frozen processed sea food | 15.6 | 16.2 | 13.7 | 24.3 | 21.1 | 6.2 | - |

According to Sales Volume

|  | Total |  | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 40,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Usere of Frozen Processed Fish | (102) | (52) | (50) |  | q | \& | $\underline{1}$ |
|  | \& | L | \& | $\frac{\text { Ocean Perch }}{\text { Cooked }}$ | 1.6 | 2.9 | - |
|  | 100.0* | 100.0 | 100.0 | Fillets | 26.2 | 33.7 | 16.9 |
| $\frac{\text { Catifish }}{\text { Fillets }}$ | 1.6 | - | 3.6 | $\frac{\text { Red Snapper }}{\text { Fillets }}$ | 5.3 | 5.8 | 4.8 |
| Steaks | . 5 | 1.0 | - | Raw | 3.7 | - | 8.4 |
| cont |  |  |  | Salmon |  |  |  |
| cooked | 1.6 | 2.9 | ${ }^{-}$ | Cooked | 1.6 | 2.9 | - |
| Fiblets | 12.8 | 14.4 | 10.8 | Fillets | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.2 |
| Qumas | . 5 | 1.0 | - | Steaks | 20.9 | 18.3 | 24.1 |
| Prpaded fillets | . 5 | - | 1.2 | Haw | 11.8 | 3.8 | 21.7 |
| Rsw | 1.6 | - | 3.6 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Smelts |  |  |  |
| Flab Cakes |  |  |  | Raw | 1.6 | 2.9 | - |
| Cooked and breaded | 1.6 | 2.9 | - |  |  |  |  |
| Flounder |  |  |  | $\frac{\text { Sole }}{\text { Fillets }}$ | 24.1 | 17.3 | 32.5 |
| couked | 1.6 | 2.9 | - |  |  |  |  |
| Fille ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 1.6 | - | 3.6 | $\frac{\text { Swordfish }}{\text { Cooked }}$ | 1.6 | 2.9 | - |
| Fiddo k |  |  |  | Steaks | 1. | 2.9 | , |
| Coritel | - 0 | 二? | - | 'furnk |  | - | 2.4 |
| Fillets | $\pm$ | 10.6 | 1.4 | R3w | $\cdots$ | - | 2.4 |
| Stwhes | $\cdots$ | - | $t$ O |  |  |  |  |
| Raw | f | - ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | - | $\frac{\text { Tront }}{\text { Riw }}$ | 43 | 2.9 | 6.0 |
| Falibut |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cookn ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $\cdots$ | cis | $\bullet$ | $\frac{\text { Whatefish }}{\text { Fint }}$ |  |  |  |
| Errat. | 11 | $\therefore 4$ | - | Fillets | 1 r | - | 3 |
| Fille: | F. $=$ | 14 | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |  |
| ataras | : 1 + | 41.4 | ; | Whit 2 th |  |  |  |
|  | + |  | - | Fluter | 5 | 0 | 1. |
| Var |  |  | - | Raw | $5_{1}$ | 0 | - |
| Friw | L' ${ }^{\prime}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

(a) Purchases were not reported in quantities large enough to compute meaningful figures.
(b) Less than half a pound.


## Table 5

## SATISFACTION OR DISSATISFACTION WITH PREPREPARATION OF FROZEN PROCESSED FLSH

|  | Total Users <br> (1) $\qquad$ |  | Total Users <br> (1) $\qquad$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ¢ |  | \% |
| Total Purchases of Cod | 100.0 | Total Purchases of Ocean Perch | 100.0 |
| Prefer more prepreparation of cod | 6.3 | Prefer more prepreparation of ocean perch | 7.7 |
| Prefer less prepreparation of cod | - | Prefer less frepreparation of ocean perch | 5.8 |
| Prefer prepreparation as it is | 90.6 | Prefer prepreparation as it is | 85.5 |
| No sumwer | 3.1 |  |  |
|  |  | Total Purchases of Salmon | 11.0 |
| Total Purchases of Haddock | 100.0 |  |  |
| Prefer more prepreparation of haddock | 5.4 | Prefer more prepreparation of salmon Prefer less prepreparation of salmon | ĺc.l |
| Prefor less prepreparation of haddock | - | Prefer prepreparation as it is | 71.2 |
| Prelen frepreparation as it is No ancwer | $\begin{aligned} & 83.8 \\ & 10.8 \end{aligned}$ | No answer | 16.7 |
|  |  | Total Purchases of Sole | 100.0 |
| Total Purchases of Halibut | 100.0 |  |  |
|  |  | Prefer more prepreparation of sole |  |
| Prefer more prepreparation of halibut | 97 | Prefer less prepreparation of sole | - |
| Prefer less prepreparation of halibut | 4.1 | Prefer prepreparation as it is | 95.6 |
| Prefer prepreparation as it is | 79.3 | No answer | 4.4 |

(1) The percentages shown in the body of the table are computed on the total number of purchases of each species of fish

Many users bought more than one species. Some establishments also bought a species prepared in two different ways. For example, haddock fillets and haddock steaks. This was counted as two purchases of the species.

Because purchases of many species were few in number, the species are not included in the table.

Table 6

SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION
WITH QUALITY AND CONDITION
OF FROZEN PROCESSED FISH


## Table 7

PACKAGE SIZES OF FROZEN PROCESSED FISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958 AND AVERAGE NUMBER OF SERVINGS PER POUND(1)

|  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  |  | \% |
|  | t | Total Purchasers of Halibut Fillets |  | 100.0 |
| Total Purchasers of cod Fillets | 100.0 | 1 pound packages |  | 5.8 2.9 |
|  |  | 3 pound packages |  | 8.9 |
| Packages less than 1 pound | 12.5 | 4 pound packages |  | 2.9 |
| 1 pound packages | 25.0 | 5 pound packages |  | 53.0 |
| 5 pound packages | 37.5 | 17 pound package |  | 2.9 |
| 15 pound packages | 8.3 | 30 pound package |  | 2.9 |
| 17 pound packages | 4.2 | 40 pound package |  | 8.9 |
| 25 pound packages | 8.3 | 50 pound package | es and over | 8.9 |
| No answer | 4.2 | No answer |  | 2.9 |
| Average number of servings per pound | 3.7 | Average number per pound | of servings | 2.9 |


| Total Purchasers of Haddock Fillet | 100.0 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Packages less than 1 pound | 11.6 |
| 1 pound packages | 116 |
| 4 pound packages | 3.8 |
| 5 pound packages | 50.0 |
| 15 pound packages | 3.8 |
| 17 pound packages | 3.8 |
| 2 pound packages | 11.6 |
| N answer | 3.8 |
| Average number of servines for pound | 45 |


(i) The table s? figures for those species and types of prepreparation whith accur most often in the city. Sometit. Uhtres are shown for packige sizes but not average number of servinge per pound. In these rases the data un servings per pound is limited.

The montaree in the bedy of the table are besed on the number of establishmerts whith bought one pecies of fish, preprepared in one manner.

Table 7
(Contd.)
PACKAGE SIZES OF FROZEN PROCESSED FISH BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958 AND AVERAGE NMMBER OF SEEVINGS FER POUND(1)

(1) The thble shows figures for those species and types of prepreparation which occur most. of ter in the city Somet imes figures are shown for fa kage sizes but not werage umbre gervine per purit Ir these casea the data on survings per ! wd is limited
The percentages in the body of the table are based on the number of establishments which bought one species of fish, preprepared in oue manter.

Table $\%$

SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION
WITY TYPES AND SIZES OF FROZEN PROCESSEL FISH PACKAGES

Gatistized
Dissatisfied

Dori＇＇know

20 20：－ater

Table 9

FFRCENTAGE OF FROZEN PROCESSED FISH SERVED FRIED，RROILED，BAKED，AND IN OTHRR WAYS
According to Sales Volune

|  | Total | Less <br> Than \＄10，000 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\$ 40,000$ and Over |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Fish | （102） | （30） | （22） | （50） |
|  | 中 | $\underline{6}$ | 中 | 中 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Establishments Serving Fried |  |  |  |  |
| None fried | 9.6 | 3.4 | 15.2 | 10.8 |
| 1－14\％ | 2.6 | 1.7 | － | 2.4 |
| 15－34\％ | 4.3 | － | 2.2 | 8.4 |
| 35－64\％ | 21.4 | 22.4 | 28．3 | 16.9 |
| 65－84\％ | 11.8 | 5.2 | 10.9 | 16.9 |
| Over $84 \%$ | 49.2 | 62.1 | 43.4 | 43.4 |
| Don＇t know，no answer，refused | 2.1 | 5.2 | － | 1.2 |
| Average percentage served | 67.5 | 70.4 | 62.8 | 04.1 |
| Estatishments Serving Broiled 8480 |  |  |  |  |
| None broiled | 80.8 | 87.9 | 89.1 | 71.1 |
| 1－14\％ | 3.2 | 5.2 | － | 3.6 |
| 15－34\％ | 1.4 | 1.7 | 8.7 | 8.4 |
| 35－04\％ | 5.6 | － | 2.2 | 12.1 |
| 55－84\％ | － | － | － | － |
| Over $84 \%$ | $1 . \dot{6}$ | － | － | 3.6 |
| Don＇t know，no answer，refused | 2.1 | 5.2 | － | 1.2 |
| Average percentice served | b． 3 | .9 | 3.2 | 11.8 |
| Establishments Serving Baked |  |  |  |  |
| None takel | 51.3 | 62.1 | 47.8 | 45.8 |
| 1－14\％ | 4.3 | － | 22 | 8． 4 |
| 15－34th | $10 . \overrightarrow{1}$ | 6.4 | 22 | 18.1 |
| $3-4.4$ | 24.1 | 20.0 | 348 | 205 |
| 景－可山妥 | － 5 | － | － | 1.2 |
| $0 \% \mathrm{rec}$ | 7.0 | 5.2 | 13.0 | 48 |
| Ina＇t kinw，：10 arswer．reflwert | 2.1 | 5.2 | － | 12 |
| 4 Prate ；reptrage－erves | 2.2 | 17．e． | S． 0 | 20. |
| Fot liuhn ats servitap ars other waya$\qquad$ |  |  |  |  |
| －Dre ${ }^{\text {r }}$ \％sther bry | 14.5 21 | － | － | 428 48 |
| －－\％\％ | ． 5 | － | － | 1.2 |
| － 1 | 11 | － | $4 \div$ | － |
| 1．－－${ }^{\text {a }}$ 年 | － | － | － | － |
|  | － | － | － | － |
|  | C． 1 | 5.2 | － | 12 |
| Averake zercortite erved | ． 8 | － | $2=$ | ． 7 |

HOW PROCESSED BEFORE PURCHASE

Total
Total Users of Frozen
Processed Shellfish
(63)

E
$100.0^{*}$

| Clams |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Cooked | -7 |
| Chopped | 2.1 |
| Raw; clean | 5.7 |


| Crabs |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Cooked | .7 |
| Crab legs cooked | .7 |
| Raw; whole, clean | 2.1 |
|  |  |
| Lobster |  |
| Cleaned and deheaded tails | 19.1 |
| Raw; clean | 8.5 |


| Oysters |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Cooked | .7 |
| Breaded | 4.3 |
| Canned | .7 |
| Raw; clean | 23.5 |
| Scallops |  |
| Cooked | 2.1 |
| Breaded | 4.3 |
| Raw; elean | 28.4 |

Shrimp
Cooked
Breaded
Patties
Cooked and breaded
Deheaded, raw in shell
Raw; clean, deheaded
shelled and deveined

```
49.6
    2.1
    1.4
    2.8
6.8
```

*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

## Table 11

QUANIITY OF FROZEN PROCESSED SHELIFISH BOUGHY IN NOVEMBER, 1958

|  | Total Pounds | All <br> Establishments | User <br> Establishments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clams |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 10 | (a) | 10.0 |
| Chopped | 120 | (b) | 40.0 |
| Raw. clean | 126 | (b) | 15.8 |
| Crats |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 60 | (b) | 00.0 |
| Crab legs cooked | 60 | (b) | 60.0 |
| Row; whole, clean | 789 | 1.8 | 20.3 |
| Lukster |  |  |  |
| Cleaned and deheaded tails | 21,046 | 48.5 | 779.5 |
| Raw; clean | 1,288 | 3.0 | 107.4 |
| Oysters |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 5 | (a) | 5.0 |
| Ereaded | 90 | (b) | 15.0 |
| Canned | (a) | ( | - |
| Raw; clean | 732 | 1.7 | 38.5 |
| Scallops |  |  |  |
| Cooked | 6 | (a) | 2.0 |
| Breaded | 366 | . 8 | 61.0 |
| Raw; clean | 2,272 | $5 \cdot 2$ | 56.8 |
|  |  |  |  |
| C.oked | 5 | (a) | 5.0 |
| Preaded | 二. 90 | 0.7 | 41.7 |
| Patties | (a) | - | - |
| Cooked and breaded | (a) | - | - |
| Deheaded, raw in shell | 1,000 | 3.7 | 405.0 |
| Raw: crean, deheaded, shelled, teverned | 15.570 | 35.9 | 236.0 |
| (a) Purchases were nct reported in quantities |  |  |  |


|  | Total <br> Users |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Purchases of Lobster |  |  |
| Prefer more prepreparation of lobster |  |  |
| Prefer less prepreparation of lobster |  |  |
| Prefer prepreparation as it is |  |  |
| No answer |  |  |

(1) The percentages shown in the body of the table are computed on the total number of purchases of each species of shellfish.

Many establishments bought more than one species. Some establishments also bought a species prepared in two different ways. For example, shrimp breaded and shrimp cooked. This was counted as two purchases of the species.

Because purchases of some species--clams, abalone, and others-were few in number, the species are not included in the table.

## Table 13

SATISFACTION AND DISSAT ISFACTIO:
WTTH QUALITY AND CONDITION OF
FROZEN PROCESSED SHELLFISH

SA ${ }^{*}$ stras
Etseatiofied

Dos': know

No answer

## Table 14

## PaCKage sizes of frozen frocessed shellfish bought in november, 1958 and average number of servings per pound (1)

|  | Total |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\underline{L}$ |  | $\underline{L}$ |
| Total Furchasers of Lobster Tails - Cleaned and Deheaded | 100.0 | Total Purchasers of Shrimp - Breaded | 100.0 |
|  |  | 1 Found packages | 4.3 |
| Packages less than 1 found | 33.4 | 2 pound packages | 22.9 |
| 12 pound packages | 3.7 | 3 pound packages | 21.4 |
| 20 pound packages | 18.5 | 4 pound packages | 5.7 |
| 24 pound packages | 11.1 | 5 pound packages | 41.4 |
| 50 pound rackages and over | 11.1 | 10 pound packages | 4.3 |
| No answer | 22.2 |  |  |
|  |  | Average number of servings fer found | 3.4 |
| Total Purchasers of Scallops - Raw | 100.0 |  |  |
|  |  | Total Purchasers of Shrimp - Raw | 100.0 |
| 1 pound packages | 7.5 |  |  |
| 4 pound packages | 2.5 | 1 pound packages | 6.1 |
| 5 pound packages | $80 . \mathrm{C}$ | 3 pound packages | 7.6 |
| 8 pound packages | 7.5 | 5 pound packages | 75.7 |
| 50 pound packages and over | 2.5 | 50 pound packages and over | 10.6 |
| Average number of servings per pound | 4.5 | Average number of servings per pound | 3.9 |

(1) The table shows figures for those species and types of prepreparation which occur most often in the city.

Sometimes fisures are shown for package sizes but not average number of servings per pound. In these cases the data on servings per pound is limited

The percentages in the body of the table are based on the number of establishments which bought one species
of shellfish, preprepared in one manner.

## Table 15

SAT LSFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION WITH TYPES AND SIZES OF FROZEN PROCESSED SHELLFISH PACKAGES

Satisfied
Dissatisfied

Inon't know

No answer
91.5 2.1 2.1

Table 16

PERCENTAGE OF FROZEN PROCESSED SHELLFISB SERVED FRIED, BROILED, BAKED, AND IN OTHER WAYS


Jote: Percentages, other than average percentages, are based on total establistments interviewed. Average fercentages are computed by assigning the cases in any one of the six intervals to the midpoint of the interval, and taking an average of all the cases.

Table 17

TYPES OF PORTIONS BOUGHT
IN NOVEMBER, 1958

|  | Total |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Portions | (42) |
|  | 中 |
|  | $100.0^{*}$ |
| kei breaded | 12.8 |
| ked-plain | - |
| ooked - breaded | 68.2 |
| ooked - plain | 28.5 |

Table 18

QUANTITY OF PORTIONS BOUGHT IN NOVEMBER, 1958

|  | Total <br> Pounds | Average Number of Pounds |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | All | User |
|  |  | Establishments | Establishments |
| Cooked - breaded | 390 | . 9 | $43 \cdot 3$ |
| Cooked - plain | (a) | - | - |
| Uncooked - breaded | 1,603 | 3.7 | 33.4 |
| Uncooked - plain | 784 | 1.8 | 39.2 |

(a) Purchases were not reported in quantities large enough to compute meaningful figures.

* Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

Table 19

AMOUNT OF PORTIONS BOUGHT BY ESTABLISHMENTS, AS COMPARED TO THE PREVIOUS YEAR


Total Users of Portions (42)

Use more now
Use about the same
46.5
40.9
7.0

Don't know

Table 20

SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION WITH
QUALTTY AND CONDITION OF PORTIONS
$\begin{array}{r}\text { Total Purchases of Types of } \\ \text { Portions, November, } 1958 \\ \hline\end{array}$
里
100.0
98.7
-

Don't know
1.3

Note: Figures are based on total purchases of types of portions. Some establishments bought more than one type.

Table 21

IS THE QUALITY OF PORTIONS BETTER THAN THAT OF OTHER
FROZEN PROCESSED FISH - FOR WHAT REASONS?
'Total

Total Users of Portions (42)
(42)
右
100.0

```
Say portions better
    Urif"rmm contrulled serving - always same gmount
    Dor'+ know - no answer
P-%orr quarer - inferior quality, car't tell
    what is in them
    Dry - dry out when cooked, not flexible
```

About the same
Den': knsiw

## Table 22

ADVANTAGES OF USIIIG PORTIONS

Total Users of Portions, November, 1958
Convenience, ease of preparation - save labor,
already prepared
Can control food cost better - know profit ..... 22.5
Fast, timesaving - quicker to serve, prepare ..... 19.7
Size of portions - uniform, controlled servings, the right size serving ..... 15.5
No bones ..... 15.5
Economical - no waste ..... 11.3
Customers like them ..... 9.9
11 others ..... 2.8
No advantages ..... 4.2

## Table 23

## DISADVANTAGES OF USING PORTIONS

|  | Total |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Portions | (42) |
|  | \% |
|  | 100.0* |
| Not economical - more expensive to buy | 25.4 |
| Quality not as good - not always sure what's in them | 18.3 |
| Lack flavor - not as tasty, sometimes dry | 4.2 |
| Portions wrong size - too small | 1.4 |
| All others | 1.4 |
| No disadvantages | 60.6 |
| Don't know, no answer | 4.2 |

DO ESTABLISHMENTS THINK CUSTOMERS PREFER PORTIONS TO OTHER

## FROZEN PROCESSED FISH - FOR WHAT RFASONS?

|  | Total |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Portions | (42) |
|  | \% |
|  | 100.0 |
| Think customers like portions better | $22.6 *$ |
| Uniform controlled servings - always the same amount | 12.7 |
| Customers order - seem to like them | 5.6 |
| Faster quicker to serve - no waiting | 4.2 |
| Attractive - eye appealing | 4.2 |
| No bones - safer for children | 1.4 |
| Think customers like portions less | 5.6 |
| Lack flavor - not as tasty | 4.2 |
| Don't know - no answer | 1.4 |
| Think customers like portions about the same | 53.5 |
| Don't know | 18.3 |

* Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

Table 25

AVERAGE WEIGHT OF PORTI ONS AND AVERAGE NUMBER
OF SERVINGS PER PACKAGE


Note: Average weight jf portions dues riJt equal averaee weight. of individua servings since some operators otained more than are serving from a portion, while zthe: operators used more than one fortion for a servine.

Table 26

SATISFACTION WITH THE SIZE OF
PORTIONS IN A PACKAGE

Total
Total Users of Portions

## Table 27

PERCENTAGE OF PORTIONS SERVED FRIED, BROILED, BAKED, AND IN OTHER WAYS

|  | Total |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Portions | (43) | Total Users of Portions | (43) |
|  | \% |  | \% |
|  | 100.0 |  | 100.0 |
| Establishments Serving Fried |  | Establisuments Serving Baked |  |
| None fried | 21.1 | None baked | 49.3 |
| 1-14\% | - | 1-14\% | 1.4 |
| 15-34\% | 2.8 | 15-34\% | 16.9 |
| 35-64\% | 18.3 | 35-64\% | 9.9 |
| 65-84\% | 9.9 | 65-84\% | 1.4 |
| Over 84\% | 47.9 | Over $84 \%$ | 21.1 |
| Average percentage served | 61.4 | Average percentage served | 29.7 |
| Establishments Serving Broiled |  | Establishments Serving in Other Ways |  |
| None broiled | 88.8 | None in ther ways | 100.0 |
| 1-14\% | 4.2 | 1-24\% | - |
| 15-34\% | 5.6 | 15-34\% | - |
| 35-64\% | 1.4 | 35-64\% | - |
| 65-84\% | - | 65-84\% | - |
| Over 84\% | - | Over 84\% | - |
| Average percentage served | 2.4 | Average percentage served | - |

Table 28

DO ESTABLISHMENTS COOK PORTIONS
WHILE SI'ILL FROZEN?


Table 29

COST OF USING PORTIONS, AS COMPARED TO OTHER FROZEN PROCESSED FISH
AND REASONS WHY PORTIONS ARE THOUGHT MORE OR LLESS EXPENSIVE
And


Total
Total Users of Portions (42)
$\frac{\text { Say portions more expensive }}{\text { Price includes processing and packaging - preprepa- } 31.0}$
ration would tend to raise cost 9.9
Cost is more for amount of serving $\quad 1.4$
Don't know - no answer 19-7
Portions less expensive
labor saving - requires no preparation
$\frac{32.4^{*}}{18.3}$
Time saving
Uniform controlled servings
Cuts cost of preparation
Less or no waste
Don't know - no answer
About the same
14.1
4.2
4.2
1.4
7.0

Don't know

* Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.


## Table 30

WHEN ORDERING PORTIONS FROM SUPPLIERS,
DO ESTABLISHMENTS SPECIFY
THE KIND OF FISH?

## Total Users of Portions

Specify kind of fish
Do not specify kind of fish

No answer
94.4

## Table 31

WOULD THE ESTABLISHMENTS LIKE TO HAVE OTHER PORTION CONTROLLED SEA FOOD ITEMS NOT NOW AVAIIABLE?
WOUII THE ESIABLISHWNTS LIKE TO HAVE OTHER PORTION
lonellon
Yes, would like other items ..... 5.1
No, would not like other items ..... 76.99.4
No answer ..... 8.6

## Table 32


*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

Table 3

TYPES OF SUPPLIER PROVIDING FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD TO ESTABLISHMENTS
According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10,000 . \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | （142） | （40） | （38） | （64） |
|  | c | 中 | 中 | 中 |
|  | 100．0＊ | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Sea food processors | － | － | － | － |
| Sea food wholesalers | 84.3 | 79.5 | 71.8 | 96.2 |
| Frozen food distributors | 10.6 | 6.4 | 16.9 | 9.4 |
| All other，grocery stores， supermarkets | 9.0 | 19.2 | 8.5 | 1.9 |
| No answer | ． 8 | － | 2.8 | － |

＊Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question．

## Table 34

## DISTANCE OF ESTABLISHMENT FROM MAIN SUPPLIER OF FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD

## According to Lacation.

|  | Total | Out of Central Business District | In <br> Central <br> Business <br> District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (142) | (116) | (26) |
|  | \% | \% | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Less than 10 miles | 83.1 | 77.6 | 100.0 |
| 10-50 miles | 16.1 | 21.4 | - |
| 51-100 miles | - | - | - |
| More than 100 miles | - | - | - |
| Don't mnow | . 4 | . 5 | - |
| No answer | .4 | . 5 | - |

Table 35

FREQUENCY OF DELTVERIES OF FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  |  | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Public Eating Places | Institutions | Less Than \$10,000 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (142) | (73) | (69) | (40) | (38) | (64) |
|  | q | \% | \% | \% | q | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Every day | 11.0 | 14.5 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 5.6 | 21.7 |
| 2-4 times per week | 17.7 | 24.2 | - | 7.7 | 26.8 | 18.9 |
| Once a week | 42.7 | 42.0 | 44.9 | 48.7 | 25.4 | 50.0 |
| 2-3 times per month | 16.1 | 7.5 | 39.1 | 18.0 | 29.6 | 5.7 |
| Once a month | 4.7 | 3.8 | 7.3 | 5.1 | 7.0 | 2.8 |
| Less than once a month | 4.3 | 3.2 | 7.3 | 11.5 | 1.4 | . 9 |
| Don't know, no answer | 3.5 | 4.8 | - | 7.7 | 4.2 | - |

Table 36

CAN SUPPLIERS OF FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD IMPROVE SERVICES TO ESTABLISHMENTS:
According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | Less <br> Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (142) | (40) | (38) | (64) |
|  | 中 | \% | \% | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, can improve services | 3.9 | 5.2 | - | 5.7 |
| No, cannot improve services | 89.4 | 87.1 | 95.8 | 86.8 |
| Don't know | 6.3 | 7.7 | 4.2 | 6.6 |
| No answer | 4 | - | - | . 9 |

## Table 37

AMOUNT SPENT FOR FROZEN FROCESSED SEA FOOD DURING PRECEDING TWELVE MONTHS
According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | Less <br> Than <br> $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (142) | (40) | (38) | (64) |
|  | q | \% | \$ | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Spent under \$ 250 | 38.0 | 78.1 | 45.9 | 8.2 |
| \$250-499 | 11.9 | 12.2 | 12.5 | 11.5 |
| \$500-999 | 15.1 | 7.3 | 33.3 | 13.1 |
| \$1,000-2,499 | 21.4 | - | 8.3 | 41.0 |
| \$2,500-4,999 | 4.0 | - | - | 8.2 |
| \$5,000-9,999 | 3.2 | 2.4 | - | 4.9 |
| \$10,000-14,999 | 2.4 | - | - | 4.9 |
| \$15,000-29,999 | 1.6 | - | - | $3 \cdot 3$ |
| \$30,000-49,999 | 2.4 | - | - | 4.9 |
| \$50,000-99,999 | - | - | - | - |
| \$100,000 and over | - | - | - | - |

## PROF TTABILITY TO ESTABLISHMENTS OF FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD AND OTHER HIGH PROTEIN FOODS

According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | Less <br> Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Users of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (142) | (40) | (38) | (64) |
|  | \& | \% | 中 | 中 |
|  | 100.0* | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| itable than other |  |  |  |  |
|  | 35.3 | 33.3 | 32.4 | 38.7 |
| le than sea food more profitable | 7.1 | 3.8 | 8.5 | 8.5 |
|  | 5.1 | 9.0 | - | 5.7 |
| in profitability | 2.7 | 3.8 | 1.4 | 2.8 |
| le than sea food | 2.7 | 3.8 | 4.2 | . 9 |
| le than sea food | 1.2 | 3.8 | - | - |
| $r$ foods more |  |  |  |  |
| food | 2.4 | - | 4.2 | 2.8 |
| ts | 19.6 | 19.2 | 23.0 | 17.9 |
|  | 26. 3 | 29.5 | 25.4 | 24.5 |
|  | 3.9 | 1.3 | 9.9 | 1.9 |

* Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.

Table 39

DO THE ESTABLISHMENTS KNOW THEY CAN BUY GOVERMMENT
INSFECTED OR GRADED FROZEN FROCESSED SEA FOOD.
According to Type of Establishment

Yes, know they can
No. do not know they can

## Public

Places Instititions

## Total Users of Frozen

 Processed Sea Food| Total | Public <br> Eating <br> Plaves | $\underline{\text { Instititions }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $(142)$ | $(73)$ | $(09)$ |
| $\underline{t}$ | $\underline{q}$ | $\underline{q}$ |
| 100.0 | $\underline{100.0}$ | $\underline{100.0}$ |
| 74.9 | 72.0 | 82.6 |
| 25.1 | 28.0 | 17.4 |

## Table 40

DO THE ESTABLISHMENTS BUY GOVERNMENT INSPECTED OR GRADED FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD?

> According to Type of Establishment

| Total Establishments Knowing Total Places Institutions |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Establishments Knowing Government Inspected or Graded Frazen Processed Sea Food Was Available | (111) | (54) | (57) |
|  | \$ | \% | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, do buy | 969 | 96.3 | 98.2 |
| No, do not buy | 3.1 | 3.7 | 1.8 |

REASONS ESTABLISHMENTS BUY GOVERNMENT LNSPECTED OR GRADED FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD

## According to Type of Establishment

|  | Total | Public Eating Places | Institutions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Purchasers of Government Inspected or Graded Sea Food | (108) | (52) | (56) |
|  | \& | \% | \% |
|  | 100.0* | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Only type available - it's all inspected, that's what supplier carries | 34.1 | 35.7 | 30.4 |
| Best quality - use better products, more uniform quality | 23.8 | 32.6 | 3.6 |
| Government inspected foods are safe - pure, fresh, clean, no germs or disease | 22.7 | 19.4 | 30.4 |
| Prefer Government inspected - wouldn't buy any other | 10.8 | . 8 | 33.9 |
| Public demands it | 4.9 | 7.0 | - |
| Government/law requires it | 4.9 | 7.0 | - |
| Company demands that it's bought. | 2.7 | 2.3 | 3.6 |
| All others | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.6 |
| Don't know, no answer | 2.2 | 3.1 | - |

* Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.


## Table 42

HAS GOVERNMENT INSPECTION AFFECTED THE AMOUNT OF FROZEN
PROCESSED SEA FOOD BOUGHT BY THE ESTABLISHMENT?
According to Type of Establishment

|  | Public <br> Eating <br> Total Users of Governmert <br> Inspected Frozen <br> Processed Sea Food | (108) | (52) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## IF GOVERNMENT INSPECTED OR GRADED FROZEN

PROCESSED SEA FOOD WERE AVAILABLE WOULD
THE ESTABLISHMEIVT BUY MORE OR LESS?

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Total Establishments Not Know- } \\
\text { ing Government Inspected or } \\
\text { Graded Frozen Processed } \\
\text { Sea Food Was Available } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
$$

| Say they would buy more | - |
| :--- | :---: |
| Say they would buy less | - |
| About the same | 85.9 |
| Don't know | 9.4 |
| No answer | 4.7 |

REASONS FOR STTOPPIIG USE OR FOR NEVER USING

Total
Total Nonusers of Frozen Processed Sea Food
(74)

最
100.0

Have served frozen processed sea food before
$11.1^{*}$
No demand - didn't sell enough, no volume, customers prefer other foods
Unable to handle preparation - didn't have the help
10.6

More expensive than other forms of fish

Have not served frozen processed sea food before
B4.9*
Sell little or no fish - no demand, call for it, not T2.t
in that business
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { in that business } & 5.0 \\ \text { No storage facilities - no freezer }\end{array}$
No storage facilities - no freezer
Unable to handle preparation - no equipment, not
enough room, no time, would need extra help
Just opened, don't know what I'll sell
4.5

Just opened, don't know what I'll sell fish fresh
fish available all year
2.8

All others
45
Don't know, no answer

Don't know

No answer

* Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.


## Table 45

DO ESTABLISHMENTS HAVE COLD STORAGE FACILITIES FOR KEEFING FROZEN PROCESSEL SEA FOOD?
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Fublic Eating Places | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishments | (216) | (130) | (86) | (87) | (56) | (33) | (40) |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \& | E | \% | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes, have cold storage facilities | 76.5 | 73.8 | 87.2 | 67.0 | 87.2 | 74.6 | 89.2 |
| No, do not have cold storage facilities | 22.6 | 25.6 | 10.5 | 33.0 | 12.8 | 23.8 | 6.2 |
| No answer | . 9 | . 6 | 2.3 | - | - | 1.6 | 4.6 |
| Average capacity, in cubic feet | 47.6 | 45.1 | 54.5 | 13.1 | 21.2 | 110.5 | 131.8 |

## Table 46

DO ESTABLISHMENTS HAVE COLD STORAGE FACILITIES FOR KEEPING FROZEN PROCESSED SEA FOOD?
According to Nonusers of Sea Food and Users Not Using Frozen Processed Sea Food

|  | Total | Nonusers of $\qquad$ | Users Not <br> Using <br> Frozen <br> Processed <br> Sea Food |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Nonusers of Frozen Processed Sea Food | (74) |  |  |
|  | \% | q | q |
|  | 100.0 | 73.7 | 26.3 |
| Yes, have cold storage facilities | 60.3 | 40.7 | 19.6 |
| No, do not have cold storage facilities | 39.7 | 33.0 | 6.7 |

## DIS'TRIBUTION OF SAMPLE

(Tables a through i contain classification data regarding operations of the establishments)

Table a

TOTAL RECEIPTS FROM MEALS SERVED DURING 1957 OR LAST FISCAL YEAR
According to Type of Establishment

|  | Total | Public Eating Places | Institutions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Establishments | (216) | (130) | (86) |
|  | \$ | \% | \% |
| Total Receipts | 100.0 | $\underline{100.0}$ | 100.0 |
| Less than \$10,000 | 45.4 | 47.9 | 34.9 |
| \$10,000-39,999 | 25.1 | 23.9 | 30.2 |
| \$40,000-99,999 | 14.5 | 14.1 | 16.3 |
| \$100,000 and over | 15.0 | 14.1 | 18.6 |

Table b

AMOUNT ESTABLISFMENTS SFENT FOR FOOD DURING PREVIOUS TWELVE MONTHS
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Estatilishment |  | ..... Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | LessThan$\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 100,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Over } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | Eating |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Places | Institutions |  |  |  |  |
| Total Establishments | (216) | (130) | (86) | (87) | (56) | (33) | (40) |
|  | \% | 中 | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Spent under \$1,000 | 10.2 | 11.1 | 7.0 | 24.2 | - | 3.0 | 4.4 |
| \$1,000-2,499 | 9.5 | 10.4 | 7.0 | 24.2 | 2.4 | 3.0 | - |
| \$2,500-4,999 | 17.6 | 18.8 | 140 | 304 | 17.1 | 8.9 | 6.5 |
| \$5,000-9,999 | 9.1 | 7.7 | 14.0 | 13.7 | 17.1 | 3.0 | - |
| \$10,000-14,999 | 10.7 | 10.4 | 11.6 | 4.5 | 31.7 | 8.9 | 2.1 |
| \$15,000-29,999 | 123 | 14.5 | 4.6 | 3.0 | 29.3 | 17.5 | 6.5 |
| \$30,000-49,999 | 8.6 | 9.7 | 4.6 | - | 2.4 | 35.1 | 6.5 |
| \$50,000-99,999 | 11.8 | 10.4 | 16.3 | - | - | 11.7 | 39.2 |
| \$100,000-249,999 | 8.6 | 6.3 | 16.3 | - | - | 8.9 | 28.3 |
| \$250,000 and over | 1.6 | . 7 | 4.6 | - | - | - | 6.5 |

## Table c

PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL OPERATING COST SPENI FOR FOOD IN PREVIOUS TWELVE MONTHS
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public } \\ & \text { Eating } \\ & \text { Places } \end{aligned}$ | Institutions | Less Than $\$ 10,000$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total Establishments | (216) | (130) | (86) | (87) | (56) | (33) | (40) |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | 中 | \% | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | $\underline{100.0}$ | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Spent under 5\% for food | 4.7 | 5.5 | 2.0 | 12.0 | - ${ }^{-6}$ | 2.9 | - |
| 5-14\% | 7.5 | 5.5 | 14.3 | 17.3 | 1.6 | 5.9 |  |
| 15-24\% | 3.8 | 3.0 | 6.1 | 1.3 | 8.2 | - | 4.6 |
| 25-34\% | 8.9 | 6.6 | 16. 3 | 9.3 | 13.1 | - | 9.3 |
| 35-44\% | 22.1 | 24.4 | 14.3 | 13.3 | 19.7 | 29.4 50.0 | 34.9 41.9 |
| 45-54\% | 34.7 | $43 \cdot 3$ | 6.1 | 26.8 | 31.2 | 50.0 | 41.9 |
| 55-64\% | 11.7 | 4.3 | 36.8 | 10.7 | 16.4 | 11.8 | 7.0 |
| 65-74\% | 2.8 | 3.7 | - | 4.0 | 4.9 | - | - |
| 75-84\% | 3.8 | 3.7 | 4.1 | 5.3 | 4.9 | - | 2.3 |
| 85-94\% |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| 95-100\% | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |

## Table d

AVERAGE NUMBER OF MEALS SERVED BY ESTABLISHMENTS

## According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public |  | Less Sales Volume |  |  | \$100,000 |
|  |  | Eating |  | Than | $\$ 10,000-$ | $\$ 40,000-$ | and |
|  |  | Places | Institutions | \$10,000 | 32,999 | 99,999 | Over |
| Total Establishments | 216 | 130 | 86 | 87 | 56 | 33 | 40 |

Average Number of Main Meals Served

| Midday, weekdays | 141 | 110 | 252 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Sea food meals | 13 | 9 | 31 |
| Midday, Saturdays and Sundays | 80 | 68 | 123 |
| Sea food meals | 5 | 6 | 1 |
| Evening, weekdays | 57 | 49 | 88 |
| Sea food meals | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Evening, Saturdays and Sundays | 55 | 48 | 79 |
| Sea food meals | 6 | 7 | - |


| 42 | 113 | 242 | 423 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 3 | 10 | 23 | 49 |
| 20 | 60 | 112 | 294 |
| 4 | 5 | 2 | 15 |
| 15 | 33 | 76 | 232 |
| 1 | 3 | 10 | 35 |
| 15 | 36 | 54 | 238 |
| - | 2 | 13 | 23 |

AVERAGE PRICE PER MEAL SERVED
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Eating Places | Institutions | Less Than \$10,000 | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 100,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Over } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Total Establishments | (216) | (130) | (86) | (87) | (56) | (33) | (40) |
|  | \% | \$ | \% | \$ | \$ | 中 | 中 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Under \$. 25 | . 2 | - | 1.2 | . 5 | - | - | - |
| \$. 25 - . 49 | 11.3 | 5.7 | 33.6 | 6.6 | 21.1 | 14.3 | 6.2 |
| \$. $50-.74$ | 18.9 | 21.0 | 10.5 | 20.9 | 16.5 | 22.2 | 13.8 |
| \$.75-.99 | 38.4 | 46.0 | 7.0 | 45.7 | 41.3 | 35.0 | 13.8 |
| \$1.00-1.49 | 11.5 | 13.5 | 3.5 | 14.7 | 9.2 | 7.9 | 9.2 |
| \$ $\$ 1.50-1.99$ | 4.6 | 5.7 | - | 1.5 | - | 9.5 | 16.9 |
| \$2.00-2.49 | . 2 | - 3 | - | - | - | - | 1.5 |
| \$2.50-2.99 | . 2 | . 3 | - | - | - | - | 1.5 |
| \$3.00-3.99 | . 2 | . 3 | - | - | - | - | 1.5 |
| \$4.00-4.99 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| \$5.00 and over | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| No answer | 9.2 | 6.9 | 18.6 | 7.1 | 4.6 | 7.9 | 24.8 |
| Nonprofit establishment | 5.3 | - 3 | 25.6 | 3.0 | 7.3 | 3.2 | 10.8 |

Table f

## NUMBER OF REGUIAR EMPLOYEES ENGAGED IN PREPARING AND SERVING FOOD

According to Sales Volume

Total establishments

Average number per establishment

|  | Less <br> Than <br> 216 | $\$ 10,000$ <br> 87 | $\$ 10,000-$ <br> 39,999 | $\$ 40,000-$ <br> 99,999 | $\$ 100,000$ <br> and <br> Over |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 56 |  | 33 | 40 |  |

Table g

SEATING CAPACITY OF ESTABLISHMENTS
According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment <br> Public <br> Eating <br> Places Institutions |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 10,000- \\ & 39,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 40,000- \\ 99,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total establishments | 216 | 130 | 86 | 87 | 56 | 33 | 40 |
| Average seating capacity, in seats | 106 | 84 | 201 | 53 | 95 | 179 | 220 |

Table h

## NUMBER OF DAYS OF THE WEEK ON WHICH ESTABLISHMENTS SERVE MEALS

According to Type of Establishment and Sales Volume

|  | Total | Type of Establishment |  | Sales Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Eating Places | Institutions | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000-1 \\ & 99,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 100,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { Over } \end{aligned}$ |
| Total Establishments | （216） | （130） | （86） | （87） | （56） | （33） | （40） |
|  | 中 | ¢ | \＄ | 中 | ¢ | 中 | \＄ |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Serve on 7 days | 60.6 | 60.6 | 60.5 | 67.0 | 42.2 | 57.2 | 75.4 |
| Serve on 6 days | 28.6 | 34.2 | 5.8 | 21.8 | 42.2 | 36.5 | 18.4 |
| Serve on 5 days | 10.1 | 4.6 | 32.5 | 10.7 | 15.6 | 6.4 | 3.1 |
| Serve on less than 5 days | ． 2 | － | 1.2 | ． 5 | － | － | － |
| No answer | ． 5 | ． 6 | － | － | － | － | 3.1 |

Table i

PERCENTAGE OF ESTABLISHMENTS SERVING SPECIALIZED TYPES OF FOOD
According to Sales Volume

|  | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less } \\ & \text { Than } \\ & \$ 10,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 10,000- \\ 39,999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 40,000- \\ & 99,999 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 100,000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Over } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Establishments | (216) | (87) | (56) | (33) | (40) |
|  | 中 | \% | \% | \% | \% |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Establishments will no specialty | 79.0 | 69.5 | 87.2 | 76.7 | 97.0 |
| Establishments with specialty | 21.0* | 30.5 | 12.8 | $\underline{23.8}$ | 3.0 |
| Mexican, Spanish | 6.2 | 10.7 | - | 9.5 | - |
| Steak or chophouse | 5.8 | 10.7 | 2.8 | - | 1.5 |
| Italian food | 4.8 | 6.1 | 5.5 | 4.8 | - |
| Chinese food | 1.6 | - | - | 9.5 | 1.5 |
| Chicken specialty | 1.2 | - | 4.6 | - | - |
| Barbecue | . 7 | 1.5 | . | - | - |
| Sea food | . 5 | - | 1.8 | - | - |
| All others | .7 | 1.5 | - | - | - |

*Denotes that percentages might add to more than the total because of more than one reply to a question.
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