



---

## Poultry Checklist Summary Results

In December 2012, FSIS announced in the *Federal Register* notice [“HACCP Plan Reassessment for Not-Ready-To-Eat Comminuted Poultry Products and Related Agency Verification Procedures”](#) its intent to conduct a survey of its inspection program personnel (IPP) in chicken and turkey slaughter and further processing establishments, including establishments that produce comminuted poultry. This poultry checklist was designed to gather information that is not otherwise collected in the Public Health Information System (PHIS). FSIS surveyed IPP in poultry establishments through a PHIS profile extension questionnaire in early 2014. Establishments were provided time to review and affirm or provide support for any corrections. This report presents the summary of the poultry checklist results for all establishments in which the checklist was completed in PHIS (1,634 completed out of 1,942 that slaughtered or produced raw poultry as of the time the survey was open).

The poultry checklist gathered information on establishment pathogen control programs, chemical interventions, and sampling programs. In addition, the checklist gathered information on whether establishments made changes to their HACCP plans in response to the required reassessment described in the *Federal Register* notice. The checklist also asked for a general description of any changes made as a result of the reassessment. FSIS is using the results of the poultry checklist to target industry-wide food safety assessments (FSAs) of comminuted poultry operations. The Agency is also using the data to inform the regulatory impact analysis for the proposed salmonella performance standards for poultry parts and not ready-to-eat (NRTE) comminuted chicken and turkey products. FSIS will continue to evaluate the information gathered from the questionnaires to determine what hazards the Agency needs to consider in establishments that produce not ready-to-eat (NRTE) comminuted chicken and turkey products.

## Poultry Checklist Summary Results

---

**Q.EP.30069 (Single Choice) When was the last time the establishment conducted a reassessment?**

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1</sup>
Within the last 6 months	1110	67.9%
Between 7 and 12 months ago	441	27.0%
Over 12 months ago	59	3.6%
Cannot determine based on available records or my observations	24	1.5%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 1634 respondents

**Q.EP.30070 (Yes/No) Did the establishment document its reason for the reassessment?**

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1</sup>
Yes	1447	88.6%
No	187	11.4%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 1634 respondents

**Q.EP.30071 (Multiple Choice) What was the documented reason for the reassessment?**

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1,2</sup>
Annual reassessment	958	66.2%
A change in HACCP system	265	18.3%
Other	259	17.9%
FRN HACCP Plan reassessment requirement for NRTE Comminuted Poultry	146	10.1%
Unforeseen hazard	27	1.9%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 1447 (Q.EP.30070 “Yes” Responses)

<sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

**Q.EP.30072 (Multiple Choice) What written and implemented changes did the establishment make to its HACCP system in the last 12 months?**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent of Establishments<sup>1,2</sup></b>
The establishment did not make any changes	746	45.7%
Other	386	23.6%
Processing methods, systems or equipment	302	18.5%
New product(s)	187	11.4%
Slaughter methods, systems, or equipment	120	7.3%
Microbial verification testing (sampling plan)	119	7.3%
Grinding or other comminuting methods, systems, or equipment	86	5.3%
Training	68	4.2%
Product formulation	59	3.6%
Purchase specifications	58	3.5%
Consumer cooking/handling instructions	51	3.1%
Intended use or consumers of the finished product	49	3.0%
Raw materials or sources of raw materials (e.g., parts for grinding or ground product for blending)	42	2.6%
Lotting practices	25	1.5%
Finished product distribution systems	20	1.2%
Pre-harvest interventions	12	0.7%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 1634 respondents

<sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

**Q.EP.30073 (Multiple Choice) What changes did the establishment make to its process control procedures in the last 12 months?**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent of Establishments<sup>1,2</sup></b>
The establishment did not make any changes	989	60.5%
Changes to one or more prerequisite program	234	14.3%
One or more prerequisite programs were added (e.g. Sanitation Standard Operating Procedures (Sanitation SOPs), purchase specifications, antimicrobial interventions)	224	13.7%
Changes to one or more CCPs	175	10.7%
Other	148	9.1%
One or more CCPs were added	87	5.3%
One or more CCPs were removed	48	2.9%
One or more prerequisite programs were removed	29	1.8%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 1634 respondents

<sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

**Q.EP.30074 (Yes/No) Does the establishment produce raw ground, mechanically separated, other comminuted, or otherwise non-intact chicken or turkey?**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent of Establishments<sup>1</sup></b>
No	921	56.4%
Yes	713	43.6%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 1634 respondents

**Q.EP.30076** Select intended use for all types of raw ground, mechanically separated, other comminuted, or otherwise non-intact (e.g. injected or mechanically tenderized) chicken or turkey produced at this establishment. Other non-intact refers to product that is not comminuted but is non –intact, for example injected, mechanically tenderized or vacuum tumbled. Product use may be intended for not ready to eat (NRTE) product, ready-to-eat (RTE) product to be produced within the establishment, or RTE to be produced at another establishment. For product to be intended for RTE, the establishment’s HACCP system would include controls in place to ensure that product receives a lethality treatment. Check “N/A” if the establishment does not produce that type of product.

**Ground Product**

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1,2</sup>
Not Ready to Eat (NRTE)	373	52.3%
N/A	282	39.6%
RTE within establishment	71	10.0%
RTE at another official establishment	54	7.6%

<sup>1</sup> Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 713 (Q.EP.30074 “Yes” Responses)

<sup>2</sup> Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

**Mechanically Separated Product**

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1,2</sup>
N/A	584	81.9%
Not Ready to Eat (NRTE)	81	11.4%
RTE at another official establishment	55	7.7%
RTE within establishment	24	3.4%

<sup>1</sup> Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 713 (Q.EP.30074 “Yes” Responses)

<sup>2</sup> Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

**Other Comminuted for example patties, sausages or meatballs**

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1,2</sup>
N/A	431	60.4%
Not Ready to Eat (NRTE)	256	35.9%
RTE within establishment	54	7.6%
RTE at another official establishment	4	0.6%

<sup>1</sup> Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 713 (Q.EP.30074 “Yes” Responses)

<sup>2</sup> Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

**Other Non-Intact**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent of Establishments<sup>1,2</sup></b>
N/A	404	56.7%
Not Ready to Eat (NRTE)	283	39.7%
RTE within establishment	43	6.0%
RTE at another official establishment	13	1.8%

<sup>11</sup> Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 713 (Q.EP.30074 “Yes” Responses)

<sup>2</sup> Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

**Q.EP.30077 (Single Choice) Does the establishment fabricate non-intact raw product (for example, mechanically separated product) that is going to further processing into RTE products at other official establishment(s)?**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent of Establishments<sup>1</sup></b>
No. This establishment does not send any type of raw intact <sup>2</sup> chicken or turkey product to another official establishment for RTE processing	549	77.0%
Yes	135	18.9%
Cannot determine based on available records or my observations	29	4.1%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 713 (Q.EP.30074 “Yes” Responses)

<sup>2</sup>This response contains a typographical error, the response was incorrectly worded ‘raw intact’ instead of ‘raw non-intact’

**Q.EP.30095** Does the establishment have written process control procedures in place to monitor and verify that product receives a lethality treatment? **NOTE: A letter of guarantee by itself is not sufficient to demonstrate product is undergoing full lethality. For example, if an establishment produces mechanically separated chicken (MSC) and indicates it is going to cooking, can the establishment show that the MSC is achieving lethality?**

Select No, if the establishment sends product for RTE processing but its HACCP Plan or other process control procedures **DO NOT** show how it is ensuring that product sent to the other official establishment(s) is for cooking or another full-lethality treatment.

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1</sup>
No	66	48.9%
Yes	49	36.3%
Cannot determine based on available records or my observations	20	14.8%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 135 (Q.EP.30077 “Yes” Responses)

**Q.EP.30079** (Yes/No) Does the establishment slaughter chickens or turkeys?

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1</sup>
No	1368	83.7%
Yes	266	16.3%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 1634 respondents

**Q.EP.30080** An establishment may evaluate information from the supplier regarding the incoming microbial levels on live birds and adjust its process when there is evidence that the bacterial load may overwhelm the system. Does the establishment have written procedures addressing the bacteria (e.g., Salmonella, Campylobacter, APC, TPC, generic E. coli, coliforms) levels on live birds at entry?

Levels can include presence or absence of bacteria, or a measurement of the amount of bacteria present (for example, Most Probable Number/MPN or cfu/gram bacteria).

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1</sup>
No	215	80.8%
Yes	33	12.4%
Cannot determine based on available records or my observations	18	6.8%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 266 (Q.EP.30079 “Yes” Responses)

**Q.EP.30081** (Yes/No) Does the establishment fabricate raw source materials (such as parts, trim, or poultry frames) that may be used to produce raw ground, other comminuted, or otherwise non-intact chicken or turkey? For example, the establishment may fabricate turkey breast trim that it grinds within its establishment. Other examples are, the establishment fabricates chicken parts for grinding at another official establishment, or the establishment fabricates chicken frames for mechanically separated chicken. If an establishment is not certain how source material may be used, select Yes.

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1</sup>
No	1231	75.3%
Yes	403	24.7%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 1634 respondents

**Q.EP.30083 (Matrix – Multiple Choice)** Select all antimicrobial rinse agents used at each slaughter or processing step in the past 12 months. Check all that apply. Check “N/A” if the establishment does not perform certain stages listed in the table. For example, for a poultry establishment that does not slaughter select “N/A” for the slaughter related stages (e.g. Pre-Scald Rinse through Post Chilling). Select “None” if establishment does not apply an antimicrobial rinse agent at that step.

### Pre-Scald Rinse

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1,2</sup>
None at this stage	142	53.4%
N/A	93	35.0%
Chlorine/Chlorine derivatives	24	9.0%
Organic acids	9	3.4%
Other Antimicrobial Agents	3	1.1%
Bacteriophage	0	0.0%
Bromine/Bromine derivatives	0	0.0%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 266 (Q.EP.30079 “Yes” Responses) <sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

### Scalding

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1,2</sup>
None at this stage	174	65.4%
N/A	39	14.7%
Chlorine/Chlorine derivatives	22	8.3%
Other Antimicrobial Agents	20	7.5%
Organic acids	18	6.8%
Bacteriophage	0	0.0%
Bromine/Bromine derivatives	0	0.0%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 266 (Q.EP.30079 “Yes” Responses) <sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

### Post-Scald Rinse

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1,2</sup>
None at this stage	145	54.5%
N/A	75	28.2%
Chlorine/Chlorine derivatives	36	13.5%
Organic acids	13	4.9%
Other Antimicrobial Agents	3	1.1%
Bacteriophage	0	0.0%
Bromine/Bromine derivatives	0	0.0%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 266 (Q.EP.30079 “Yes” Responses) <sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

### Feather Removal or Picking (e.g. Rinse or New York wash)

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1,2</sup>
None at this stage	120	45.1%
Chlorine/Chlorine derivatives	96	36.1%
Organic acids	31	11.7%
N/A	17	84.36.4%
Other Antimicrobial Agents	8	3.0%
Bacteriophage	0	0.0%
Bromine/Bromine derivatives	0	0.0%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 266 (Q.EP.30079 “Yes” Responses) <sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

### Rehang

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1,2</sup>
None at this stage	145	54.5%
Chlorine/Chlorine derivatives	71	26.7%
N/A	34	12.8%
Organic acids	19	7.1%
Other Antimicrobial Agents	3	1.1%
Bacteriophage	0	0.0%
Bromine/Bromine derivatives	0	0.0%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 266 (Q.EP.30079 “Yes” Responses) <sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

### Evisceration

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1,2</sup>
Chlorine/Chlorine derivatives	170	63.9%
None at this stage	58	21.8%
Organic acids	42	15.8%
N/A	11	4.1%
Other Antimicrobial Agents	9	3.4%
Bacteriophage	0	0.0%
Bromine/Bromine derivatives	0	0.0%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 266 (Q.EP.30079 “Yes” Responses) <sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

### On-line Reprocessing

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1,2</sup>
Organic acids	91	34.2%
Chlorine/Chlorine derivatives	86	32.3%
N/A	65	24.4%
None at this stage	33	12.4%
Other Antimicrobial Agents	15	5.6%
Bacteriophage	0	0.0%
Bromine/Bromine derivatives	0	0.0%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 266 (Q.EP.30079 “Yes” Responses) <sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

### Off-line Reprocessing

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1,2</sup>
Chlorine/Chlorine derivatives	182	68.4%
Organic acids	55	20.7%
None at this stage	30	11.3%
N/A	17	6.4%
Other Antimicrobial Agents	7	2.6%
Bacteriophage	0	0.0%
Bromine/Bromine derivatives	0	0.0%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 266 (Q.EP.30079 “Yes” Responses) <sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

### Pre-Chilling

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1,2</sup>
Chlorine/Chlorine derivatives	89	33.5%
Organic acids	84	31.6%
None at this stage	62	23.3%
N/A	35	13.2%
Other Antimicrobial Agents	14	5.3%
Bacteriophage	0	0.0%
Bromine/Bromine derivatives	0	0.0%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 266 (Q.EP.30079 “Yes” Responses) <sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

### Chilling

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1,2</sup>
Organic acids	142	53.4%
Chlorine/Chlorine derivatives	86	32.3%
None at this stage	36	13.5%
Other Antimicrobial Agents	20	7.5%
N/A	14	5.3%
Bromine/Bromine derivatives	2	0.8%
Bacteriophage	1	0.4%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 266 (Q.EP.30079 “Yes” Responses) <sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

### Post Chilling

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1,2</sup>
Chlorine/Chlorine derivatives	87	32.7%
Organic acids	85	32.0%
None at this stage	69	25.9%
N/A	25	9.4%
Other Antimicrobial Agents	25	9.4%
Bacteriophage	1	0.4%
Bromine/Bromine derivatives	0	0.0%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 266 (Q.EP.30079 “Yes” Responses)

<sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

### Applied to poultry parts intended for non-intact use within the establishment (e.g. Raw ground, mechanically separated, other comminuted, or otherwise non-intact poultry such as injected product)

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1,2</sup>
None at this stage	379	53.2%
Organic acids	235	33.0%
Other Antimicrobial Agents	51	7.2%
Chlorine/Chlorine derivatives	46	6.5%
N/A	18	2.5%
Bacteriophage	5	0.7%
Bromine/Bromine derivatives	2	0.1%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 713 (Q.EP.30074 “Yes” Responses)

<sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

**Applied to poultry parts intended for non-intact use at another official establishment**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent of Establishments<sup>1,2</sup></b>
N/A	1405	86.0%
None at this stage	161	9.9%
Chlorine/Chlorine derivatives	44	2.7%
Organic acids	25	1.5%
Other Antimicrobial Agents	13	0.8%
Bacteriophage	3	0.2%
Bromine/Bromine derivatives	1	0.1%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 1634 respondents

<sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

**Applied to poultry parts intended for use as NRTE finished product**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent of Establishments<sup>1,2</sup></b>
N/A	1183	72.4%
None at this stage	327	20.0%
Chlorine/Chlorine derivatives	64	3.9%
Organic acids	60	3.7%
Other Antimicrobial Agents	22	1.3%
Bacteriophage	2	0.1%
Bromine/Bromine derivatives	0	0.0%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 1634 respondents

<sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

**Q.EP.30085 (Multiple Choice) Does the establishment use one or more alternative procedures under an approved waiver of regulations? If so, indicate the alternative procedure(s) used by the establishment.**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent of Establishments<sup>1,2</sup></b>
The establishment does not use alternative procedures in place of one or more regulations	1236	75.6%
Other	179	11.0%
Procedures for generic E. coli and Salmonella sampling and testing [9 CFR 381.94]	177	10.8%
Procedures to operate online reprocessing (OLR) [9 CFR 381.91]	130	8.0%
Procedures for chilling young chickens [9 CFR 381.66]	124	7.6%
Procedures to operate off-line reprocessing (OFLR) [9 CFR 381.91]	89	5.4%
Procedures for finished product standards (FPS) [9 CFR 381.76]	86	5.3%
Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points-based Inspection Models Project (HIMP)	29	1.8%
Procedures for line speeds	22	1.3%
Procedures for bird spacing (9 CFR 381.36)	11	0.7%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 1634 respondents

<sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

**Q.EP.30086 (Matrix – Multiple Choice) Which on-going microbial verification testing does the establishment conduct on carcasses, parts, poultry components or equipment? Check “N/A” if the establishment does not perform certain stages listed in the table. Select “None” if establishment does not perform any testing at that step or select “Do not know” if the establishment conducts on-going microbial testing but you cannot determine the type of testing based on available records or your observations)**

Note that “Slaughter equipment” and “Processing equipment” refer specifically to product contact surfaces. Slaughter area and Processing area refer to non-product contact surfaces.

**Pre chill Poultry Carcasses**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent of Establishments<sup>1,2</sup></b>
Salmonella	148	55.6%
Campylobacter	134	50.4%
Generic E. coli	109	41.0%
None at this stage	72	27.1%
APC	50	18.8%
N/A	32	12.0%
Total coliform count	16	6.0%
Other	2	0.8%
Do not know	2	0.8%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 266 (Q.EP.30079 “Yes” Responses)

<sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

**Post chill Poultry Carcasses**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent of Establishments<sup>1,2</sup></b>
Salmonella	195	73.3%
Generic E. coli	188	70.7%
Campylobacter	182	68.4%
APC	46	17.3%
None at this stage	26	9.8%
Total coliform count	25	9.4%
N/A	12	4.5%
Other	2	0.8%
Do not know	0	0.0%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 266 (Q.EP.30079 “Yes” Responses)

<sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

### Poultry parts

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1,2</sup>
N/A	1223	74.8%
None at this stage	286	17.5%
Salmonella	68	4.2%
APC	51	3.1%
Total coliform count	29	1.8%
Generic E. coli	28	1.7%
Campylobacter	22	1.3%
Do not know	20	1.2%
Other	5	0.3%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 1634 respondents

<sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

### Slaughter equipment

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1,2</sup>
APC	109	41.0%
None at this stage	96	36.1%
Total coliform count	35	13.2%
N/A	33	12.4%
Other	10	3.8%
Generic E. coli	7	2.6%
Salmonella	4	1.5%
Do not know	3	1.1%
Campylobacter	1	0.4%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 266 (Q.EP.30079 “Yes” Responses)

<sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

### Raw comminuted poultry components

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1,2</sup>
N/A	1328	81.3%
None at this stage	225	13.8%
Salmonella	55	3.4%
APC	26	1.6%
Campylobacter	18	1.1%
Total coliform count	18	1.1%
Generic E. coli	16	1.0%
Do not know	12	0.7%
Other	5	0.3%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 1634 respondents

<sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

### Other Non-Intact poultry parts

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1,2</sup>
N/A	1309	80.1%
None at this stage	225	13.8%
Salmonella	36	2.2%
APC	24	1.5%
Total coliform count	20	1.2%
Generic E. coli	17	1.0%
Do not know	17	1.0%
Campylobacter	14	0.9%
Other	5	0.3%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 1634 respondents

<sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

### Slaughter area

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1,2</sup>
None at this stage	133	50.0%
APC	57	21.4%
N/A	50	18.8%
Total coliform count	19	7.1%
Generic E. coli	8	3.0%
Do not know	8	3.0%
Salmonella	5	1.9%
Other	5	1.9%
Campylobacter	4	1.5%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 266 (Q.EP.30079 “Yes” Responses)

<sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

### Processing equipment

Response	Frequency	Percent of Establishments <sup>1,2</sup>
N/A	886	54.2%
None at this stage	389	23.8%
APC	220	13.5%
Total coliform count	89	5.4%
Other	77	4.7%
Salmonella	58	3.5%
Generic E. coli	43	2.6%
Do not know	16	1.0%
Campylobacter	8	0.5%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 1634 respondents

<sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

**Processing area**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent of Establishments<sup>1,2</sup></b>
N/A	909	55.6%
None at this stage	464	28.4%
APC	131	8.0%
Other	73	4.5%
Total coliform count	60	3.7%
Salmonella	44	2.7%
Generic E. coli	30	1.8%
Do not know	22	1.3%
Campylobacter	8	0.5%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 1634 respondents

<sup>2</sup>Percentages may not sum to 100% because of option for multiple choice.

**Q.EP.30087 (Single Choice) Does the establishment have written procedures in place to respond if its microbiological data show that the food safety system is not functioning as designed?**

**If the establishment does not perform microbiological sampling of any of its raw chicken or turkey products, select Not Applicable.**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent of Establishments<sup>1</sup></b>
Not Applicable	989	60.5%
Yes	393	24.1%
No	201	12.3%
Cannot determine based on available records or my observations	51	3.1%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 1634 respondents

**Q.EP.30088 (Single Choice) Does the establishment have written supporting documentation for any of the cooking methods listed on the label of its products?**

**If the establishment does not provide cooking instructions for any of its raw chicken or turkey products, select Not Applicable.**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent of Establishments<sup>1</sup></b>
Not Applicable	1036	63.4%
Yes, the establishment has supporting documentation for ALL of the methods selected	365	22.3%
No	177	10.8%
Yes, the establishment has supporting documentation for SOME of the methods selected	56	3.4%

<sup>1</sup>Percent of Establishments = # of Responses / 1634 respondents