GREENBERG QUINLAN ROSNER STRATEGY + RESEARCH

Johns Hopkins Center For a Livable Future Survey Analysis July 2018

CAMPAIGNS CORPORATIONS ADVOCACY WORLDWIDE

Methodology

On behalf of the Johns Hopkins Center For a Livable Future, an academic center based at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, GQR conducted a nationwide live interview phone survey among 1005 National Registered Voters. Margin of error for this sample is +/- 3.1 percentage points at the 95 percent confidence level. Margin of error is higher among subgroups. Not all measures will add up to 100% as "don't know" and refuse to answers are not included.

The survey was conducted from June 5 to June 12, 2018.

Majority believe the government should be doing more to meet the needs of people, though a partisan split

Now, I am going to read you a pair of statements. Please tell me which statement comes closer to your own view, even if neither is exactly right.



Majorities prefer forward looking and sustainable ag practices

Next you will hear some pairs of statements. For each pair, please tell me which statement is closer to your own view, even if it is not exactly right.



Government seen as doing poor job across the board on food and ag policy

Next I will read you some information about areas of food policy in which the federal government may be involved in. Based on what you know, please tell me whether the government is doing an excellent, good, just fair, or poor job in that area.

	Poor Just Fair Excellent Go			
Keeping food safe in the U.S.	4	8 20	50	
(SPLIT) Making sure the prices of important foods do not dramatically change from month to month.	58	21	37	
Ensuring that food is produced in a sustainable way that ensures the availability of food in the future	61	26	34	
Supporting farmers in times of drought and low crop yield.	56	21	31	
(SPLIT) Making sure people in all neighborhoods have access to healthy food	68	39	28	
(SPLIT) Ensuring people with low or modest incomes have enough money for basic food necessities.	71	38	27	
(SPLIT) Protecting farmers from big changes in crop prices.	63	26	21	

Three quarters believe the government should be supporting ag producers, including small & mid-size



Most want more support for small/mid-sized farms

(SPLIT) From what you know, do you think the federal government should be providing more <u>funding and support</u> to small and mid-sized agricultural producers, less support to small and mid-sized agricultural producers, or is it giving about the right amount of support to small and mid-sized agricultural producers?

(SPLIT) From what you know, do you think the federal government should be giving more <u>funding and support</u> <u>to agricultural producers</u>, less support to agricultural producers, or is it giving about the right amount of support to agricultural producers?



More than half want to see more oversight on large scale industrial animal farms

Now let me ask you a question about industrial animal farms, which include large-sized farms that produce large quantities of meat, poultry, eggs, and dairy products. From what you know, do you think that there should be more oversight of industrial animal farms, less oversight, or should the level of oversight stay the same as it is now?



FARM BILL

Few registered voters are familiar with the U.S. Farm Bill

First, how familiar are you with the U.S. Farm Bill: very familiar, somewhat familiar, a little familiar or have you never heard of the U.S. Farm Bill?



Most support an increase in funding for the Farm Bill

The U.S. Farm Bill needs to be reauthorized this year. From what you know, do you generally think funding for the Farm Bill should be increased, decreased, or stay the same?



Increasing funding for the Farm Bill supported

across the country

The U.S. Farm Bill needs to be reauthorized this year. From what you know, do you generally think funding for the Farm Bill should be increased, decreased, or stay the same?



Strong support for expanding assistance to new farmers, specialty crops, and conservation practices

Now let me read you some specific proposals that may be considered as part of the reauthorization of funding for the Farm Bill. For each one, please tell me whether you favor or oppose this proposal.

						٦		
	Oppose		Support		Net:			
	Stror	ngly Op	pose	Strongly Favo	-			
(NEW FARMS) Increase opportunities for beginning, socially disadvantaged, and veteran farmers and ranchers to participate in crop insurance and conservation programs.		10		48		٤	85	+75
(SPLIT)(INCREASE INSUR) Require farmers seeking crop insurance assistance to in practices that protect our land, water and health such as improving water quality, soil erosion and establishing vegetation buffers between farm land and waterways	reducing			61		8	34	+73
(SPLIT) (EXPAND INSUR) Expand the list of crops eligible for crop insurance to incl fruits, vegetables and nuts, as well as organic crops.	ude	14		48		8	2	+68
(FOREIGN ASSISTANCE) Increase funding for food assistance support to nations experiencing natural disasters.		19	8	49		80	0	+61
(SNAP WORK) Require people who receive SNAP or Food Stamp Benefits meet minimum work requirements in order to receive their benefits.	31	1	19	46		67		+36
(INSUR LIMITS) Limit the total subsidies a farmer or agribusiness can receive from crop insurance programs to pay for insurance premiums to \$50,000 per year.	38		15	15	47			+9

Most do not support scaling back SNAP funding; more mixed on a SNAP cap

Now let me read you some specific proposals that may be considered as part of the reauthorization of funding for the Farm Bill. For each one, please tell me whether you favor or oppose this proposal.

	Oppose Strongly oppose			ngly favor	Net:	
(SPLIT)(SNAP CAP) Place a cap on SNAP or Food Stamp benefits for households of 6 people or more.	46	29	30	49	+3	
(EQIP CAFO) Prohibit funding for all new and expanding Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations, which are industrial farms that produce and often release large amounts of animal waste into public waterways.	46	27	28	49	+3	
(SPLIT) (FOREIGN FARMS) Ban federal agriculture loans to foreign-owned farms on US land.	45	21	26	47	+2	
(PREEMPTION) Stop state and local communities from being able to pass health or safety regulations on farming or agricultural operations that conflict with other federal or state laws.	52	24	15	39	-13	
(CONSERVE FUNDING) Eliminate funding for conservation programs that help farmers and agricultural operations maintain environmental quality of their land and protect 5 public health.	57	42	21	41	-16	
(SPLIT) (SNAP CUTS) Reduce funding for the SNAP or Food Stamp program that provides food purchasing assistance for low-income families by more than 200 billion dollars over 10 years.	L	46	20	35	-26	

Messaging on proposals

After asking an uninformed favor/oppose on the 12 proposals (shown on the previous slides), we offered respondents more information on 5 of the proposals:

- 1. Prohibiting funding for all new and expanding CAFOs
- 2. Eliminate funding for conservation programs
- 3. Increasing funding eligibility for crop insurance assistance for farmers who use farming practices that protect our land, water and health
- 4. Expanding the list of crops eligible for crop insurance to include crops like fruits and vegetables, and organic crops
- 5. Preventing state and local communities from being able to pass health or safety regulations on farming or agricultural operations that conflict with other federal or state laws

Respondents heard balanced messages from both sides of the issue and were re-asked their support for each proposal.

Majority support prohibiting funding for new CAFOs

After hearing more information, let me ask again, <u>do you favor or oppose prohibiting funding for all new and</u> <u>expanding Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations</u>, which are industrial farms that release large amounts of animal waste into public waterways, to focus eligibility on smaller and mid-size farms?

Some people say the program to help small and mid-size family farms make improvements to their land no longer works. Originally, funding was available to small and mid-size family farms, but now large industrial animal farms that release large amounts of animal waste that ends up in public waterways eat up most of the funding. The purpose of this program is to help farmers improve the quality of soil, water and air. Instead it is being used to put small farms out of business and mismanage natural resources. We need to prohibit funding to these Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations. Other people say these programs that provide funding for farmers to improve their conservation and land management are needed by every American farmer, large and small. People across the country and around the world rely on American farmers no matter the size of their farm. Large animal farming operations receive more support from these programs because they produce more food and have higher levels of risk. Excluding them from funding will put businesses at risk and could make food more expensive.



Solid opposition to eliminating funding for conservation programs

After hearing more information, let me ask again, do you <u>favor or oppose eliminating funding for conservation</u> <u>programs</u> that help farmers and agricultural operations maintain environmental quality of their land and protect public health?

Some people say conservation programs have been critical to ensuring the long term stability of American farm land and have already been cut by 6 billion dollars in 4 years. These programs promote sustainable agricultural practices that protect water and soil quality, public health and maintain biological diversity so land stays productive for years to come. Other people say conservation programs are just too expensive and not a good use of government funds. These programs cost 26 billion dollars to tell farmers how to farm land their family has been farming for generations. That money can be better spent helping farmers and agribusiness to help keep the cost of food down for consumers.



Strong support for insurance covering sustainable ag

(SPLIT) After hearing more information, let me ask again, do you <u>favor or oppose increasing funding eligibility for crop</u> <u>insurance assistance for farmers who use farming practices that protect our land, water and health</u> such as improving water quality, reducing soil erosion and establishing vegetation buffers between farm land and waterways?

Some people say the current process for providing crop assistance and loans incentivizes poor farming practices. Instead of helping farmers implement agricultural practices that are sustainable and productive over time, the government subsidizes a narrow set of farming practices that are not suited for all types of land and climates, decreasing the efficiency and long term stability of farms across the country. We need to level the playing field and help the farms manage their land in such a way that protects our land, water and health. Other people say the current process for providing crop assistance and loans prioritizes the fundamental farming practices that have worked for generations. These practices support crops like corn, soybean and wheat which are versatile, hearty and are the basis for thousands of food products consumers purchase every day. The federal government should not be in the business of subsidizing every crop and every farmer, just the ones critical to ensuring a stable food supply, and farms that provide these crops should not be punished.



Strong support for insurance covering specialty crops

(SPLIT) After hearing more information, let me ask again, do you <u>favor or oppose expanding the list of crops eligible</u> for crop insurance to include crops like fruits and vegetables, and organic crops?

Some people say the current process for providing crop assistance and loans prioritizes the wrong crops. Instead of helping farmers grow the best crop for their particular land and making our agricultural practices more sustainable and productive over time, the government subsidizes just a dozen or so crops that are not suited for all types of land and climates, decreasing the efficiency and long term stability of farms across the country. In fact, just 1 percent of farms receive 20 percent of all crop insurance subsidies. We need to level the playing field and help farms that manage their land in such a way that protects our land, water and health. Other people say the current process for providing crop assistance and loans prioritizes the fundamental crops that America and the world rely on. Crops like corn, soybean and wheat are versatile and hearty and are the basis for thousands of food products consumers purchase every day. These crops also are the foundation of other food industries like beef, poultry and hog industries. The federal government should not be in the business of subsidizing every crop, just the ones critical to ensuring a stable food supply, and farms that provide these crops should not be punished.

	 Strongly Favor 	Somewha	t Favor	 Strongly Oppose 	Somewhat Oppose
80		19		+61	
60					
40					
20		46			18
Ο					
0	Favor expan	ding insurance	to	Oppose exp	anding insurance to
	speci	alty crops		spe	cialty crops

Mixed opinions on preemption

After hearing more information, let me ask again, do you <u>favor or oppose preventing state and local communities</u> <u>from being able to pass health or safety regulations on farming or agricultural operations that conflict with other</u> <u>federal or state laws</u>?

Some people say this proposal allows the federal government to take control away from state and local governments who know what is best for their communities and puts the interests of big corporate industrial farms over the interests of people. Local areas will be prevented from passing laws that protect health and environmental standards for large industrial farms, including the management of waste and runoff and use of pesticides that get into air and water.

Other people say it is important to protect our farmers and agricultural operations from burdensome regulations and red tape that limits their ability to do business. Conflicting regulations across states make it harder for farms to produce and sell their products and this proposal protects free trade between states and communities without government interference.



After messages, majority still believe there should be more oversight on large animal farms

Now let me ask you again, thinking about industrial farms, which include large-sized farms that produce large quantities of meat, poultry, eggs, and dairy products. From what you know, do you think that there should be more oversight of industrial farms, less oversight, or should the level of oversight stay the same as it is now?



CONTACT US



WORLD **EUROPEAN** HEADQUARTERS HEADQUARTERS

CANADIAN HEADQUARTERS

Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Greenberg Quinlan Rosner

1101 15th Street NW Suite 900 Washington, DC 20005 2 Eastbourne Terrace London, UK W2 6LG

Greenberg Quinlan Rosner 350-1 First Canadian Place Toronto Board of Trade Tower Toronto, ON M5X 1C1

Phone: +1 202 478 8300 Fax: +1 202 478 8301

T: +44 (0)20 3740 9029

Phone: +1 647 526 6754