

Agricultural and Food Policy Issues

Idaho Respondents' Views for 1995 Legislation

Linette Fox and Neil Meyer



University of Idaho

College of Agriculture

Cooperative Extension System

S
53
E415
no. 772

Table of Contents

Summary	3
Introduction	4
The Survey	4
Profile of Producers Responding to the Survey	5
Farm Commodity Programs	6
Conservation, Environment, and Water Quality Programs	10
Disaster Assistance	14
International Trade	15
Domestic Food Aid	17
Food Nutrition	19
Other National Issues	21
Idaho Issues	24
Appendix A	27
Appendix B	28
Bibliography	35

About the Authors: Linette Fox is an Extension research associate and Neil Meyer is an agricultural economist at the UI Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology.

Credits: The Idaho Department of Agriculture and the Idaho Statistical Reporting Service both provided valuable assistance in preparing this publication.



AGRICULTURAL AND FOOD POLICY ISSUES: IDAHO RESPONDENTS' VIEWS IN 1994

Linette Fox and Neil Meyer

Summary

Idaho respondents are divided on international trade, farm commodity program, environmental, and food safety issues. There is, however, agreement in the general direction respondents would like to see farm commodity, environmental programs, disaster assistance, international trade, food safety and food aid take. General conclusions are:

1. Respondents tend to favor the gradual elimination of farm programs.
2. Respondents prefer more flexibility within programs and are reluctant to support radically new programs.
3. Respondents indicate a willingness to change their agricultural practices to help build a higher quality environment, reduce chemical pollutants in soil and water, and protect the land from soil erosion and destruction of natural habitats.
4. Compensation for implementing environment mandates which decrease profitability of agricultural operations is preferred over no compensation.
5. The majority of respondents favor private crop insurance, as opposed to government disaster programs.
6. If the government provides crop insurance they prefer that the insurance be based on individual yields.
7. Respondents are in favor of the United States negotiating bilateral and multilateral trade agreements, but do not support funding foreign food aid.
8. Respondents prefer revamping the domestic food aid program by allowing states to distribute funds and limiting distribution to the elderly and families with children under poverty level incomes.
9. Respondents prefer increasing food safety. Producers, through strengthening food inspections, and retailers, through providing instructions for proper storage and cooking, should be a part of that process.
10. Respondents indicate the nutrition information provided by United States Department of Agriculture reaches about half of them, and, for those it reaches, it is a good educational tool.
11. Respondents desire more diet and nutrition information.
12. Biotechnology benefits both producers and consumers.
13. Respondents support continued research developing new uses for agricultural products and projects to help small and intermediate sized farms.
14. Respondents see needs for economic development in their communities.
15. Respondents indicate the most important factor for planning their future farming operations is farm prices and profitability.
16. Respondents prefer direct farm support payments and the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) be

reduced relative to environmental programs and foreign market development.

17. Environmental Protection Agency worker protection standards are not affecting the majority of agricultural operations.
18. Forty-two percent of the respondents agreed with forming a Canadian Wheat Board type marketing organization while 17 percent disagreed.

There are differing preferences among respondents with different gross sales levels and different major agricultural income sources. In general, respondents with high levels of gross sales tend to be more clear in their responses with a smaller percent marking "not sure" on their questions.

Respondents with different major sources of agricultural income tend to prefer programs that benefit the type of agricultural operation in which they are involved. There is a tendency to choose domestic plans or programs that help all farmers but to support only those international programs that benefit their particular type of operation.

Introduction

Major problems and concerns of agricultural producers have evolved over time. The initial focus on local production and sales issues has changed to an emphasis on international trade policies, farm commodity programs, conservation programs, environmental concerns, food safety issues, nutrition standards, and rural non-farm income. Government commodity programs have strongly influenced agricultural production in the past ten years. These commodity programs, however, may be only a part of the public's future influence on agriculture. Changing public opinion on environmental, food safety, and international trade issues demands change in agricultural production methods and marketing policies.

Some of these changes in agricultural production and marketing methods must be made at the farm level. The 1994 National Agriculture and Food Policy Preference Survey obtained responses from Idaho producers. Opinions on future policies concerning commodity programs, international trade, conservation practices, environmental policies, water quality requirements, compensation for compliance with environmental mandates, disaster assistance

programs, food aid (domestic and international), food safety, and food nutrition standards are solicited. Responses from producers are tabulated and presented in this bulletin.

Many of the general comments from respondents suggest concern about the government's involvement in agricultural production and the decline in the number of producers, especially young producers. These concerns are supplemented by environmental issues and a general frustration with foreign policy. Respondents are not inclined to support many of the food aid programs, both domestic and abroad.

The survey reflects responses from producers raising several agricultural products with different levels of agricultural income. More than half of the survey respondents' gross sales were less than \$40,000 per year, suggesting that many respondents may have a second source of income.

The Survey

The Idaho Statistical Reporting Service's agricultural producer list was used to identify producers to be sent questionnaires. The sample of 3,286 producers was randomly selected. Each selected producer received a questionnaire through the mail.

During March of 1994, the National Agricultural and Food Policy Preference Survey was mailed to the sample of farmers and ranchers operating land in Idaho.¹ Completed questionnaires were received from 1,296 respondents, yielding a response rate of 39.4 percent. On March 4, an explanatory letter and the questionnaire were sent to the selected agricultural producers. A reminder card followed on March 16. A second request was mailed on March 25 to all producers that had not responded.

Once the questionnaires were returned, the data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie, etc.). Responses to personal information are used to examine the similarities and differences between the sample and the general population as reported in the 1992 Census of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Commerce. In addition, responses to information, such as gross sales and the major source of income from the respondent's agricultural operation, are used to tabulate frequency and

¹ A copy of the survey is presented as Appendix B.

statistical information on the respondents preferences for agricultural and food policies in the future.

The survey asked producers their views on key issues expected to be discussed and debated when Congress writes the 1995 Food and Agricultural and Trade Policy Act. This publication summarizes the responses and divides them according to levels of gross sales and type of agricultural operation as defined by predominant source of income.

Gross sales are divided into three categories. These categories are:

1. Respondents with gross annual sales of \$40,000 or less are defined as "small."
2. Respondents with gross sales of \$40,000 to \$249,999 are defined as "medium."
3. Respondents with gross sales of \$250,000 or more annually are defined as "large."

The major sources of income for each respondent are classified as grain, livestock (beef, sheep and swine), dairy, potatoes/sugarbeets, or hay and other miscellaneous agricultural products. Often respondents have very different preferences for policies depending on their major source of income.

This publication reflects the preferences given by the respondents to the survey. Without further statistical analysis, the authors refrain from making inferences about the Idaho farm and ranch population in general.

Profile of Producers Responding to the Survey

The age groups are, under 35, 35 to 49, and 50 to 64 are 7, 37, and 34 percent, respectively of the respondent population. Twenty-one percent of respondents are 65 and older.

The primary difference between the census data and the sample is that the percentage of respondents under 35 is much lower in the survey sample than the number reported by the census. According to the census, 11 percent of the producers are under 35 years of age, as opposed to 7 percent of the respondents.²

Another measure of whether the sample is representative of the population is gross sales distribution. Fifty-one percent of the respondents classified as small reported their gross sales are less than

\$40,000. This is followed by 37 percent classified as medium receiving between \$40,000 and \$249,999. Twelve percent of the respondents classified as large reported gross sales exceeding \$250,000.

Fifty-one percent of the respondents are in the category of gross sales under \$40,000. However, the U.S. Census of Agriculture reported 65 percent of Idaho farms in the under \$40,000 category. The reason for the difference is that the sample population for the survey is drawn from the Idaho Agricultural Statistical Service (IASS) list of agricultural operators. This list contains 16,665 operators. A larger number of operators (22,124), is reported in the 1992 Census of Agriculture. The IASS list often does not have information on operators that produce less than \$5,000 of agricultural products, while all agricultural operations are included on the Census list.

The second grouping scheme for respondents is to classify them by major source of income. In this study the major sources of income are: (1) grain, (2) dairy, (3) livestock (beef, sheep and hogs), (4) potatoes and sugarbeets, and (5) hay and other. Agricultural operators raising livestock dominate the survey sample—33 percent. Grain producers are also well represented—20 percent. Responses from dairymen, potato and sugarbeet growers, and hay and other producers 9 percent, 12 percent, and 26 percent respectively. The distribution is displayed on Appendix Table A-7.

Respondents are divided into categories according to personal and economic characteristics, such as their participation in farm programs, the tenure of the operator, income from off-farm sources, and education.³ According to the survey, 27 percent of all respondents receive wheat program benefits.⁴ Seventeen percent receive feed grains program benefits and 13 percent receive CRP program benefits. Nine percent received disaster program benefits. This participation rate implies that respondents have a general knowledge of the programs discussed in the survey.

Most respondents owned a large part of the land they operate. More than 60 percent of all respondents own between 75 and 100 percent of the

²U.S. Census of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1993, Table 48: Summary by Age and Principal Occupation of Operator, 1992.

³Appendix A has a complete set of tables for personal data.

⁴Sugar and dairy program benefits are indirect. Sugar benefits come through a sugar loan price and control of imports. Dairy program benefits also come through price support purchases of certain products and the limitation of imports.

land they farm. Those that did not own a major part of their land are evenly distributed among those owning no land, those owning less than 25 percent, those owning 26 to 50 percent and those owning 51 to 75 percent of their land.

Thirty-seven percent of the respondents earn less than \$10,000 from off-farm sources. Sixty-three percent of the respondents report that they or their family members earned \$10,000 or more from non-farm sources.

Respondents are well educated. Sixty-three percent have at least some training after high school. Twenty-eight percent have a high school diploma. Only 10 percent do not have a high school education.

Farm Commodity Programs

The thrust of this project is to understand respondent preferences for agricultural and food policy issues and programs. The first category of programs addressed in the survey is farm commodity programs.

Respondents tend to favor the gradual elimination of commodity programs. Their comments and responses clearly indicate they want less government involvement in private agricultural enterprises. Furthermore, respondents desire more flexibility in their production choices, but they do not favor radically new programs.

Production Controls and Associated Price Supports—More than 50 percent of respon-

dents support a gradual elimination of all commodity programs including set-aside, price support, deficiency payments, and government storage programs (Table 1). All sales category respondents support elimination.⁵ Respondents whose gross sales are in the small category strongly support gradual elimination of programs. Respondents in the medium category are more inclined to look at alternatives, such as establishing a mandatory supply control program with all producers required to participate; or separating government payments from production requirements (decoupling).

Grain producer respondents show the least support for gradual program elimination, while livestock producers show the most support. Dairyman and livestock producer respondents are very supportive of gradual elimination. Nearly 70 percent of the dairy and livestock respondents prefer gradual elimination of commodity programs.

Target Price Policy—Respondents were asked to choose their preference from among the following four alternatives: keep target prices at the current levels, raise target prices each year to match the rate of inflation, lower target prices by some percent each year to reduce federal deficiency payments and discourage production, and phase out target prices completely over a 5 to 10 year period. Nearly half the respondents favor phasing out target prices within a 5 to 10 year period (Table 2). A substantial number of respondents (34 percent),

Table 1. Idaho respondents' opinions about production controls and associated price support.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep and Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Keep current program	34	29	36	33	48	27	26	39	30
Mandatory supply control	3	6	4	2	2	7	2	5	3
Decouple	8	14	9	5	12	5	5	11	7
Gradual eliminate	55	52	51	60	38	62	67	45	61

⁵Significance levels are discussed throughout the text. SPSS produces a series of significance tests for cross tabulations. The first of these are parametric tests: the Pearson Chi-Squared test and the Likelihood Ratio Test. These tests are used to determine if the distribution of responses from one category of individuals is significantly different than another category. The second set of tests are non-parametric tests. These tests, such as Spearman's correlation and the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, test the association of the preferences of the respondents with the different gross sales levels and the various major sources of agricultural income of the respondents. Significantly different refers to a statistical significance between the various categories at the 1 percent level according to both the parametric tests unless otherwise specified.

however, favor raising target prices each year to match the rate of inflation.

The strongest support for raising target prices comes from grain producer respondents and the respondents with medium and large gross sales. Respondents from small agricultural operations favor gradual elimination. Respondents from middle and large size farms show a mixed set of preferences, especially for the alternatives of raising target prices by the rate of inflation or phasing out the program. The distribution of preferences from the respondents in different gross sales categories is significant at the 1 percent level.

Commodity Loan Rate Policy—Respondents are slightly less willing to eliminate the com-

modity loan rate program than production controls and price supports. The majority of respondents, 47 percent, prefer to eliminate loan rates and commodity loans completely, but nearly as many respondents prefer basing loan rates on the average market prices (Table 3).

modality loan rate program than production controls and price supports. The majority of respondents, 47 percent, prefer to eliminate loan rates and commodity loans completely, but nearly as many respondents prefer basing loan rates on the average market prices (Table 3).

The split between basing the loan rate on average market prices and eliminating the program is fairly homogenous across all gross sales and major source of income sectors. The only exception is grain producer respondents would prefer basing loan rates on average market prices relative to phasing out the program.

The third alternative is to raise loan rates as a primary means to support prices. Twenty-one percent of grain producer respondents prefer this option, but only 11 percent of all respondents prefer raising loan rates.

Where to Cut Spending on Farm Programs—Respondents supported cutting spending if cuts must be made but often differ in their opinions as to how spending should be cut (Table 4). They favor farm commodity program benefits to small and medium agricultural operations. The difference in the distribution of preferences between respondents in each of the three sales categories is significant at the 1 percent level.

Table 2. Idaho respondents' opinions about target prices.

	GROSS SALES			MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES					
	All Respondents (%)	250,000 and Over (%)	40,000 to 249,999 (%)	Under 40,000 (%)	Grain (%)	Dairy (%)	Beef Sheep and Hogs (%)	Potato Sugarbeet (%)	Hay & Other (%)
Keep current program	11	9	11	11	13	9	10	12	10
Raise by rate of inflation	34	41	40	28	51	33	24	46	28
Lower to reduce product.	5	5	5	6	3	9	60	6	5
Phase out	49	46	44	55	33	50	60	36	58

The split between basing the loan rate on average market prices and eliminating the program is fairly homogenous across all gross sales and major source of income sectors. The only exception is grain producer respondents would prefer basing loan

rates on average market prices relative to phasing out the program.

The third alternative is to raise loan rates as a primary means to support prices. Twenty-one percent of grain producer respondents prefer this option, but only 11 percent of all respondents prefer raising loan rates.

Flexible Non-payment Acres—Respondents are consistent in their desires to keep government out of private business (Table 5). More than 50 percent

commodity loan rate program than production controls and price supports. The majority of respondents, 47 percent, prefer to eliminate loan rates and commodity loans completely, but nearly as many respondents prefer basing loan rates on the average market prices (Table 3).

Grain and livestock respondents are more inclined to prefer cutting farm program spending only if the benefits are distributed to large agricultural operators. However, two categories of respondents have different distributions of preferences. Livestock respondents favor basing payments on financial need as their next highest preference, while grain respondents often prefer reducing payment acres.

Table 3. Idaho producers' preferences for the Commodity Loan Rate Policy.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents (%)	250,000 and Over (%)	40,000 to 249,999 (%)	Under 40,000 (%)	Grain (%)	Dairy (%)	Beef Sheep and Hogs (%)	Potato Sugarbeet (%)	Hay & Other (%)
Avg of market price	41	40	40	43	47	40	37	40	43
Raise the loan rate	11	13	15	8	21	6	6	17	9
Phase out loan rates	47	48	45	49	32	55	43	43	49

of all respondents agree or strongly agree that producers should be permitted to plant more flexible non-payment acres in any year and still retain the historic acreage bases for their program crops.

Respondents have significantly different preferences depending on their gross sales level category or their type of agricultural production operation. In particular, grain respondents and medium and large gross sales respondents are more supportive of flexible non-payment acres.

Producer-owned Grain Reserves—All respondents generally favor some form of producer-owned grain reserve with a national minimum and maximum level (Table 6). A greater percentage of respondents with higher gross sales prefer a grain reserve program than those in the small gross sales level. Differences in preferences of respondents are insignificant across the different major source of income categories. An equally large group are not sure about having a producer-owned grain reserve.

Income Safety Net—A study team proposed that the 1995 Food Security Act include an income safety net through a revenue assurance program where each producer is assured 70 percent of normal crop revenue. The proposed program eliminates target prices, acreage reduction programs, federal crop insurance, and disaster assistance. In addition, the program allows producers to choose crop type and amount while maintaining non-recourse commodity loans and grain reserves. Although 32 percent of the respondents do not agree with this proposal, they do not disagree either (Table 7). Over 36 percent of respondents are not sure suggesting that details of the proposal need to be clarified. Respondents with large gross sales are in strongest disagreement with the proposal. The distribution of preferences is significantly different depending on gross sales levels and principal income sources of the respondents.

Dairy Marketing Board—Respondents were asked if the dairy program should be financed

Table 4. Idaho respondents' preferences for areas to cut spending in farm commodity programs if cuts must be made.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Reduce target price and def. payments	21	29	20	18	14	33	20	22	25
Reduce payment acres	15	30	19	8	26	10	10	25	11
Payments to small and medium size operations	41	23	41	44	48	34	42	40	37
Base on financial need	24	19	20	29	13	24	29	14	27

Table 5. Idaho respondents' preferences for flexible non-payment acres.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Strongly agree	23	30	26	20	34	24	19	27	19
Agree	30	22	34	29	38	26	29	27	30
Not sure	29	27	22	33	16	33	34	22	30
Disagree	10	16	9	10	7	9	11	16	11
Strongly disagree	8	5	8	8	6	8	7	8	10

Table 6. Idaho respondents' preferences for producer-owned grain reserve with national minimum and maximum amounts to be stored.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Strongly agree	7	6	7	6	10	8	5	6	6
Agree	33	36	35	32	33	36	35	32	32
Not sure	38	29	34	43	35	40	38	36	41
Disagree	13	19	14	10	14	11	12	20	11
Strongly disagree	9	10	10	9	8	6	9	6	12

Table 7. Idaho respondents' preferences for proposed Income Safety Net Program.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Strongly agree	6	5	7	6	8	7	5	4	7
Agree	26	20	26	27	28	28	28	16	25
Not sure	36	29	33	40	30	39	37	35	36
Disagree	21	28	24	17	23	18	18	30	22
Strongly disagree	11	17	10	11	12	8	12	16	10

by milk producer assessments and administered through a producer marketing board with the power to control production. There is less support for a marketing board among dairy producers than other respondents. In general, all respondents favor a board or are not sure (Table 8). Dairy respondents tend to be skeptical of this program, with many more respondents disagreeing (48 percent) with the pro-

posal than agreeing (33 percent). Other agricultural operators tend to favor this proposal, especially livestock and potato/sugarbeet respondents.

A significant difference is found in the respondents' preferences according to their gross sales levels. The large sales respondents are more in favor of a dairy marketing board than those with lower gross sales levels.

Table 8. Idaho respondents' preferences for a dairy program funded through producer assessment and with a marketing board that has the power to control production.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Strongly agree	9	9	11	8	6	11	10	11	16
Agree	32	42	33	31	31	22	35	40	46
Not sure	33	26	33	34	41	20	31	29	50
Disagree	17	13	16	19	15	28	17	14	25
Strongly disagree	9	11	8	9	7	20	7	6	14

Conservation, Environment, and Water Quality Programs

The traditional commodity programs discussed in the previous section have been a concern of agricultural producers for a long period of time. These programs are generally thought of as the primary programs that policy makers and agricultural interest groups discuss and debate. Recently, there has been a growth of interest in agricultural production from an environmental view. Although the Conservation Reserve Program began in 1985, the public is just now beginning to become aware of how farming practices can influence water quality; how farmers can help prevent soil erosion along stream banks and in waterways; and the quantity of pesticides used in agricultural production.

Respondents to this survey indicate they are willing to change their agricultural practices to help improve the environment, reduce chemical pollutants in soil and water, and protect the land from soil erosion and natural habitat destruction. They are also willing to record their pesticide usage. A large percent stated they are using smaller quantities of pesticides today than five years ago. Respondents favor compensation for their efforts in providing a healthier and more environmentally safe agriculture.

Conservation Reserve Program—The Conservation Reserve Program is one of the first major farm programs instituted to encourage environmentally friendly agricultural practices. Beginning in 1986, 10-year contracts were given to producers to protect highly erodible land with cover crops. Respondents have mixed views on what should be the new policy as these contracts expire. One option is to extend all the contracts for several years at the

current payment rate per acre. Other options include extending the contracts on only the most erodible land, discontinuing the program or creating a new program (a conservation and water quality program with incentive payments).

Each alternative is preferred by at least 20 percent of the respondents (Table 9). Furthermore, there is not a significant difference in response distribution when comparing different gross sales levels. Significantly different responses are found, however, from respondents with different major sources of agricultural income. Livestock and dairy producers prefer discontinuing the program or replacing it with an incentive program. Crop producers prefer extending the program or extending the program only on the most erodible land.

Conservation Compliance—To be eligible for agricultural programs, producers are required to implement approved conservation plans. Most respondents agree that this conservation compliance program should be continued (Table 10). The percentage of all respondents agreeing with maintaining the compliance program as a part of farm program policies is 53 percent. The largest gross sales group are strongest supporters of conservation compliance. Livestock producers feel less strongly about conservation compliance relative to other major source of income groups.

Government Regulation and Water Pollution—Water quality is a concern throughout the United States, particularly in the West. Respondents were asked if the government should regulate specified farming practices and land uses to reduce pollution of underground and stream water. A majority of all respondents disagree (Table 11). There is

Table 9. Idaho respondents' preferences concerning the future of the Conservation Reserve Program.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Extend at current rate	20	23	20	20	25	16	12	31	21
Extend only on the most erodible land	29	31	31	26	37	36	23	33	27
Discontinue this program	31	24	31	33	22	32	42	21	30
Replace with incentive program	20	22	18	21	17	16	24	15	23

stronger disagreement expressed by producers with large gross sales (67 percent) than by producers with small gross sales (46 percent).

Respondents whose primary source of income is from potato/sugarbeet production express strongest disagreement with government control of agricultural

farmers, 50 and 62 percent respectively. The differences in preferences by the major source of income groups are significant at the one percent level.

There are also differences in the views between producers in the middle gross sales group and those in the small gross sales group. Those produc-

Table 10. Idaho respondents' preferences for continuing the Conservation Compliance Program.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents & Over	250,000	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Strongly agree	10	9	10	10	11	8	9	10	11
Agree	43	50	42	43	43	37	43	52	45
Not sure	19	14	16	22	16	21	19	14	18
Disagree	18	16	21	16	15	23	20	17	18
Strongly disagree	11	11	11	9	16	10	10	6	8

practices and land uses (65 percent) to reduce water pollution. Hay and other producers are less emphatic in their disagreement. Forty percent agree with government regulation in comparison to 48 percent opposed. The difference between the source of income respondent preferences is statistically significant.

Protection of Stream Banks—Respondents are also not inclined to support being required to protect stream banks. The question is phrased: "To protect water quality, all farmers should be required to plant grass protection strips along stream banks and in waterways." Overall, 51 percent of the respondents disagree (Table 12). Livestock producers, are less inclined to oppose the proposition than dairy

ers in the middle group are very opposed to being required to plant grass along the stream banks (63 percent disagree), while those in the lower gross sales group are less opposed (40 percent disagree).

Compensation for Protecting Stream Banks—Although respondents do not favor being required by the government to plant grass along the stream banks and waterways, they favor compensation to producers for environmental efforts to protect stream banks. To accomplish environmental goals, a producer must spend time and money planting and maintaining grass protection strips along stream banks. Thus, it is not surprising that the respondents are in favor of compensation.

Sixty-two percent of all respondents favor

Table 11. Idaho respondents' preferences concerning government regulation of agricultural practices to control water pollution.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents & Over	250,000	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Strongly agree	7	2	4	10	5	3	7	3	10
Agree	26	18	24	30	20	20	28	26	30
Not sure	13	12	11	15	14	15	14	9	12
Disagree	30	36	31	29	37	28	28	36	29
Strongly disagree	23	31	31	17	24	34	23	29	19

compensation, while only 26 percent are opposed (Table 13). The preferences are nearly the same for those whose major source of income is for livestock and dairy as for those whose major source of income comes from grains or other crops. Responses for the different categories of agricultural income are not significantly different. In descending order of gross sales, 65 percent, 61 percent, and 59 percent agree that farmers should be compensated for their efforts to protect the environment by protecting stream banks and water ways.

Compensation for Government Regulations that Reduce Property Values—Respondents are strongly in favor of compensating property

Eighty percent of the respondents agree that agricultural land owners should be compensated (Table 14). The only significant differences are between the gross sales levels. Respondents with medium and large gross sales are more inclined to agree with compensation than those with small gross sales.

Pesticide Use—An important note documented by this survey is that 37 percent of respondents report using less pesticide today than five years ago (Table 15). Respondents from all types of agricultural production operations note a reduction in pesticide use. The largest decline in pesticide use is respondents in the large gross sales group. Only 6

Table 12. Idaho respondents' preferences on being required to plant grass to protect stream banks.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents & Over	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Strongly agree	7	1	4	10	5	3	8	1	11
Agree	27	3	21	33	23	17	28	21	33
Not sure	16	2	12	17	15	19	15	19	12
Disagree	32	29	37	28	35	39	29	33	31
Strongly disagree	19	27	26	12	23	23	21	25	13

owners for losses when government regulations reduce the value of agricultural property. Recall that a considerable number of the respondents own 75 percent or more of the property they operate. Thus, many of the respondents have a vested interest in the value of their property.

percent of the producers in the high gross sales category report not knowing whether they are using more or less pesticide. This compares with 14 percent in the category of respondents in the small gross sales group. There is a significant difference between the responses of those in the small and large gross sales groups.

Table 13. Idaho respondents' preferences concerning compensation for protecting stream banks and water ways.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents & Over	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Strongly agree	18	18	21	15	23	16	16	15	16
Agree	44	43	44	44	43	40	44	50	43
Not sure	13	17	10	13	12	18	11	12	14
Disagree	19	13	19	21	16	17	21	18	21
Strongly disagree	7	9	7	8	6	10	8	6	7

Recording Pesticide Use—Forty-seven percent of all respondents are in agreement that producers should be required to record their use of pesticides (Table 16). In particular, potato/sugarbeet growers respond more positively to recording pesticide use (51 percent) than grain growers (35 percent).

Permitting the Draining of Wetlands—The final question in the Conservation, Environment, and Water Quality Programs section concerns prohib-

iting drainage and farming of wetlands. Forty-nine percent of the respondents disagree, meaning that producers should not be prevented from draining and farming wetlands (Table 17). The only significant difference in preferences among the different categories of respondents is that livestock and dairy respondents are more likely to favor producers being able to drain wetlands for production.

Table 14. Idaho respondents' preferences concerning compensation when government regulations reduce value of farm property.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Strongly agree	42	48	49	36	47	44	46	41	32
Agree	38	35	35	42	37	32	36	41	44
Not sure	10	9	8	10	6	13	9	10	10
Disagree	7	7	5	8	8	7	6	6	8
Strongly disagree	3	1	3	4	2	4	2	3	5

Table 15. Idaho respondents' estimates on use of pesticide today compared to five years ago.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
More	5	4	6	4	7	1	3	8	4
About the same	48	49	50	47	52	49	47	56	46
Less	37	41	37	36	37	39	37	30	37
Do not know	11	6	7	14	5	11	13	6	14

Table 16. Idaho respondents' preferences on being required to keep application records on pesticide use.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Strongly agree	7	7	5	9	5	8	7	5	10
Agree	40	43	38	41	30	36	40	46	45
Not sure	14	10	13	16	17	14	16	8	11
Disagree	28	22	31	28	34	27	29	28	25
Strongly disagree	11	18	14	7	13	14	9	13	9

Disaster Assistance

The disaster assistance program has come under scrutiny in the recent past because of its high cost and the political nature of the program in general. Two questions in the questionnaire specifically address this program.

Government Protection from Natural Disasters—Respondents were asked: “Should the government protect producers from natural disasters?” The respondents chose one of the following responses:

The majority of the respondents (54 percent) support private crop insurance without government intervention (Table 18). Strong support came from respondents in all gross sales categories. Grain producers are the only respondents that favor some sort of government supported protection.

Type of Insurance Program—Respondents were then asked their preferences for a government subsidized crop insurance program, with no disaster program is available. The respondents chose

Table 17. Idaho respondents' preferences on whether producers should be prevented from draining and planting crops on wetlands.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Strongly agree	10	6	9	12	7	7	9	11	14
Agree	25	23	26	25	27	15	21	35	28
Not sure	16	17	17	15	19	24	13	18	14
Disagree	32	36	29	33	32	29	36	25	30
Strongly disagree	17	18	19	16	14	26	21	12	14

1) Yes, let Congress decide each year about disaster aid programs; 2) Yes, develop a permanent disaster program for losses that exceed 50 percent and encourage farmers to buy additional protection by using private crop insurance; 3) Yes, set up a mandatory crop insurance program for all farmers as a condition of eligibility for additional disaster payments; and 4) No, let farmers buy private crop insurance if they want protection and get the government out of crop insurance and special disaster assistance.

between these three alternatives: 1) Let farmers buy crop insurance on a voluntary basis, paying for coverage based on their individual farm yields; 2) Let farmers buy crop insurance on a voluntary basis, but offer lower premiums by basing premiums on county average yields with no pay-off unless county yields drop by more than some specified percent; and 3) Require all farmers to buy crop insurance.

Sixty-five percent of the respondents would choose voluntary crop insurance based on individual

Table 18. Idaho respondents' preferences as to whether or not the government should protect producers from natural disasters.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Yes and let Congress decide	14	13	12	14	18	12	12	14	11
Yes and develop permanent fund	24	28	27	22	29	21	23	28	22
Yes and set up mandatory insurance program	8	9	9	8	9	10	8	7	11
No, private sector provide	54	51	53	56	44	57	58	51	57

yields (Table 19). Respondents with large gross sales are most inclined (74 percent) to favor the voluntary crop insurance program based on individual yields.

Respondents from all income groups favor the voluntary insurance program based on individual production, but grain producers are more likely to support this choice than livestock producers. Grain crops are more susceptible to natural elements, so these producers are more likely to participate in the insurance programs. Grain producer respondents desire coverage based on individual yields because many agricultural risks such as hail or floods only cover a small area but devastate that area. Thus, an insurance program based on the individual yield would reduce risk, but the county average program that would not pay unless the county yield is severely affected would not reduce risk as much.

International Trade

Responses to the international trade section vary widely depending on the type of agricultural

Table 19. With government subsidized crop insurance and no disaster program, the type of insurance program favored by Idaho respondents.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Voluntary based on individual production	65	74	69	60	72	71	60	64	61
Voluntary based on county averages	31	21	28	36	37	26	37	33	33
Mandatory	4	5	3	4	3	3	3	3	7

operation and the gross income level of the respondent. From the respondent preferences, it appears that all respondents support propositions that are in the best interest of their operation. There is a much clearer pattern of responding in a self-interest manner regarding international trade issues.

Trade Agreements—Respondents were asked to respond to the statement: "Beyond the current NAFTA and GATT agreements, the U.S. should continue to vigorously negotiate multilateral and bilateral arrangements to further reduce trade barriers." Respondents reply positively to negotiating trade agreements with 62 percent indicating agreement (Table 20). The preference is stronger

from respondents in the larger gross sales group (74 percent). Those in the lowest gross sales group respond with 58 percent in agreement.

There is little variation among respondents with different primary sources of income. Sixty-seven percent of the respondents whose major source of farm income is hay and other crops are in agreement, while 55 percent of the dairy producers are in agreement. The percentages for all groups of respondents fall between 55 and 67 percent. The responses from the major sources of agricultural income groups are not significantly different from each other.

Subsidized Exports of Agricultural Products—More respondents agree that the United States should continue to subsidize export sales of agricultural products than disagree, with 38 and 32 percent respectively (Table 21). Responses vary significantly by gross sales level. More than half the respondents in the \$250,000 and over category support agricultural product subsidies. Agricultural producers in the lowest gross sales category are more

likely to disagree with subsidization (38 percent).

The variation in responses among producers with different primary sources of income is just as wide and significantly different. Forty-five percent of the respondents whose major source of income is livestock do not support subsidizing exports of agricultural products. In 1993/94, the United States exported about 30 percent of its grain production. If the United States did not subsidize grain exports, it is likely less grain would be sold abroad. This would reduce the price of grain in the domestic market because larger supplies would be available. Livestock producers would then be able to buy grain at a lower price. Because grain is an important input into

livestock operations, the livestock producers would have lower feed costs.

Grain producers are in favor of the U.S. subsidizing the export of agricultural products. Fifty-eight percent agree with the continuation of this program. Another group supporting export subsidies is the sugarbeet/potato growers with 54 percent favoring such subsidies.

Subsidized Value Added Exports—

Respondents generally disagree with subsidizing value added exports. Margins between those who agree and those who disagree are slim. Respondents from the large gross sales group respond slightly more positively than negatively to subsidizing value added agricultural export products, with 37 percent and 34 percent respectively (Table 22). On the other hand, respondents from the smallest gross sales group do not support subsidizing value added exports. Twenty-one percent agree while 36 percent disagree. These differences in response distribution by income category are significant.

Dairy producers are slightly more in favor of subsidizing value added export products with 31 percent in favor versus 26 percent opposed. Forty-three percent are not sure. Grain producers are divided on subsidizing value added exports. Twenty-eight percent favor subsidizing value added exports, while 33 percent are opposed. Forty percent are not sure.

Except for the large gross sales group, all other categories have 40 percent or more not sure about subsidizing value added exports.

Decrease Foreign Food Aid—The last question of this section is whether or not the U.S. should decrease its funding for foreign food aid. The overwhelming response is affirmative - 60 percent of all respondents agree (Table 23). Respondents with differing levels of gross sales have varying degrees of support for decreasing foreign food aid. Producers from the large gross sales group are more against decreasing foreign food aid (23 percent) than producers in the small gross sales group (13 percent).

Table 20. Idaho respondents' opinions concerning the government making multilateral and bilateral trade agreements.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Strongly agree	18	23	20	15	20	14	17	17	19
Agree	44	51	44	43	45	41	41	43	48
Not sure	25	15	21	30	21	31	26	25	23
Disagree	9	7	9	8	8	10	10	11	7
Strongly disagree	5	4	5	4	6	4	6	3	3

Table 21. Idaho respondents' preferences concerning whether the U.S. should subsidize the export of agricultural products.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Strongly agree	9	15	13	3	17	6	5	14	6
Agree	29	37	32	25	41	31	19	40	27
Not sure	31	27	27	34	23	47	32	28	31
Disagree	24	22	22	29	15	10	35	17	27
Strongly disagree	8	6	5	9	4	7	10	1	9

Domestic Food Aid

The next two questions address respondent opinions on domestic food aid. Respondents are also reluctant to support domestic food aid. Food stamps and other food programs were 60 percent of the U.S. Department of Agriculture budget last year. Thus, support of these programs is a major financial effort. Questions address concerns about how food aid should be distributed and who should be eligible for benefits.

State Distributed Food Programs—

Fifty-five percent of the respondents agree that food programs should be shifted to cash grants, and states should distribute the funds (Table 24). The percentage of respondents that agree with this proposition is

products are now distributed through a national distribution program. Without the national program that distributes free dairy products to low income persons, the demand for dairy products could decrease. Differences in the distributions for all categories of respondents are, however, insignificant.

Food Stamps Only to Specific Groups

—Respondents are in even stronger agreement, (79 percent agree) that food stamps should be distributed to only the elderly and families with children and incomes below poverty levels (Table 25). This level of agreement is consistent across all three gross sales groups. The distribution of the responses also show little variation among respondents from different types of agricultural production operations.

Table 22. Idaho respondents' preferences concerning whether the U.S. should subsidize the export of value added agricultural products.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Strongly agree	3	7	3	3	3	3	4	3	3
Agree	21	30	22	18	25	28	20	26	16
Not sure	41	29	42	44	40	43	41	44	41
Disagree	27	29	27	27	25	21	28	24	31
Strongly disagree	7	5	6	9	8	5	8	3	8

the same for all gross sales levels, but respondents differ slightly according to their major source of agricultural income.

Responses vary from 58 percent of the grain producers agreeing to only 47 percent of the dairy producers agreeing with state distribution. Dairy

Food Safety

The food safety questions addressed more the issues of storage and cooking, inspections and comparison of domestic and imported food.

Retail Meat Should Carry Instructions—

The first question respondents were asked is whether

Table 23. Idaho respondents' preferences concerning whether the U.S. should continue to decrease foreign food aid.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Strongly agree	18	15	18	19	14	20	19	15	21
Agree	42	33	39	46	43	40	47	38	38
Not sure	23	28	22	22	21	25	20	25	24
Disagree	15	22	17	11	18	11	12	19	15
Strongly disagree	3	1	5	2	5	3	2	3	2

or not all meat and meat products sold at retail should carry instructions for proper storage and cooking. Among all respondents, 65 percent agree with this idea (Table 26). A lower percent of large gross sales respondents favor the idea than those with the smallest gross sales (57 percent and 69 percent respectively).

Major source of income has no significant effect on the preference distribution. Livestock producers are slightly more in favor of the meat carrying instructions than other producers. However, there is no statistically significant difference between the producers.

strengthened. The percent of the respondents from the different gross sales levels agreeing with the proposition are respectively small (77 percent), medium (69 percent), and large (61 percent).

The producer income source also affects respondent preferences. Livestock producers favor strengthening food inspections more than dairy producers, (77 percent versus 60 percent, respectively).

Imported Food and Beverage Safety Requirements—The final question in this section is whether imported food and beverages meet the same safety requirements as domestic products.

Table 24. Idaho respondent preferences concerning domestic food programs being made into cash grants for states to distribute.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Strongly agree	13	17	13	13	14	9	14	11	15
Agree	42	37	46	40	44	38	41	43	42
Not sure	20	21	18	22	19	19	22	21	18
Disagree	16	16	13	17	14	17	16	21	16
Strongly disagree	9	10	11	8	8	17	7	11	8

Table 25. Idaho respondent preferences concerning food stamps given only to elderly and families with young children.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Strongly agree	28	21	30	28	31	21	25	28	31
Agree	51	55	50	52	46	56	56	52	49
Not sure	11	14	9	12	14	12	11	11	8
Disagree	8	9	9	7	7	11	6	7	10
Strongly disagree	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2

Food Inspections Should Be Strengthened—Seventy-three percent of the respondents favor strengthening food inspections to ensure safer and better quality foods (Table 27). Respondents with smaller gross sales (under \$40,000) are more inclined to agree that food inspections need to be

More respondents agree than disagree that imported foods and beverages meet the same requirements as domestic products, 44 percent to 37 percent respectively (Table 28).

Thirty-one percent of respondents from the large gross sales group agree while 51 percent dis-

agree. Respondents from the medium gross sales group that agree is 42 percent, while the percentage disagreeing is 51 percent. Thus, a greater percentage of respondents in the higher gross sales bracket disagree while a greater percentage in the middle gross sales bracket agree. Respondents in the lowest gross sales bracket tend to agree more than they disagree, (47 percent and 31 percent respectively).

Respondents grouped by income source agree more than disagree that imported foods and beverages

help the public become more aware of diet and nutrition through educational programs, package labelling, and advertising. The next set of questions asked respondents if the tools used to educate the public are working.

Respondents are producers of agricultural products but they are also consumers. They are asked to comment on the USDA food pyramid: is it useful? should food labels contain more diet and nutritional information? and do they read food labels?

Table 26. Idaho respondents' preferences concerning meat and meat products storage and cooking instructions.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents (%)	250,000 & Over (%)	40,000 to 249,999 (%)	Under 40,000 (%)	Grain (%)	Dairy (%)	Beef Sheep & Hogs (%)	Potato Sugarbeet (%)	Hay & Other (%)
Strongly agree	13	6	13	15	14	11	13	8	15
Agree	52	51	49	54	50	52	54	54	52
Not sure	10	10	14	9	10	11	9	11	10
Disagree	21	22	25	19	20	20	22	23	21
Strongly disagree	4	7	2	4	5	6	3	4	3

ages meet the same safety requirements as the U.S. food products. The only exception is dairy respondents, where 38 percent agree and 47 percent disagree.

Food Nutrition

Americans are becoming increasingly concerned with nutrition. Food nutrition is another measure of the quality of food. County extension services and other organizations have been trying to

Most respondents indicated that some information is reaching them: More information would be desirable and they do not always use the information available to them.

Familiarity with the USDA Food Pyramid?—Forty-seven percent of the respondents have seen the USDA food pyramid with guidelines for proper nutrition (Table 29). The higher gross sales group respondents claim to have seen more nutrition information. The percentage that have seen the

Table 27. Idaho respondents' opinions concerning strengthening the inspections to ensure safer and better quality food.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents (%)	250,000 & Over (%)	40,000 to 249,999 (%)	Under 40,000 (%)	Grain (%)	Dairy (%)	Beef Sheep & Hogs (%)	Potato Sugarbeet (%)	Hay & Other (%)
Strongly agree	17	5	14	21	19	11	17	5	22
Agree	56	56	55	56	52	49	60	61	54
Not sure	12	13	13	11	10	18	12	14	11
Disagree	12	21	16	8	27	17	10	17	10
Strongly disagree	3	5	2	3	3	6	1	3	3

USDA pyramid in the high gross sales bracket is 57 percent versus 42 percent in the low gross sales bracket.

Major source of producer income group makes a difference in whether or not the respondent has seen the information. Dairy producers are the highest at 57 percent.

Is USDA Information a Useful Educational Tool?—The second question of this part asked if respondents had seen the USDA food pyramid. If so, did respondents think the food pyramid was a useful educational tool? Respondents from all gross sales levels and from all major sources of

the USDA nutritional information. However, this group had the highest percentage respond in agreement. Sixty-one percent agree that food labels should be required to contain more diet and nutrition information (Table 31). More respondents in the middle gross sales bracket have seen the USDA nutrition information, but they are least likely to agree that more information should be required. A majority of all source of income producers responded positively to the need for more nutrition information.

Reading Food Labels For Content Information—Most of the respondents, 53 percent, said they occasionally read food labels. Forty-one

Table 28. Idaho respondents' responses concerning imported food and beverages meeting the same safety requirements as the United States.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Strongly agree	24	16	24	25	23	20	26	20	22
Agree	20	15	18	22	21	18	20	17	18
Not sure	20	18	18	21	16	14	21	19	25
Disagree	23	32	23	22	27	21	22	29	22
Strongly disagree	14	19	17	9	13	26	11	15	12

producer income are in agreement this is a useful educational tool. Sixty-nine percent of all respondents agree the USDA food pyramid is a useful educational tool (Table 30).

More Nutrition Information on Food Labels—More diet and nutrition information on food labels is preferred by 57 percent of the respondents. Respondents with different levels of gross sales respond differently. Respondents in the lowest gross sales bracket are the least likely to have seen

percent said they read labels often (Table 32). Forty-five percent of small gross sales respondents claimed to read labels often. This gross sales category of respondents in favor of more nutritional information on food labels; thus, it is not surprising they often read nutrition labels.

A diversity of those who read labels often and those who only read labels occasionally is found in the different major sources of producer income. Potato/sugarbeet producers are more occasional

Table 29. Has the Idaho respondent seen USDA food pyramid with guidelines for proper nutrition?

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Agree	47	57	52	42	54	57	44	48	44
Disagree	45	35	41	50	40	35	48	45	49
Not sure	8	8	7	8	6	8	8	7	7

readers of nutrition information than the hay and other producers, 30 percent and 47 percent respectively. The difference is between who considers themselves an occasional reader and who considers themselves a frequent reader.

Other National Issues

This section focuses on research and economic development for rural communities and agricultural production operations.

Biotechnology Benefits Producers—

Fifty-nine percent of respondents agree that biotechnology benefits consumers and 31 percent of respondents are not sure (Table 33). The respondents with large gross sales are more likely to agree that producers benefit from biotechnology than those with smallest gross sales (73 percent and 56 percent respectively). This difference in responses by gross income category is statistically significant.

There is some variation in the responses from producers with different major sources of agricultural

Table 30. Respondents' opinions concerning the USDA food pyramid as a useful educational tool.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Yes	69	63	66	73	75	63	66	67	69
No	18	23	20	15	13	29	17	20	19
Not sure	13	15	14	12	12	8	17	13	13

Table 31. Idaho respondents' preferences on whether food labels should be required to contain more diet and nutrition information.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Strongly agree	12	7	10	15	11	11	10	6	17
Agree	45	50	41	46	50	40	45	46	42
Not sure	19	16	22	18	19	18	20	23	19
Disagree	20	23	23	18	17	25	23	21	19
Strongly disagree	3	4	3	3	3	6	3	4	3

Table 32. Idaho respondents' frequency of reading food labels for content information.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Often	41	42	36	45	40	42	40	30	47
Occasionally	53	52	57	49	54	52	54	63	48
Never	6	6	7	6	6	6	6	7	6

income. These differences in preferences from respondent categories are insignificant. Potato/sugarbeet respondents are more likely to agree that biotechnology benefits producers than the livestock producer respondents (69 percent versus 57 percent respectively). Operations that benefit from new biotechnology may be more aware of the benefits received than operations that do not currently use such advancements.

Biotechnology Benefits Consumers—

Fifty-nine percent of all respondents agree consumers benefit from biotechnology (Table 34). The pattern is nearly identical to the previous question. Producers with a high level of gross sales are significantly

used to subsidize fuels development from plants. Fifty-six percent favor subsidizing ethanol and plant diesel production (Table 35). Respondents from all gross sales levels favor the subsidy, 58 percent, 56 percent, and 55 percent in descending order of gross sales. There is no significant difference in their responses.

There is significant variation in responses according to the major source of agricultural income. Grain producers respond most favorably to subsidizing the production of ethanol and plant diesel with 66 percent agreeing.

Research Directed to Small and Medium Sized Farms—

Most respondents, (76 per-

Table 33. Idaho respondents' opinions concerning whether biotechnology benefits producers.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents (%)	250,000 & Over (%)	40,000 to 249,999 (%)	Under 40,000 (%)	Grain (%)	Dairy (%)	Beef Sheep & Hogs (%)	Potato Sugarbeet (%)	Hay & Other (%)
Strongly agree	12	15	12	12	12	13	11	10	14
Agree	47	58	49	44	49	45	46	59	46
Not sure	31	24	29	33	32	27	30	26	31
Disagree	7	3	7	8	5	9	10	5	5
Strongly disagree	3	0	2	4	2	6	3	1	5

more likely to agree, while those that have a low level of gross sales are less likely to agree. Potato/sugarbeet growers are more likely to see consumers as benefitting from biotechnology than livestock producers (67 percent versus 55 percent respectively).

Tax Money Should be Used to Subsidize Plant Based Fuels—

The third question asked respondents was whether tax money should be

cent) agree that government supported research should be targeted to benefit small and medium sized farms (Table 36). There is a significant variation in responses according to the gross sales of the agricultural operation. Seventy-four percent of the respondents from medium gross sales group and 82 percent of the respondents from small gross sales group prefer directed research efforts. Large gross sales

Table 34. Idaho respondents' opinions concerning whether biotechnology benefits consumers.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents (%)	250,000 & Over (%)	40,000 to 249,999 (%)	Under 40,000 (%)	Grain (%)	Dairy (%)	Beef Sheep & Hogs (%)	Potato Sugarbeet (%)	Hay & Other (%)
Strongly agree	11	15	11	11	10	15	11	8	13
Agree	48	58	52	43	52	44	44	59	49
Not sure	32	22	27	37	29	28	36	24	31
Disagree	7	5	7	7	7	8	7	8	5
Strongly disagree	2	0	2	3	2	5	2	1	3

group respondents are less likely to support directed research efforts, only 51 percent.

There is considerable variation among respondents from different sources of agricultural income groups. For example, livestock producers are much more likely to support directed research efforts than potato/sugarbeet respondents (80 percent to 62 percent).

throughout all respondents regardless of their gross sales level or major source of agricultural income.

Need for Economic Development—

Respondents saw important needs for economic development in their communities. Respondents were asked to check the three most important needs out of the following list but many checked more than three:

Table 35. Idaho respondents' opinions concerning whether tax money should be used to subsidize ethanol and plant based diesel.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents (%)	250,000 & Over (%)	40,000 to 249,999 (%)	Under 40,000 (%)	Grain (%)	Dairy (%)	Beef Sheep & Hogs (%)	Potato Sugarbeet (%)	Hay & Other (%)
Strongly agree	14	14	16	12	21	6	11	14	13
Agree	42	44	40	43	45	46	41	39	31
Not sure	21	21	21	21	18	23	20	23	14
Disagree	20	18	21	19	12	17	25	22	17
Strongly disagree	4	4	2	5	4	7	3	1	5

Rural Area Development Programs—

The third research question asked respondents to give their preference on the following: "the federal government should increase funding for programs to expand employment and economic activity in rural areas." Forty-five percent agree, 34 percent disagree, but 37 percent admitted that they are not sure (Table 37).

Although generally favoring rural area development, respondents appear to have insufficient information to be decisive in their answer. Furthermore, the indecisiveness of their answers extends

- (1) More support for public education
- (2) New or improved sewage plants
- (3) Business development
- (4) More law enforcement and crime prevention
- (5) New or improved roads
- (6) New or improved bridges
- (7) Public training to improve worker's skills
- (8) Improved health care facilities
- (9) Other

Of these choices, the four most frequently checked are: more support for public education, business development, more law enforcement and

Table 36. Idaho respondents' opinions on whether government supported research should be directed to supporting small and medium sized farms.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents (%)	250,000 & Over (%)	40,000 to 249,999 (%)	Under 40,000 (%)	Grain (%)	Dairy (%)	Beef Sheep & Hogs (%)	Potato Sugarbeet (%)	Hay & Other (%)
Strongly agree	19	9	18	21	22	16	17	17	19
Agree	57	42	56	61	55	56	63	45	58
Not sure	11	16	12	10	8	17	9	20	11
Disagree	10	23	11	7	12	7	9	21	9
Strongly disagree	3	10	2	1	3	4	2	3	3

crime prevention, and new or improved roads (Table 38). Respondents are concerned about these problems in their community. Responses suggest they see a need for rural economic development.

Idaho Issues

A section of the survey focuses on issues important to Idaho producers for future planning. Questions focused on issues such as commodity

level of government support, ground and surface water quality, rural community/family values, food safety, water availability, endangered species listings, farm prices/profitability, pesticide use and availability (Table 39).

Economic and physical factors received the most important rankings (i.e., farm prices/profitability and water availability). The lower the mean, the more important the rating. It is not surprising that profitability is the number one factor (a mean rank of 2.57),

Table 37. Idaho respondents' opinions on whether the government should expand employment and economic activity in rural areas.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENTS' AGRICULTURAL INCOMES				
	All Respondents	250,000 & Over	40,000 to 249,999	Under 40,000	Grain	Dairy	Beef Sheep & Hogs	Potato Sugarbeet	Hay & Other
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Strongly agree	8	4	8	10	9	6	9	7	8
Agree	37	36	39	36	39	38	35	33	39
Not sure	20	23	16	22	21	21	20	26	15
Disagree	26	30	27	24	24	26	28	28	21
Strongly disagree	8	7	10	7	7	9	8	6	10

programs, Canadian competition, and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) mandates.

Important Factors in Planning the Future of Your Operation—Idaho respondents were asked to rank nine different factors in terms of importance for planning the future of their agricultural operation. Factors they were asked to rank are economic, social, physical, and environmental (1 being most important and 9 being least important). These factors are: land uses/urban encroachment,

because agricultural production is a business and the bottom line of any business is whether the owner makes a profit. Second is water availability (mean 2.95) is also important for much of Idaho's agricultural production.

Social and environmental factors are not far behind the physical and economic factors. From highest to lowest rating, these factors are rural community/family values (4.11), ground and surface water quality (4.57), food safety (5.44), land uses/urban encroachment (5.45), and pesticide use and availability (5.49).

Table 38. Idaho respondents' perceptions of needs for economic development in their area.

Community Needs	Positive Response (%)
More support for public education	88
Business development	84
New or improved roads	82
More law enforcement and crime prevention	77
Public training to improve worker's skills	54
New or improved bridges	37
Improved health care facilities	24
New or improved wewage plants	17

Factors ranking low on the list of importance are level of government support (6.94) and endangered species listings (7.38). Very few respondents ranked these two factors even moderately important; thus, they are considered of negligible importance to nearly all respondents. (Authors' comment: Endangered species did not appear to be linked to water availability in respondents' answers.)

Areas to Reduce Agricultural Spending in the Future—The second question asked Idaho respondents to indicate which areas they would prefer to see the biggest spending cuts: direct farm support payments, soil and water conservation,

Conservation Reserve Program, foreign market development funding, and export enhancement subsidies. Respondents preferences for receiving cuts are primarily for direct farm payments and the conservation reserve program (28 percent and 30 percent respectively). However, preferences did vary according to the area of the respondent (Table 40).

The north, central, and eastern Idaho respondents are most inclined to support cutting the Conservation Reserve Program, while the southwestern area respondents saw deficiency payments as the area to cut. These differences are significant at the 1 percent level.

and with establishing a grain marketing board with 42 percent agreeing (Table 41). Only 17 percent disagree. Respondents from eastern Idaho are most supportive of creating a grain marketing board, while respondents from other regions are less supportive of this action.

Permanent Elimination of Acreage Set Aside—Respondents generally prefer permanently eliminating the acreage set-aside requirements. Forty-five percent of all respondents favor elimination (Table 42). Twenty-seven percent are opposed to elimination and 28 percent are not sure. Respon-

Table 39. Idaho respondents' perceptions of important factors in planning their future farming operation.

	highest to lowest									Mean
	1 (percent)	2 (percent)	3 (percent)	4 (percent)	5 (percent)	6 (percent)	7 (percent)	8 (percent)	9 (percent)	
Farm prices/ profitability	42	21	12	9	7	5	3	2	1	2.57
Water availability	25	27	21	8	7	4	4	2	2	2.95
Rural community/ family values	15	12	15	16	13	12	7	7	3	4.11
Ground and surface water quality	5	11	14	20	17	17	11	6	1	4.57
Food safety	4	7	7	13	16	19	19	12	4	5.44
Land uses/ urban encroachment	7	7	8	11	15	14	15	14	9	5.45
Pesticide use and availability	1	7	14	13	14	15	15	14	7	5.49
Level of government support	1	5	4	6	7	8	17	26	27	6.94
Endangered species listing	2	3	4	4	5	7	11	17	17	7.38

Table 40. Idaho respondents' preferences for cutting agricultural spending if limits are imposed.

	All Respondents (percent)	North (percent)	Southwest (percent)	Central (percent)	East (percent)
Direct farm support payments	28	25	37	29	24
Soil and water conservation cost - sharing programs	10	13	4	14	10
Conservation reserve program - contract payments	30	29	24	33	32
Foreign market development funding	15	17	15	12	16
Export enhancement subsidies	17	16	21	13	18

Establishing a Grain Marketing Board—Canada is a competitor of the United States in the world grain market. Our Canadian competitors use a grain marketing board to negotiate foreign grain sales. Idaho respondents were asked whether the U.S. should establish a similar board to compete with the Canadian marketing practices. Most Idaho respondents seemed unsure of the outcome for such a venture. Preferences are split and 41 percent not sure

from the central part of the state are much more in favor than those coming from the northern or eastern part of Idaho (50 percent relative to 36 and 43 percent, respectively). The north and eastern parts of the state grow more grains that are associated with set-aside programs.

Effect of New EPA Worker Standards—The final question in this section was “how have the new EPA worker protection standards affected your

operation?" Choices that are given for respondents to choose are: no effect, more training for managers, training for all employees, discontinued producing a crop, and other. Answers varied widely from area to area, but overall 65 percent of all respondents indicated that there is no effect (Table 43).

Respondents from southwestern and central Idaho are more inclined to indicate there is an effect from worker protection standards. These are areas where migrant labor is used and the new EPA worker protection standards require more training and facilities. Ten percent of the respondents from southwestern Idaho stated they have discontinued producing a crop because of the EPA regulations.

Although this is a small fraction compared to the 61 percent who said there is no effect, this represents a significant impact on the affected group of producers.

Summarizing, Idaho respondents have a number of different views on international trade, agricultural commodity programs, environmental issues, food safety issues and rural development issues. There is agreement on the general direction respondents would like to see food security policy move. These include gradual elimination, more flexibility, a concern for the environment, focused domestic food programs, and needs for alternative rural jobs and incomes.

Table 41. Idaho respondents' preferences to establishing a grain marketing board similar to the Canadian marketing board.

	All Respondents	North	Southwest	Central	East
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Strongly agree	9	10	7	9	9
Agree	33	27	31	32	38
Not sure	41	40	41	47	38
Disagree	11	13	13	9	11
Strongly disagree	6	10	7	3	5

Table 42. Idaho residents' preferences on permanently eliminating the Acreage Set Aside Program.

	All Respondents	North	Southwest	Central	East
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Yes	45	36	48	50	43
No	27	30	22	21	34
Not sure	28	35	30	29	23

Table 43. The effects of the new EPA worker protection standards on Idaho respondents.

	All Respondents	North	Southwest	Central	East
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
No effect	65	76	61	58	66
More training for managers	6	4	5	6	9
More training for all employees	16	12	15	22	16
Discontinued producing a crop	5	4	10	4	2
Other	8	5	9	9	7

Appendix A

A PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS

Table A1. Idaho respondent participation in 1993 farm programs.

	GROSS SALES				MAJOR SOURCE OF RESPONDENT'S AGRICULTURAL INCOME				
	All Respondents (%)	250,000 Plus (%)	40,000 to 249,999 (%)	Under 40,000 (%)	Grain (%)	Dairy (%)	Beef Sheep and Hogs (%)	Potato Sugarbeet (%)	Hay & Other (percent)
Wheat	27	21	54	25	45	5	15	22	13
Feed grain	17	17	60	17	43	11	22	11	13
CRP	13	9	39	53	35	4	22	9	30
Disaster relief	9	11	67	23	34	5	29	12	20

Table A2. Age of Idaho respondents.

Categories (years)	All Respondents (%)
Under 35	7
35 to 49	37
50 to 64	34
65 and older	21

Table A3. Percent of farm land owned and operated by Idaho respondents.

Percentage Land Owned	Percent Respondents
None	10
1 to 25	9
26 to 50	10
51 to 75	10
Over 75	61

Table A4. Idaho respondents' annual gross sales in year 1993.

Gross Sales	Percent Respondents
Less than \$40,000	51
\$40,000 to \$249,999	37
\$250,000 and Over	12

Table A5. Off-farm family income earned by Idaho respondents.

Off-farm Income Earned	Percent Respondents
Under \$10,000	37
\$10,000 to \$19,999	20
\$20,000 to \$39,999	26
\$40,000 and Over	17

Table A6. Off-farm income for Idaho respondents under 65 years of age and with gross farm sales of less than \$40,000.

Age	\$10,000 to 19,999 (%)	\$20,000 to 39,999 (%)
	Under 35 (25 respondents)	72
35 to 49 (174 respondents)	88	72
50 to 64 (189 respondents)	81	61

Table A7. Most important source of 1993 agricultural income for Idaho survey respondent.

Commodity	Percent Respondents
Grain	20
Dairy	9
Potatoes	7
Beef, sheep, and hogs	33
Sugarbeets	5
Hay	11
Other	15

Table A8. Last year in school completed by Idaho respondent.

Level of Schooling	Percent Respondents
Grade school	4
Some High school	6
High school	28
Some college or technical training	36
College graduate	27

Table A9. Idaho Respondent Membership in Agricultural and Commodity Organizations.¹

Organization	Reporting (%)
American Agricultural Movement	1
Farm Bureau	50
Farmers Union	2
Grange	10
NFO	2
Cattlemen's Association	33
Grain Producers	25
Milk Producers	12
Pork Producers	2
Sugarbeet Association	0
Labor Union	6
Other	10

¹Respondents could indicate membership in more than one organization.

Appendix B

1994 NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL AND FOOD POLICY PREFERENCE SURVEY

Cooperative Extension Service, University of Idaho

Please respond to each part of the first question.

On land operated by the farm, ranch or individual(s) listed on the label:

- | | YES | NO |
|---|-------|-------|
| a. Is any or all of your operation in CRP? | _____ | _____ |
| b. Will crops be grown or hay cut at any time during 1994? | _____ | _____ |
| c. Will grain be stored at any time during 1994, or do you have storage facilities used for storing grain? | _____ | _____ |
| d. Will any fruits, vegetables, nursery crops, mushrooms or other specialty crops be grown at any time during 1994? | _____ | _____ |
| e. Are there now or will there be any cattle, sheep, hogs or poultry on this operation during 1994? | _____ | _____ |

If NO to all the above items, please provide name and address of the new operator and return the questionnaire.

ACRES OPERATED IN 1994

How many total acres of land are you operating in 1994? _____

What is the GRAIN STORAGE CAPACITY
on the total acres operated on January 1, 1994? _____ bushels

ACRES PLANTED OR INTENDED TO BE PLANTED FOR HARVEST IN 1994

Corn _____

Potatoes _____

Oats _____

Winter Wheat _____

Spring Wheat _____

Barley _____

Alfalfa & alfalfa mixtures (cut for hay) _____

All other hay cut _____

Number of cattle and calves on farm January 1, 1994 (including dairy type) _____

Maximum number of WORKERS HIRED at any one time last year _____

SECTION A.. FARM COMMODITY PROGRAMS

1. What should be the policy toward production controls and associated price supports after the 1990 Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act (1990 Farm Bill) expires in 1995?

(Check one)

- Keep the present program _____
- Establish a mandatory supply control program with all farmers required to participate after approved in a referendum _____
- Separate government payments from production requirements. (Sometimes called decoupling) _____
- Gradually eliminate all commodity programs including set aside, price support, deficiency payments and government storage programs _____

2. What should be the policy toward target prices:

(Check one)

- Keep target price at the current levels _____
- Raise target prices each year to match the rate of inflation _____
- Lower target prices by some percent each year to reduce federal deficiency payments and federal expenditures and to discourage production _____
- Phase out target prices completely over a 5 to 10 year period _____

3. What should be our commodity loan rate policy? (Check one)
- a. Base loan rates on the average of market prices to keep prices competitive _____
 - b. Raise loan rates as a primary means to support prices _____
 - c. Eliminate loan rates and commodity loans completely _____
4. If further spending cuts must be made in farm commodity programs, which would you prefer? (Check one)
- a. Reduce target prices and deficiency payments _____
 - b. Reduce the number of payment acres (increase flex acres) _____
 - c. Make payments only to small and medium size farms _____
 - d. Make payments based on financial need _____
5. Farmers should be permitted to plant more flexible non-payment acres in any year and still retain the historic acreage bases for their program crops. (Check one)
- | | | | | |
|----------|-------|-------|----------|----------|
| Strongly | | Not | | Strongly |
| Agree | Agree | Sure | Disagree | Disagree |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
6. Some form of farmer-owned grain reserve (FOR) with national minimum and maximum amounts to be stored should be continued. (Check one)
- | | | | | |
|----------|-------|-------|----------|----------|
| Strongly | | Not | | Strongly |
| Agree | Agree | Sure | Disagree | Disagree |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
7. A Farm Bill Study Team has proposed that the 1995 Farm Bill include an income safety not through a revenue assurance program in which each producer is assured 70 percent of normal crop revenue. The proposed program would eliminate target prices, acreage reduction programs, federal crop insurance and disaster assistance, allow producers to plant whatever crops in any amount they desire and maintain non-recourse commodity loans and grain reserves. Do you agree or disagree with this proposal? (Check one)
- | | | | | |
|----------|-------|-------|----------|----------|
| Strongly | | Not | | Strongly |
| Agree | Agree | Sure | Disagree | Disagree |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
8. The dairy program should be financed by milk producer assessments and administered through a producer marketing board with the power to control production. (Check one)
- | | | | | |
|----------|-------|-------|----------|----------|
| Strongly | | Not | | Strongly |
| Agree | Agree | Sure | Disagree | Disagree |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

SECTION B. CONSERVATION, ENVIRONMENT, AND WATER QUALITY PROGRAMS

1. The Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) is established in 1986 with 10-year contracts to protect highly erodible land with cover crops. What should be the policy when these contracts begin to expire in 1996? The government should: (Check one)
- a. Offer to extend all contracts for several years at the current payment rate per acre _____
 - b. Offer to extend some contracts on the most erodible acres with new bids _____
 - c. Discontinue this program _____
 - d. Replace CRP with conservation and water quality program incentive payments _____
2. To be eligible for farm program benefits, farmers are required to implement approved conservation plans by January 1, 1995. This compliance program should be continued. (Check one)
- | | | | | |
|----------|-------|-------|----------|----------|
| Strongly | | Not | | Strongly |
| Agree | Agree | Sure | Disagree | Disagree |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

3. Water quality has become a major concern. Government should regulate specified farming practices and land uses to reduce pollution of underground and stream water. (Check one)
- | | | | | |
|----------|-------|-------|----------|----------|
| Strongly | | Not | | Strongly |
| Agree | Agree | Sure | Disagree | Disagree |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
4. To protect water quality, all farmers should be required to plant grass protection strips along stream banks and in waterways. (Check one)
- | | | | | |
|----------|-------|-------|----------|----------|
| Strongly | | Not | | Strongly |
| Agree | Agree | Sure | Disagree | Disagree |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
5. Farmers should be compensated for planting grass protective strips along stream banks and in waterways. (Check one)
- | | | | | |
|----------|-------|-------|----------|----------|
| Strongly | | Not | | Strongly |
| Agree | Agree | Sure | Disagree | Disagree |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
6. When government regulations reduce the value of farm property, the owner should be compensated for this loss. (Check one)
- | | | | | |
|----------|-------|-------|----------|----------|
| Strongly | | Not | | Strongly |
| Agree | Agree | Sure | Disagree | Disagree |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
7. How does the amount per acre of agricultural pesticides (active ingredients) you are using compare with five years ago? (Check one)
- | | | | | |
|-------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|
| More | About the | | Don't | |
| | Same | Less | Know | |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
8. Farmers should be required to keep application records on their use of all agricultural pesticides. (Check one)
- | | | | | |
|----------|-------|-------|----------|----------|
| Strongly | | Not | | Strongly |
| Agree | Agree | Sure | Disagree | Disagree |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
9. Farmers should not be permitted to drain wetlands and plant crops on these lands. (Check one)
- | | | | | |
|----------|-------|-------|----------|----------|
| Strongly | | Not | | Strongly |
| Agree | Agree | Sure | Disagree | Disagree |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

SECTION C. DISASTER ASSISTANCE

1. Major droughts and floods show the high risks farmers face. Should the government protect farmers from such disasters? (Check one)
- Yes. Let Congress decide each year about disaster aid programs _____
 - Yes. Develop a permanent disaster program for losses that exceed 50 percent and encourage farmers to buy additional protection by using private crop insurance _____
 - Yes. Set up a mandatory crop insurance program for all farmers as a condition of eligibility for additional disaster payments _____
 - No. Let farmers buy private crop insurance if they want protection and get the government out of crop insurance and special disaster assistance _____
2. If the government are to offer a subsidized crop insurance program and no disaster program, which type of program would you prefer? (Check one)
- Let farmers buy crop insurance on a voluntary basis, paying for coverage based on their individual farm yields _____
 - Let farmers buy crop insurance on a voluntary basis, but offer lower premiums by basing premiums on county average yields with no pay-off unless county yields drop more than some specified percent _____
 - Require all farmers to buy crop insurance _____

SECTION D. INTERNATIONAL TRADE

- 1. Beyond the current NAFTA and GATT agreements, the U.S. should continue to vigorously negotiate multilateral and bilateral arrangements to further reduce trade barriers. (Check one)
Strongly Agree Agree Not Sure Disagree Strongly Disagree

- 2. The U.S. should continue to subsidize export sales of agricultural products. (Check one)
Strongly Agree Agree Not Sure Disagree Strongly Disagree

- 3. The United States should subsidize exports of value added products (such as meat, flour, and similar processed commodities) rather than bulk commodities. (Check one)
Strongly Agree Agree Not Sure Disagree Strongly Disagree

- 4. The U.S. should continue to decrease its funding of foreign food aid. (Check one)
Strongly Agree Agree Not Sure Disagree Strongly Disagree

SECTION E. FOOD AID

- 1. Food stamps and other food programs take more than half of the U.S. department of Agriculture budget. Food programs should be shifted to cash grants and let states distribute the funds. (Check one)
Strongly Agree Agree Not Sure Disagree Strongly Disagree

- 2. Food stamps should be distributed only to the elderly and families with children which have incomes below poverty levels. (Check one)
Strongly Agree Agree Not Sure Disagree Strongly Disagree

SECTION F. FOOD SAFETY

- 1. All meat and meat products sold at retail should carry instructions for proper storage and cooking. (Check one)
Strongly Agree Agree Not Sure Disagree Strongly Disagree

- 2. Food inspections should be strengthened to insure safer and better quality foods. (Check one)
Strongly Agree Agree Not Sure Disagree Strongly Disagree

- 3. Imported food and beverages now meet the same safety requirements as domestic products. (Check one)
Strongly Agree Agree Not Sure Disagree Strongly Disagree

SECTION G. FOOD NUTRITION

1. Have you seen the USDA food pyramid with guidelines for proper nutrition? (Check one)

	Not	Sure
Yes	No	
_____	_____	_____

2. If yes, do you think it is a useful educational tool? (Check one)

	Not	Sure
Yes	No	
_____	_____	_____

3. Food labels should be required to contain more diet and nutrition information. (Check one)

Strongly		Not	Strongly
Agree	Agree	Sure	Disagree
_____	_____	_____	_____

4. Do you read the food labels on the package to find what the product contains? (Check one)

Often	Occasionally	Never	
_____	_____	_____	_____

SECTION H. IDAHO ISSUES

1. How would you rank the following factors in terms of their importance to you in planning your future farming operation? (Rank 1-9 with 1 being most important and 9 least important).
 - _____ land uses/urban encroachment
 - _____ level of government support
 - _____ ground and surface water quality
 - _____ rural community/family values
 - _____ food safety
 - _____ water availability
 - _____ endangered species listings
 - _____ farm price/profitability
 - _____ pesticide use and availability

2. If agriculture spending limits are further reduced, which area would you favor receive the biggest cuts?
 - a. Direct farm support payments, i.e. deficiency payments? _____
 - b. Soil and water conservation cost-sharing programs _____
 - c. Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) contract payments _____
 - d. Foreign market development funding _____
 - e. Export Enhancement Subsidies _____

3. Our Canadian competitors use a monopolistic grain marketing board to negotiate foreign grain sales. The U.S. should establish a similar board to compete against Canadian marketing practices.

Strongly		Not	Strongly
Agree	Agree	Sure	Disagree
_____	_____	_____	_____

4. Do you favor the permanent elimination of acreage set aside requirements?

	Not	Sure
Yes	No	
_____	_____	_____

5. How have the new EPA worker protection standards affected your operation? (Check one)
 - No effect _____
 - More training for managers _____
 - Training for all (employees and managers) _____
 - Discontinued producing a crop _____
 - Other _____

SECTION I. OTHER NATIONAL ISSUES

- 1a. Biotechnology (the use of living organisms, plants, animals, and microbes to develop different traits in plants, livestock and poultry) will be beneficial for producers. (Check one)
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
- 1b. Agricultural biotechnology will be beneficial for consumers. (Check one)
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
2. Tax money should be used to subsidize fuels developed from plants (ethanol and plant based diesel). (Check one)
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
3. Government supported agricultural research should be targeted to benefit small and medium sized farms. (Check one)
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
4. The federal government should increase funding for programs to expand employment and economic activity in rural areas. (Check one)
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
5. Check the 3 most important needs for economic development in your area from the following list:
- a. More support for public education _____
 - b. New or improved sewage plants _____
 - c. Business development _____
 - d. More law enforcement and crime prevention _____
 - e. New or improved roads _____
 - f. New or improved bridges _____
 - g. Public training to improve worker's skills _____
 - h. Improved health care facilities _____

SECTION J. PERSONAL DATA

To help us group responses for farmers with similar operations, we would like to know more about you. (Check one)

1. Your age
- | | | | |
|----------|-------|------------|-------|
| Under 35 | _____ | 50 - 64 | _____ |
| 35 - 39 | _____ | 65 or over | _____ |
2. Approximate average annual gross sales (including government payments) from your farm in recent years. (Check one)
- | | | | |
|---------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------|
| Under \$19,999 | _____ | \$100,000 - \$249,000 | _____ |
| \$20,000 - \$39,000 | _____ | \$250,000 - \$499,999 | _____ |
| \$40,000 - \$99,999 | _____ | \$500,000 plus | _____ |
3. What percent of your total farm cash receipts in 1993 came from sales of livestock and livestock (including dairy and poultry) products? (Check one)
- | | | | |
|-----------------|-------|------------------|-------|
| None | _____ | 51 - 75 percent | _____ |
| 1 - 25 percent | _____ | 76 - 100 percent | _____ |
| 26 - 50 percent | _____ | | |

4. What is the last year of school you completed? (Check one)
 Grade school _____ Some college or technical school _____
 Some high school _____ Graduated from college _____
 Graduated from high school _____
5. If you or members of your family are employed off the farm, check the approximate amount of family income in 1993 that came from off-farm employment. (Check one)
 Under \$10,000 _____ \$20,000 - \$39,000 _____
 \$10,000 - \$19,000 _____ \$40,000 plus _____
6. What is your most important source of cash receipts in 1993? (Check one)
 Grain _____ Beef, sheep or hogs _____
 Dairy _____ Sugarbeets _____
 Potatoes _____ Hay _____
 Other (specify) _____
7. Check the government programs that you received benefits from during 1993.
- | | Feed | | | |
|----------------------|-------|-------|--------|-------|
| | Wheat | Grain | Cotton | Rice |
| Price support | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Conservation Reserve | _____ | _____ | | |
| Farmer Owned Reserve | _____ | _____ | | |
| Wool/Mohair | _____ | | | |
| Disaster Program | _____ | | | |
| Other programs | _____ | | | |
8. What percent of the land that you farm do you own? (Check one)
 None _____ 51 - 75 percent _____
 1 - 25 percent _____ 76 - 100 percent _____
 26 - 50 percent _____
9. Please check your membership in these organizations in 1993.
 American Agriculture Movement _____
 Farm Bureau _____
 Farmers Union _____
 Grange _____
 National Farmers Organization (NFO) _____
 Cattleman's Association _____
 Potato Growers _____
 Barley Growers _____
 Grain/Producers _____
 Milk Producers _____
 Pork Producers _____
 Wool Growers _____
 Sugarbeet Association _____
 Wheat Growers _____
 Labor Union _____
 Other (specify) _____
10. Would you like a summary of the responses from this survey?
 _____ YES _____ NO

Thank you for answering these questions. You are welcome to make any comments on a separate sheet if you want to provide further suggestions.

Bibliography

Nie, N.H., C.H. Hull, J.G. Jenkins, K. Steinbrenner and D.H. Bent. 1988. Statistical Package for the social sciences. Third Edition. SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, 1992 Census of Agriculture. U.S. Printing Office: Washington, D.C.

Issued in furtherance of cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics, Acts of May 8 and June 30, 1914,
in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, LeRoy D. Luft, Director of Cooperative Extension System,
University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho 83844. The University of Idaho provides equal opportunity in education and employment on the basis of
race, color, religion, national origin, gender, age, disability, or status as a Vietnam-era veteran, as required by state and federal laws.