University of Connecticut
College of Agriculture and Natural Resources

SURVEY OF LIVESTOCK PRODUCERS IN SOUTHERN NEW ENGLAND

Northeast SARE Professional Development Program State Implementation Plan for:

University of Connecticut, University of Massachusetts, and University Of Rhode Island

PROJECT: PRODUCING NATURAL LOCAL MEATS FOR CONSUMERS

TRI-STATE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS:

Joseph Bonelli	University of Connecticut
Stephen Herbert	University of Massachusetts
Kristin Castrataro	University of Rhode Island

PROJECT COORDINATOR:

Michael T. Keilty, Sustainable Food Systems Coordinator, University of Connecticut

NORTHEAST SARE
Sustainable Agriculture Research & Education

PROJECT ABSTRACT

Northeast SARE Professional Development Program Implementation Plan for University of Connecticut, University of Massachusetts and University of Rhode Island

Project Title: PRODUCING NATURAL LOCAL MEAT FOR CONSUMERS

Project Duration: July 1, 2008-June 30, 2011

Abstract:

Important concerns regarding food safety, farm preservation and farm viability has stimulated renewed interest in the production of local food. The project is designed to increase engagement of Cooperative Extension Personnel in Connecticut, Massachusetts and Rhode Island, Departments of Agriculture, other state and local agencies, USDA agencies and NGOs, and farmers in the production, processing and marketing of natural locally grown meats and other products for consumers.

Project performance targets will include educational events on sustainable grazing practices, creating a tri-state sustainable foods working group, conducting a tri-state survey of meat producers, demonstrations of successful marketing techniques, and a farmer owned fully inspected, stationary and/or mobile meat processing cooperative.

Consumers will benefit from the availability of locally grown natural meats. Farmers will benefit from selling their meat directly to consumers. A ripple effect will be increased utilization and preservation of farm land in Southern New England.

Tri-State Project Principal Investigators:

Joseph Bonelli	860-870-6935	joseph.bonelli@uconn.edu
Stephen Herbert	413-545-2250	stephen.herbert@pssci.umass.edu
Kristin Castrataro	401-935-7308	kdame@mail.uri.edu

Project Coordinator:

Michael T. Keilty, Sustainable Food Systems Coordinator, UCONN
860-567-8324 michael.keilty@uconn.edu

SURVEY OF LIVESTOCK PRODUCERS IN SOUTHERN NEW ENGLAND

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SURVEY OF LIVESTOCK PRODUCERS IN SOUTHERN NEW ENGLAND

Important concerns regarding food safety, farm preservation and farm viability have stimulated renewed interest in the production of local food. The Universities of Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island received a Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education (SARE) grant from the USDA entitled "Sustaining Natural Local Meat for Consumers." A component of the grant for the first program year was a survey of meat producers in the three states.

An electronic survey was designed by the project team for the grant and conducted during February and March 2009 throughout the three states. Potential participants who raised some type of meat in the three states were identified by the project team. The survey was sent to 285 farmers and a total of 117 responses were received. Outreach to participants was primarily limited to those who could be reached by email, although there was an opportunity to complete the survey on paper and mail or fax it forward.

Survey questions were generally grouped in three areas:

1. General questions about the size of local farms, the numbers of livestock produced, the process by which farmers slaughter and process their meat for sale, and the ways in which farmers plan to protect their land and/or farms for farming in the future

2. Questions about pasturing and grazing in feeding animals

3. Questions about marketing techniques used and needs for other tools and advice.

The survey report includes an Executive Summary, a description of Highlights and Observations from the Survey Results, and a compendium of data, tabulations, and cross-tabulations for each of the 36 questions.

Survey of Livestock Producers in Southern New England

Executive Summary

The survey yielded a wealth of information about the current level of knowledge and activity among farmers in the three state area engaged in the production of natural local meat, information that is useful to the objectives of the SARE funded project.

In total 117 responses to the survey were received. The survey was sent to 285 farmers. Caution should be used in projecting the survey findings to the entire target population as the 41% response rate may not allow this.

<u>General Information</u>

90% of respondents own some or all of the land they farm, and most own 50 acres or less. 51% of respondents rent some or all of the land they farm, and most rent 50 acres or less. Renting rather than owning land may have implications for how the land, the farm and the pastures are managed – the subject of several other questions in the survey.

Overall 75% of respondents are part-time farmers. There are significantly fewer part-time farmers in MA (53%) than in CT (87%) or RI (94%). The high incidence of part-time farmers has implications for how and when meetings are scheduled, e.g., holding meetings on evenings and weekends instead of during regular business hours.

More than 7 in 10 survey respondents raise beef. Most often (68%) these farmers raise 1-10 beef cattle. Although the average respondent is raising more than one species, the majority (56%) of respondents in each state raise primarily beef.

About 2 in 10 respondents raise poultry, most often less than 1000 birds.

Overall 7 in 10 respondents who raise four-legged animals use a USDA inspected slaughter facility vs. nearly 6 in 10 respondents who raise poultry. Results are nearly identical for use of a fully inspected cutting/processing facility.

The most frequent response as to number of miles traveled to take animals to slaughter or processing was 20-50 miles.

Notably, more than 7 in 10 respondents reported they would expand their business if they had better access to a USDA inspected slaughter facility.

There is very high interest (over 3 in 5) in a farmer-owned cooperative business for USDA inspected slaughter and processing, with potentially even higher interest if more information is provided to the nearly 1 in 3 respondents that indicated they “did not know” if they were interested. Fewer than 1 in 10 respondents would <u>not</u> be interested.

Overall nearly seven in ten respondents would be interested in a USDA inspected mobile slaughter facility.

Access to a USDA inspected slaughter facility, access to processing and regulations pose the biggest barriers (some or major) to most of the respondents.

Notably, 9 in 10 respondents believe their land will remain in farming, pasture or grazing beyond the next 10 years, however, only about half of them have a plan in place to make sure that will happen.

Overall the most prevalent other farm enterprises of respondents were: growing hay (66% of respondents) and growing vegetables (52% of respondents).

About 8 in 10 respondents would be interested in on-farm research grants, and nearly 7 in 10 have heard about the Northeast Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education (SARE) on-farm research grants for farmers.

<u>Pasturing</u>

There are notable differences in the responses to some of the questions on pasturing based on the species primarily raised. Looking at the responses of all survey respondents overall:

- 90% of respondents feed animals using pasture or pasture and browse.

- Two-thirds of respondents use farm pasture as half or more of the feed for their animals. Just over one-third of respondents use farm pasture as 75% or more of their feed. Less than 10% of respondents use farm pasture as 100% of their feed.

- Nearly 80% of respondents manage pastures by moving animals from one large field to another when pasture is becoming short or by implementing an intensely managed grazing plan.

- More than 90% of respondents decide how much pasture to make available for grazing based on pasture available or based on plan for set rotation of fields. Less than 10% indicated they have difficulty knowing how much pasture to rotate.

- The pasture description most often used by respondents was “mixture of grasses and legumes. This was followed by the description “mostly grasses.” Only about 1 in 5 respondents described their pastures as “weedy.”

- Nearly 60% of respondents manage weeds in their pastures by mowing them. This was followed by using “primary animal species to eat weeds,” mentioned by nearly one-third of respondents. Only 14% mentioned the use of herbicides.

- More than 9 in 10 respondents use soil testing to determine the nutrient management of their pastures. The next highest method, forage testing, was far behind, mentioned by only 15% of respondents.

- Strong needs for information about pasturing were expressed by the majority of respondents (7 in 10).

Marketing

Overall respondents market by direct sales of inspected processed meat and by live animal sale to the consumer in equal proportions, 58%. However, there are notable differences in the prevalence of the top two marketing approaches by state. In CT 80% of respondents market through live animal sale to the consumer; only 46% by direct sale of inspected processed meat. In MA it is the opposite. The high rate of live animal sales in CT correlates with the lack of USDA inspected slaughter and/or processing facilities in the state.

Nearly 9 in 10 respondents use word of mouth as a tool in marketing their meat, followed by nearly 7 in 10 who use on-farm sales. About one-third of respondents each use the Farmers Market, the Internet and the Buy Local campaign tools.

Regarding potential challenges to marketing their meat, nearly 8 in 10 respondents listed regulations as either a major challenge or some challenge. The next highest major challenge was cost/expenses of advertising.

Overall the top three strategies at present in labeling meat for sale, each mentioned by roughly one-quarter of respondents are: 1) Locally grown, 2) Label individual farm or product by farm name, and 3) Grass-fed and finished.

Regarding interest in participating in a local/regional farmer cooperative approach to marketing, most respondents were positive on this idea or unsure, likely an indication of the need for more information on such a proposal.

Overall half of respondents indicated they thought their customers prefer local meat because “Local meat means you know your producer.”

Survey of Livestock Producers in Southern New England

Highlights and Observations from Survey Results

General

Total number of survey responses was 117: 45 CT, 45 MA, 23 RI; 4 did not indicate what state their farm is in.

Survey was emailed to 285 farmers (102 from CT, 107 from MA, 76 from RI).

Response rate was: 41% overall, 44% CT, 42% MA, 30% RI.

<u>Q. 1 -- Survey Introduction</u>

<u>Q. 2 -- How many acres of land do you have available? (Check all that apply)</u>

90% of respondents (104 of 116 respondents who answered this question) own some or all of the land they farm.

- 55% own 50 acres or less; 45% more than 50 acres.

10% of respondents (12 of 116) did not indicate that they own any of the land they farm; they only rent the land that they farm.

51% of respondents (59 of 116) rent some or all of the land they farm.

- 63% rent 50 acres or less; 37% more than 50 acres.

Renting rather than owning land may have implications for how the land, the farm and the pastures are managed – the subject of several other questions in the survey.

Only 72% of respondents answered the part of the question on number of acres available for pasture.

- This could mean that 28% of respondents have no acres available for pasture or that they do not know number of acres available for pasture.

Of those who did respond, 79% have 50 acres or less available for pasture; 22% have more than 50 acres.

<u>Q. 3 -- What type of farmer are you? (Check one)</u>

Overall 75% of respondents are part-time farmers. There are significantly fewer part time farmers in MA (53%) than in CT (87%) or RI (94%).

The high incidence of part-time farmers has implications for how and when meetings are scheduled, e.g., holding meetings on evenings and weekends instead of during regular business hours.

Q. 4 -- How many animals do you raise each year for processing? (Check all that apply)

71% of respondents (77 of 108) raise beef (71% CT, 68% MA, 81% RI)
- Most often (68%) these farmers raise 1-10 beef cattle

36% of respondents (39 of 108) raise swine (49% CT, 35% MA, 19% RI)
- Of these farmers, about half (49%) raise 11-50 swine and 44% raise 1-10.

20% of respondents (22 of 108) raise goats (20% CT, 19% MA, 29% RI)
- Most often (59%) these farmers raise 1-10 goats

37% of respondents (40 of 108) raise sheep (31% CT, 43% MA, 43% RI)
- Of these farmers, 46% raise 1-10 sheep, 27% raise 11-50 and another 27% raise 50 or more.

32% of respondents (35 of 108) of respondents raise other species than those listed on this survey question (36% CT , 41% MA, 14%RI). They are:
- Chickens and/or turkeys, eggs, other types of fowl – 23 respondents
- Veal, dairy or cull cows – 6 respondents
- Rabbits – 4 respondents
- Emu, llama, donkeys, or bison – 3 respondents

Overall the average respondent raises more than one type species as shown by the fact that there were 1.9 species mentioned per respondent to this question. .

Q. 5 -- If you raise poultry how many birds do you raise each year for processing?

Overall 41% of respondents (48 of 117) raise poultry (38% CT, 53% MA, 30% RI)
- Most often (85%)these farmers raise less than 1000 birds (82% CT, 83% MA, 100% RI)

Q. 6 -- Do you use a USDA inspected slaughter facility? (Select one)

66% of respondents use a USDA inspected slaughter facility (64% CT, 73% MA, 52% RI)

70% of respondents who raise four-legged animals use a USDA inspected slaughter facility vs. 58% of respondents who raise poultry.

Q. 7. -- Do you use a fully inspected cutting/processing facility? (Select one)

71% of respondents use a fully inspected cutting/processing facility (59% CT, 82% MA, 73% RI)
- CT use of such facilities is notably lower than MA and RI

75% of respondents who raise four-legged animals use a fully inspected cutting/processing facility vs. 62% of respondents who raise poultry.

Q. 8 -- How far do you travel (one way) to take animals to slaughter? (Select one)

Most frequent response was 20-50 miles, with only 7% of CT , and 9% each of MA and RI respondents reporting that they travel more than 100 miles.

Q. 9 How far do you travel (one way) to take animals to processing? (Select one)

Most frequent response in MA was 20-50 miles, in CT and RI the most frequent response was less than 20 miles. Only 7% of CT , and 8% of MA and 5% RI respondents reported that they travel more than 100 miles.

Q. 10 -- If you had better access to a USDA inspected slaughter facility would you expand your business over the next 3 years? (Select one)

More than 7 in 10 respondents (72%) reported they would expand their business if they had better access to a USDA inspected slaughter facility. The proportion of farmers who would expand is somewhat greater in CT (74%) and RI (79%) than in MA (67%).

A total of 21 respondents also responded in the "Other" category: 15 of these comments are about expanding if they had better access; 4 comments indicated no expansion; 2 said they did not know.

Q. 11 -- Would you be interested in a farmer owned cooperative business for USDA inspected slaughter and processing? (Select one)

Overall 60% of respondents would be interested in such a business, 31% did not know and only 9% would not be interested. Responses were similar across the three states.

This indicates there is already very high interest (over 3 in 5) in a farmer owned cooperative with potentially even higher interest if more information is provided to the nearly 1 in 3 respondents that indicated they "did not know."

Q. 12 -- Would a USDA inspected mobile slaughter facility meet your needs? (Select one)

Overall the strong majority (69%) of respondents would be interested in a USDA inspected mobile slaughter facility; 31% would not. MA respondents were the most interested (80%), followed RI (71%), followed by CT (61%).

69% of respondents who raise four-legged animals would be interested in a USDA inspected mobile slaughter facility vs. 88% of respondents who raise poultry.

Q. 13 -- Rating of eight different issues as to whether they present barriers to the continued existence or growth of respondent's business. (Select one per row)

Respondents indicated that the first two issues – Access to USDA inspected slaughter facility and Access to processing – pose the biggest barriers (some or major) overall. About 81% of respondents indicated that each of these issues presented barriers (some or major) to the continued existence or growth of their businesses.

The next most frequently mentioned barrier was "Regulations" with about 76% indicating this barrier to continued existence or growth.

Q. 14 -- Do you believe that your land will remain farming, pasture or grazing beyond the next 10 years? (Select one)

Overall 90% responded "yes," with little variation in this response by state.

Q. 15 -- Do you have a plan in place to make sure that your land will remain in farming, pasture or grazing? (Select one)

Overall respondents were almost evenly split on this question, with the edge going to those not having a plan (52%), as compared to 48% having a plan. CT respondents were least likely to have a plan (56%).

It is notable that while 90% of respondents believe their land will remain in farming, only about half have a plan for making sure that happens.

Q.16. -- If you do have a plan, can you describe your plan? (Select one)

From the previous question, 56 respondents indicated that had a plan. Only 31 of these 56 expected respondents picked either of the two categories "sale of development rights" (17 responses) or "conservation easement" (15 responses).

By far the largest number of responses was in the "Other" category (46 responses). A review of these responses found that they fall into roughly three categories:

- Farm protected, a specific provision or method cited – 28 responses
- Farm not protected by a specific plan or provision – 13 responses
- In process of putting place farm protection – 5 responses

(Note that the response count of 85 in the "skipped question" refers to those who did not select either the a. or b. option. However, some of these 85 did give an "Other" response of which there were 46 in total.)

Q.17 -- What other farm enterprises do you have in addition to meat or poultry production? (Check all that apply)

Overall the most prevalent other farm enterprises of respondents were: growing hay (66% of respondents) and growing vegetables (52% of respondents). Hay was most often noted by CT respondents (79%) and RI respondents (67%); Vegetables by MA respondents (64%).

There were a total of 25 "Other" responses which varied widely: the largest category, fruit, vegetables, and honey had 6 responses; the next largest was eggs with 4 responses; all other categories were mentioned 2 times or fewer.

Q. 18 -- Would you be interested in on-farm research grants that are available for farmers? (Select one)

About 80% of respondents in each of the states surveyed would be interested in such grants.

Q. 19 -- Have you heard about the Northeast Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education (SARE) on-farm research grants for farmers? (Select one)

Overall 65% of respondents have heard of SARE grants. There are significant variations in this by state: 53% CT, 84% MA, 55% RI.

Q. 20. -- If you raise more than one livestock species, please identify the primary species that you raise and answer questions 21-27 about that species. (Select one)

A number of respondents did not follow instructions in answering this question. While 105 survey respondents answered this question, they gave 129 responses.

Overall the majority (56%) of respondents in each state primarily raise beef. This is true for CT (59%), RI (62%) and nearly true for MA (49%).

Note: For questions 21-27 responses are shown below for all respondents and by species primarily raised. Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Q. 21 -- How do you feed your animals? (Select one)

	Overall n=108	Beef n=55	Sheep n=24	Swine n=13	Poultry n=19	Goats n=9
Pasture	48%	60%	42%	15%	53%	22%
Pasture and browze	42%	31%	54%	62%	32%	67%
Forage, animals confined	10%	9%	4%	23%	16%	11%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Overall, 90% of respondents feed animals using pasture or pasture and browse, but there are notable differences by species primarily raised as shown above.

Q. 22 -- Approximately what percent of feed is farm pasture? (Select one)

	Overall n=109	Beef n=55	Sheep n=24	Swine n=13	Poultry n=21	Goats n=9
None	7%	4%	0%	15%	19%	11%
25%	26%	20%	17%	31%	43%	33%
50%	31%	26%	50%	15%	19%	44%
75%	28%	42%	25%	39%	19%	11%
100%	7%	9%	8%	0%	0%	0%
Total	99%	101%	100%	100%	100%	99%

Overall two-thirds of respondents use farm pasture as half or more of the feed for their animals. Just over one-third of respondents use farm pasture as 75% or more of their feed.. Less than 10% of respondents use farm pasture as 100% of their feed. There are notable variations in this by species raised as shown above.

Q. 23 -- How would you describe your pasture management? (Select one)

	Overall n=110	Beef n=55	Sheep n=24	Swine n=13	Poultry n=21	Goats n=9
Animals are confined	7%	6%	4%	15%	14%	11%
No specific grazing management.	15%	13%	13%	0%	14%	11%
Animals moved from one large field to another when pasture is becoming short	35%	35%	46%	23%	14%	56%
Intensely managed grazing plan implemented	44%	47%	38%	62%	57%	22%
Total	101%	101%	101%	100%	99%	100%

Overall nearly 80% of respondents manage pastures by moving animals from one large field to another when pasture is becoming short or by implementing an intensely managed grazing plan. There are notable variations in this by species raised as shown above.

Q. 24 -- How do you decide how much pasture to make available for grazing? (Select one)

	Overall n=104	Beef n=52	Sheep n=23	Swine n=11	Poultry n=17	Goats n=8
Based on pasture available	52%	44%	30%	46%	41%	75%
Based on plan for set rotation of fields	40%	48%	61%	55%	53%	25%
Would like to rotate pastures, but have difficulty knowing how much pasture to rotate	8%	8%	9%	0%	6%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	101%	100%	100%

Overall more than 90% of respondents decide how much pasture to make available for grazing based on pasture available or based on plan for set rotation of fields. Less than 10% indicated they have difficulty knowing how much pasture to rotate.

Q. 25 -- How would you describe your pastures? (Check all that apply)

	Overall n=109	Beef n=55	Sheep n=24	Swine n=13	Poultry n=20	Goats n=9
Mixture of grasses and legumes	47%	47%	38%	54%	70%	78%
Weedy	21%	20%	29%	15%	5%	33%
Mostly grasses	39%	44%	46%	39%	30%	11%
Need help in identifying plants in my pasture	6%	4%	8%	8%	0%	11%
Avg. no. of responses per respondent	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.3

Overall pasture description most often used by respondents (47%) was "mixture of grasses and legumes. This was followed by the description "mostly grasses" (39%). Only about 1 in 5 respondents described their pastures as "weedy."

Q. 26 -- How do you manage the weeds in your pasture(s)? (Choose all that apply)

	Overall n=108	Beef n=54	Sheep n=24	Swine n=13	Poultry n=19	Goats n=9
Herbicides	14%	20%	17%	15%	11%	22%
Mow weeds	58%	69%	67%	54%	37%	56%
Use different species of animal to follow rotation to control weeds and invasives	21%	17%	25%	39%	32%	33%
Use primary animal species to eat weeds	31%	22%	33%	15%	32%	44%
Don't control weeds	19%	20%	13%	15%	16%	11%
Avg. no. of responses per respondent	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.7

Overall nearly 60% of respondents manage weeds in their pastures by mowing them. This was followed by using "primary animal species to eat weeds," mentioned by nearly one-third of respondents. Only 14% mentioned the use of herbicides.

Q. 27 -- How do you determine your nutrient management of your pasture? (Check all that apply)

	Overall n=86	Beef n=45	Sheep n=16	Swine n=12	Poultry n=16	Goats n=5
Soil testing	94%	93%	94%	100%	94%	100%
Agricultural service provider	12%	11%	13%	8%	13%	20%
Fertilizer salesman	7%	11%	6%	0%	0%	0%
Another farmer	6%	9%	6%	8%	0%	40%
Forage testing	15%	20%	13%	17%	0%	20%
Avg. no. of responses per respondent	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.1	1.8

Overall more than 9 in 10 respondents use soil testing to determine the nutrient management of their pastures. The next highest method, forage testing, was far behind, mentioned by only 15% of respondents.

Q. 28 -- Please indicate your level of need for information about pasturing in each category? (Check all that apply)

Overall responses to this question clearly indicate strong needs for information in all four of the categories listed:

	Need some information or Have major need for information
Grazing management	67%
Weed management	78%
Livestock management	66%
Soil management	77%

State by state tabs showed that the majority of respondents in all three states surveyed, indicated the need for information (some and major) in all four of the listed categories.

Q. 29 -- How do you currently market your meat? (Check all that apply)

Overall respondents market by direct sales of inspected processed meat and by live animal sale to the consumer in equal proportions, 58%. Less than 20% market by auction and less than 15% by wholesale sales.

There are notable differences in the prevalence of the top two marketing approaches by state. In CT 80% of respondents market through live animal sale to the consumer; only 46% by direct sale of inspected processed meat. In MA it is the opposite: 77% by direct sale of processed inspected meat and only 37% by live animal sale to the consumer. These two approaches are about equally used in RI. (Note: the high rate of live animal sales in CT correlates with the lack of USDA inspected slaughter and/or processing facilities in the state.)

<u>Q. 30 -- What tools do you use to market your meat? (Check all that apply)</u>

The overwhelming majority of respondents use word of mouth (87%), followed by On-farm sales (67%). About one-third of respondents each use the Farmers Market, the Internet and the Buy Local campaign tools.

There were modest state variations in these responses. Over 90% of CT and RI respondents use Word of mouth (91% and 96% respectively), whereas only about three – quarters (77%) of MA respondents mentioned this tool. MA respondents were just as likely to mention On-farm sales (77%); CT and RI were less likely to mention this tool (69% and a much lower 44% respectively). Notably, MA respondents mentioned more marketing tools than respondents did in the other two states: an average of 3.3 tools mentioned per respondent in MA as compared to 2.6 in CT and 2.4 in RI.

<u>Q. 31 -- Please rate each of these potential challenges to marketing your meat. (Check all that apply)</u>

The most often mentioned Major Challenge (31%) was Regulations, mentioned almost twice as often as the next highest Major Challenge, Cost/expenses of advertising at 16%.

Regulations were noted by fully 78% of respondents as Some Challenge or as a Major Challenge; this is 20 percentage points or more higher than any of the other challenges listed. Four other issues ranked next in degree of challenge by between 55-58% of respondents: Identifying/developing "brand", Lack of marketing expertise, Lack of expertise in internet sales and costs of advertising.

<u>Q. 32 -- What is your best strategy right now in labeling your meat for sale? (Choose one)</u>

Overall the top three strategies, each mentioned by roughly 25% of respondents are Locally grown, Label individual farm or product by farm name, and Grass-fed and finished.

Q. 33 -- Would you be interested in participating in a local/regional farmer cooperative approach to marketing? (Select one)

Overall there were few negative responses to this question (14%). Most responses were positive (46%) or Don't know (40%) which is likely an indication of the need for more information on such a proposal. RI responses were the most positive.

Q. 34 -- Why do you think that your customers prefer local meat? (Select one)

Overall half of respondents indicated the reason was that "Local meat means you know your producer." This response was highest in CT (59%). It was lowest in RI (37%) where it was equal to the "Local meat is healthier" response (37%).

There were 17 "Other" responses. 13 of the 17 said all of the reasons listed were why customers prefer local meat. One respondent mentioned that local meat is fresh not frozen; one mentioned that ethnic lamb consumers require fresh carcasses.

Q. 35 -- Results from this survey will not identify any specific respondent. It would help us to know the general location of your farm. (Select one)

Respondents farm in 22 counties in the three states -- CT (8), MA (10) and RI (4). More respondents farm in Litchfield County in CT than in any other county in the survey.

Q. 36 -- If you would like us to contact you individually about the survey and any questions you ay have, please provide contact information. This is optional.

Overall 44% of respondents (52 respondents) provided contact information. In each case but two, this was name and email address. See Tab 24 for this list.