

# DATA FOR **PROGRESS**

From July 26 to 30, 2024, Data for Progress conducted a survey of 1,226 U.S. likely voters nationally using web panel respondents. The sample was weighted to be representative of likely voters by age, gender, education, race, geography, and 2020 recalled vote. The survey was conducted in English. The margin of error associated with the sample size is  $\pm 3$  percentage points. Results for subgroups of the sample are subject to increased margins of error. Partisanship reflected in tabulations is based on self-identified party affiliation, not partisan registration. For more information please visit [dataforprogress.org/our-methodology](https://dataforprogress.org/our-methodology).

NB: subgroups with a n-size less than 50 (<50) are not shown on these cross-tabs. We choose not to display N<50 subgroups because the sample is too small to have statistical significance. We did, however, take samples of these subgroups for representational and weighting purposes to accurately reflect the electorate makeup. Some values may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

N=1,226 unless otherwise specified.

## [1] How much have you seen or heard about the term "PFAS," or per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances?

Response	Topline	Democrat	Independent / Third party	Republican	Female	Male	Under 45	45+	No College	College	Black or African American	White	Latino
A lot	5	6	5	5	4	7	7	5	4	9	5	7	4
A little	24	25	26	21	23	24	28	22	22	26	26	23	25
Nothing at all	71	69	69	75	73	68	66	74	74	65	69	70	71
Weighted N	1,226	483	317	426	654	572	390	836	790	436	130	876	155

## [2] How much have you seen or heard about the term "forever chemicals"?

Response	Topline	Democrat	Independent / Third party	Republican	Female	Male	Under 45	45+	No College	College	Black or African American	White	Latino
A lot	12	14	11	9	11	13	15	10	10	15	11	12	10
A little	39	38	45	35	35	43	37	39	36	43	37	41	30
Nothing at all	50	48	44	56	54	45	48	50	54	42	53	47	60
Weighted N	1,226	483	317	426	654	572	390	836	790	436	130	876	155

**[3]** Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances, more commonly known as PFAS or "forever chemicals," are a class of more than 15,000 man-made chemicals that repel water, grease, and stains and are commonly used in food packaging, personal care products, cookware, clothing, and more.

Recent research demonstrates PFAS can persist in human bodies and the environment for decades, and have contaminated drinking water sources across the country.

**Knowing what you know now**, do you think that the federal government provides too much, enough, or not enough access to information and resources on PFAS?

Response	Topline	Democrat	Independent / Third party	Republican	Female	Male	Under 45	45+	No College	College	Black or African American	White	Latino
Too much	4	5	2	3	4	4	8	2	3	5	4	3	8
Enough	14	15	12	14	12	16	23	10	14	13	23	12	19
Not enough	72	68	76	72	74	69	58	78	71	73	59	75	59
Don't know	11	12	10	10	11	11	12	10	12	9	13	9	14
Weighted N	1,226	483	317	426	654	572	390	836	790	436	130	876	155

**[4]** Which of the following health problems, if any, do you associate the most with PFAS, or "forever chemicals"? Please select all that apply.

Response	Topline	Democrat	Independent / Third party	Republican	Female	Male	Under 45	45+	No College	College	Black or African American	White	Latino
Kidney, liver, prostate, and testicular cancer	34	36	37	32	34	35	28	37	33	38	38	35	25
Developmental effects	33	34	36	30	33	34	30	35	29	40	30	35	29
Reproductive harm	32	35	34	27	33	31	31	32	30	36	27	33	31
Lower immune system response	29	31	34	23	28	29	27	30	27	33	29	29	27
Hormone disruption	26	27	29	22	29	22	27	25	24	30	24	27	20
I have not heard of PFAS or forever chemicals	26	24	22	30	27	24	18	29	26	25	18	27	28
I don't associate any of these with PFAS or forever chemicals	18	16	18	19	15	20	20	16	20	13	23	16	15
Increased cholesterol and obesity	13	14	15	12	12	15	14	13	13	13	14	13	11
Weighted N	1,226	483	317	426	654	572	390	836	790	436	130	876	155

**[5]** Earlier this year, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announced a new rule that establishes legally enforceable limits on the level of PFAS in drinking water systems. It also requires public water systems to monitor for these PFAS, notify the public of any violations of these limits, and take measures to reduce PFAS exposure.

Do you support or oppose the new PFAS drinking water standards?

Response	Topline	Democrat	Independent / Third party	Republican	Female	Male	Under 45	45+	No College	College	Black or African American	White	Latino
Strongly support	50	58	50	41	50	50	40	55	44	62	42	55	35
Somewhat support	25	19	26	30	24	26	25	25	25	24	24	27	22
Somewhat oppose	7	8	6	7	7	7	11	6	9	4	14	5	18
Strongly oppose	5	3	5	7	5	5	7	4	6	3	9	4	7
Don't know	13	11	12	15	14	11	17	11	15	8	11	10	18
SUPPORT (TOTAL)	75	77	76	71	74	76	65	80	69	86	66	82	57
OPPOSE (TOTAL)	12	11	11	14	12	12	18	10	15	7	23	9	25
SUPPORT (NET)	+63	+66	+65	+57	+62	+64	+47	+70	+54	+79	+43	+73	+32
Weighted N	1,226	483	317	426	654	572	390	836	790	436	130	876	155

**[6]** Earlier this year, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announced that it would set enforceable limits on the level of six PFAS in U.S. municipal drinking water systems.

Since then, the EPA has faced scrutiny from many public water utilities, which claim that they shouldn't have to cover the cost of cleaning up PFAS contamination, given that PFAS enters drinking water systems from many sources.

Which of the following entities do you think should be held **most** responsible for paying to clean up municipal water systems to meet new PFAS drinking water standards?

Response	Topline	Democrat	Independent / Third party	Republican	Female	Male	Under 45	45+	No College	College	Black or African American	White	Latino
The federal government	24	28	24	20	22	26	31	21	26	20	29	22	37
Industry/chemical companies	36	33	38	37	37	34	22	42	31	44	22	40	24
State governments	15	13	16	15	13	16	19	13	15	14	18	13	16
Municipal water utilities	13	15	10	13	13	13	11	14	13	13	16	13	10
I don't think we should require new PFAS drinking water standards	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	5	2	7	3	6
Don't know	9	8	7	11	11	7	12	7	10	7	9	8	8
Weighted N	1,226	483	317	426	654	572	390	836	790	436	130	876	155

**[7]** Given what you currently know about PFAS, what percentage of Americans do you think have some level of PFAS in their bloodstream?

To answer this question, please drag the slider below

— % of Americans

Response	Topline	Democrat	Independent / Third party	Republican	Female	Male	Under 45	45+	No College	College	Black or African American	White	Latino
Average	62.9	64.6	65.1	59.3	65.1	60.4	63.2	62.8	61.0	66.3	58.7	64.6	58.1
Weighted N	1,226	483	317	426	654	572	390	836	790	436	130	876	155

**[8]** Food can be contaminated with PFAS via the soil, water, and air where it's grown, in addition to contact with plastic food packaging and when heated in non-stick cookware.

How concerned, if at all, are you about your own exposure to PFAS in the food supply?

Response	Topline	Democrat	Independent / Third party	Republican	Female	Male	Under 45	45+	No College	College	Black or African American	White	Latino
Very concerned	35	42	34	26	35	34	39	33	36	32	42	31	40
Somewhat concerned	43	42	45	42	44	41	40	44	40	47	38	46	35
Not very concerned	11	5	11	18	9	13	7	13	10	12	7	13	8
Not at all concerned	4	3	4	5	3	5	4	4	4	3	4	4	5
Don't know	8	8	6	9	9	7	10	7	9	6	8	6	12
CONCERNED (TOTAL)	78	84	79	68	79	75	79	77	76	79	80	77	75
NOT CONCERNED (TOTAL)	15	8	15	23	12	18	11	17	14	15	11	17	13
CONCERNED (NET)	+63	+76	+64	+45	+67	+57	+68	+60	+62	+64	+69	+60	+62
Weighted N	1,226	483	317	426	654	572	390	836	790	436	130	876	155

**[9]** CDC studies have found that 98% of Americans have some level of PFAS in their bloodstream, and that it is also detectable in breastmilk. PFAS is excreted slowly from the body over time, with some longer chains taking several years to exit the body.

Exposure to PFAS has been linked to several serious health issues, including multiple types of cancer and hormone disruption.

Having read more, how concerned are you about long term exposure to PFAS?

Response	Topline	Democrat	Independent / Third party	Republican	Female	Male	Under 45	45+	No College	College	Black or African American	White	Latino
Very concerned	51	59	52	40	54	47	49	52	49	54	53	48	55
Somewhat concerned	32	29	31	35	30	34	32	31	32	31	34	34	24
Not very concerned	8	4	8	11	6	10	7	8	8	7	6	9	8
Not at all concerned	3	1	3	4	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3
Don't know	7	6	5	10	8	7	10	6	8	6	5	6	10
CONCERNED (TOTAL)	83	88	83	75	84	81	81	83	81	85	87	82	79
NOT CONCERNED (TOTAL)	11	5	11	15	8	13	9	11	11	9	9	12	11
CONCERNED (NET)	+72	+83	+72	+60	+76	+68	+72	+72	+70	+76	+78	+70	+68
Weighted N	1,226	483	317	426	654	572	390	836	790	436	130	876	155

**[10]** When thinking about health risks associated with PFAS exposure, what routes of exposure concern you the most? Please select **up to two** options.

Response	Topline	Democrat	Independent / Third party	Republican	Female	Male	Under 45	45+	No College	College	Black or African American	White	Latino
Drinking water	69	70	71	67	70	67	67	70	68	71	68	71	62
Direct food or food packaging exposure	56	59	53	54	55	57	49	59	56	56	65	57	48
Household and commercial products	18	18	19	17	17	18	17	18	16	21	17	18	13
Personal care products	11	11	11	12	12	10	14	10	11	11	8	11	16
Biosolids or municipal sludge spread on agricultural land	9	8	11	7	10	7	10	8	7	11	5	9	11
Firefighting Foam (AFFF) used at airports, military bases, refineries, and on large ships	5	5	3	6	3	7	6	4	5	4	7	5	5
Don't know	7	7	6	9	7	8	10	6	8	6	5	6	9
Weighted N	1,226	483	317	426	654	572	390	836	790	436	130	876	155

**[11]** Scientists project that PFAS may be contaminating millions of acres of farmland across the country, with contaminated biosolids widely used as fertilizer across the U.S. for decades. As more farmers have begun to test for PFAS, an increasing number have suffered huge financial losses, as contaminated lands and crops are unsafe for use.

Recently, a bipartisan group of senators proposed creating a safety net for farmers whose land has become contaminated by PFAS and other impacted groups to offset financial losses related to exposure.

Would you support or oppose creating a fund for groups that have been negatively affected by PFAS exposure, such as farmers, agricultural workers, and industry workers to offset financial losses related to exposure?

Response	Topline	Democrat	Independent / Third party	Republican	Female	Male	Under 45	45+	No College	College	Black or African American	White	Latino
Strongly support	37	47	28	31	36	38	38	36	35	40	38	36	43
Somewhat support	43	37	54	43	41	45	37	46	43	43	44	45	32
Somewhat oppose	7	6	5	8	8	6	10	5	7	6	10	6	17
Strongly oppose	3	2	2	5	4	2	4	3	4	3	4	3	1
Don't know	10	8	12	12	12	9	11	10	11	9	4	11	7
SUPPORT (TOTAL)	80	84	82	74	77	83	75	82	78	83	82	81	75
OPPOSE (TOTAL)	10	8	7	13	12	8	14	8	11	9	14	9	18
SUPPORT (NET)	+70	+76	+75	+61	+65	+75	+61	+74	+67	+74	+68	+72	+57
Weighted N	1,226	483	317	426	654	572	390	836	790	436	130	876	155

**[12]** Should the federal government or individual state governments be responsible for creating a fund for groups that have been negatively affected by PFAS exposure, such as farmers, agricultural workers, and industry workers? (N=978)

Response	Topline	Democrat	Independent / Third party	Republican	Female	Male	Under 45	45+	No College	College	Black or African American	White	Latino
The federal government should be responsible for creating a fund	27	30	24	26	24	31	33	25	25	32	28	27	34
Individual state governments should be responsible for creating a fund	12	8	13	15	12	11	15	10	14	7	12	11	12
Both the federal government and individual state governments should be responsible for creating a fund	60	60	62	56	62	57	50	64	59	60	57	61	52
Don't know	2	1	1	3	1	2	2	1	2	1	3	1	2
Weighted N	978	405	259	314	504	474	295	683	615	363	107	707	116