

Follow-Up Questions for Humane Society of the United States Farm Animal Protection (2018)

Approximately how many “ag-gag” bills have you helped prevent from becoming laws?

More than 30.

Can you provide estimated expenses and your fundraising goal for 2019 if you have it?

We're hoping to spend about \$3.6 million and hopefully fundraise \$4 million.

Of your corporate commitments secured in 2018, are there any individual commitments that you expect affected more than five million broiler chickens?

On their own, no individual 2018 commitments likely impact over five million broilers. When viewed in the overall context of the broiler campaign, they each bring us closer to a tipping point that will undoubtedly impact billions of broiler chickens though. Additionally, our biggest broiler campaign (which is ongoing) for 2018 is our McDonald's campaign, which would individually impact over five million chickens and, if we're successful, would be the most significant broiler policy in terms of impact in history.

Do you have any insight into the number of animals affected by your fur commitments?

The short is answer is no. The number of animals killed per garment varies widely (from .01 animals up to 100 animals or more), and companies have never disclosed the number of fur garments they've sold, which changes year to year. Even fur import data is broken down into fur “pieces,” which could be a part of an animal or several animals sewn together. There is no clear data that would allow us to come up with an estimate on this. In terms of the overall industry, there's not even clear data on the number of animals used for fur. We estimate that it's roughly 100 million per year, but that doesn't include rabbits which, for myriad reasons, aren't included in the the tally—and could number in the tens of millions (or even reach another 100 million) on their own.

How many staff members received our culture survey? (We'd like to calculate the response rate.)

24

There are many more farmed fish than other species of farmed animals. Has HSUS FAP considered allocating more of their resources towards farmed fish advocacy?

We'd certainly like to in the future, and already helped with legislation to prevent aquaculture operations from being constructed. At the same time, we haven't yet completed our broiler campaign and we feel we have to keep fighting strong on that issue which of course affects more land animals than any other.

How can donors be sure that their funds will be restricted to HSUS FAP? Is it possible to avoid the fungibility issues that can arise when donating to one sector of a larger organization?

That's an easy one. FAP doesn't get any funds from HSUS' general funds and survives solely on restricted donations to our team.

Given that the corporate pledges HSUS campaigns for are non-binding, how can we be sure that they meaningfully support improvements in farmed animal welfare?

In the sense that companies aren't contractually bound to honor their pledges, the commitments are non-binding; but in another sense, many of them are. For example, any company that is publicly-owned is bound by SEC regulations to not lie to shareholders. Therefore, we've long held that if any publicly-held company tries to back out of an animal welfare commitment, we would urge the SEC to take enforcement action (assuming that company's commitment included website/PR statements that could reasonably be assumed to have been viewed by shareholders). Similarly, we would also urge the FTC to take action against a company that made public commitments or other consumer-facing statements and then tried to back out.

Additionally, we've always viewed a corporate commitment not as an end but a beginning. That is, a commitment or pledge is just the first step toward actual victory (which would be a meaningful change in production). Therefore, our campaigning doesn't necessarily end once a company makes a pledge. We continue pushing them to report on their progress, and once the time gets closer to commitments coming into effect (e.g., once deadlines are closer) we will do so

through campaign tactics such as shareholder proposals, press releases, investigations, possibly even public campaigns targeting companies.

Does HSUS FAP worry that focusing on some of the most extreme confinement practices could lead to complacency with other forms of suffering farmed animals endure or with meat consumption?

No. While our campaigns have been tremendously successful both legislatively and via corporate policies, most of the advancements have yet to be implemented and still need more wins to ensure a confinement-free future. As an example, while we've worked with virtually every major food company to announce a cage-free policy, still 83% of egg-laying hens are confined in cages and there's a total of about 300 million laying hens. Most of the 6 million mother pigs are still confined in gestation crates, as well. So these are very big numbers, the intensity of suffering is massive, and there's not yet a conclusion to abolish these practices.

Simultaneously, we have worked with about 100 food companies to enact comprehensive broiler chicken reforms and are waging a massive campaign against McDonald's on the issue. Also, we have the most in-depth institutional meat reduction campaign in the world, so that's a priority as well.

Why does HSUS FAP favor institutional meat reduction over individual meat reduction using tactics such as leafleting and online ads?

Rather than persuading 300 million Americans to eat plant-based foods, we believe the most efficient strategy to reduce the number of factory farmed animals is enacting meat reduction policies at major institutions and corporations that serve thousands, sometimes millions of meals daily. We work with school districts, universities, hospitals, correctional facilities, foodservice companies, and the military to serve less meat and increase the percentage of meals that are plant-based. This approach has the benefit of tangibly reducing meat purchases while making delicious plant-based foods more widely available.

In addition to tangibly reducing meat purchases, many of the institutions do marketing initiatives to promote the concept of eating more plant-based fare and less meat, so our efforts have the secondary impact of individual outreach, but institutions are doing it rather than us having to.

Why does HSUS FAP (and HSUS in general) invest so heavily in influencing policy through ballot initiatives, which are very expensive on a per-initiative basis? Have you considered alternatives which might be cheaper, such as lobbying representatives or even administrative agencies such as the USDA?

Unfortunately, passing laws for farm animals without a ballot measure—or threat of a ballot measure—is virtually impossible. The only time in history it's happened that I'm aware of has been Kentucky on veal crates (it's a regulation, not a law, but a good step) and Rhode Island on veal crates, gestation crates, and battery cages. We couldn't even pass a confinement law in liberal Massachusetts, New Hampshire, or Connecticut. Even HSUS' home state of Maryland has blocked our efforts. So the few examples where it's ever happened have been low-impact states. Compare that to laws we've passed in California, Massachusetts, Ohio, Michigan, and more that all occurred because we threatened or went through with a ballot measure.

With the USDA, they are ardent opponents to our work and even attempted to funnel millions of dollars against us during the Prop 2 campaign in California. They also divert money to give to the National Pork Producers to fight against our efforts. Another way to look at it with Prop 12 currently being waged in California is this: how much money would we be willing to spend to ensure the world's 5th largest economy bans the sale of eggs, pork, and veal from caged hens, which would be the most far-reaching law for farm animals in the world? Seems like if we spend \$7 million to do that, it's a steal.