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Abstract

This study is an exploration of effective strategies used in animal advocacy. While ethical appeals can constitute an effective argument for some, this stance is often not enough to bring about systemic change, especially in the context of improving standards and regulations for industrial agricultural animal welfare. Producers, on average, care most about potential economic gains, so finding ways to correlate improved welfare with improved product yields is an important objective to explore. While more studies need to be done, as current ones are conflicting, it seems likely that with increased welfare, there are also increased direct costs. Strategies for addressing economic concerns include convincing producers that costs would be minimal or that when the system is examined beyond direct costs, there are actually net savings and profits.

For this to hold true, it may be essential to find ways to recycle benefits to society, such as increased public health, back to producers as compensation for their increased efforts. Further, partnerships between animal advocates and producers are an important part of both convincing other producers to increase standards and ensuring that all parties involved are able to make gains, whether those are financially or ethically driven. Considering partnerships, there is a large division in the animal advocacy community regarding philosophies of animal welfare and animal rights, which can result in suppressing infighting. Overall, animal advocacy is a complex issue, and changes in standards and regulations affect more than the animals themselves. A multifaceted approach to animal advocacy is imperative to maximize results, and the strategies uncovered in my findings have applications throughout the entire nonprofit sector.
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Section 1. Introduction

In the *Art of Rhetoric*, Aristotle postulates:

"Of the modes of persuasion furnished by the spoken word there are three kinds. The first kind depends on the personal character of the speaker [ethos]; the second on putting the audience into a certain frame of mind [pathos]; the third on the proof, or apparent proof, provided by the words of the speech itself [logos]. Persuasion is achieved by the speaker’s personal character when the speech is so spoken as to make us think him credible" (Roberts, 1954).

Advocacy, the application of these rhetorical devices to a social and legal context, is the means by which many who fight for ideals bring about systemic change and make lasting impact. The orientation of advocacy towards animals is not a new concept. San Francisco’s namesake, St. Francis of Assisi, patron saint of animals and ecology, and Leonardo Da Vinci, are but a few early animal activists that proposed society change the ways in which animals are treated. Today, animal advocacy can be classified into two major mindsets: animal welfare and animal rights. Efforts to improve current industrial animal treatment are led by organizations that fall into these categories. The most common strategy employed by both of these groups/camps is pathos and moral arguments. However, this approach is naturally self-limited, and does not fully utilize the three classic modes of persuasion, lacking ethos (appeal to authority) and logos (appeal to logic and reason). The purpose of this capstone is to explore industrial agricultural animal advocacy strategy based in modes other than pathos, particularly examining the logical appeal of increased animal welfare as a benefit to society. Namely, it
explores the argument that increasing animal welfare has positive effects on the economy and public health, and a myriad of currently used strategies are covered. Increasing animal welfare in this context has many strong opponents and counterarguments, and it is hoped that this project facilitates effectively addressing them. Furthermore, while this exploration is on the topic of animal welfare, many of the principles and arguments found can be applied to various advocacy situations, augmenting resources available to those fighting for positive change in the world. The format of this report initially introduces the issue, then explores relevant literature on the topic. After methods of approach are reviewed, data from interviews is presented, and implications, results, and recommendations conclude the report.

The Problem Facing Animal Welfare

In the United States, there are roughly 100 million cattle, 110 million hogs, and 500 million chickens used for industrial agricultural purposes, mostly for procuring meat and egg production (United States Department of Agriculture, 2011). While these 700 million animals are subject to the welfare regulations set forth in the Animal Welfare Act of 1966, many agree that these standards do not go nearly far enough (Ventura, 2014). While efforts have been made to improve standards, “The meat industry in the United States is a powerful political force, both in the legislative and the regulatory arena” (Johnson, 2018). Big Ag., as the agricultural coalitions are collectively called, has repeatedly fought against improved welfare regulations and production oversight, through efforts such as, “[Convincing] House Republicans to include language in the proposed 2017 House Agricultural Appropriations bill that would exempt agricultural commodity groups from Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests” (Huehnergarth, 2016). While Big Ag. holds great lobbying power and influence, they also
engage in public advocacy that promotes low animal welfare standards and regulation. Often, they argue that increased animal welfare standards increase direct costs, which burdens the production system, in turn hurting farmers, producers, and consumers alike. In order to address this stance, animal advocacy groups must compose counter arguments that satisfy multiple stakeholders and address the economic implications of improving welfare. However, there are organizations within the animal advocacy community, including some animal rights groups, that not only solely engage in pathos-based welfare arguments, but will go so far as to actually fight against improving animal welfare that correlates with economic advancement. This division of animal advocacy groups, into animal welfare and animal rights organizations, is possibly the largest hindrance to improving animal welfare in industrial agriculture, aside from Big Ag. itself.

Animal Welfare versus Animal Rights

While the two animal advocacy groups both fight for the sake of animals, their fundamental philosophies differ in ways that can be inhibiting to each other’s efforts. Overall, the difference can be surmised as: “Animal rights means that animals are not ours to use for food, clothing, entertainment, or experimentation. Animal welfare allows these uses as long as ‘humane’ guidelines are followed” (PETA, 2018). Animal rights activists have a more Kantian-rooted philosophy, and as such, their arguments tend to be ethically, morally, and emotionally charged. Alternatively, animal welfarists are considered to have a more utilitarian approach, believing that any strategy that works is good and any improvements to animal welfare, however small, are beneficial. The stances are well explained by Ken White, President of the Peninsula Humane Society (PHS) Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA): “At its
core, the argument is whether a small step is better than nothing vs. small steps are simply not worth taking” (K. White, personal communication, July 25, 2018). Finally, some animal rights groups argue that improved welfare regulations do not go far enough, and actually empower animal production and Big Ag., therefore being counterproductive to their final goal of ending all animal use. The two groups have, at times, become fairly antagonistic, such as with regard to California’s 2018 Proposition 12, the Farm Animal Confinement Initiative. This infighting has directed many funds away from animal advocacy on both sides and lessened the potential impact both groups could have on common goals.

Section 2: Literature Review

In this capstone, various strategies for animal advocacy are explored. While the goal is to make considerations beyond the ethical argument for increasing animal welfare posed by many groups, it is still important to initially consider this stance and the motivation behind it. Fraser et al. (1997) explained the main justifications commonly used as an ethical incentive to promote animal welfare:

“At least three overlapping ethical concerns are commonly expressed regarding the quality of life of animals: (1) that animals should lead natural lives through the development and use of their natural adaptations and capabilities, (2) that animals should feel well by being free from prolonged and intense fear, pain, and other negative states, and by experiencing normal pleasures, and (3) that animals should function well, in the sense of satisfactory health, growth and
normal functioning of physiological and behavioural systems” (Fraser et al, 1997).

Beyond this stance, the economic, public health, partnership benefits, and more must be considered to maximally impact animal advocacy with a multifaceted approach. Several of the strategies and logic behind animal advocacy arguments are explained below.

Animal Welfare Influences on Economics

Potentially, one of the most important aspects of animal advocacy that must be addressed is the economic implication of increasing animal welfare. This is a hotly debated topic and is the basis for the most prominent arguments used by Big Ag. corporations against improving standards. In general, production corporations and Big Ag. lobbyists claim that improving welfare regulations would increase costs to the degree that farmers, producers, organizations, and consumers are negatively impacted. Direct production costs, though often minimal, do increase, as well as, incurring initial costs associated with updating practices and systems. In a study which highlighted the correlation between increased animal welfare and direct production costs, Vetter et. al (2014) explained the relationship. Vetter noted that, “Changes in farm animal welfare standards impact production costs first. Animal welfare regulations mostly require alterations that carry substantial extra costs. Therefore, statutory deadlines for adaptation are often quite long” (Vetter, 2014). With regard to direct production costs only, costs tend to increase with improved animal welfare. However, the authors argued that there is also a point at which decreasing animal welfare further would lead to large and rapid increased costs, considering loss associated with disease and mistreatment. Generally, if companies are not concerned with welfare, and only with maximizing apparent profits, they will
seek regulations that offer the minimum welfare standards, just above the threshold where losses begin to overshadow the increase in production cost. Vetter (2014) carefully noted that this relationship excludes other potential economic gains to a larger system than direct inputs and outputs.

Temple Grandin’s impacts on improving animal welfare in industrial animal agriculture cannot be overstated. In fact, for her contributions to improved cattle management efficiency and welfare, among many other contributions, she was inducted into the list of the 100 most influential people, published by Time Magazine in 2010. Grandin is in the perfect position to evaluate direct costs on the factory floor, since, in addition to being an animal welfare professor, she is employed by major producers to maximize both welfare and efficiency. Grandin has published many studies correlating improved animal welfare with improved capital gains, both direct and indirect. In her book, Improving Animal Welfare: A Practical Approach, she compiled most of her studies, and drew on them to formulate convincing arguments in favor of animal welfare. In chapter 14, the Effect of Economic Factors on the Welfare of Livestock and Poultry, Grandin (2015) argued that there are five major ways that producers, consumers, and the economy benefit directly from increased animal welfare standards:

1. There are great improvements to product quality.
2. It increases employee safety from accident reduction while stunning or handling.
3. It decreases labor costs, since well-handled animals move more easily than those poorly handled.
4. It significantly decreases expensive ‘line stoppages,’ a.k.a. a delay from stunning or handling of the animal.
5. Overall, it improves the production company’s image, and can be used positively for marketing, while helping to avoid costly bad publicity.

In contrast to Grandin’s assessment, there are many who believe improving animal welfare can only have economic gains if society desires and elects to pay higher prices for animal commodities with high welfare standards. McInerney (1991) explained the difference between price and value, then claimed, “Economic values are measures placed on things, not ones they automatically and always possess”. Value is a social construct, and if the social value of increasing animal welfare exceeds the increased price of production, then there are net gains to be had. For example, Simpson & Rollin (1984) examined the animal welfare issue of decreasing overcrowding and its relationship to consumers being willing to pay higher premiums. They ascertained that while price was a factor, many consumers accepted the theoretically higher costs. In this way, farmers and producers would not experience negative financial consequences from increased welfare, and consumers would be satisfied with their purchase decisions. Vetter (2014) agreed with this mentality, as they explained, “Contrary to popular belief, in the developed countries, price is not the primary determinant behind food purchases . . . People seek not the cheapest food items but those with characteristics they want, so they are searching for maximum consumer benefit” (Vetter, 2014, pp. 125). To reinforce this idea, Gavinelli & Park (2007) found that, “Consumers are willing to pay an average of 17–60 percent more for eggs from non-cage systems”. Kehlbacher et al. (2012) stipulated that there is an optimization for animal welfare and consumer’s willingness to pay, determined through consumer studies, varying regionally. They emphasized that for proper evaluation, further
studies are needed for each product in various locations. Another study by Bennett (1997) summarized the effects of the European Union converting to improved animal welfare systems, and correlated that with consumer’s willingness to pay more. While results were similar to the previous study, Bennett (1997) also postulated that, “The combination of legislation and producer subsidies may provide an appropriate policy which improves animal welfare without directly constraining food consumption choice and could help to achieve other policy aims”. Through subsidies, Bennette raised an important aspect and viable way of sharing economic benefits to society back with producers. Subsidies or tax-breaks can be very effective in mitigating the potential direct costs associated with improving animal welfare.

While the above considerations have mostly existed for some time, there are novel approaches to addressing animal welfare that have positive economic implications. Arguably, the most modern of these would be genetic manipulation of farm animal to increase welfare, production, and efficiency. Jensen (2018) showed the correlation between genetic manipulation and increased welfare by affecting animal’s intrinsic motivations and behavioral outlets. While the animals benefit from decreased stress levels, producers gain from increased ease of handling and product quality.

**Animal Welfare Influences on Workers and Public Health**

As Temple Grandin noted, along with increasing animal welfare, there are many potential direct benefits to production workers and animal handlers, dealing mostly with increased safety and efficiency, leading to fewer injuries. However, there are also benefits to worker and public health with increased welfare from a correlating decrease in harmful pathogens and the secondary (and tertiary) effects that come with that improvement. Authors
Boyle & O’Driscoll (2011) explained the association between increased stress (poor welfare) and immunosuppression in farm animals, leading to increased rates of foodborne pathogens. Clark et al. (2016) agreed with this assessment, and further cited overcrowding as a key issue promoting disease spread. Furthermore, the authors explained that, “Prophylactic use of antibiotics was identified as a concern,”, with the possibility of antibiotics entering humans through animal product consumption. There is also concern about creating diseases with antibiotic resistance from overuse, as is the case in some strains of E. Coli, which do lead to grave sickness or death (Saenz, 2004).

**Importance of Partnerships in Animal Advocacy**

For decades, animal welfare and animal rights groups have opposed each other on many platforms relating to animal advocacy. Sumner (1988) explored the setbacks caused by this conflict and found them to be great. Considering the influential coalitions against animal advocacy, she postulated that, “If both sides move to more defensible theoretical positions, their remaining differences on that level may be compatible with a broad area of convergence on practical issues,”. In other words, if the two groups focused on their common goals of animal advocacy for greater animal wellbeing, they would find more common ground, and be able to unite in efforts. Another important aspect of animal advocacy is establishing partnerships with farmers and producers, especially those who see the benefits of increased animal welfare and, in turn, welfare standards of their own accord. However, there are many challenges to overcome here, particularly in regard to the perception of animal welfare as an issue and the magnitude of it. Velde et al. (2002) highlighted the difference in opinions that farmers and the public can have, which ultimately leads to fundamental disagreement on
welfare issues: “According to [farmers], nothing is wrong with animal welfare in livestock breeding. The perceptions of the consumers we interviewed are more divergent, but generally negative. Both groups show ambivalence as a result of discrepancies between perceptions and behavior”. This ‘ambivalence’ on both sides is counterproductive, and if it is to be amended, each side must find motivations that resonate with each other. This is important, as partnerships with farmers and producers can have great animal advocacy benefits.

**Summary of Literature Review**

Dawkins (2016) composed a thorough compilation of essentially all of the major aspects of the aforementioned arguments. Resolution to conflicts between producers and animal advocates were found in many ways, but all related back to potential financial gains to consumers and producers alike. Dawkins listed the most important aspect to consider here, highlighting the main strategies explored above:

“These benefits [of animal welfare] include increased profits through: (i) reduced mortality; (ii) improved health; (iii) improved product quality; (iv) improved disease resistance and reduced medication; (v) lower risk of zoonoses and foodborne diseases; (vi) farmer job satisfaction and contributions to Corporate Social Responsibility; and (vii) the ability to command higher prices from consumers. Current conflicts between animal welfare and production may be resolved by future developments in genetics, management practices and new technology. Financial benefits reinforce, rather than replace, ethical arguments for good animal welfare.”
Section 3: Methods and Approaches

In pursuit of effective animal advocacy strategies, three methods were used for data gathering: a literature review of articles on the topic, interviews of industry professionals, and a web-based search for animal advocacy examples. In the literature review, accredited sources are cited and discussed to focus on works that highlight the social benefits of increased animal welfare, particularly economic and public health related studies.

Six interviews were conducted through phone calls with professional leaders in advocacy, animal welfare, and animal rights. Three interviews with advocacy experts were made, with two professionals working directly in animal advocacy, and one having a strong background in economic policy. Additionally, two executive directors of animal rights organizations and one president of a large animal welfare organization, all of whom engage in animal advocacy, were interviewed. The interview itself followed the following format: to begin, questions about the interviewee’s current positions and involvement in advocacy were asked, followed by inquiring about all of the animal advocacy strategies they know of or employ, along with their analysis of each strategy’s effectiveness. After this free-response section, specific questions about the role and influence of economics were asked, along with potential responses to typical Big Ag. arguments. If not discussed in the free-response section, inquiries were made about other advocacy platforms, such as the role of emphasizing increased public health, and thoughts revolving around the animal welfare versus animal rights issues were explored, as well as the importance of partnerships in general. Each interview was
immensely helpful and contributed valuable information to this capstone; collected data from these sources is presented in the following section, Data Analysis.

While researching peer-reviewed articles on animal advocacy is important, much can also be learned through directly examining the animal advocacy platforms and arguments presented online by various organizations, including those advocating for animal welfare, animal rights, and Big Ag. In that regard, an online exploration of these groups has proven useful in understanding the current state of animal advocacy, as well as in examining current and past ballot initiatives. Some of the websites explored include those of the Humane Society of the United States, the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, the Humane Legislative Fund, Prevent Cruelty California, People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, the Humane Farming Alliance, the Humane League, Ballotpedia, the Association of California Egg Farmers, the National Pork Producers Council, and the American Veal Association.

This Capstone follows participatory action research typology. Not only is the information uncovered relevant to the nonprofit sector, but several stakeholders that have key interest in animal advocacy strategies also participated. Results are considered through various domains, including evaluating the economic, social, and political implications. On a personal level, my philosophy has been geared towards an animal welfare bias. Through attending the University of California, Davis as an undergraduate and majoring in animal welfare and behavior, I was conditioned to explore ways to increase animal welfare and productivity at the same time, examining cutting-edge research that my professors were conducting in the field. However, the purpose of this capstone is not to promote the welfare mentality or to slander
animal rights efforts. To the best of my ability, I have made an effort to remain objective, and solely present aggregate information from the aforementioned sources. Further, through this study, I have learned a great deal on a personal level and have come to better understand some of the merits behind the animal rights mentality and approach. Therefore, I do not consider myself to have discovered which viewpoint is right or wrong; all I can claim is to better understand the state of animal advocacy than I previously have, along with some of the strategies that are capable of truly making changes to the current situation.

Section 4: Data Analysis

Table 1: Interviewees, Positions, and Stance on Economic Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Do Economics Affect Animal Advocacy?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethan Pollack</td>
<td>The Aspen Institute</td>
<td>Associate Director of Research and Policy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Holbein</td>
<td>Humane Society Legislative Fund</td>
<td>Public Policy Director of the Farm Animal Protection Campaign</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe Novic</td>
<td>Humane League</td>
<td>Director of Grassroots Advocacy in the Bay Area</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken White</td>
<td>Peninsula Humane Society, SPCA</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP Novic</td>
<td>Center for Animal Protection and Education</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Sturla</td>
<td>Animal Place</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Does not engage in this argument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Ethan Pollack:** While not directly engaged in animal advocacy, Mr. Pollack is an expert in economic policy, a key consideration for this project. Additionally, he is very engaged in advocacy in Washington, D.C., and was kind enough to share many effective advocacy strategies. The considerations he presented were highly formative in designing subsequent explorations and interviews. First, he agreed that addressing economic concerns relating to increased animal welfare should be addressed in order to affect policy. He explained that politics was a game of both numbers and intensity of the fight, and if one side can dampen the opposition, even a numerical minority (in terms of both people and accessible funds) can still achieve their goals. In the case of increasing animal welfare, he noted that advocates must show how the economic impacts can be either negligible or even positive. To do this, he suggested first to compile research that has these implications, particularly studies that originate from the opposition, so there is less that opponents can refute, as it is their own work. Then, he suggested establishing partnerships with farmers and producers that already have higher than regulation welfare standards, using them to highlight the feasibility of adopting new regulations, and as evidence that the new system would remain economically viable. The partnering farmers and producers themselves would be incentivised to join the advocacy effort, because it is beneficial for them to have the entire industry adhere to the standards they already follow, which would help level the overall market and make them relatively more competitive. Also, Mr. Pollack explained that advocacy for increased animal welfare is often seen as a liberal agenda, posed by those who want to impose their ideals on others, while feeling none of the drawbacks themselves. However, when the advocacy comes from a farmer or producer, that classic Big Ag. argument is nullified. To quote, Mr. Pollack stated, “Farmer
versus Pelosi is bad, but Farmer versus farmer is good, even if there are only a few” (Pollack).

Additionally, Mr. Pollack talked about the importance of enforcing current regulations and standards, as failing to do so allows certain groups to undercut the market, making it harder to adhere to and advocate for proper standards. Indeed, this is a classic issue relating to Big Ag., which has constantly lobbied for decreased oversight authority. Next, he explained the importance of consumer empowerment, and that advocacy is a highly effective way to educate consumers. To complement this, he advised to approach the subject not from the standpoint of ‘Do things this way,’ but rather ‘You care about this aspect, and we can help facilitate your decision.’ Naturally, that involves having strong knowledge of stakeholder and consumer opinions and desires. Finally, he noted that in his experience (which is fairly vast, evident from review of his career), he has found people to be very responsive to health concerns, and less so about environmental impact, though all benefits to increasing animal welfare should be explored and used in the right place, at the right time.

**Chris Holbein:** Mr. Holbein is an influential leader in one of the forerunners of animal advocacy, the Humane Legislative Fund (HLF), an animal welfare organization. As a 501(c)(4), he and his team are solely engaged in animal advocacy in Washington, D.C. Further, aside from his long history advocating for agricultural animals, he currently serves as the Director of Public Policy for the Farm Animal Campaign, and as such, is one of the most qualified individuals available to comment on this particular capstone. When asked about how to respond when Big Ag. argues that increasing animal welfare also increases cost of production to consumers, he responded that increased costs are minimal, or, at times, increased welfare would actually increase profit. He cited several studies that illustrated this point, specifically referring to how
going cage-free with laying hens would only increase the cost per egg by two cents. Also, he referenced a study from the American Veal Association that claimed increasing welfare to new standards (specifically, the ones outlined in California’s 2018 Proposition 12, the Farm Animal Confinement Initiative, examined in the case study below) could yield an 11% savings in industry costs. In addition to these types of benefits to farmers and producers, he explained several benefits to worker and public health, and the correlating benefits to society, in terms of improved economy and public health. When asked to comment on opposition to Proposition 12 from certain animal rights organizations, he commented that, “It is disappointing, but we will continue to put out the facts” (Holbein). He went on to explain that the HFA and PETA are putting out false information, which is addressed on their website. Also, he explained PETA’s stance, which is that if industrial animals are treated in terrible ways, more people will become vegan, so increasing current animal welfare standards is counterproductive to their agenda. In response, he explained that incremental progress is most effective under our current system and with our society’s mindset, in the sense that this progress will lead to even more progress. Lastly, he emphasized the importance of consumer empowerment, particularly advocating for lab grown meat, which is scheduled to enter the general market by the end of 2018. He noted that a large upcoming battle will be regarding the usable terminology for this product, as Big Ag. has lobbied for the term ‘meat’ to solely refer to that which is carved from the carcass of an animal. In these ways, Mr. Holbein and HLF are fairly congruent with the recommendations and observations from Mr. Pollack, increasing the credibility of both individuals.

**Zoe Novic:** As the Director of Grassroots Advocacy in the Bay Area for the Humane League, an animal rights organization in support of Proposition 12, Ms. Novic (Zoe) contributed
an important perspective on animal advocacy, as someone who works directly with the public and addresses their concerns and perceptions. Through our correspondence it was observed that, at least in these cases, animal advocacy grassroots efforts dealing directly with the public are more effective when addressing health concerns and generating empathy for the animals affected. This is opposed to the economic perspective, which seems to be more often argued by Big Ag. and animal advocates in Washington, D.C., who deal directly with legislators and policy enactors. However, when asked for ways to address economic concerns of increasing animal welfare, she cited how in Massachusetts, a similar initiative to Proposition 12 was passed, which resulted in only a one-cent increase in the price, per egg. Also, she emphasized the health benefits generated from increasing animal welfare. When asked to respond to the stance of HFA and PETA, though Ms. Novic (Zoe) wanted to remain ‘diplomatic’ in regard to fellow animal rights organizations; she did explain that it was, “Important to work hard to move in the right direction,” and that, “Advocacy has an educational component, which has an exponential impact” (Novic). Novic also explained how the Humane League’s efforts to convince retailers like Walmart, to only buy products with high welfare standards has influenced the market and facilitated current animal advocacy efforts. Ms. Novic (Zoe) and the Humane League also seem to be in-line with several of the recommendations from Mr. Pollack.

Ken White: Representing the Peninsula Humane Society (PHS), a branch of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA), Mr. White offered quick and direct thoughts on animal advocacy, which were highly representative of the general animal welfare stance. He emphasized focusing on human health, economic opportunities, and to stop fighting between
animal advocacy organizations. In regard to the latter, his stance is best represented from his direct quote regarding this issue:

“The highly Balkanized world of animal welfare has so many different voices shouting at each other on social media that it’s almost impossible to ever hear a unified voice speaking in opposition to what should be seen as a common target. This same lack of consensus, often actual infighting, has long hurt legislative agendas with elected officials recognizing that there is rarely a way to stand with one group of animal advocates without alienating another . . . I suggest that animal welfare advocates would do well to look at the success of other movements and find ways to bring in other constituent voices to thereby broaden the voice speaking out for the cause. Farmed animal issues, for example, need to be presented not as a vegetarian/vegan agenda, but be better, more forcefully aligned with issues of human health and economic discrimination.”

Mr. White is a highly reputable source, and even an author for a column in the San Francisco Chronicle. His recommendations to focus on human health, economic benefits, and cessation of animal advocacy infighting are consistent with the opinions of the above interviewees. He serves as a strong reinforcer of the aforementioned stances.

**JP Novic:** While Ms. Novic (JP) runs a mid-sized animal rights shelter and education center, her life and career have been characterized by animal advocacy, including former involvement with HFA, which, along with her quality insights, make her a valuable reference. While she agreed that addressing the economic argument was important, she stipulated that
she did not know much on the matter, and rather focused on the ethics of the situation. However, she noted every viable strategy for improving animal welfare should be employed, including economic justification for increasing industrial agriculture standards. When asked about HFA and PETA’s actions against Proposition 12, she explained that, “It is hard to work within a movement when there is disagreement, but all contributions are important, and groups should be civil”. She continued with, “Change requires a multifaceted approach, including focusing on issues like climate change, welfare, and public health; it is made through education, legislation, and access to alternative options.” On the last point, she related the issue back to economics: “Costs of alternative meat products must be affordable and available; currently they are out of most people’s price range.” This later insight provides a novel viewpoint of economics as related to animal advocacy and should indeed be addressed as a part of a multifaceted approach to enacting change.

Kim Sturla: As Executive Director of Animal Place, an animal rights organization and farm animal sanctuary, Ms. Sturla was exceedingly busy, and did not have much time to converse. As such, only a few pertinent questions were explored. Particularly, her stance on using potential economic benefits in animal advocacy, to which she responded that her organization does not engage in that particular discourse. However, aside from pure, ethics-based arguments, she stipulated that Animal Place did promote increased health from reducing animal product use. Overall, the efforts appeared grassroots in nature, such as their frequenting college campuses and events, where they attempt to educate people and help them empathize with the plight of animals.
Summary of Interviews

Through interviews with these professionals, much insight was gained and reinforced through their fairly consistent arguments. Overall, most agree that addressing the economic arguments posed by Big Ag. is an important aspect of animal advocacy. Further, it is generally agreed that a multifaceted approach yields the largest results. Common strategies include citing studies showing positive correlation between public health, economics, and employee welfare with improved animal welfare. Additionally, partnerships are highly valued, especially with farmers and producers. Many feel that the dissent within the animal advocacy community is a large hindrance, though none explicitly commented on how to alleviate the situation or come to an understanding. This aspect will be an important part of follow-up research. Finally, other aspects, including increased regulatory enforcement and consumer empowerment, were mentioned multiple times.

Economic Counter Argument to Increased Welfare

Big Ag. frequently counters increasing animal welfare standards with the argument that such change would increase cost of production, which would burden farmers, producers, and consumers. It is an important component of this capstone to explain their concept of the relationship between production and animal welfare, so that each aspect may be addressed. Figure 1 below is a helpful visualization, highlighting Big Ag.’s concept of the relationship between.... However, by only examining direct costs, the overall economic implications may be than what is interpreted through figure 1. The argument does not factor in other economic forces that can make this situation show generation of net financial savings and returns.
Figure 1: Big Ag.’s Interpretation of the Relation Between Animal Welfare & Production


The figure above, though omitting many considerations, explains the basis for the economic argument against increasing animal welfare, showing a negative correlation with productivity in viable ranges (beyond Point B). The vertical axis represents animal welfare and the horizontal axis represents production efficiency, a.k.a. economic gains.

- **Point A** signifies wild animals and a natural level of welfare.
- **Point B** is the theoretical maximum for animal welfare that could be achieved. After this, welfare is traded for production, approaching Point D.
- **Point D** is the minimum welfare standards by law, below is legally ‘cruelty.’
- **After Point E**, production regresses, as animals sicken or get injured.
- **Point C** is the socially agreed compromise between welfare and production.
**Case Study: Ca. 2018 Proposition 12, the Farm Animal Confinement Initiative**

In 2008, California overwhelmingly approved Proposition 2 (63%) - “Standards for Confining Farm Animals,” which was a major win for animal welfare (Ballotpedia, 2018). This November, California will vote on Proposition 12, the “Farm Animal Confinement Initiative,” which is an update of Prop 2, specifying gaps or lack of clarity in the regulation, established back in 2008. The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), an animal welfare organization, is leading the fight for Prop 12, through its ballot measure committee, “Prevent Cruelty California.”  Supporters, and Prop 12 itself, state, “The purpose of this Act is to prevent animal cruelty by phasing out* extreme methods of farm animal confinement, which also threaten the health and safety of California consumers, and increase the risk of foodborne illness and associated negative fiscal impacts on the State of California” (Prevention of Cruelty to Farm Animals Act, 2018). (Note*: Phasing out reflects the mentality of animal welfare organizations; that incremental steps are better than nothing and may be the only way to change the entire system, slowly but effectively, with minimal negative impacts on all involved, including producers, consumers, and the industry itself.)

Opposition comes from the Association of California Egg Farmers, National Pork Producers Council, HFA, Friends of Animals, PETA, and some other animal rights organizations. HFA sponsored and created the initiative “Californians Against Cruelty, Cages, and Fraud” to fight Prop 12 (Ballotpedia, 2018). Opposing arguments include:

- The Association of California Egg Farmers: "HSUS is reneging on the original agreement and this expedited timeline may result in supply disruptions, price spikes and a shortage of eggs for sale” (McGreevy, 2017)
- National Pork Producers Council: "Changes in housing systems, which come with significant costs that increase food prices, should be driven by consumer purchasing decisions, not the agenda of any activist group" (McGreevy, 2017).

- The Humane Farming Association: "The Humane Society of the United States is ... perpetuating the suffering of millions of egg-laying hens throughout California" (The Humane Farming Association, 2018)

Citing sources usually associated with their opponents, like the American Veal Association, proponents argue that increases in animal welfare through this proposition can be done in a way that also increases profits, particularly in veal and pork production. They claim that studies show a potential two-cent increase in price per cage-free egg, but stipulate that when human health benefits are taken into account, there is a large positive net economic effect. Proponents also explain the hidden costs to society that producers are not affected by, unless litigation occurs. Their main argument here is:

"The FDA estimates that 79,000 Americans are sickened every year by consuming eggs tainted with Salmonella. Research shows that cage confinement facilities are significantly more likely to harbor this dangerous bacteria, which is why the Center for Food Safety endorses Prop 12" (Prevent Cruelty Ca., 2018).

While there were increases in California egg prices after the full adoption of Prop 2, Prevent Cruelty Ca. explained that it was not due to animal welfare regulations. Instead, they cite an outbreak of bird flu and the egg industry ‘dragging their feet’ while artificially inflating prices. Also, they refer to how California egg prices were below the national average one year after all Prop 2 regulations went into effect. Finally, they highlight benefits to the company and workers corresponding to increased animal welfare. Less injuries, sickness, and subsequent
company compensation and sick leave are incurred in higher-welfare situations. Also, they give specific examples of benefits to farm workers and producers, highlighting farms that have already adopted these policies.

Section 5: Implications and Recommendations

Animal advocacy has intrinsic ties to the nonprofit sector. Observations from the literature review support the statements made by those willing to be interviewed for this capstone. It has been observed that usually more than one approach to animal advocacy is employed. However, considering the formidable forces that animal advocacy must overcome, a multifaceted approach that utilizes all of these approaches, strategies, and arguments is needed to make the largest gains for the effort as a whole. In this way, not only will animal advocacy be maximized, but through considering the standpoints of producers and consumers, solutions can be found that benefit all parties involved. Though arguments may have specific tactics, animal advocacy, other than ethically-based arguments, often relates back to economic forces. Increased public health, improved factory working conditions, and improved product quality are all benefits of raising industrial agricultural animal welfare that have strong economic implications. As mentioned previously, the strategies uncovered here, such as partnerships and looking to new technologies, are not unique to animal advocacy, but apply to all efforts within the nonprofit sector that seek to change systems in a way that might disrupt the status quo and settle contending philosophies.
As a consequence of these findings, it is hoped that animal advocacy organizations broaden their approaches as wide as possible, and also consider not only their position, but how to make gains for all parties involved as well. Specific recommendations are as follows:

1. **Establish cooperation between animal advocacy groups**: Animal Rights and Animal Welfare organizations must come to an understanding and unite to stop wasting effort on each other and maximize their impact.

2. **Have various animal advocacy arguments and perspectives**: A multidisciplinary approach that goes beyond the ethical/moral standpoint is crucial and considering potential economic and human health benefits is imperative for successful advocacy.

3. **Partner with producers**: Particularly producers with welfare standards above current regulation, yet are economically viable, should be sought.

4. **Make macro-level economic arguments**: All economic gains to society must be addressed, on a social level, especially since on a direct production level, costs may appear to increase, but net impact on society results in gains.

5. **Reciprocate socioeconomic benefits to producers**: Reward and compensate producers for increasing welfare standards, such as through subsidies or tax-breaks.

6. **Negotiate reasonable time-frames for change**: Ensure that reasonable and incremental timeframes for change are agreed upon, so costs here are minimal to producers and, in turn, impacts are minimized on consumers.

7. **Establish regulations and enforce them**: Produces strive for lowest costs, and when they cut corners, that undermines the market, making it harder for those adhering to high welfare to compete. For a level market, have regulations creating equal opportunity and support legislation that empowers regulatory facilities.

8. **Advocate for decreasing produce and alternative meat product cost**: The current price point is unaffordable for most, and people need options to be able to change lifestyles. Innovations and new technologies, such as genetic manipulation and lab grown meat, should be pursued. The complementary recommendation here is to advocate to have Big Ag. pay for its hidden costs, like what has been done with Big Tobacco and the Oil
Industry. In this way, animal products would become more expensive, truly representing their costs, and making alternative products relatively cheaper and more viable.

9. **Conduct more studies on health benefits**: Show positive correlation between animal welfare and animal, consumer, and societal health through high quality and extensive studies, to better address the situation.

10. **Conduct more studies on economic benefits**: Show the true correlation between animal welfare economics, including indirect and direct gains and costs to producers, consumers, and society. Examine this from various perspectives, including the future of industrial animal agriculture.

**Section 6: Conclusions**

Increasing animal welfare has implications beyond the wellbeing of the animal. Producers, consumers, and society as a whole are impacted by changes in standards and regulations. While promoting animal welfare as an ethical and moral obligation does make headway in the fight for animal advocacy, it is not enough to yield maximal change upon the animal agricultural system. To further animal advocacy, a variety of strategies and arguments must be explored. Notable ones include addressing economic implications, public health benefits, forming partnerships, and exploring innovations that have benefits to animals and people alike. Economically-based arguments are particularly important to address, as they are widely used through Big Ag, lobbying and advocacy. Studies and partnerships with producers that demonstrate increased welfare standards are necessary to properly respond to economic arguments and prove the change can be beneficial to society. The application of the strategies
explored here extends beyond animal advocacy, and into any advocacy effort nonprofits are likely to face.

The major limitations of this study are twofold. First, there is always more to be uncovered, and this examination of effective animal advocacy strategies is by no means complete. Exploration is an ongoing process, and further studies should strive to increase the pool of accurate raw data on aspects relating to improving animal welfare. Second, while the goal was to be as objective as possible, considerations in this capstone were based more in an ‘animal welfare’ philosophy. It should be noted that there are many animal rights arguments that have merit. For example, if improving animal welfare does indeed correlate with economic gains, then producers and consumers may be incentivised to increase productivity and consumption as a result. While there are counter arguments here, this effect is possible. In that sense, increasing welfare could be counterproductive to the overall animal rights goal of ending all animal use and exploitation. Studies substantiating these positions and comparing likely results to other solutions within animal advocacy are needed to better understand the complex dynamic between animal welfare, animal use, and society.

A final recommendation for further study, which I will be following up with in particular, is to explore the relationship dynamics between animal welfare and animal rights organizations. Finding ways to mediate their differences would greatly add to the resources available to promote animal advocacy. Similarly, relations with animal advocates and farmers and producers should be further explored, to find as many mutual benefits as possible.
List of References


PROPOSITION 2

This initiative measure is submitted to the people in accordance with the provisions of Article II, Section 8, of the California Constitution. This initiative measure adds sections to the Health and Safety Code; therefore, new provisions proposed to be added are printed in italics to indicate that they are new.

PROPOSED LAW

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE
This act shall be known and may be cited as the Prevention of Farm Animal Cruelty Act.

SECTION 2. PURPOSE
The purpose of this act is to prohibit the cruel confinement of farm animals in a manner that does not allow them to turn around freely, lie down, stand up, and freely extend their limbs.

SECTION 3. FARM ANIMAL CRUELTY PROVISIONS
Chapter 13.8 (commencing with Section 25990) is added to Division 20 of the Health and Safety Code, to read:

PROPOSITION 1 CONTINUED

25992. EXCEPTIONS. This chapter shall not apply:
(a) During scientific or agricultural research.
(b) During examination, testing, individual treatment or operation for veterinary purposes.
(c) During transportation.
(d) During rodeo exhibitions, state or county fair exhibitions, 4-H programs, and similar exhibitions.
(e) During the slaughter of a covered animal in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 30100) of Part 3 of Division 9 of the Food and Agricultural Code, relating to humane methods of slaughter, and other applicable law and regulations.
(f) To a pig during the seven-day period prior to the pig's expected date of giving birth.

25993. PENALTY. Any person who violates any of the provisions of this chapter is guilty of a misdeemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not to exceed one thousand dollars ($1,000) or by imprisonment in the county jail for a period not to exceed 90 days or by both such fine and imprisonment.

CONCLUSION OF CHAFTER
The provisions of this chapter are in addition to, and not in lieu of, any other laws protecting animal welfare, including the California Penal Code. This chapter shall not be construed to limit any state law or regulation protecting the welfare of animals, nor shall anything in this chapter prevent a local governing body from adopting and enforcing its own animal welfare laws and regulations.

SECTION 4. SEVERABILITY
If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid or unconstitutional, that invalidity or unconstitutionality shall not affect other provisions or applications of this act that can be given effect without the invalid or unconstitutional provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this act are severable.

SECTION 5. EFFECTIVE DATES
The provisions of Sections 25990, 25991, 25992, 25993, and 25994 shall become operative on January 1, 2013.

82 | Text of Proposed Laws

August 29, 2017

VIA PERSONAL DELIVERY

Hon. Attorney General of California
1300 I Street, 17th Floor, P.O. Box 944255
Sacramento, CA 95814

Attention: Ashley Johansson, Initiative Coordinator

Re: Request for Title and Summary for Proposed Initiative Statute

Dear Ms. Johansson:

Pursuant to Article II, Section 10(d) of the California Constitution, I hereby submit the attached proposed Initiative Statute, entitled “The Prevention of Cruelty to Farm Animals Act,” to your office and request preparation of a title and summary of the measure as provided by law. Included with this submission are the required proponent affidavits signed by the proponent of this measure pursuant to Sections 9001 and 9608 of the California Elections Code. My address as a registered voter is attached to this letter, along with a check for $2,000.00.

All inquiries or correspondence relative to this initiative should be directed to Nielsen, Merksamer, Parrinello, Gross & Leoni, LLP, 1415 I Street, Suite 1200, Sacramento, CA 95814, (916) 446-6752, Attention: Kurt Oneto (telephone: 916/446-6752).

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Cheri Shankar, Proponent

Enclosure: Proposed Initiative Statute
THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. This Act shall be known and may be cited as the Prevention of Cruelty to Farm Animals Act.

SECTION 2. The purpose of this Act is to prevent animal cruelty by phasing out extreme methods of farm animal confinement, which also threaten the health and safety of California consumers, and increase the risk of foodborne illness and associated negative fiscal impacts on the State of California.

SECTION 3. Section 25990 of the California Health and Safety Code is hereby amended to read:

In addition to other applicable provisions of law:
(a) A person a farm owner or operator within the State of California shall not tether or confine knowingly cause any covered animal to be confined in a cruel manner, on a farm, for all or the majority of any day, in a manner that prevents such animal from:
   (a) Lying down, standing up, and fully extending his or her limbs; and
   (b) Turning around freely.
(b) A business owner or operator shall not knowingly engage in the sale within the State of California of any:
   (1) Wholeveal meat that the business owner or operator knows or should know is the meat of a covered animal who was confined in a cruel manner.
   (2) Whole pork meat that the business owner or operator knows or should know is the meat of a covered animal who was confined in a cruel manner, or is the meat of immediate offspring of a covered animal who was confined in a cruel manner.
   (3) Shell eggs that the business owner or operator knows or should know is the product of a covered animal who was confined in a cruel manner.
   (4) Liquid eggs that the business owner or operator knows or should know are the product of a covered animal who was confined in a cruel manner.

SECTION 4. Section 25991 of the California Health and Safety Code is hereby amended to read:

For the purposes of this chapter, the following terms have the following meanings:
(a) "Breeding pig" means any female pig of the porcine species kept for the purpose of commercial breeding, who is 6 months or older or pregnant.
(b) "Business owner or operator" means any person who owns or controls the operations of a business.
(c) "Cage-free housing system" means an indoor or outdoor controlled environment for egg-laying hens within which hens are free to roam unrestricted; are provided enrichments that allow them to exhibit natural behaviors, including, at a minimum, scratch areas, perches, nest boxes, and dust bathing areas; and within which farm employees can provide care while standing within the hens' usable floor space. Cage-free housing systems include, to the extent they comply with the requirements of this subsection:
(1) “Multi-tiered aviaries” in which hens have access to multiple elevated platforms that provide hens with usable floor space both on top of and underneath the platforms;
(2) “Partially-slatted systems” in which hens have access to elevated flat platforms under which manure drops through the flooring to a pit or litter removal belt below;
(3) “Single-level all litter floor systems” bedded with litter, and in which hens have limited or no access to elevated flat platforms; and
(4) Any future systems that will comply with the requirements of this subsection.

(a)(d) “Calf raised for veal” means any calf of the bovine species kept for the purpose of producing the food product described as veal.

(e) “Confined in a cruel manner” means any one of the following acts:
(1) Confining a covered animal in a manner that prevents the animal from lying down, standing up, fully extending the animal’s limbs, or turning around freely; or
(2) After December 31, 2019, confining a calf raised for veal with less than 43 square feet of usable floor space per calf; or
(3) After December 31, 2021, confining a breeding pig with less than 24 square feet of usable floor space per pig; or
(4) After December 31, 2019, confining an egg-laying hen with less than 144 square inches of usable floor space per hen; or
(5) After December 31, 2021, confining an egg-laying hen with less than the amount of usable floor space per hen required by the 2017 edition of the United Egg Producers’ Animal Husbandry Guidelines for U.S. Egg-Laying Flocks: Guidelines for Cage-Free Housing, or in an enclosure other than a cage-free housing system.

(b)(f) “Covered animal” means any pig during pregnancy, calf raised for veal, breeding pig, or egg-laying hen who is kept on a farm.

(e)(g) “Egg-laying hen” means any female domesticated chicken, turkey, duck, goose, or guinea fowl kept for the purpose of egg production.

(d)(h) “Enclosure” means any cage, crate, or other structure (including what is commonly described as a “gestation crate” for pigs; a “veal crate” for calves; or a “battery cage” for egg-laying hens) used to confine a covered animal or animals.

(o)(i) “Farm” means the land, building, support facilities, and other equipment that are wholly or partially used for the commercial production of animals or animal products used for food or fiber, and does not include live animal markets, establishments at which mandatory inspection is provided under the Federal Meat Inspection Act, or official plants at which mandatory inspection is maintained under the Federal Egg Products Inspection Act.

(i) “Farm owner or operator” means any person who owns or controls the operations of a farm.

(k) “Fully extending his or her the animal’s limbs” means fully extending all limbs without touching the side of an enclosure, including, in the case of egg-laying hens, fully spreading both wings without touching the side of an enclosure or other egg-laying hen or another animal.

(l) “Liquid eggs” means eggs of an egg-laying hen broken from the shells, intended for human food, with the yolks and whites in their natural proportions, or with the yolks and whites separated, mixed, or mixed and strained. Liquid eggs do not include combination food products (including pancake mixes, cake mixes, cookies, pizzas, cookie dough, ice cream, or similar processed or prepared food products) that are comprised of more than liquid eggs, sugar, salt, water, seasoning, coloring, flavoring, preservatives, stabilizers, and similar food additives.

(m) “Person” means any individual, firm, partnership, joint venture, association, limited liability company, corporation, estate, trust, receiver, or syndicate.
(h) “Pig during pregnancy” means any pregnant pig of the porcine species kept for the primary purpose of breeding.

(n) “Pork meat” means meat, as defined in 3 CCR 990 as of August 2017, of a pig of the porcine species, intended for use as human food.

(o) “Sale” means a commercial sale by a business that sells any item covered by this chapter, but does not include any sale undertaken at an establishment at which mandatory inspection is provided under the Federal Meat Inspection Act, or any sale undertaken at an official plant at which mandatory inspection is maintained under the Federal Egg Products Inspection Act. For purposes of this section, a sale shall be deemed to occur at the location where the buyer takes physical possession of an item covered by section 25990 of this chapter.

(p) “Shell egg” means a whole egg of an egg-laying hen in its shell form, intended for use as human food.

(q) “Turning around freely” means turning in a complete circle without any impediment, including a tether, and without touching the side of an enclosure or another animal.

(r) “Uncooked” means requiring cooking prior to human consumption.

(s) “Usable floor space” means the total square footage of floor space provided to each covered animal, as calculated by dividing the total square footage of floor space provided to the animals in an enclosure by the number of animals in that enclosure. In the case of egg-laying hens, usable floor space shall include both ground space and elevated level flat platforms upon which hens can roost, but shall not include perches or ramps.

(t) “Veal meat” means meat, as defined in 3 CCR 990 as of August 2017, of a calf raised for veal intended for use as human food.

(u) “Whole pork meat” means any uncooked cut of pork (including bacon, ham, chop, ribs, riblet, loin, shank, leg, roast, brisket, steak, sirloin or cutlet) that is comprised entirely of pork meat, except for seasoning, curing agents, coloring, flavoring, preservatives and similar meat additives. Whole pork meat does not include combination food products (including soups, sandwiches, pizzas, hot dogs, or similar processed or prepared food products) that are comprised of more than pork meat, seasoning, curing agents, coloring, flavoring, preservatives, and similar meat additives.

(v) “Whole veal meat” means any uncooked cut of veal (including chop, ribs, riblet, loin, shank, leg, roast, brisket, steak, sirloin or cutlet) that is comprised entirely of veal meat, except for seasoning, curing agents, coloring, flavoring, preservatives, and similar meat additives. Whole veal meat does not include combination food products (including soups, sandwiches, pizzas, hot dogs, or similar processed or prepared food products) that are comprised of more than veal meat, seasoning, curing agents, coloring, flavoring, preservatives and similar meat additives.

SECTION 5. SECTION 25992 OF THE CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE IS HEREBY AMENDED TO READ:

This chapter shall not apply:

(a) During scientific or agricultural medical research.

(b) During examination, testing, individual treatment or operation for veterinary purposes.

(c) During transportation.

(d) During rodeo exhibitions, state or county fair exhibitions, 4-H programs, and similar exhibitions.

(e) During the slaughter of a covered animal in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 19501) of Part 3 of Division 9 of the Food and Agricultural Code,
relating to humane methods of slaughter, and other applicable law and regulations.

(f) To a breeding pig during the seven-day-five (5) day period prior to the breeding pig's expected date of giving birth, and any day that the breeding pig is nursing piglets.

(g) During temporary periods for animal husbandry purposes for no more than six (6) hours in any twenty-four (24) hour period, and no more than twenty-four (24) hours total in any thirty
30-day period.

SECTION 6. SECTION 25993 OF THE CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE IS HEREBY AMENDED TO READ:

(a) The California Department of Food and Agriculture and the California Department of Public Health shall jointly promulgate rules and regulations for the implementation of this Act by September 1, 2019.

(b) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this chapter is guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not to exceed one thousand dollars ($1,000) or by imprisonment in the county jail for a period not to exceed 180 days or by both such fine and imprisonment. In addition, a violation of Section 25990(b) of this chapter constitutes "unfair competition" as defined in Section 17200 of the Business and Professions Code and is punishable as prescribed in Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 17200) of Part 2 of Division 7 of the Business and Professions Code.

(c) The provisions of this chapter relating to cruel confinement of covered animals and sale of products shall supersede any conflicting regulations, including conflicting regulations pursuant to the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Division 2, Subdivision 6, Chapter 6.

SECTION 7. SECTION 25993.1 IS HEREBY ADDED TO THE CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE TO READ:

It shall be a defense to any action to enforce Section 25990(b) of this chapter that a business owner or operator relied in good faith upon a written certification by the supplier that the whole veal meat, whole pork meat, shell eggs, or liquid eggs at issue was not derived from a covered animal who was confined in a cruel manner, or from the immediate offspring of a breeding pig who was confined in a cruel manner.

SECTION 8. This Act shall be amended only by a statute approved by a vote of four fifths of the members of both houses of the Legislature. Any amendment of this Act shall be consistent with and further the purposes of this Act.

SECTION 9. If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid or unconstitutional, that invalidity or unconstitutionality shall not affect other provisions or applications of this Act that can be given effect without the invalid or unconstitutional provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this Act are severable.
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