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CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Good afternoon everyone. This is the Committee on Health here at the New York City Council. Thank you for joining us today on today's hearing on pet store regulation. My name is Corey Johnson. I am Chair of the Committee on Health. Today the committee will consider four bills that would regulate the sale of animals in pet shops, all with the common purpose of improving the welfare, health and safety of both people and pet animals in the city of New York. We are joined today by Council Member Elizabeth Crowley with whom \(I\) have co-sponsored all four of these bills that we will hear today and to whom I extend my thanks for her leadership on Intro 55 and on Intro 136. In just a moment she will discuss those bills, but first let me begin by setting the context for today's hearing. Since the year 2000 and then until very recently, New York State Law prevented municipalities from regulating and licensing pet stores that sell cats and/or dogs exclusively. Such stores have been licensed and regulated exclusively by the state.

Accordingly, New York City's regulations governing--if folks could just keep it quiet in here. Accordingly, New York City's regulations governing pet shops have applied only to those shops that sell cats and dogs in addition to other animals such as fish, reptiles, birds and rodents. Consequently, this city has had little power to define what role pet stores should have in controlling pet overpopulation, reducing supply of animals with serious behavioral problems and costly medical
conditions, ensuring that the city is able to
return lost and stray pets to their owners,
keeping animals out of the hands of animal
abusers, promoting animal welfare, collecting
funds requiring to maintain the city's shelter
system and educating and protect the consumers,
all of which are issues of public importance.
In this vacuum, serious and devastating
problems have proliferated. Large scale
commercial breeders have contributed to
significant pet overpopulation and have been a
persistent source of animals with serious
behavioral problems and costly medical
conditions. These animals are often sold to
unwitting customers who are deceived by false
claims that a pet store does not deal with
puppy mill animals or who receive no
information about the animal's source. Not only
do these animals end up in shelters, burdening
an already overcrowded system, but the excess
supply of animals reduces the demand for pets
from shelters and from rescues, and while
shelters spay and neuter animals they receive,
pet shops release unaltered animals to the
public and these animals breed litters that too
often end up in the shelter or rescue system.
As a city, we should be putting our resources
towards helping unwanted animals find a home.
Pet stores can and should play a critical role
in making that happen. After hearing in this
committee last June, in which witnesses
testified about the restoration of municipal
control over pet sales was necessary to address
these problems, the City Council passed
resolution 1798 of 2013, again co-sponsored by
my colleague Council Member Crowley, calling
upon New York State, the New York State
Legislature to pass and the Governor to sign,
Assembly Bill 740 and Senate Bill 3753 to allow
municipalities to regulate pet dealers. On
January \(9^{\text {th }}\) of this year, Governor Cuomo signed
that bill into law as Chapter 553 of the laws
of 2013. Known as the Puppy Mill Bill, Chapter
553 repealed provisions of the state law that
pre-empted municipal regulation and the
licensing of pet dealers. Chapter 553 also
expressly authorizes municipalities to enact
any local law regulating these pet dealers so
long as the local law is at least astringent
than state law and does not result in the
banning of the sale of all dogs or cats raised
in a safe and healthy manner. Pursuant to this
authorization and for the reasons I've
articulated, this committee is considering the
bills before us today. I would like to thank
Assembly Member Linda Rosenthal for her
leadership on this issue and for helping make
it possible for the council to consider the
legislation before us today. Without her
leadership we would not be having this hearing
today. We're hearing a number of bills today.
I'd like to provide a brief summary of these
bills. Intro number 55 will prohibit the sale
of puppies and kittens bred in puppy and kitten
mills. It would establish minimum standards of
care for animals on pet shop premises, require
pet shops to provide to purchasers written
certifications about the source and conditions
of animals sold and require the maintenance and
retention of certain documents and records in
connect with the purchase and sale of dogs and
cats. This is a seminal bill in the city's
effort to improve animal welfare and cut off a
cascade of problems that flows from selling
animals who come from irresponsible dealers.
Introduction Number 73 would amend the
definition of a pet shop within the animal
abuse registration act to require all pet
shops, including those that sell only cats and
dogs to consult the registry before releasing
an animal to the purchaser. When the council
first passed this law in December of last year,
state regulated pet dealers were exempt from
compliance. This committee and the Council
over-rode the previous Administration's veto of
this bill in January. It was on the first acts
that the new council and this Committee took.
The bill today would close that loophole.
Introduction number 136 would require pet shops
to spay or neuter any cat, dog, rabbit or
guinea pig before releasing it to a purchaser
and would further require pet shops to obtain
from the purchaser of any dog a completed
license application and any license fees
required by law. This bill would help reduce a
pet overpopulation problem that is both bad for
animals and a drain on the city's resources.
Introduction 146 would prohibit a pet shop from
releasing a dog or cat to a purchaser unless
such animal is implanted with a microchip for
identification, and such microchip is
registered with the identification information
of the purchaser. This bill would be a boon to
the effort to rescue animals that are abandoned
or lost. Taken together, these bills will
enable the city to strengthen its shelter
system, empower consumers, decrease the number
of unwanted litters, increase the number of
lost animals returned to their owners and join
the nationwide effort to keep bad actors out of
the pet supply chain. Before we turn to Council
Member Crowley, I would like to note that \(I\) am
requiring everyone who testifies today to be
sworn in. Given the large number of people who
want to testify, every person will be given
three minutes to present testimony. If you have
written testimony that will take more than
three minutes to present, please summarize it.
Members will then ask questions of each panel
of witnesses. I also want to thank all the
advocates who have worked so long and worked so
hard to get us to this point, and I assure
everyone that this is a deliberative [sic] of
process and that all voices are welcome. For
the purpose of today's hearing, for this
committee to further investigate the need for
this legislation and to hear recommendations
about how it should be amended so that it will
both effectively fulfill the objectives we've
discussed. All this testimony presented today
or submitted for the record will be factored in
to deliberations on how we proceed on these
bills. Finally, I want to acknowledge my
colleagues on the health committee who have
joined us Council Member Eugene, Council Member
Koo and Council Member Crowley who is not on
the committee, but who \(I\) mentioned before. I
also want to thank my legislative director who
has spent a significant amount of time on this,
Lewis Sheldon Brown [sp?], Council Member
Crowley's legislative director Jeff Mailman
[sp?], Health Committee Counsel Dan Hayfits
[sp?], Policy Analyst for the Health Committee
Crystal Pond [sp?], Finance Analyst for the
Health Committee Crillian Francisco [sp?], and
I would especially like to thank Jeff Campanga
[sp?] who is the legislative counsel handling
this package of legislation and has spent an
enormous amount of time on this. I also want to
personally say that \(I\) am very proud that the
Council is taking this up in the first six
months of constituting a new council. When I
was growing up I never said I wanted to be an
elected official. I actually wanted to be a
veterinarian or work with animals in some way,
so this legislation is, you know, very
meaningful to me and has a place within my

adopted a resolution that \(I\) introduced which
expressed the city's desire to regulate these
pet shops. I introduced this introduction we're
hearing today, Introduction 55, I introduced
with Council Member Corey Johnson, which I'm
going to refer to as the Puppy Mill Bill to
prevent pet shops from selling dogs and cats
that were sourced from puppy and kitten mills.
Puppy and kitten mills are high volume, large
scale breeding facilities in which dogs and
cats are raised in deplorable conditions. Often
the cages are inadequate in size. The animals
are often forced to breed. They are neglected.
They are not properly groomed, and they most
often have congenital defects and illnesses.
The vast majority of pet shops procure animals
from these mills. Consumers are generally
unaware of this and only learn about the origin
of their pets when they incur veterinarian
bills totaling hundreds, if not thousands of
dollars. This legislation is needed to end this
practice. The puppy mill bill prohibits pet
shops from selling animals obtained from high
volume breeders, requires pet shops to give
consumers disclosure information about the
source of the animal and the animal's medical
history and sets forth greater standards of
animal care for animals in pet shops. Since
these animals are most difficult to handle or
more difficult to handle than well-bred pets,
often sadly owners resort to placing them in
animal shelters. These shelters become over
burdened and sadly, thousands of dogs and cats
are euthanized each year. The Puppy Mill Bill
along with spay/neuter dog licensing bill and
the micro chipping bill are all intended to
reduce the shelter population and thereby
reduce the number of animals that are
euthanized each year. I'm interested in hearing
comments from the Department of Health and all
interested parties so that we can achieve our
common goal of ensuring that animals sold in
New York City are bred in good environments
that consumers receive animals that will make
good pets and that our shelters will not be
overburdened with dogs and cats that end up
having to be euthanized. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you,
Council Member Crowley. We are going to start
with our first panel. I really appreciate them
all being here today. I'd like to swear you in
if you would all please raise your right hand.
Do you swear and affirm to tell the truth, the
whole truth and nothing but the truth in your
testimony for this committee and to respond
honestly to all Council Member questions?
Thank you very much. So, the first panel is
Risa Weinstock from Animal Care and Control,
the Executive Director, Daniel Kass, who is the
Deputy Commissioner for Environmental Health at
the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene,
and Mario Merlino, an Assistance Commissioner
at the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene.
Is Coryn Shift [sp?] here as well?

UNKNOWN: I believe that Animal Care and Control will testify after us.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Is after?

Okay, great. So you were sworn in. I apologize. Coryn Shift is a special projects director in the division of Environmental Health at the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. Thank you all for being here today and you may proceed in whatever order you'd like. With your
```

testimony, please identify yourself for the
record before you speak.
DANIEL KASS: I'm Dan Kass. I'm the

``` Deputy Commissioner for Environmental Health at the City Department of Health. So good afternoon, Chairman Johnson and the members of the Health Committee, Council Member Crowley, Koo, Eugene. Glad to have you here. My name's Dan Kass, as I said, and I'm joined here today by two colleagues who will be available to help answer questions, Mario Merlino to my left is the Department's Assistant Commissioner overseeing veterinary health and Coryn Shift [sp?] to my right is, as you said, the Director of Special Projects in the Division, and on behalf of Commissioner Bassett, I want to thank you for the opportunity to testify. So this is the first time that \(I^{\prime} v e ~ h a d ~ a ~ c h a n c e ~ t o ~\) testify directly before this committee in the new year, and \(I\) wanted to just take a moment to describe for you the roles played by the Department with respect to animals. The Department oversees the animal sheltering system which retrieves and accepts, cares for
and temporarily shelters abandoned or unwanted
animals. The Department also administers the
animal population fund, spay/neuter programs
which funds spay and neuter services for dogs
and cats owned by low income New Yorkers. Our
regulatory work includes issuing dog licenses
and--

UNKNOWN: [off mic]

DANIEL KASS: Okay. So as I was saying, our regulatory work includes the issuing of dog licensing, the regulating of horse carriage and commercial riding industries. We also receive and respond to reports of animal bites. We coordinate rabies testing and rabies prophylaxis when needed and we investigate animal nuisance complaints. We monitor both wildlife and domestic animals for diseases such as rabies that can impact human health and domestic animals, \(I^{\prime} m\) sorry, and issue permits for the exhibition of wild and exotic animals. Our regulatory work also includes permitting and inspecting animal handling establishments. This includes boarding, grooming, training facilities and pet
shops that sell animals other than cats and
dogs. Four bills are under consideration today
and these bills are collectively intended to
help reduce the population of stray, abandoned
and homeless animals and to establish a
standard of care for all pet shop animals. We
recognize that the council cannot legislate
directly over puppy and kitten breeders who are
outside the city and we appreciate your effort
to promote safe and humane conditions for dogs
and cats. The Administration supports these
goals and we're here today to offer brief
comments for the council's consideration,
answer any questions and extend our offer to
continue working with the council on these
important issues. First, I'll speak to Intro 55
seeks to prohibit the sale of animals bred in
puppy or kitten mills by prohibiting pet shops
from selling dogs and cats acquired from
certain sources and applies the standard of
care pet stores must provide for their dogs and
cats to all the animals in their possession. In
2013, the Governor signed amendments to New
York State Agriculture and Markets Law, article
26A that removed the state's blanket
restriction on local regulation of the care and
condition of dogs and cats in pet shops. The
Administration supports Intro 55's efforts to
influence the acquisition, care and sale of
animals notably by discouraging the
overbreeding of dogs and cats. If the
Department is to expand its responsibility over
pet stores to inspect establishments selling
dogs and cuts, conduct extensive paperwork
review and evaluate pet shop's day to day care
of all animals, we will require additional
staff. This will include new staff of
veterinary expertise, additional inspectors and
funding to modify our inspectional software. We
welcome the opportunity to work with the
Council to strengthen some of the provisions in
this bill. We can enhance the Department's
enforcement authority, such as by requiring pet
shops to maintain and produce records
electronically and explicitly enabling the
Department to issue notices of violations
subject to fines following a hearing. We do not
yet know how many dogs and cats are purchased
through pet shops. We also do not know how many
fewer dogs and cats would be sold if it became
more difficult to acquire them through pet
shops or more expensive to acquire puppies and
kittens from breeders. We hope that overall the
expanded regulation of pet shops will encourage
New Yorkers to adopt from shelters run by
Animal Care and Control. Intro 136 would
broaden the types of animals required to be
sterilized prior to being released from an
animal shelter or pet shop to include rabbits
and guinea pigs, require pet shops to sell dog
licenses and mandate that pet shops report
monthly information to the, excuse me, to the
Department about all dogs sold. The Department
supports efforts to increase animal
sterilization where medically appropriate and
to expand dog licensure. State law requires
that owners of dogs in New York City license
them. Lost dogs are more likely to be reunited
with their owners if they're licensed. A
license is required to use one of the city's
dog parks and license fees help support the
city's animal care efforts. Including by
funding low cost spay and neuter services for the city's cats and dogs. We fully endorse the laws mandate to license dogs. We believe that pet shops can easily comply with the requirement to license dogs sold, and indeed they do currently when we look at them, and note that the Department is redesigning its licensing system to enable third parties to main inventories of licenses to provide at the point of sale. We are concerned, however, about requiring the sterilization of guinea pigs and small rabbits. The mortality rate from such surgeries may be quite high and we do not believe that there's a significant risk of overpopulation to justify the expense and potential harm to these animals. We suggest eliminating guinea pigs from the bill and provide a means by which rabbits would be sterilized only at an appropriate size. Intro 146 would require pet shops to microchip and register a dog or cat before releasing the animal. This mandate would be consistent with the practice at Animal Care and Control which microchips dogs and cats before they are
adopted or returned to their owners. The
Department supports this legislation and
believes it will help owners find their lost
animals, reducing the population of lost
animals in the shelter system. Intro 73 would
amend the definition of pet shop in the Animal
Abuse Registry Act. The Department supports
this amendment and suggests that each bill
under consideration today adopt a single
definition of pet shops to avoid confusion.
Thank you for the opportunity to testify. We'll
be happy to answer your questions.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Right amount
of time. Thank you. I want to give an
opportunity to Council Member Crowley to ask
questions first, given that she has other
committees she has to be at today if she wants
to ask any right away.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Thank you, Chair Johnson.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Oh, and excuse me. I want to just recognize that we've been joined by Council Member Majority Leader Jimmy Van Bramer.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY:

Commissioner, can you tell us what the size of our shelter system is today? Like, how many puppies or dogs, cats and rabbits are in our shelter system? In addition to the Animal Care and Control, do you have a--does the city have a handle on how many are in these smaller nonprofit shelters as well?

DANIEL KASS: We, do but \(I\) want to apologize. I didn't bring those numbers with me. I know that \(I^{\prime} m\) being followed by Risa Weinstock from the shelter system who probably has those numbers with her. I will say that the number has been on a kind of tendency to decline. That's true nationally as well. Although because of the increased hours of operation of the shelter system over the last several years, the days open at the receiving centers, the number has climbed in the last year. Dogs and cats obviously represent the vast majority of animals that entered the shelter system. Rabbits are the third most common, but the numbers are dramatically smaller, and guinea pigs follow that.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Do you know what the monetary cost is to the city, pet overpopulation of the pets in the shelters?

DANIEL KASS: Well it's difficult to determine exactly how to monetize that cost. I mean, we know what the city spends in its contract on the animal, on the shelter system that exceeds 12 million dollars a year. There's the expense of actually operating the facilities themselves and deferred rent, the staff of the Health Department also associated with responding to animal nuisance complaints or to investigating dangerous dog bites, which also are--or rather dog bites which are, you know, part in parcel of the problem of overpopulation, bad behavior, backyard breeding, that sort of stuff. You know, together those costs are millions of dollars more each year. That doesn't--that in of itself doesn't account for the cost associated with veterinary care in the private sector for people who are seeking care for animals that may be poorly tended, badly bred, the care of animals that leave the shelter to rescue
organizations, the cost of operating those, the
grants to them, the fees that they retrieve. So
it's quite a lot of money.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Does the
city keep track of how many dogs have to be
euthanized in the shelter system?
    DANIEL KASS: We do.
    COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Do you have
an idea of how many are euthanized each year?
    DANIEL KASS: We'll get you the exact
number, but the number last year was about
5,000 .

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Five
thousand? Now--

DANIEL KASS: [interposing] Sorry, that's dogs and cats together.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Sorry, say
that again?

DANIEL KASS: That's the number of dogs and cats together.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Together.

DANIEL KASS: That are--that's the total number of animals euthanized.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: And do you keep track of how many of those were euthanized because of sickness? Are they all, you know, illness brought on by conditions that may have existed either in a shelter system or they--you know, do you have an idea of the origin of the pet, whether they may have been victims or born into a puppy mill environment that maybe had brought on illness later?

DANIEL KASS: We don't, to my knowledge, we don't have good knowledge at this point about many of the origins of the animals. By origin \(I\) mean, whether they originated in puppy mills. One of the advantages of the bill, of the microchipping bill will be to allow some greater degree of tracking of animals if more of then come into the shelter with chips and we'll know the original registrant of that chip in either the pet shop or potentially even the breeder itself, and we can trace it back.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: But on any given day, nearly 100-200 dogs and cats are euthanized?

DANIEL KASS: No, that's--I'm sorry, that's not correct.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Well, the number was 5,000. Is it--

DANIEL KASS: [interposing] It's 5,000 on an annual basis, so the number would be closer to 15.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Okay, closer to 15. And we don't know how many of those dogs will, you know, be a young dog versus and older dog? Do we have an actual age on those dogs?

DANIEL KASS: We do have an estimated age. I don't have that data and \(I\) certainly get back to you with it.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: And--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing] Excuse--I'm sorry, Council Member Crowley. I just--a mistake on my part. I should have called Risa Weinstock up. I know that AC and C is an entirely separate thing from the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, but since so many of these questions are focused on this issue where they may have some expertise
or answers that DOHMH may not have at its fingertips, \(I^{\prime} d\) like to call Risa Weinstock up. Is she here? Yes. So maybe you can answer some of these questions, then when we're done with the DOHMH then you can present your testimony. Okay? Thank you very much.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And let me just quickly swear you in. Do you swear and affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in your testimony before this committee and to respond honestly to all Council Member questions? Thank you. Go ahead, Council Member Crowley. I apologize.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: The first question \(I\) asked that \(D O H\) was not able to answer was the actual number of pets currently in the shelter system.

RISA WEINSTOCK: Okay, you'll see in my testimony, I include that on the first page, but in 2013, the number of animals that were taken in by AC\&C was 30,264, and--

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Now, there's a network of smaller nonprofit animal shelter
throughout the city. Are they reporting numbers
to AC\&C?

RISA WEINSTOCK: They do not report numbers to us. These are the animals that came through AC\&C's doors.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: So, hundreds if not thousands of more are being dropped off at smaller shelters throughout the city?

RISA WEINSTOCK: I don't think that's correct. AC\&C is unique. We're the only not for profit animal welfare organization in New York City that has an open admissions policy, which means that we take any single animal that comes to us. We do not turn any single animal away. We often do get animals from adoptions or from pet shops and they bring them to AC\&C because we will not turn them away.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: I'm going to ask a question to DOH, and then \(I^{\prime} m\) going to give it back to the Chair. I think maybe we should hear from Risa before we ask more questions. But just how many--what's the population of dog and cat owners in the city
that actually have license? Is it--do we have
an idea of that in DOH?

DANIEL KASS: Yeah, we do know. I mean, we know from a variety of survey efforts, others that have relied on projecting census data on New York City and direct surveys by us in our Community Health Survey, that there are just about 500,000 dogs in New York City. We have at the moment just over about 100,000 of them are licensed. I'm sorry. And so the--I'm sorry, 83,000 are currently licensed. So the vast majority are not licensed. I mean, I will say that we have worked pretty diligently on trying to increase those numbers for many reasons, not the least of which is that its important that people license their dogs to be able to retrieve them, to fund the shelter system, to be responsible citizens, to be able to use public amenities as they're supposed to. There have been advertising campaigns that have been launched several times. We're making modifications. We've made some. We're making additional modifications to our licensing system to try to streamline it. We'll be
offering multiyear licenses to try to help
people not have to renew quite so frequently.
So we have improvement efforts under way, but
the percentage of dogs that are licensed is
low.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: And that's
just the statistic for dogs?

DANIEL KASS: They're the only animal
that's required to be licensed.
                            COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: And so
approximately less than one in five dogs from--
    DANIEL KASS: [interposing] That's
right.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: That's a problem. That's a big problem. What can we do as a city to help get you closer to 100 percent?

DANIEL KASS: Well, as I said, I think there are a variety of efforts underway. We have conducted focus groups. We have done survey work and \(w e^{\prime} v e\) been meeting on a regular basis with several animal welfare organizations on a dog licensing strategy discussion. I think it depends on awareness on one hand, on the
part of the public. It depends on an ease of
licensing, which we acknowledge is our
responsibly to work on, which we are. It, I
think it also is important that the public
understand that licensing is intended as a
means of raising funding for the protection of
animals, their housing and their welfare, and
it's the responsible thing to do to follow
through on those requirements. So \(I\) think it's
a--it's going to require quite a bit of work.
It's--there's where possible we do enforce. We
do check records at the pet shops currently
that we regulate that do sell dogs and cats.
They're largely--they' re very compliant with
those things. We license all of the dogs that
leave the shelter system directly for adoption.
We hope that the rescue organizations are also
licensing dogs. We talk to them and we meet
with them, but currently there is no formal
mandate that they issue the license as well.
                                    COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Okay, thank
you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you,
being slightly haphazard. There was a
misunderstanding at the beginning, but \(I\) would
love to hear from Risa Weinstock from AC\&C and
let her provide her testimony today.

RISA WEINSTOCK: Thank you, Chairman Johnson and members of the Health Committee. My name is Risa Weinstock and \(I^{\prime} m\) the executive director and general counsel of Animal Care and Control of New York City. Thanks for the opportunity to testify this afternoon concerning the proposed local laws to amend the administrative code of the City of New York with regard to pet shops. I'd like to address several provisions of three of these bills, in particular, the provisions requiring pet shops to spay, neuter, license and/or microchip the dogs, pets and other animals they offer for sale which could impact the many challenges posed by the over population of stray, homeless and abandoned pets in New York City, challenges that AC\&C faces every single day. Before I address the particulars of these bills, allow me to give you a brief overview of AC\&C. We are one of the largest animal welfare organizations
in the northeast and unique in the animal
welfare community of New York City because we
are the only organization that takes in and
cares for more than 30,000 animals each year in
the five boroughs. AC\&C was established in 1995
as 501C3 not for profit organization dedicated
to rescuing, caring for and finding loving
homes for homeless and abandoned animals in New
York City. Through a contract with the city of
New York and DOHMH, AC\&C operates five
facilities, one in each borough that are open
admission, meaning that each center accepts any
animal that comes through its doors regardless
of the behavior they're exhibiting, the
condition they are in or their medical status.
We are the only not for profit animal welfare
organization in New York City that is open
admissions. We receive animals of all kinds at
each of these locations, dogs, cats, rabbits,
snakes, birds, reptiles, and on occasion,
various farm animals. The number of animals at
AC\&C takes in is staggering, and the amendments
that City Council is proposing are a positive
step toward reducing the number of stray, lost
and abandoned animals in New York City. Of the
30,264 animals AC\&C took in last year, 11,726
were dogs, 18,538 were cats, 382 were rabbits
and 126 were guinea pigs. These numbers include
owner surrenders, owner requests for
euthanasia, strays, returns, and animals
brought in by the police. Of this number, only
1,528 dogs and cats were returned to their
owner or to an existing pet colony. My
testimony will focus on aspects of the
amendments that \(A C \& C\) believes can impact the
overpopulation of stray and abandoned animals
in New York City and help us more effectively
find homes for these animals. As stated in
Intro 55, the requirement that a pet shop
provide an information statement to every
purchaser of a cat or dog at the time of sale
is quite helpful. These information sheets can
be an excellent source of information for \(A C \& C\)
as well in the event that the purchaser of the
dog or cat surrenders their pet to one of our
shelters or receiving centers. With this
additional information, AC\&C will be able to
understand the dog or pet's history and make a
more informed decision about that animal's care
and placement. We recommend that the same
information required for dogs be provided for
cats and suggest that section \(2 C\) describing
breed, sex, color and identifying marks for
dogs also be included in section one for cats,
provided such information is available.
Additionally, since so many of the animals at
AC\&C are strays, it would be helpful if the pet
shop were required to keep this information for
at least three years. This would be useful in
the event that a dog or cat's microchip
information is not current, but we are able to
trace the microchip back to the pet store.
Having more information about a stray animal
will help inform how we care for and seek
placement for an animal. Regarding Intro 136
provision on sterilization as \(I\) explained
before, New York City has an enormous
population of stray and abandoned animals. On
average we take in over 600 animals weekly.
That's more than 85 every day. Many of these
animals are unclaimed and there's never a
shortage of dogs, cats and rabbit available for
adoption at AC\&C and throughout New York City.
Every animal adopted from \(A C \& C\) is required to
be spayed or neutered barring any special
circumstances. By requiring the same of pet
shops, mandatory sterilization as proposed by
City Council has the potential to change those
intake numbers in a very positive way. AC\&C
offers one recommendation to section \(2 F\) of this
amendment which contains a proviso that a dog
or cat must be at least eight weeks of age to
be spayed or neutered. We strongly recommend
that in addition to the age requirement, the
council include a proviso that the dog or cat
also be a minimum of two pounds, since some
animals may be under two pounds even at eight
weeks of age. Regarding section five, the
licensing requirement, we strongly support the
requirement for pet shops to ensure that a
purchaser or adopter of a dog or cat complete
an application for license. A license is one of
the most effective sources of information that
our customer care officers rely on to help us
reunite a lost pet with their family.
Additionally, if our field officers are able to
identify a dog's owner through a current dog license attached to that dog's collar, the dog may be able to get what we call "a free ride home" rather than being brought to the shelter as a stray. Section \(B\) of this amendment exempts a pet shop from the license obligations if a purchaser submits a written statement that the dog is to be harbored outside of the city. AC\&C suggests that the purchaser be required to submit more substantial evidence than a written statement such as a copy of a utility bill and some other form of identification that establishes more clearly that the purchaser resides outside of New York City and is therefore exempt. Regarding Intro 146 and microchips, similar to the requirement to licensed dogs sold in pet shops, AC\&C supports this amendment to require a microchip for dogs and cats, just like the license and microchip is a very effective means for a staff to identify a pet. In calendar year 2013 we took in 6,436 stray dogs, 12,714 stray cats. In just the past four months AC\&C has taken in 1,977 stray dogs and close to 3,000 stray cats. We
support the council's effort to help ensure
that these animals have a chance at being
reunited with their families through a
microchip. A microchip may also help us obtain
information such as the information sheet
proposed in Intro 55 about these animals from
either the pet store or the contact information
for the individuals who purchased the cat or
dog originally. AC\&C welcomes the efforts of
the City Council to help reduce the
overwhelming number of abandoned and stray
animals in New York City through these
amendments. The magnitude of this issue not
only impacts \(A C \& C\), it impacts the health and
welfare of the entire city.
    CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: You may
continue.

RISA WEINSTOCK: The proposed
amendments help promote responsible ownership
and community involvement including the
cooperation and participation of pet shops.
AC\&C has been licensing, microchipping and
sterilizing our adopted animals for nearly two
decades. We welcome the support of the City

Council to require pet shops to do the same. Thank you for the opportunity to testify and I'm happy to take any questions.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very much for your testimony today. I do have a few questions for you and then \(I^{\prime} m\) happy to go back to Council Member Crowley or we've been joined by Council Member Arroyo as well. And I should--I know that she has been a leader on these issues in the Council. So I wanted to understand a bit more what the impact does the supply of animals from commercial breeders have on the demand for shelter and rescue adoptions in New York City.

RISA WEINSTOCK: We take in all kinds of animals. When people come to adopt, we get a lot of request, "Oh, I would like a certain type of animal." Pure bred dogs and breeders just are adding animals to the--it's sort of our competition for adoptions. There are people who go to breeders instead of adopting animals, and as I said, the statistics show that there's never a shortage of animals available for adoption.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you. If hypothetically there were a complete ban on the sale of cats or dogs in pet shops, what would the impact be do you believe for the shelter and rescue adoptions in the city?

RISA WEINSTOCK: Hypothetically speaking \(I\) would hope that more people who are looking for pets would think about adoption as a first alternative, but \(I\) really, \(I\) wouldn't know for certain.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And would you support more stringent legislation requiring a certain percentage of animals sold in pet stores come from shelters or rescue?

RISA WEINSTOCK: It would certainly help us improve adoptions and get more animals placed.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: So would you support that?

RISA WEINSTOCK: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Yes. I have a few questions for you. Jeff, where are they? Regarding the microchipping and the spay and neuter, so what percentage of animals that come
into AC\&C shelters in New York City currently
have microchips?

RISA WEINSTOCK: We don't have a lot of animals with microchips, and \(I\) think \(I\) had said that only of the--we had about \(28-29,000\) dogs and cats come in last year in 2013 and of that number there were 1,528 that were returned to their owners or returned to a colony. And so if we had identifying information they would probably fall within that 1,500 number. So it's very small.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Very small.

RISA WEINSTOCK: And cats, obviously are not required to be licensed, so there's a better opportunity for us to find information about a dog than it is a cat.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: If you do find an animal that comes into AC\&C that is microchipped, is the microchip typically always registered to the owner of the pet?

RISA WEINSTOCK: It is not.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: It is not?

RISA WEINSTOCK: No. It will be--but we can trace it back, and we'll trace it back
to the microchip company to find out where the
chip was implanted, and so if the pet owner
didn't register the microchip properly, we
would at least know where the chip was
implanted and start from there to build the
information that we need to find the owner.
    CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And when an
animal is implanted with a microchip that is
registered to the owner, what is the return
rate typically to the owner?
    RISA WEINSTOCK: If the information
is current, the return rate is generally
successful. Sometimes a microchip, the
information hasn't been updated. So someone may
adopt a pet or purchase a pet, have it
microchip implanted and then for some reason
they give their pet away and that person never
updates the information, but at least it's a
connection, and we'll contact the former owner.
Hopefully, that information is still workable,
and then we'll pursue it from there. But it's a
much better chance of finding an owner.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And when there is a microchip in an animal that is brought
into \(A C \& C\) and the microchip is not correlating to the owner, who is typically on the microchip? Is it a pet store? Is it a breeder? Who is on that microchip?

RISA WEINSTOCK: It can be any number of individuals. It could be a prior owner. It could be the pet shop and we haven't seen that it, the microchip has gone to a breeder. We don't really get involved with the breeders on any regular basis.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And when it isn't tagged or tied to the owner, what is the return rate then? Much smaller I would imagine.

RISA WEINSTOCK: No, if the microchip, if we find the owner through the microchip--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing] No, no, if the--if the owner is not tagged in that microchip, but it doesn't match up, what is the return rate then of the animal back to the person who is the owner even though the owner isn't on the microchip? Very low I'd imagine.

RISA WEINSTOCK: It is very low. And what happens at that point is we will try to contact anybody and everybody who we can find through that microchip and we give that person the opportunity to come in and claim the animal, but after a certain amount of time we'll deem that owner, that animal to be up for placement through the shelter.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Great. I have a couple questions on spay and neuter license and then \(I^{\prime} m\) going to go back to Council Member Crowley. How much would mandatory spay and neuter licensing and microchipping impact AC\&C's intake, return to owner and euthanasia rates?

RISA WEINSTOCK: I think it can have a significant impact. The more animals that are altered, the less are reproducing and what we've seen in the last couple of years was a slight decline in intakes, although our receiving centers have longer hours of operation, so it started to spike up again and we're at 30,000. But there's been tremendous effort in the community to do proactive
```

spay/neuter, to get out to different locations
and offer free or low cost spay/neuter to owned
animals, and I think that would make a
significant change. Licensing also, and
microchips, the sooner we can match up an owner
the better. I think the spay/neuter requirement
will help us with respect to the number of
stray animals and the licensing and microchip
requirement will help us with respect to
reuniting stray animals with their owners.

```
    CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And some people
have said that spaying or neutering too early
can cause animals to develop behavioral
problems. Is it your opinion that that is true?
Do you have information on that?
    RISA WEINSTOCK: I'm not qualified
to testify on that, but in our organization we
follow the same model that you have with
respect to sterilization that the animal should
be at least eight weeks of age and also we
suggest including the requirement that they be
at least two pounds.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And then on
rabbits, if you could just describe currently
what are--what's the marketplace for rabbits in
New York City? What are the overpopulation
issues currently and when it comes to mandatory
spaying and neutering of rabbits, why do you
think such a measure is necessary?
    RISA WEINSTOCK: So with respect to
the population of rabbits, if you look at my
testimony, it's only 382 rabbits that came into
the shelter either as stray or owner surrender.
That's a significantly small number in
comparison to the number of cats and then dogs.
However, we do adopt out rabbits. We alter our
rabbits before they're adopted. There isn't as
high a demand for rabbit adoptions as there are
for cats and dogs. And with respect to
spay/neuter, it's--we recommend it highly.
Rabbits can populate very quickly and we just
think that that again will also curtail the
number of rabbits.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Great. Thank you. I want to go back to Council Member Crowley.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Thank you, Council Member Johnson. Now, I'd like to get an
idea about the extent of the behavioral
problems and illnesses of the pets that are
dropped off at the shelter. How often, what
percentage of the pets have behavioral
problems, illnesses and you know, and how does
that effect their chance of being adopted?
                    RISA WEINSTOCK: So that covers a lot
of territory. To bring it back to pet shops and
puppy mills, we don't know if the medical
problems are because of a puppy mill or because
an animal that's been overbred. We do see many
animals that come in that have either health
problems or behavior issues, and also while at
the shelter issues do develop. It's like I
said, 85 animals coming in every day. Our
population right now is swelling. This is what
we call cat season. We have a lot of animals
that we're housing, trying to find owners,
holding them for their mandatory legal hold
period and trying to find placement for them.
So we have a population of animals that may
have behavior issues when we bring them in or
may develop behavior issues that we will only
adopt out to our rescue partners and not really
available for the general public, and we also
have animals that either come in with a health
problem or may develop a health problem while
they're with us, again, that we will--we do not
adopt animals with those challenges to the
general public.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: So if a animal has a behavioral problem or an illness, they're not adoptable or you let the public know?

RISA WEINSTOCK: We try to place them with our rescue partners. We have a very robust group of partners we call "New Hope Partners." They take many of the animals that we put on our at risk of euthanasia list. These are animals that are at risk of being euthanized because of their behavioral challenges or health challenges or both and have not been adopted or taken from the shelter either by their owners or someone interested in these animals.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Now, your population, I didn't hear any statistic on the
percentage of behavioral problems or illnesses.
Do you have a handle on that number?

RISA WEINSTOCK: I can get you a
number. We look at animals that are just at
risk of euthanasia for both of those reasons.
You had asked Dan Kass about euthanasia and the
number of euthanasia and last year for dogs and
cats it was 4,843 of the 29,000 dogs and cats
that came into the shelter. That equates to an
82 percent live release rate. That's something
that we're working on improving every day. It's
not something that exists because there's no
other reason these animals were trying to find
placement for with a population of 30,000
animals it becomes very difficult. So that's
why we are really in favor of a lot of the
provisions in these amendments just to try and
get our population down and also to get pets
and their owners reunited.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: I agree. New
Yorkers, I believe, and that's why we're here
today hearing these bills, need to do more to
stop so many puppies and dogs or cats from
euthanized. That's nearly 5,000 that could have
been avoided had circumstances been different
Maybe those--may it's not just puppy mills that
are causing the problem. I'd like to know from
your experience what other types of breeders
are, you know, causing the over population and
what we could do to prevent to try to track
those breeders.

RISA WEINSTOCK: We think a lot of the overpopulation comes from irresponsible pet ownership. Spay and neuter is really an
important thing. There are many backyard
breeders. We do see dogs come in with litters
of puppies that were found stray. We find--
we'll find the female that has been bred and
bred and then just left on the street as a
stray. We know from people who challenge the
requirement to have their animals spayed or
neutered once they're upon return. They
challenge that because they say, "Well, I breed
my dog. I need her back unaltered." And that's
not an exception to the sterilization
requirement as it exists now. And so we are
told people are breeding them. They're breeding
them for money and for other reasons, but we
know that individuals can get between 50 and
over 1,000 dollars for a puppy, and in
particular a pit bull puppy.
    COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: And
unfortunately it's the pit bulls that appear to
be the largest breed of do that is in the
shelter system.

RISA WEINSTOCK: The majority of the dogs that we take in and the majority of our population are pit bulls and pit bull mixes, yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: No other questions.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you,

Council Member Crowley. I want to recognize we've been joined by Council Member Espinal as well and \(I^{\prime} m\) happy if he has any questions he can weigh in. I just wanted to ask the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene on some of those questions if there were anything that you wanted to weigh in on, or are you comfortable with what was said today.

DANIEL KASS: I don't think there's much more that we want to say at this point. I
```

mean, I again, I think this bill especially the
bill that restricts the acquisition of dogs and
cats from the large breeders will go some of
the way to helping stem some of the supply of
animals that end up unwanted or stray or
inappropriately bred. You know, it's going to
take much more than that, but it's certainly a
start.

```

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And in your
testimony earlier you mentioned the fact that
supportive of these measures, but that for the
agency to be able to enforce these and have the
staff capacity to make sure that they are
enforced in the correct way. As we know most
things in the city come down to enforcement if
they're going to have any real teeth. What do
you think the impact would be on the Department
when it comes to needing additional funds for
staff or resources?

DANIEL KASS: Well, you know, we've begun to estimate this. For us there will be-the impact will happen in a couple of ways. One is that there will be additional pet shops that will come under our purview that currently are
state regulated only. Second, there will be a
group of pet shops that we--that are currently
jointly permitted by the state and the city and
then we will assume responsibility for the dog
and cat component of the inspection as well as
for sort of additional requirements for
standard of care, and then the third sort of
chunk of activity at the pet shop level would
be a much more robust inspection than we
currently conduct. You know, our inspections
typically last a couple of hours per pet shop
per inspection unless there's a very
significant problem discovered. We expect that
the duration of the inspection given the
responsibility to review paperwork to evaluate
the standard of care to look at the records per
pet on a pet by pet basis will substantially
increase the amount of time at each inspection.
So we've estimated that we will require a
veterinarian, three inspectors, and a couple of
clerical people to also support the backend and
the data entry and what we expect to be, you
know, a request for information from the public
about our activity. The--in the first year we
would have to build out changes to our
information technology system. Currently we do
have a handheld system for pet shops, but it'll
obviously have to be changed fairly
dramatically and then we'll also have to modify
the permitting system for the city. So there
are a whole bunch of sort of balls that have to
be juggled to make modifications. We estimate
the cost in the first year, north of 800,000
dollars and in subsequent years about 650,000
dollars a year.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you. On
that point with regard to the current licensing
of pet shops, some that are regulated or
overseen by the city, some that are jointly,
some that are just by the state. State law
prohibits pet shops permitted pursuant to the
health code from releasing any dog to a
purchaser unless the pet shop has obtained a
complete license application and fee from the
purchaser. What difficulties does DOHMH have
enforcing this law and making pet stores in New
York accountable for the licensing of every
dog?
difficulty at all. Pet shops are already doing
it. They're selling dogs and cats that we
already--that were in because they sell small
animals or small numbers of dogs and cats. And
as \(I\) mentioned in testimony, we are making
modifications to our licensing system to ease
the issuance of licenses. Right now, third
parties typically either complete paperwork on
behalf of someone or they accept paperwork and
then transmit it to us after which we fulfill
the license request by mail. We will have a
system in place that allows the pet shop
themselves to maintain an inventory of the
licenses and just communicate to us who they
issued it to. So it'll be better for customers.
It'll be better for the pet shops.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you.

Council Member Crowley, do you have any further questions on these today? Okay. Council Member Espinal, do you have any questions? So I think we're going to leave it at this. I would just ask that the committee and the committee staff may have additional questions for you all and
we may want to submit those to you and get a
timely and appropriate response, and it would
be helpful if someone from the Department
stayed for the entirety of the meeting, and it
would be helpful if \(A C \& C\) stayed as well or had
someone stay to listen to the advocates and the
rest of the testimony today.
                            DANIEL KASS: We'll have someone here
and we will be happy to work with you going
forward.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you,

Deputy Commissioner. Thank you all for testifying. We're going to call next an elected official who is here and then we're going to get to the advocates and other folks from the public who have signed up to testify today. I want to call forward Assembly Member Linda Rosenthal, who she wasn't here during my introductory remarks, my opening statement, but Assembly Member Rosenthal, I just wanted to let you know that in the opening statement and subsequently we said that we wouldn't be here today having this hearing if it wasn't for your advocacy and hard work in passing the bill that
you were able to get signed into law in
January. I know you were a tireless advocate on
this and one of the biggest champions in Albany
on humane animal welfare legislation. So I
wanted to thank you for your advocacy and hard
work and ask you to testify today on these four
measures, which include, which I'm sure you
know, Introduction Number 55 prohibiting the
sale of puppies and kittens bred in puppy and
kitten mills, your bill allowed that
introduction to come here today. Introduction
73, updating the definition of pet store within
the animal abuse registry which the city
adopted. Introduction Number 136 , spay and
neuter of licensing of animals sold in pet
shops, and introduction 146, the microchipping
of animals sold in pet shops, and with that \(I\)
would like to turn it over to you to testify
today. Oh, and I have to swear you in. So if
you please raise your right hand. Do you swear
and/or affirm to tell the truth, the whole
truth and nothing but the truth in your
testimony before this committee and to respond
honestly to all Council Member questions?

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Okay. Well, thank you so much for having me. Thank you, Chair Johnson. I'm delighted to be here in front of your committee. Member Crowley and my former colleague and member Espinal, thank you for having me here today. I'm joined by my Chief of Staff Lauren Schuster and my Legislative Director Funsho Owolabi. We all worked on this legislation. Good afternoon. I'm Assembly Member Linda B. Rosenthal and I represent the \(67^{\text {th }}\) Assembly district, which includes the upper west side and parts of the Clinton Hell's Kitchen neighborhood in Manhattan. As a long time champion for animal welfare and the prime sponsor of the state law, Chapter Five of the laws of 2014 that gives New York City and municipalities across the state the ability to regulate local sales of animals by pet dealers, \(I\) am pleased that the council is holding this hearing today. Today's hearing
represents and important phase in an ongoing
dialogue on animal welfare in New York City.
Chapter five was a product of more than a
year's worth of work by advocates, experts and
animal lovers who banded together in the face
of unprecedented industry opposition to pass
legislation that would allow New York to crack
down on puppy mills, a pernicious problem whose
solutions are elusive. The goal of this law is
to provide municipalities with tools to ensure
that pet shops are selling healthy animals
which were sourced from healthy and safe
environments. The final language was arrived at
after months of negotiation and this law
presents a real opportunity for municipalities
to address the problem of puppy mills in New
York. Before the passage of chapter five, the
state of New York had sole responsibility for
regulating pet dealers and by extension, the
sale of live animals from disparate
jurisdictions, for example, Thurman, New York,
a small rural town in Upstate New York and New
York City. After more than a decade of
preemption, it became abundantly clear that a
one size fits all approach to pet dealer
regulation was inadequate to ensure the safety
of animals sold or offered for sale or to
protect consumers and municipalities. State
regulators were ill-equipped to enforce lax
standards and state law proved inadequate to
address pet dealer regulation in a localized
way. In addition, municipalities were often
left to assume the financial burden of care for
sick puppy mill dogs. I introduced an assembly
bill in 2009 to lift the state preemption and
restore to municipalities the authority to
regulate the sale of live animals by pet
dealers in order to allow them to pass laws,
rules, regulations or ordinances to protect
animals and consumers against unscrupulous
breeders, commonly referred to as puppy mills.
In this way, municipalities can ensure that all
animals sold in pet shops are healthy and safe
throughout all stages of the breeding and sales
process. Puppy mills are large scale commercial
breeders who place profit above general
accepted veterinary practice and the humane
treatment of animals. The vast majority of
puppy mill dogs are kept in filthy, tiny
enclosures for the entirety of their short
lives, are given little if any medical care or
exercise, are not socialized with humans or
other dogs, and the breeding females are forced
to give birth to countless litters. Puppy mill
dogs live short and tortured lives, but the
abuse does not end there. It is greed that
propels the inhumane practices of puppy mills,
and our aim is to put an end to an industry
whose profit is derived from other's pain and
suffering. Pet stores unwittingly or not are an
integral part of the chain that encourages
breeders to continue these abusive practices.
The people who purchase the adorable "doggy in
the window" which they expect to be happy and
healthy additions to their families, often find
themselves with a sick animal that requires
medical treatment to alleviate painful maladies
or to save its life. Our power to end this
cycle of greed which causes heartbreak on so
many levels lies in our ability to pass strong
common sense regulations pursuant to chapter
five. Unfortunately, the vast majority of dogs
offered for sale in pet stores across the
country are in fact the product of puppy mills
and they are afflicted with serious congenital
defects caused by the poor breeding practices
employed by the mills which are exasperated by
the poor conditions in which the animals are
forced to live. In a situation that occurs with
unfortunate frequency after someone purchases
an animal for a premium and takes that animal
home, they discover that it suffers from
serious often life threatening medical
conditions, the treatment of which is
prohibitively expensive. Many owners spend
thousands of dollars on medical treatments
before deciding to euthanize the animal. Others
choose to drop off the unwanted animals at
local shelters or with rescue organizations
whose resources are already stretched far too
thin. We must end the puppy mill to pet store
pipeline, and New York City has a tremendous
opportunity to do just that with the proposed
bills before the Council. Chapter five gives
municipalities the authority to issue
regulations governing the source of animals
sold or offered for sale regarding whether
spaying or neutering is required prior to sale,
and to ensure that all animals sold or offered
for sale are healthy and have been safely
maintained throughout all stages of the
breeding process among other regulations so
long as the regulations do not result in
essentially banning all sales of animals that
are raised or maintained in a healthy and safe
environment. Additionally, municipalities also
have the ability to issue regulations on
grounds that are not enumerated in this section
of law. This language provides New York City
and all municipalities in the state with wide
latitude to protect animals and consumers by
cracking down on bad breeders. It is with this
specific intent in mind that \(I\) provide
testimony on the four bills that are subject of
today's hearing, Intro number 55, 73, 136 and
146. The bulk of my testimony, however, will
focus on intro number 55 which most
specifically relates to responsibilities of New
York City pet dealers. I'd like to provide an
explanation of the intent behind each of the
specific provisions of chapter five. I must
begin with the proposed definition of high
volume breeder. A facility with 20 breeding
females, each birthing a litter every several
months as is common in most puppy mills will
result in hundreds of offspring annually. A
sound approach would be to limit the allowable
number of breeding females to five and to
additionally place a limit on the total number
of litters permitted in a lifetime. This likely
would result in more responsible breeding
practices and gets to the core of the
pernicious puppy mill problem. It also
guarantees that breeding females will not spend
their entire lives pregnant or nursing. One of
the most powerful provisions of chapter five
lies in the ability of municipalities to
regulate the source of animals offered for sale
in New York City. The legislature specifically
intended for New York City and other
municipalities to be authorized to require that
animals are sourced from breeders that conform
to standards prescribed by municipal law. To
that end, the City Council may require pet
shops operating in New York City to prove that
they are sourcing animals that will be sold or
offered for sale from breeders that adhere to
high health and welfare standards. In passing
this law, the legislature intended for
municipalities to have the ability to define
the standard of care based on local facts and
circumstance. I resisted efforts to define the
meeting of the health or safety of animals
acquired or maintained by pet dealers so that
municipalities could do so themselves. Pet
shops operating in New York City or elsewhere
may be required to require from source breeders
via a sworn statement or the written instrument
that the animals in their care were humanely
treated and raised and maintained in a healthy
and safe manner. Source language also provides
New York City with the opportunity to
precipitously reduce the number of animals in
the city shelter system and other independent
animal rescues by requiring that a certain
percentage of animals sold or offered for sale
here are sourced from animal shelters or rescue
organizations. Municipal--excuse me.

Municipalities can require that any percentage of animals that amount to less than 100 percent of all animals sold or offered for sale are sourced from shelters or rescues. Language specifying that municipalities may regulate so long as the regulation does not "result in essentially banning all sales of dogs or cats raised and maintained in a healthy and safe environment" provides municipalities with wide regulatory authority. The language was written to allow municipalities to ban the sale of animals that are not raised and maintained in a healthy and safe environment. For animals that are raised and maintained in a healthy and safe environment, municipalities are specifically empowered through this law to regulate pet dealer up until the point that the regulation would essentially represent a total ban on all sales of healthy and safely maintained animals from a particular source. I am pleased that Intro 55 includes shelter and veterinary standards that track with current state law and that it also requires that a comprehensive certificate of health be provided to the
consumer, but it should go further to
promulgate stronger shelter standards that will
ensure the health and safety of animals sold in
pet shops. Because chapter five presents
municipalities with the authority to regulate
to guarantee the health and safety of animals
maintained by pet dealers, the council may
spell out in great detail shelter standards and
exercise requirement in addition to required
socialization and minimum standards for
veterinary care among other things that must be
provided to animals in pet shops. Additionally,
the council should require that animals in pet
shops not be euthanized unless they are
incurably ill and treatment or rehabilitation
would be dangerous or impossible. Any animal
that is too ill to be sold or offered for sale
but not ill enough to warrant euthanasia should
be transferred to a shelter or rescue
organization. I am pleased that intro 136 will
require that dogs, cats and other animals be
spayed or neutered prior to sale as I fought
hard to maintain that language in chapter five.
Requiring presale spaying and neutering will
help to reduce the number of unplanned litters
that end up in the municipal shelter system, at
rescue groups or on the street. Because animals
could attain weeks of age without reaching the
weight of which veterinarians would consider
spay and neuter safe, \(I\) would urge the sponsors
to consider including language relating to the
safe age and weight of animals to be altered.
The sponsors should work with appropriate
experts to determine the proper age and weight
for altering rabbits, which \(I\) have been told
differ dramatically from dogs and cats with
respect to spay and neuter requirements. Also
included in chapter five is the ability for
municipalities to create their own pet dealer
licensing or permitting scheme. It is critical
to the success of municipalities' pet dealer
legislation that localities have the ability to
set up a permitting scheme by which they can
monitor and investigate compliance with the new
regulations and also generate revenue to help
fund the new enforcement responsibilities. It
is important to convey that I resisted attempts
to include language in chapter five that would
expressly prohibit municipalities from creating
and maintaining a permitting system and require
them instead to rely upon the state's
permitting system in section 403 of article 26A
of the Agriculture and Markets Law. Intro 73
will ensure that City Council can require all
pet shops regardless of the kinds of animals
they sell to obtain a permit to operate under
section 161.09 of the New York City Health
Code. An amendment to section 161.09 of the
Health Code requiring pet shops to obtain
permits exempted pet shops exclusively selling
dogs or cats from that requirement. I was
conscious of this loophole when drafting
chapter five and wanted to ensure that New York
City and other municipalities have the ability
to require pet shops to acquire permits. I
support Intro 146 which requires that all dogs
and cats be microchipped prior to sale in New
York City. Microchips are a good way to help
reunite lost animals with their owners, thereby
reducing the number of stray or homeless
animals. I am the sponsor of legislation in the
New York State Assembly that would require any
organization that accepts lost, stray or
homeless animals to examine them for
identifying information including microchips. I
recommend that the City Council pursue similar
legislation on the city level. Finally,
enforcement of these new laws is key to their
ultimate success. The bill should specify what
the penalties are if any for violating their
requirements. By their very nature, puppy mill
operators flout the law with impunity. It is
critical that New York City make clear via the
imposition of heavy fines that takes violation
of these new sections very seriously. In
addition, it is vital that the city specify
clearly which agency will be responsible for
enforcement and lay out and explicit plan by
which that agency will conduct regular
inspections to monitor and guarantee
compliance. Despite a massive and well funded
opposition, advocates and individuals from
across the state fought long and hard for
months to ensure that bill A740A became law,
because they believe as I do that
municipalities are in the best position to
regulate local pet dealers and crack down on
puppy mills. These animal lovers donated their
time and resources and spent months working
with my office and national and local animal
groups to ensure the bill became law. They now
look to New York City to exercise its authority
under this new law to help put an end to puppy
mills. New York City has a unique opportunity
to be a model for every municipality in New
York State considering its options under this
new state law. I urge the council to build upon
this framework and work closely with animal
advocates and experts to include my
recommendations into the final bills. I applaud
the sponsors for approaching this important
issue with courage and tenacity and I look
forward to collaborating on this and future
legislation. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you,
Assembly Member, and \(I\) just want to state for
the record when you mentioned at the beginning
that you also cover a portion of Hell's Kitchen
and Clinton, I am very glad we get to work on
many issues together in the community, but I'm
especially proud of the timing that you are
able to get this done in January so Council
Member Crowley, after passing resolutions in
the past could work on this and I could work on
this with her given the importance of it. I
also just want to say \(I\) think that your
recommendations that you've given to us to
improve the bill are very helpful, and I look
forward to working with your office and Council
Member Crowley and the advocates in improving
this bill before it gets voted upon throughout
the legislative process. We do have some
questions for you, and \(I\) want to recognize
we've been joined by Council Member Cornegy and
also Council Member Barron. Does anyone have
any questions? No? Yeah, we're going to go to
Council Member Crowley and then we'll go to
Council Member Espinal.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Thank you,

Council Member Johnson. I want to add to the praise. Thank you, Linda Rosenthal for all that you've done. Assembly woman, you've been a strong advocate. We wouldn't be here today hearing real legislative opportunities that the
city can enforce if you had not had the
foresight and the commitment to animal rights
and so I am very appreciative. I know that
we'll continue to work together to make sure
that we put an end to euthanasia of sick
animals that come from puppy mills that we
could better regulate the industry and we have
our work cut out, because thousands of dogs and
cats are killed every single year because of
conditions that are happening in pet shops and
puppy mills and so this is a unique
opportunity, and \(I\) thank you for your extensive
review of the bills and your encouragement to
put forth new legislation. Thank you.
    ASSEMBLY MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Thank
you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very much Council Member Crowley. Council Member Espinal?

COUNCIL MEMBER ESPINAL: I just wanted to say hello and it's a pleasure seeing you here today.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Hello.
actually a proud sponsor of your bill up in
Albany, \(I\) think it was the last bill. Then the
Governor signed it with my name on it, and so
I'm also a proud sponsor of intro number 55 and
look forward to helping the committee pass this
as well. Thank you.
                    ASSEMBLY MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Thank
you. Good to see you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you,
Council Member. I just want to check and see
here. In your testimony, Council Member
Rosenthal--I mean, sorry, Assembly Member
Rosenthal, you marked the number that you
believed is the safest and most adequate number
for breeding dogs to be five females. I know
that this is an important and incredibly
important part of the language in this bill,
and I just wanted to understand a little more
from your perspective why you believe that's
the appropriate number.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ROSENTHAL: In conversations with advocates and people who've spent years in the trenches. Okay. Sorry. In
conversations with advocates who have spent
years in the trenches, this is the number that
they think is the optimum number that prevents
a breeding facility from crossing over into a
puppy mill. It's a responsible number. It would
provide enough healthy animals for the breeder
to make a living, but it would not cause the
operation to descend into puppy mill status.
It's more than 20 is just too many, and you
know, there may be other opinions on how many
is the optimal number, but \(I\) think the smaller
the number the more responsible the operation
will be and the fewer animals will be brought
into a world that is teaming with unwanted
puppies and cats.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you. Our
legislative counsel, Jeff Campagna, who spent
an inordinate amount of hours working on this
legislation has a very specific question for
you that we think it's important to have in our
record in this hearing.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: So I'm going to let him--I'm not a lawyer. I'm going to let him
as the attorney that's been working on this ask
you that question.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Okay. JEFF CAMPAGNA: Thank you, Assembly Member. I really appreciate you coming here and explaining the legislative intent which is very important to us as we establish the legislative record. You said two things in your testimony that \(I\) really want to drill down on to make sure we're getting precisely what the intent was. I spoke with your office last night and we've discussed the issue of the word "all animals bred in a safe and healthy manner." In your testimony you specifically said that municipalities can require that any percentage of animals that amounts to less than 100 percent of all animals sold or offered for sale are sourced from shelters or rescues, which I would assume means that if we said 95 percent of animals had to be from shelters or rescues, it was your intent that we could do that.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ROSENTHAL: That would be permissible, yes.

JEFF CAMPAGNA: Okay. And then the next paragraph you said for animals that are raised in a safe and healthy environment, municipalities are specifically empowered through this law to regulate pet dealers up until the point that the regulation would essentially represent a total ban on all sales of healthy and safely maintained animals from a particular source. So in that instance, my question is, could we say that--could we ban all animals from a source where animals are raised in a safe and healthy manner, say if they--I'll get to that in one second. This is Jeff Campagna, Committee Counsel. They wanted me to say that for the record. Could we ban the sale of all animals if they were raised in a safe and healthy manner, if they came from a commercial breeders, large numbers of breeding dogs if we also allowed animals that came from breeders that only had say five breeding dogs or less? In essence we would be allowing some dogs that were raised in what we call a safe and healthy manner, but not allowing others
that might, some might argue were raised in a
safe and healthy manner.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Okay, can you repeat that? Or rephrase it, because its-JEFF CAMPAGNA: [interposing] When you said all--

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ROSENTHAL: It's a complicated instruction.

JEFF CAMPAGNA: When you used all, did the word all many any, or did it mean all?

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ROSENTHAL: It meant all.

JEFF CAMPAGNA: So, we could ban--we could ban from any source as long as we didn't ban all healthy and safely raised animals.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Yes, yes.

JEFF CAMPAGNA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you for clarifying that. I mean, we're drilling down on this because \(I\) think this is an incredibly important part of trying to close the puppy mill loophole that currently exists and making this as stringent as possible as was intended--

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ROSENTHAL:
[interposing] Yes.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: by the state Legislature and you in passing this piece of legislation and granting this right to municipalities given that \(I\) think this legislation may, and \(I\) hope it doesn't come under attack from the folks that want to
continue to allow this practice to take place in New York City and around the country. Are there any other questions? Council Member Barron, do you have any questions? Okay. Sure, absolutely. Council Member Barron.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: I just want to welcome my former colleague from the Assembly. Good to see you and to encourage you as you continue to do the work that you've been doing all the years that \(I^{\prime}\) ve been knowing you. Keep it up.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And if folks could please turn off their cell phones that would be very helpful to us. Put them on
vibrate. So I believe that's it. I wanted to
thank you for coming down to City Hall to
testify today. I want to thank you again for
allowing us to actually take this step in the
first few months of the Council. It's
incredibly important for the future of our
city, and \(I\) hope as you said, that New York
City becomes a model not just for the rest of
the State of New York and allowing the
municipalities to engage in this effort as
well, but hopefully a national model where
other people can learn from what we've done
here and make sure that animals and pets are
treated humanely and safely and that this
continued practice of puppy mills isn't allowed
to continue in a reasonable and humane society.
So thank you.
                    ASSEMBLY MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Well,
thank you very much. And \(I\) know that you and
other members of your committee are incredibly
serious about getting this right, because just
as I and my colleagues in Albany were prevailed
upon by outside influences to not be as
stringent as we were, I'm sure you will suffer
those same onslaughts, but \(I\) know that you
understand the problem and \(I\) am confident that
you will do your best to protect the animals
and the consumers. So thanks so much.
    CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: We are going to
make this bill as strong as possible that is
able to hold up to scrutiny if it comes to
that, but we want this to be the strongest bill
possible and in the strongest way that you're
allowing us under state law. So thank you.
                                    ASSEMBLY MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Thank you
so much.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: We are now
going to go to a panel to testify. I just want
to remind folks that we are going to keep
people strictly at three minutes on the clock.
I know that everyone has a lot of really
helpful hopefully things to say today, and I
really want to tell you, and this is the honest
to God truth as \(I\) said from the very beginning,
this is going to be very a deliberative
process, and that all of the testimony here
today is going to be taken under advisement as
we move forward. So if you're not able to
finish your testimony or if someone has
testified in the same way, you can summarize
your remarks and \(I\) would hope that everyone
brought written testimony so that we can look
at that testimony as we move forward to improve
these bills. So the first panel is going to be-
-the first panel is going to be Brian Shapiro
from the Humane Society of the United States,
if he could come up. The second person is going
to be, and I apologize if \(I\) do not get your
name correctly, is Elinor Molbegott from the
Humane Society of New York. The third person is
going to be Elizabeth Stein from the New York
City Bar Association Animal Law, and the fourth
person on this panel is going to be Steven
Gruber from the Mayor's Alliance for New York
City's Animals. Is she here? Thank you all
for coming today. If you could all please raise
your right hand. Do you swear and affirm to
tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but
the truth in your testimony before this
committee and to respond honestly to all
Council Member questions? Thank you very much.
You can go in whatever order you'd like, but
before you speak, please identify yourself for
the record and please speak as closely to the
microphone as possible and make sure that the
mic is lit up which means that you're on the
microphone. Thanks a lot.

ELINOR MOLBEGOTT: My name is Elinor Molbegott. \(I^{\prime} m\) Counsel for the Humane Society of New York and \(I\) just want to quickly thank the council for conducting this hearing on important humane legislation and also most to Assembly Woman Rosenthal for her passion and persistence in getting the legislation through the State Legislature. I'm going to summarize the comments that \(I^{\prime}\) ve given you, but in essence for the spay, neuter and dog licensing provisions to take effect so that pet stores can once again sell dog licenses, even those that exclusively sell dogs and cats and that pet stores again be required to spay and neuter dogs and cats before they sell them, which was really a wonderful piece of legislation that the City Council was before its time on many years ago but it never took effect or it never was enforced because of the pre-emption law
that passed just at the same time. Either the
City Council can pass legislation to require
that these pet shops be permitted and sell
these licenses and spay/neuter, or the Healthy
Department can just change 161.09 to again
require pet stores to have this permit and once
that happens it triggers the law that already
has been passed by the City Council to require
spay/neuter, that's already on the books, but
it just pertains to those pet shops that have a
permit under 161.09 and some of them do not.
The same goes for dog licensing, which for
years pet stores were selling dog licenses and
when the pre-emption law came into being, that
also was no longer allowed to be regulated. So
it could either be done through you or the
Health Department and we applaud either way
that it can get done most quickly. On the
spay/neuter language, we would just suggest
that the language currently in the law is a
little confusing in that it requires
spay/neuter, but it also gives the consumer the
right to have their veterinarian 10 days before
the animal is released to say that the animal
may be too sick to go through the procedure,
and it doesn't make a whole lot of sense
because the purchaser would have had the animal
to do that. So we're suggesting some changes
to the spay/neuter language as well. By
changing the permitting requirement under
161.09, that also takes care of the animal
abuse registry loophole, which can be done
through your legislation or through a change in
the permit. We support the microchip
requirement as well. It's really an animal's
best chance at being reunited and we think
that's so important. On 55, there's so much
that needs to be done for puppy mill's dogs and
the source is the key. Am I done?
                            CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: You can wrap up
very quickly.
    ELINOR MOLBEGOTT: I'm going to wrap
up by saying that the disposition of animals
from puppy mills should be--there needs to be a
standard so that pet stores have to go to the
actual puppy mill that they are going to
purchase some animals from and adhere to a list
of standards and have some accountability that
```

if they're going to say that they're getting
animals that are healthy and safely and
humanely raised, that they ought to go there
and see it for themselves. In addition to that-
-
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing]

```
Thank you.

ELINOR MOLBEGOTT: and I'm just
going to wrap up.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: No, no, we have--I'm sorry. We have so many people that have to testify today.

ELINOR MOLBEGOTT: Can \(I\) just say
one more thing? And \(I^{\prime} m--\)

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing]

Have your written testimony.

ELINOR MOLBEGOTT: Alright. That the animals, 99 percent or a large percentage should also have to come from shelters--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing]

Thank you very much.

ELINOR MOLBEGOTT: for adoption.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you.

ELIZABETH STEIN: Good afternoon. My name is Elizabeth Stein and \(I^{\prime} m\) testifying on behalf of the New York City Bar Association Committee on Animal Law and we applaud the council for moving so quickly with the intros. I'll be discussing 55, 136 and 146 , which we do recommend. We support, but we do have certain comments and suggestions. With respect to Intro 55, we believe very strongly that the definition of high volume breeder as Assembly Member Rosenthal was stating needs to be amended such that the numbers be lowered. We would also suggest that there be also as Assembly Member Rosenthal suggested that there be a limit as to the number of litters that a breeding female may have in a lifetime. We think that these are all methods of basically separating the high volume puppy mill breeders from responsible respectable breeders. We also agree that you can, although it can be--you can't completely ban the source of well raised animals. You can have a certain number, not 100 percent that do come from animal shelters. We strongly encourage that. We also as the Humane

Society of New York was suggesting that there be standards that--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing]

Could you just speak a little more closely into the mic. I just want to make sure all your testimony shows up in our transcript and it all comes from these microphones.

ELIZABETH STEIN: Yes, absolutely. I'm so sorry. That the standards that are applicable to pet--to the pet stores be applicable to pet dealers, to the breeders as well. We would suggest that the standards be enhanced because as the bill is presently drafted, it is the same standards that are in the agriculture and markets law. So it's really just a codification what is already there and the council now has the ability to enhance them, by enhancing them and making them applicable to breeders as well. We would suggest that a pet store be required to get a certification from the breeder, that the breeder is adhering to all of these enhanced standards. With respect to Intro 136 , the spaying and neutering, we strongly encourage
that pet stores be required to have the animals
spayed and neutered prior to release, prior to
them being purchased. We believe that they
should be, that this mandatory sterilization
should be applicable to rabbits, but we have
been advised by many people that guinea pigs,
it is dangerous to their healthy to be
sterilized. They do not pose a significant
burden on the city in terms of the animal
sheltering, so we would recommend that they be
taken out.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very much, and \(I\) have your testimony on the microchipping.

ELIZABETH STEIN: Very good, and also there are other parts of the spay/neuter if you could look at as well.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Absolutely. No, we're going to look at everyone's. We really are. We're going to look at everyone's testimony. We want to make this bill very strong.

ELIZABETH STEIN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: So thank you
for your testimony.

STEVEN GRUBER: Hi, I'm Steve.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: You have to put it as close as possible. We have to hear you. Is the mic on? No, the light has to be on.

STEVEN GRUBER: No it's on. It's a miracle.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Say your name again.

STEVEN GRUBER: Steve Gruber and I represent the Mayor's Alliance for New York City's Animals. I wanted to thank you, Chairman Johnson and Council Member Crowley and members of the health committee for this opportunity to testify. Excuse me. And we also appreciate the council acting so quickly after the Governor signing the law. Very quickly, the Mayor's Alliance for New York City's Animals, we are a 501C3 nonprofit organization. We work with the city, but we're not a city agency, and our goals is to see the day when no healthy or treatable animals in New York City are killed. I'm here today to support with recommendations
Intros 136 and 146 because we believe that the
pet stores should be required to ensure that
the dogs and cats who they sell to the general
public did not contribute to the city's
existing overpopulation problem. The Alliance
supports the enactment of Intro 136 regarding
spaying and neutering and licensing of animals
sold in pet shops with the following
recommendations. We support the amendment to
expand pet shop sterilization requirement to
include rabbits, but suggest that the reference
to guinea pigs and other small animals be
eliminated, and so far as they do not present a
serious overpopulation issue and generally are
not sterilized for safety reasons. We applaud
the inclusion of rabbits in this bill. We
recommend an exception that the exception in
the bill which permits pet store to release
unsterilized animals with a letter from the
consumer's veterinarian stating that the animal
be sterilized at a later date be eliminated
just as a practical matter. It's unlikely that
the logistics would make that possible. We
recommend that the bill be amended to require
that all puppies and kittens who are at least
eight weeks of age and at least two pounds in
weight must be sterilized, and in the case of
rabbits, we suggest that the bill be amended to
include a mandatory sterilization age of at
least four months as recommended by rabbit
experts. The Alliance supports the enactment of
Intro 146 regarding microchipping, and with
just a couple of recommendations to amend the
bill to clarify that mandatory microchip
registration by the pet store must be with a
bonafide microchip company. Very quickly, and
that the usage instructions from the company
provided to the consumer and amend the bill to
increase the period of time which the pet store
must maintain the records--
    CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing]
Thank you.

STEVEN GRUBER: for more than five years. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very much.

BRIAN SHAPIRO: Thank you, Chairman. My name is Brian Shapiro. I am the New York

State Director for the Humane Society of the United States and \(I^{\prime} d\) like to thank both you and the committee for inviting us to participate here today and to provide testimony. On behalf of the HSUS and our members and supporters in New York City, I respectfully submit this testimony to support New York City's proposal to limit the sale of puppy mill dogs in pet stores. The HSUS opposes the sale of puppies bred in inhumane conditions everywhere that they are sold, including in New York City pet shops. We feel that it is not only within the purview of the counsel and the committee to enact legislation and to move forward, not just to increase the standards of care for animals, looking at it from an animal welfare perspective, but also for consumers as well. The conditions that were referred to as staggering earlier by the Director of AC\&C don't happen in a vacuum and there's a direct correlation to conditions in puppy mills and the animals that are sold here in New York City that come from such conditions. Federal laws regulations--Federal laws and regulations are
not sufficient to provide, to prevent the
proliferation of dogs sourced from inhumane
origins. The Federal Animal Welfare Act
provides survival standards for dogs, the
barest conditions for survival and does not
uphold humane standards. We have provided very
thorough documentation on this and we do hope
that the committee will take a look at that and
a hard look particularly at direct and indirect
violations that tie into these standards of
care. The USDA fails to adequately enforce the
Animal Welfare Act. That's no secret that there
are challenges, and that's why this legislation
was introduced not only at the state level, but
we also have to be concerned about conditions
at the federal level and the lack of
inspection, lack of proper inspection and
enforcement. There have been reports from the
USDA itself that have noted its own
shortcomings in this area and we hope that hard
look will be taken at that as well. In
conclusion, the morals and values of New York
City cannot be represented by allowing the
continued sale of puppy mill dogs, an industry
that is intrinsically linked to unnecessary
animal suffering. It is incumbent upon the
council and the committee once again to
recognize that the challenges faced by \(A C \& C\) do
not happen in a vacuum and are directly linked
to these larger issues that are happening with
puppy mills that are from out of state and to
keep in mind the source as an issue to be
looked at and applied in this process. Thank
you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very
much. I have a lot of questions for this panel.
So I want to get them underway. Brian, I want
to stay with you and just ask you how many dogs
and cats are sold in the United States each
year?
                            BRIAN SHAPIRO: I don't have that
information on hand. I want to get you accurate
facts and figures, and \(I\) will get that to the
council.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Okay, thank you. And when you get that number, it'd be helpful to know how many of those animals come from commercial breeders and brokers.

BRAIN SHAPIRO: I will get those figures for you, but again to look at it in terms of New York City as was as in testimony that we heard before from city officials, you can't separate the animals that are for adoption and the impact that has directly upon New York City tax payers and animals that are for sale in pet stores. Inevitably, animals that are for sale in pet stores do impact the animals that we she in the shelter.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: I totally agree with you on that point. I'm trying to--we want to create as substantial a record as possible in support of this legislation so that we have all the facts surrounding it. And so some of these questions are just important for us to have answered for the record for this committee and for the Council. So another question that \(I\) have that you may not be able to answer is how many cats and dogs are sold in pet stores each year? So how many are sold in the United States, how many sold in pet stores, and how many of these come from commercial breeders and
brokers? It would be helpful to get those numbers.

BRIAN SHAPIRO: We'll supply.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Okay, great.

BRIAN SHAPIRO: Absolutely.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Maybe and someone else has this number, how many pet stores in New York City sell cats and dogs and upon what data is that number being based on? Does any of you on this panel have that information? No. So, maybe other folks who are going to testify have that. When we speak about puppy and kitten mills, what distinctions should be drawn between brokers and breeders?

BRIAN SHAPIRO: That's--there's a lot of leeway with that question. I think the-as you get closer to a breeder and away from what is termed as a puppy mill where you're really putting profit ahead of just animal welfare standards. Once you get to the point of a broker, you're moving more and more away from someone who practices shall we say animal husbandry, who knows about the litter, who cares about the litter and who can provide
```

proper care that benefits not only the animal
or consumers. So you have to look at that
distinction. Once you get to a broker, you are
moving further and further away from direct
oversight of that care to those animals. That
again affects animal welfare and consumers as
well.

```

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And could you
detail or give your opinion on what is actually
wrong with large commercial breeders and large
brokers? Does the size of a breeder have any
correlation with the treatment of the animals
or its compliance with the animal welfare act
and the USDA regulations?
    BRIAN SHAPIRO: Compliance with the
Animal Welfare Act, as I mentioned earlier,
there are a lot of problems in that area, and
we can't rely solely upon the Animal Welfare
Act to provide care for these animals. We've
seen many times that the Animal Welfare Act
leaves foreign inspectors, federal inspectors a
lot of latitude to make judgment calls.
Sometimes we will see direct violations that
will pertain to health conditions for the
animals that directly affect the health
welfare and safety of animals fall into a
category of indirect. So we think of indirect
as being perhaps paperwork is not in order,
someone puts something in the wrong place. We
are seeing actual violations where animals are
left outside in subfreezing temperature or
animals are covered in feces and the hair is
matted. So that's what we're seeing through the
Animal Welfare Act and we have to again take a
hard look at that.
    CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Are those
treated as direct or indirect violations?
    BRIAN SHAPIRO: We've seen those
conditions actually be filed as indirect
violations which comes as a surprise to many
individuals because of a latitude that is given
to inspectors. I think that's important for the
council to as you go through this process to
take a hard look at that.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: So the first
part of my question, is there a correlation
between the size of the breeder or broker with
regard to compliance of the Animal Welfare Act?

BRIAN SHAPIRO: I would say that the
larger an entity, the more difficult it is
keeping in mind that these are living creatures
to ensure that all these animals are provided
with the proper conditions, not only to benefit
them but consumers as well.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Is there a
certain size of breeding dogs that you believe
is safe? I know that someone else testified
that they support what the Assembly Member said
which was five breeding dogs. Do you agree with
that number?

BRIAN SHAPIRO: We'll provide the committee with information. At this point I think that there's some discussions that can bet had on that. We would like to see it as regulated as possible.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: So you have no recommendation on the number of breeding dogs?

BRIAN SHAPIRO: At this time, no sir.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Okay. If anyone on this panel has information on how many puppies and kittens are sold in New York City where they' re--or they originate in puppy or
kitten mills, do we have any information on that? No?

STEVEN GRUBER: Not in terms of numbers, no sir.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Okay. And do we have information on how many arrive in New York City pet stores via a broker like the Hunt Corporation?

STEVEN GRUBER: No sir, I think that perhaps that's a good question for some of the city based organizations.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Okay. We will ask it. How common are latent behavioral and health problems in animals from these sources, from puppy mills?

BRIAN SHAPIRO: I think that it--I can't give a specific figure, but it is generally recognized that we do see in addition to behavioral problems, we do see health issues from inbreeding. Again, I'm going to go back to the further away you get from responsible breeders connected to, again to use the term animal husbandry not to use an agricultural term, but knowing the animal and having direct
care over the animal, how could you possibly
provide proper adequate care and address
behavioral issues when you are dealing with at
a puppy mill, again a factory that cranks out
so many animals it doesn't seem possible, and
it logically leads to such a question, and yes,
you are going to see behavioral issues.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And do we have any information on how common it is currently
for pet stores to misrepresent the source of
their animals or to fail to disclose the source
of their animals to customers?
    BRIAN SHAPIRO: We've provided
actually to the committee various invest--
information that details various investigations
that we've done including in New York City
where we have seen misrepresentation of the
sources of animals and that is in the record.
That's been supplied to the committee.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And is it
common that a pet store will claim that they are selling, that they're a puppy mill free pet store when in fact they are buying animals from
puppy mills like the Hunt Corporation? Is that
prevalent?

BRIAN SHAPIRO: Common is a
subjective term. It certainly happen, and when it happens, it happens too often.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: You could just state, state your name again.

ELINOR MOLBEGOTT: I was just going to say--Elinor Molbegott, Humane Society of New York. What we have found from the many calls that we receive from people who purchase sick animals and are very upset, is they have expressed to us and we have a large veterinary facility and treat 800 patients a week. They have said, "Well, they told me it was not from--the dog was not from a puppy mill." And it's because that term is a negative description of certain breeders. So of course, when a customer whose heard about puppy mills asks the pet store, "Is this from a puppy mill?" The pet store is not going to say, "Oh, sure. We get them from dirty facilities where animals live in squalor." So it's a question of semantics to a certain degree, but in fact the pet stores do
```

often get their animal from large breeding
facilities, however one wants to call them. But
if the Inspector General's report that the
USDA's own report on enforcement shows that
these large breeders violate the regulations
that the enforcement officers are lax and
animals suffer as a result, and those are the--
those animals go to pet stores. That's the
business of puppy mills.

```
    CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: NOw, I would
imagine, \(I\) mean \(I\) wouldn't think that someone
who is selling animals acquired or bought from
a puppy mills is going to tell people, "Yeah, I
bought these from a puppy mill." And it depends
on how these pet stores even define what a
puppy mill is. In their mind it may not be a
puppy mill if it's 30 breeding dogs or 20
breeding dogs. So it's actually getting a real
definition and that definition may vary
depending on who you're asking.

ELINOR MOLBEGOTT: Absolutely, and
that's why in our testimony we're suggesting
that instead of pet stores representing to the
consumer all is well, that the pet stores
```

actually go and see the places where they're
purchasing the animals from and certify that
things are in order. I don't think they'll be
able to do that, and that's for the small
percentage of animals that they would sell from
breeders. Hopefully, that wouldn't be the
majority.

```

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: I mean, I'm not
opposed to that. I just want to say it may be
hard for the city to verify that someone
actually went and looked at something. I mean,
possibly they could sign an affidavit or
something along those lines, but it's not easy
to enforce whether or not someone has gone and
actually looked at where they're getting their
animals from.
    ELIZABETH STEIN: Right, and if I
could just add one other thing. Elizabeth
Stein, and this is what \(I\) have experienced in
my own private practice of calls that I get
from people who have purchased not kittens but
puppies from pet stores. They'll say to me,
"But \(I\) don't understand. On my papers it said
that my puppy came from Sunny Valley Farms in

Ohio. How can Sunny Valley Farms be a puppy mill?" And what's happening is, you know, people are putting these beautiful labels--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing] It's a misnomer.

ELIZABETH STEIN: Exactly, and then the pet store's telling the consumer, "Don't worry about it. Here's the person's name. Give them a call. They'll tell you everything is great."

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And what is the recourse when that happens? Does--what recourse does a consumer have when they believe they are buying a pet that is not from a puppy or kitten mill but in fact they are, does a consumer have any recourse?

ELIZABETH STEIN: Well, they have-they have certain recourse if the animal is unwell under the law. They might have recourse for fraud, but again, it depends because since there is no definition of what a puppy mill is, and since if the pet store is not actually saying, "No, this is not a puppy mill, but you know, this is \(x, y\) and \(z\) breeder." Who's to say
that it's not \(x, y, z\) breeder without an actual
definition, and just anecdotally what \(I\) have
heard in terms of the question of what
separates a broker from a breeder, what \(I\) have
always been told is that no responsible breeder
would ever sell one of his or her puppies to
somebody that he or she does not know. So a
responsible breeder would not be placing
puppies from their litter in a pet store where
that--where there are no standards--
                                    CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing] I
understand.
    ELIZABETH STEIN: in terms of sale
to the consumer.
                            CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you. Is
there any official documentation that is
supposed to follow an animal from breeder to
pet store that could serve as proof of source
to a potential purchaser and to a potential
inspector that comes into a pet store?
                            BRIAN SHAPIRO: There is
documentation. I would like to get more
specifics. There is documentation that can
follow but it's really incumbent upon whether
it's the city or municipalities to detail that
information to make it available so it could be
made available. I know that it could be made
available upon request but there is information
that follows, but again, consumers have to be
able to understand the source and be
knowledgeable of the law in order to make those
decisions as a consumer.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: When you speak
of that requirement, you mean a requirement
from the USDA?
    BRIAN SHAPIRO: It's munic--with
passage of the preemption law, municipalities
can put into effect rules and regulations that
can detail and require specifics. So it's
really up to this body to decide what kind of
information would be made available to the
consumers. It is possible to track that if
that's your question. Yes, it is absolutely
possible to track that information.
                            CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And how common
is it for pet stores to sell pets to customers
without providing documentation to a purchaser?
Very common?
is common. I don't want to say very, but it
happens often in the course of business.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Great.

ELIZABETH STEIN: I would just add that the state law does require that pet stores provide the purchaser with the name of the breeder for dogs and for cats. The problem is that's meaningless to a consumer because what the consumer doesn't really know this breeder in Missouri or wherever.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: So on that point, is there information available on what the five largest puppy and kitten mills are, who they are that sell to pet shops in New York City? Has there been investigations and information on that?

BRIAN SHAPIRO: Yes, and that information \(I\) believe has been forwarded and if not, we can provide that. I know the ASPCA as well has that information available.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Is there any way you could get that information to us right
```

now, or is there anyone else that has that
information?

```

BRIAN SHAPIRO: If--I can get that to you within what is right now. I can get that to you as soon as possible.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Okay. Well, I have more questions, so if you want to try to work on it right now that would be helpful. We do want--

BRIAN SHAPIRO: [interposing] Would it be disrespectful if \(I\) start--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing] We want this information for the record.

BRIAN SHAPIRO: typing? Okay.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Yeah, it's relevant to questions that we're going to ask further in this committee hearing. What is the role that brokers like the Hunt Corporation have in the larger pet industry? Does anyone have an answer to that? No?

BRIAN SHAPIRO: I'm sorry?

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: What is--I know I'm sorry, you're trying to do things simultaneous.
the role that a company like the pet--like the
Hunt Corporation has in the larger pet
industry, what type of role do they have?
    BRIAN SHAPRIO: Well, they are a
major player that cannot be discounted. I think
when people go to puppy store, or excuse me, to
a pet shop, they don't think of this. They
don't think of, again, the term of a puppy mill
a factory. So yeah, there is a direct role and
again, that specifically comes down to how it
is effecting New York City and why it's
incumbent upon this council to take action.
                            CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: What is their
business model? What is a company like the
Hunt Corporation, what is their business model
on how they make profit?
    BRIAN SHAPIRO: I would reserve
giving details on that without getting specific
information. I will refer back to, as \(I\) said
before, I think many consumers believe that
they are getting puppies that are raised by
responsible breeders.
do? What does the Hunt Corporation do?
                    BRIAN SHAPIRO: The Hunt Corporation
basically does not directly raise these
animals. It's--they're sourcing animals. They
are--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing]

It's an intermediary?
BRIAN SHAPIRO: Yes, absolutely. It's removed. It's where the animal then becomes the product.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Is Hunt
considered a particularly bad actor in the industry?

BRIAN SHAPIRO: There are concerns that our organization has about those practices and others as well that--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing]

And why?
BRIAN SHAPIRO: [interposing] stray--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing]

Why is that?

BRIAN SHAPIRO: They don't practice again and tie into the type of standards that
consumers expect care for animals. As \(I\) said
earlier, the concept of putting profit above
the welfare of an animal, which is the standard
model, the business model that you were
referring to earlier.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And where do they obtain their animals from?

BRIAN SHAPIRO: I will defer to other speakers on that.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Okay. We have other folks that are going to testify and \(I^{\prime} m\) sure speak to some of these questions. Why do you believe, this panel believe that we should limit the sale of animals obtained from a broker like Hunt, there are others, if their animals originate with small breeders? Do you want me to repeat it? The question is, if in fact Hunt is actually buying animals and is the intermediary for animals that are actually coming from smaller breeders, would you object to that?

BRIAN SHAPIRO: I will refer--I will reserve comment on that, and \(I\) do think again that there are other organizations here who are
active in this, particularly the ASPCA who
could provide very accurate information that
will be helpful to the council today.
    CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Okay. I
appreciate that. So, the pet industry joint
advisory council posted the following comment
on their website in advance of today's hearing.
They said, "The number of animals a breeder has
in their possession has nothing to do with the
quality of care the breeder provides. Breeders
used by responsible pet stores in the city are
thoroughly inspected by the USDA, and since
local pet stores rely on repeat business, no
responsible pet store in the city would knowing
risk their reputation by providing unhealthy
pets from questionable sources to the public."
As the Humane Society who have worked on these
issues and--

BRIAN SHAPIRO: A 2010 report issued
by the USDA office of Inspector General, as
Elizabeth mentioned earlier, I found that the
agency's "enforcement process" was ineffective
in achieving dealer compliance with AWA and
regulations which are intended to ensure the
humane care and treatment of animals. So that
comes from the USDA itself and clearly points
to the shortcomings of relying upon their
standards.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And based up on
the Humane Society's investigations and your
own experience in working on these issues,
could you comment on the accuracy of the
statement \(I\) just read with respect to the
relationship between the number of animals as
we discussed earlier and the quality of care?
Are those things tied together?
    BRIAN SHAPIRO: Again, \(I\) would
reserve comment on that and \(I\) do think there's
other organizations here today which would like
to add their views.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very
much. I think we're going to call up another
panel that may be able to answer some of these
questions. I just wanted to get as many people
as possible to weigh in on this for the record.
    BRIAN SHAPIRO: Thank you, sir.
    CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you all
for your testimony today, and we really
appreciate your time here and the work that you
do on a day to day basis. We are going to call
five people up. So maybe we can take one of
those smaller chairs right there that is
unoccupied and pull it up next to the witness
table. This panel is going to be Steven Lane
from the Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council,
Ann Lettis from the American Kennel Club,
Leandro Jacoby from Citipups NYC Corporation,
and David Dietz from Puppy Paradise, and
lastly, Michael Glass from America's Pet
Registry Inc. So again, you can start in
whatever order you'd like. If you could please
state your name for the record and \(I\) will swear
you all in if you all, if all five of you could
please raise your right hand. If you could
raise your right hand. Do you swear and affirm
to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing
but the truth in your testimony before this
committee and to respond honestly to all
Council Member questions?
                            UNKNOWN: I do. [off mic]
                                    CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very
much. So you may begin in whatever order you'd
like. Again, please state your name for the record.

STEVE LANE: Good afternoon. My name is Steve Lane and I Own Steve's Wonderful World of Pets in Buffalo, New York. I'm here today on behalf of the Pet Industry Joint Advisory Committee, PIJAC. PIJAC represents interest of all segments of the pet industry throughout the United States including organizations, corporations and individuals involved in the commercial pet trade. More specifically, PIJAC represents the interest of pet industry distributers, manufacturers, breeders, retailers and pet owners throughout the state of New York. Even as PIJAC has worked to raise standards of care among breeders, they have battled misconceptions about the quality of pet store animals and the sourcing of such animals. The unsubstantiated assertion that pet store puppies generally come from substandard breeding facilities is commonly used as a smoke screen to obscure the fact that the overwhelming majority of pet owners who choose pet stores bring home a happy, healthy pet and
that they remain highly satisfied with their
pet store experience. The reality is that
almost all pet store puppies that originate
from USDA licensed sources come from breeders
who are regularly inspected and found to comply
with appropriate care standards. By contrast
many of the dogs and cats from other sources
including rogue internet operators, private
breeders, shelters and rescues do not come from
licensed breeders. By titling this law as you
have and by then going on to use the term puppy
mill in the text of the law even though you
didn't officially define it, you are
demonstrating a bias against USDA licensees.
PIJAC has actively supported cooperative
efforts among representatives of the
veterinarian and animal welfare communities who
adopt state of the art breeding welfare
standards including an agreement last year on
what constitutes a puppy mill. However, the
industry decries the casual use of this term
because it is often used in an overly broad and
incorrect manner to describe all breeders
responsible and irresponsible. So from quoting
from the HSUS, they have identified as a puppy mill an operation that sells dogs for money and fails to breed them appropriately or provide adequate housing, shelter, staffing, nutrition, socialization, sanitation, exercise and veterinary care. The definition was agreed to last year by the HSUS, the ASPCA, the American Pet Products Association, the Pet Industry Distributor's Association and PIJAC as well as Pet Co and Pet Land. Note that this agreed upon definition does not include the number of breeding females or the puppies sold in a year. The reason--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: You may continue.

STEVE LANE: Thank you. The reason for this is that there is no inherent correlation between either figure and the standards of care that a facility can provide. A professional breeder with the state of the art equipment, well-trained staff and sufficient space may be able to care for dozens of animals in a much more responsible manner than a hobby breeder who operates out of their
home can care for a single litter. By choosing the arbitrary figures to define high volume breeder and then prohibiting pet stores from sourcing directly from such breeders, you are denying New York City pet stores and potential pet owners from utilizing professionally run, well-regulated breeders based solely on the number of animals for whom they care.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you.

STEVE LANE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: I appreciate your testimony.

ANN LETTIS: I'm Ann Lettis, the Director of Responsible Dog Owners Association of New York, and \(I^{\prime} m\) also representing the American Kennel Club. I've been involved in K9 legislation for 30 years, and the recent intros of \(136,146,73\) and \(53,55, I^{\prime} m\) sorry, raise a great deal of concern for responsible dog owners within the five boroughs. None of these proposed laws provide any definition for responsible hobby breeder. 136 calls for the early sterilization of animals and I've attached information about that, the pros and
the cons, and you're going to see that the cons
really greatly out rule the pros of early
sterilization. 136, within number 136 there's a
stipulation that any animal released from a pet
shop have this procedure. However, a consumer
can present the pet shop with the a letter from
his veterinarian as to why this should be not
done until a specific date. So what \(I^{\prime} m\) asking
is, the dates--it's four months. Who is going
to check? First of all, how can the
veterinarian make that decision if the pet shop
can't release the puppy? And after four
months, even if it is release, after four
months, who's going to check to see if this dog
has been sterilized or not? Within the same
proposal is about the application for a dog
license. One says that the pet shop is
responsible for the dog license, but Intro 55
says it's different and it's not. One thing
that is really that \(I\) find is the definition of
a high volume breeder even includes a person
who has an interest or a cust--or is in custody
of one or more breeding females or cats, dogs
or cats, and who sells these for sale. What is
the definition of a breeding female? You know,
like is it--can you have a bitch, and I just
put my old bitch to sleep. She was 16 years old
and she was not spayed. Would she be
considered a breeding female? There's
absolutely no definition about this. Just
because a bitch is not spayed does not mean
that she's for breeding, okay? I venture to say
that many responsible breeders, like myself, do
have a co-ownership specifically because of
their interest which is to protect the female
dogs which they have bred. Hobby breeders have
good quality dogs, healthy and good temperament
will have a co-ownership of all female dogs so
that they can enable a responsible breeder to
carefully select and decide who and from--who
their line should be bred to, when they should
be bred, if they should be bred to continue the
soundness and good temperament of their dogs.
While breeders are subjected to inspections by
the American Kennel Club and pet shops are
inspected by the USDA, who inspects the
shelters? I have attached two articles. I have
attached two articles relating to the
increasing problem that's caused in shelters by
importing dogs from other countries and other
states.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: You may finish.

ANN LETTIS: Not only is the shelter population then blamed on breeders and puppy mills, but worse, problems occur because there's no health inspection of what is brought into shelters. When the media mentions the wonderful stories about how dogs are brought into our New York State shelters, while some individuals may get \(a\) warm and fuzzy feeling, I'm personally appalled.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: I--

ANN LETTIS: [interposing] A few years ago, 30--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing] I have the rest of your testimony. I understand and we're going to have questions. So you'll be able to weigh in when we have questions, but I appreciate that you provided this. Everyone's not going to be able to get through all of their testimony. A lot of people brought more information than would fit in three minutes,
but again we are taking every testimony, a
piece of testimony today and really considering
it as part of our legislative process. So I
appreciate your testimony.
    ANN LETTIS: You're welcome.
    CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very
much.
                    MICHAEL GLASS: Thank you. First,
please forgive the informal, for a lack of
better word, scribble on the submitted
testimony. There were some last minute
thoughts, but it's--hopefully that it's self-
explanatory. I am Michael Glass. I work for
America's Pet Registry and please for the
interest--in the interest of credibility, we
are accepted as a pure bred registry by the New
York State Department of Ag and Markets. You
know, \(I^{\prime}\) ve sat throughout the country listening
to a lot of testimony and \(I^{\prime} v e\) had the
privilege of sharing a lot of information and
learning a lot of information from a lot of
bills, and typically you sit in a committee
meeting like this and you have one side that
says, "Not strong enough. We need more." And
then you've got the other side that says, "Oh, my goodness. Leave us alone. We're fine." I don't think you're going to find anybody on this panel that says, "Oh, please let us go breed those puppy mills." You're not going to find anybody on this panel that's going to say, "Oh, we agree with indiscriminate breeding." It's just not going to happen. My concern is with the foundation, the foundation of this bill. And here's where \(I^{\prime} m\) kind of scratching my head, and \(I^{\prime} m\) not really sure where the panel's coming from. Verbally \(I^{\prime} m\) hearing an appeal for we want to make this a fair strong bill; puppy mill. Puppy mill. Puppy mill. Is that a noun? Is that a place? Is that a hard place where puppies are kept in such horrible conditions, or is it an adjective that's used to be inflammatory, an inflammatory adjective to say, "Hey, listen to me. Our bill has to pass because we've got to get rid of these puppy mills because they're horrible." We know they're horrible. I just came from Suffolk County, to conclude my thoughts here, and I would encourage you to, excuse me, to review
the agreements that they just came from. They
did the impossible. They got pet stores and dog
breeders to sit in one room along with the
rescues and the Humane Society, and might I add
another thought here if \(I\) can digress, there's
a need for rescues. We need the rescues. They
do a wonderful thing. They take the sick dogs,
the hurt dogs, the unwanted dogs, the lame
dogs, the dogs that need special attention, but
everybody's not right. Everybody's not fit to
give that dog a home and the rescues are not
going to go away and the unwanted dogs are not
going away, and putting a close on a pet store
ban with an arbitrary number is like putting a
bucket in the middle of that room to fix the
leaky roof. So we would encourage passage of a
bill that would be amicable by everybody, and I
think it can happen, because for the first time
in history \(I\) just witnessed that in Suffolk
County. With regards to spay and neuter, I
would encourage you to please include the
thoughts on veterinary practices. There's a lot
of study now that's showing early spay and
neuter on large dogs, large breeds or giant
breeds can present health concerns. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very much for your testimony and for being here today.

DAVID DIETZ: Great. Hi, my name is David. I'm from Puppy Paradise. I'm the pet store that everybody's trying to shut down and close because of selling sick puppies or doing unscrupulous practices that are resulting from the breeders. So let me tell you my perspective is we've been in business for maybe 35 years. I've been in the business for almost 50 years. I care very much about what we're doing in the business and every dog that comes in we inspect the breeders. We purposely go out and figure out who's giving bad problems, who's causing problems for us and for the consumers that are getting the dogs. Why don't you try maybe allowing the pet stores to help govern and help you solve your problems over there rather than doing it all yourself. We are very good at what we do. We love what we do. We make a living at what we do. We support our families, other
people, workers in the store, our children are
coming into the business. My family's been in
the business and we can do a job, if you allow
us. There are many different ways to solve this
problem. You know, I don't--no offense to the
city, but the city has a way of doing things
that make more work. We like to cut to the
chase and really solve the problems if you let
us. I mean, what are you really trying to do
here? You're trying to control puppy mills
through pet stores, by shutting down pet stores
is from what \(I\) am seeing. Am I wrong? Is that
what's going on? So, this is what you're trying
to shut down \(100^{\prime} \mathrm{s}\) of stores, \(100^{\prime} \mathrm{s}\) of business
that are--do care about what's going on with
the animals. So why don't you allow the smart
people who are running businesses help create a
model store, and a model store in my opinion is
someone who can take the puppies in, check the
breeders, see the dogs that have problems on a
regular basis, have veterinarians that are
behind them follow through with the care, have
dog trainers that train the puppies to be
better animals and more self-sufficient and
then have these stores bring more business back to themselves and to the community through grooming, through supplies, through hotel services. Now I know personally for me when \(I\) started in 1980, in 1991 I went to the ASPCA because \(I\) didn't want to sell puppies from puppy breeders. I got them from the ASPCA and rehomed them. Thought it was a great idea. The SPCA after trying to do this over and over again turned me down. They said, "No, you're a pet store. We will not sell to you." Why? It was mind boggling, and as \(I\) walking out, there was a man named George who manage the ASPCA in Brooklyn, and as \(I\) was walking out, the dog that \(I\) was looking to adopt, he said, "okay, that's the dog you're going to put down right now." I could not believe it. And this is over 20 years later and \(I^{\prime} m\) still upset that they won't allow a pet facility who does a great job at rehoming dogs. I mean, they are
professional. It's a livelihood. You don't allow us to do that. I am complete. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very much sir, and I would just say that we are here
today having this very substantial meeting
because we care about animals, we care about
humane treatment of animals, and it's my
opinion that these measures are necessary,
though they could be improved and that's why
we're having the legislative process to hear
from everyone and that's why we're taking
testimony to ensure that animals are treated
well, and \(I\) don't know your pet store, so I
can't comment on your practices, but \(I\) can just
say that if in fact what you said is true, and
you swore to tell the truth so I assume that it
is true, that not every pet store is behaving
that way, that there are plenty of pet stores
that are not abiding in the same way that you
say that you are. So today is about making sure
that our animals that are coming into New York
City are treated properly, are coming from a
humane source, and if there are suggestions
that anyone has on what the proper numbers are
or along those lines, we are happy to take
that. We are not wedded to a certain number. We
want to make this as safe as possible. I'm
going to let this gentleman testify and then
we're going to have questions and you can weigh
in again. I'm not cutting you off. Thank you
very much. Yes, sir, if you could just state
your name for the record and speak closely to
the microphone.
                            LEANDRO JACOBY: My name is Leandro
Jacoby. I represent Citipups. I'm sorry I don't
have any statement here today, but \(I\) have just
to mention a few things. I, myself, have been
in business for 13 years. The store has been
there for 20 years. It's pretty much a family
owned business.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Where's your store?

LEANDRO JACOBY: In Chelsea in the West Village.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: How many
locations?

LEANDRO JACOBY: We have only two locations. And \(I\) just want to make a correction to a statement given previously. Myself and my co-workers, my partners in the business, we have visited, we visited our breeders. We know where they come from. Their information's
available upon request by the perspective
purchase of the dog. We are, you know,
inspected regularly by the Health Department,
so we comply with every dot, every comma on
their book. Same thing with the USDA. They come
in. They inspect all our paperwork. It's very
difficult pass a bill like this because it's
just a gray line. We have requested, we have
tried to find several times rescue kittens to
put for adoption at our facility, but
unfortunately we cannot find, and whenever we
do fine, they're just so unfit for rescue we
just can't deal with it. And also we support
Earth Angel. She comes in every week to our
stores who brings rescue dogs. Some people are
already familiar with the rescue Earth Angel
with Emma-Linda [sp?]. Very popular in the
City. She brings her own dogs in. She rescued
them. She fostered them to different people.
And we do our best in order to make sure the
dogs are healthy, our well care, and
unfortunately there are things that are
happened to people that purchase a dog that
it's pretty much impossible to correct, to know
```

for sure. What I'm trying to say is sometimes a

```
person buys a small puppy because it don't have
immune system, they will get a runny nose. They
will get a cough, and that's \(I\) believe is the
most common problem people have it, complains
that people have online. Just because a dog had
a small cough, a runny nose, they'll just blast
anyone online and make any reviews look very
bad. We do have bad reviews, but also we do
have very good reviews and unfortunately there
are just things that unfortunately other pet
store or just the government, whoever any
responsible government agency cannot correct is
just unfortunately things just happen with the
dogs. It doesn't matter if from a shelter or a
pet store or puppy mill, things just happen.
That's just my statement.
                            CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very
much for your testimony. I live down the block,
I believe, from one of your stores. I live at
\(15^{\text {th }}\) Street and \(8^{\text {th }}\) Avenue. You're at \(17^{\text {th }}\) and
\(8^{\text {th }}\) Avenue?
                            LEANDRO DIETZ: \(17^{\text {th }}\) and \(8^{\text {th }}\) Avenue,
right there.

STEVE LANE: First, thank you very
much for being willing to listen to us, and
yes, \(I\) believe that \(P I J A C\) is the largest
activist voice in the industry.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And if you could please describe the makeup of your organization, the umbrella organization's members. Does it include large scale commercial breeders and brokers?

STEVE LANE: Yes, breeders, brokers, manufacturers, distributors, pet stores, national chains, locally owned independent stores, anybody in the industry.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you. And is the Hunt Corporation or any business that is characterized as a puppy mill or a kitten mill
by a previous panel member of your
organization?

STEVE LANE: First, I need to say I've never heard the term kitten mill used before. I'm not aware of any commercial breeders of cats in the industry. And in terms of puppy mill, \(I\) sort of see that pejorative, but Andrew [sic] Hunt is not a breeder, and Hunt is a member of PIJAC.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Hunt's a member of PIJAC?

STEVE LANE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: What percentage of your breeder and broker members received a direct or indirect violation by the USDA in the last five years?

STEVE LANE: I have no information--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing]

Could you get that information to us?

STEVE LANE: I believe so. I'm not sure how many breeders are actually members of PIJAC.
those numbers are available. You know who your members are and so you'd be able to tell us.

STEVE LANE: What percentage of the members of PIJAC that are breeders that have direct violations, certainly.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Yeah, direct or indirect violations from the USDA in the past five years.

STEVE LANE: Certainly.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: That would be helpful. Thank you. What types of violations or conduct should disqualify a breeder or broker from the New York City market? Any of you can answer that type of question.

DAVID DIETZ: Yes, my name is David. So, I've been doing this for 35 years and generally it's people who don't care about the dogs that go out. They have problems on a regular basis with upper respiratory, hip problems, they're dealing with their own breeders who are regularly just pushing it through for the sum of profit and--
So you think that is going on currently in the
city?
[cross-talk]

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: With some pet stores are buying from breeders or brokers where that is the case.

DAVID DIETZ: I can't answer for other people. I can only answer for myself, and even though we buy from only USDA registered and certified because we get inspected regularly and we can prove every record. In the past it has happened where private breeders that don't control their health situation comes in, but we control it because it comes into the store and state law mandates pet facilities to be totally responsible within a 14 day period to pay vet bills, reimburse the money, and they get to keep the dog. So we are on top of our game to make sure that that animal comes in. First off all, we're not getting sick animals where we have to pass it on and we don't. We're getting animals that are healthy. We make sure they stay healthy and we follow through with
the customers, because if we're in business for
more than 10 years, obviously we're doing
something that we try to stay right on and we
care about what's going on. So we follow
through even after it's sold. Personally for
me, six week program.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: So you
testified that you have actually gone and
visited the place that you--you have not. You
have not visited?
    DAVID DIETZ: I have not personally
visited.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Why not?

DAVID DIETZ: I'm a business man. I stay in the store. My manager runs it and we talk directly with the people on a regular basis. We're in relationship with any of our breeders that we get from.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: But you've never seen the facilities ever that your pets are coming from?

DAVID DIETZ: No, we don't need to see them. We see the dogs--

DAVID DIETZ: [interposing] that come in.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: As someone who cares about animals, and you know there is a problem out there amongst some breeders and brokers that are raising animals and breeding animals in unhealthy inhumane unsafe conditions, wouldn't it be important for you to actually go and physically see where your pets are coming from?

DAVID DIETZ: Well, is that a
mandatory thing that you're recommending?
Because we have a way of scrupulizing [sic]
which dogs are problems and which breeders are
problems without going to see the facilities.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: How?

DAVID DIETZ: You go online. You visit their sites. You see what other complaints are going on.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Anyone could put anything on a website.
saying that \(I\) should go see the facilities? Is
that you request? Is that standard?
    CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: I'm not making
any request of you. \(I^{\prime} m\) asking you questions.
I'm not telling you how to run your business.
I'm asking you what \(I\) believe to be legitimate
questions on this issue.
    DAVID DIETZ: We have not. We don't
need to unless we want to be in relationship.
We've been invited out to several facilities.
                            CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: You have been
invited?
    DAVID DIETZ: Yeah, oh absolutely.
So--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing]
You work seven days a week?
    DAVID DIETZ: Personally, I have.
That's correct. I really love what \(I^{\prime} m\) doing.
    CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: But you have no
time to visit the facilities that you purchase
pets from?

DAVID DIETZ: You know what? Anybody who cares about animals, it's seven days a
week. It's 24 hours a day. My phone is on call better than a veterinarians because \(I\) really care about when a customer has a problem, can it be solved and it has to be micromanaged. It's not like I'll put it off 'til tomorrow. CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Do you believe that the 14 day period is enough time? What if one of the animals that are bought from your facility get sick 15 days later? You wouldn't have to cover the cost. Do you cover the cost if someone comes in 17 days later with a sick animal?

DAVID DIETZ: Okay. So we are responsible. I talk to the customer. We manage the cost. Will \(I\) cover it to the full state of the law [sic]? Give back all the money. Give back any vet bills. And by the way, you must be aware that the veterinarians love New York State law for the simple reason is that when a puppy is sold and dog goes into them with a minor upper respiratory, I mean not even done, a slight cough, possible limp, anything else, that's a equivalent for them to charge 500, \(1,000,2,000,3,000--\)

DAVID DIETZ: and then bring it back
to the store.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Sir, I don't
want to--

DAVID DIETZ: Have you?

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: I don't want to use broad strokes describing veterinarians. I think that--

DAVID DIETZ: [interposing] Well, it's a fact in the pet facilities that we have to deal with.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: But let me speak. I would hope that most veterinarians never want to see a pet unless they must see a pet. So that would be my hope for veterinarians that they wouldn't like the law because they get to see more sick animals. My hope would be they would only want to help animals if they must have to help them, and if there are preventative measures that could take place beforehand where they wouldn't end up in their office, they'd prefer that. I have a question
for you. Who are your biggest vendors of
animals? Where do you get your animals?
    DAVID DIETZ: Where what?
    CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Where do you
buy--who are your vendors?
    DAVID DIETZ: Okay, that's my manager
knows that. I'm the back office. I make sure
that all things are done.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: You're the
owner of the store.
    DAVID DIETZ: I am the owner of the
store.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: You do not know where you purchase your animals from?

DAVID DIETZ: I cannot give you
accurate information at this time. You can
speak to me later and \(I^{\prime} d\) be happy to provide
the information to you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: That's really hard for me to believe that you wouldn't have that information.

DAVID DIETZ: I don't have it on me, but \(I\) can provide it for you, no problem.
you had your store for?

DAVID DIETZ: More than 35 years.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: You don't have any remembrance of 35 years of where you buy your pets?

DAVID DIETZ: So I--in the back
office. My manager has been running and basically took over the store for the past 18 years. So basically \(I\) handle all business and management of that. So if you want that information you're more than welcome to it.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: I would love that information if you could please provide that to the council.

DAVID DIETZ: Absolutely. You give me the email wherever you need it provided I'd be happy to take care of that for you. And just to comment on the veterinarians on there. I would also love if they had a scrupulous attitude towards their practice and wanted to do the just and right thing, but as human nature goes, veterinarians have a tendency to be greedy and they take res--they take the New

York State law and they carry it a little bit further than what they should on there, because there's a big difference when we go into an office--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing] We're not here to talk about that today, but I appreciate--

DAVID DIETZ: [interposing] But you brought it up. So, and you're asking--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing] No, no you brought it up. I didn't bring it up. You brought up veterinarians, I didn't. I said I wanted to be a veterinarian when \(I\) grew up.

DAVID DIETZ: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you. For the right purposes. So \(I\) have a question for PIJAC. On your website you posted the following comment about Intro 55, which we're here discussing today, "The number of animals a breeder has in their possession has nothing to do with the quality of care the breeder provides. Breeders used by responsible pet stores in the city are thoroughly inspected by the USDA and since local pet stores rely on
repeat business, no responsible pet--no, no
responsible pet store in the city would
knowingly risk their reputation by providing
unhealthy pets from questionable sources to the
public." In that context, what is your response
to the statement that according to the USDA,
small breeders are more likely to comply with
federal animal welfare regulations?
    STEVE LANE: Well they certainly
might be more liable to, but the size of
facility does not determine whether or not. You
can't say a small one is going to comply and
the larger one's not. Responsibility is about
how much they care for the animal, and in a lot
of cases they get a larger economy of scale and
they can do more. If they have more puppies
they can maybe have a veterinarian on staff.
They're more able to meet the requirements to
breed properly.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: I'm sure that
you know that the Inspector General of the USDA
issued a port that the USDA has not been
adequately enforcing the Animal Welfare Act. So
if that is the case, then that's admission from
the IG as the USDA, how can you conclusively
state that breeders use by responsible pet
stores are thoroughly inspected by the USDA?
                            STEVE LANE: Breeders that are--they
are inspected by the USDA as opposed to many of
the other sources. As many pet stores have
started doing shelter dogs, they're not
inspected by anybody, and so some inspection is
better than no inspection and the quality of
inspection has gotten considerably stronger of
late.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Why did the USDA exempt breeders with four or less females? Why do you think that is?

STEVE LANE: It's about--I don't know.

UNKNOWN: May I?

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Well, this is what they say. The USDA says, this was in September of last year, "However, we recognize that if we were to remove a certain section from the regulations, we would expose to licensing a subcategory of individuals. Those with four or fewer breeding female dogs, cats
and/or small exotic or wild mammals who sell at
least some of their offspring of these animals
sight unseen. Offspring that we consider to
present a low risk of noncompliance with the
Animal Welfare Act. It has been our experience
that such individuals maintain few enough
breeding females in their premises to offer
adequate care and treatment to each animal, to
continue to exempt these individuals from
licensing we included breeding females." That
was their reason. And then they go on to state,
"Finally, it is not possible under the Animal
Welfare Act to exempt a pure bred dog or cat
fancier from licensing solely because he or she
is a pure bred dog or a cat fancier. However,
dog and cat fanciers who meet the criteria in
the subsection will be exempt from licensing
because we consider them to be retail pet
stores for the purposes of Animal Welfare
regulations." So, I mean, I--the Inspector
General and the USDA, I mean, I've spoken on
this in some ways and \(I\) would think based on
findings and investigations. I just--I'd like
to, you know--

MICHAEL GLASS: a question that you had asked before.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Yes.

MICHAEL GLASS: I forget exactly how you phrased it, but for lack of better words how to discern the difference or what barometer would be put on a good breeder or a bad breeder. What happened with the USDA was embarrassing from their point of view, and because of that embarrassment they've stepped up inspections. I work with dog breeders across the United States, dog breeders with two dogs, 20 dogs, and 200 dogs and more. Now you may come up with the old cliché, well you know, a dollar short and a minute late, whatever the case may be, but there is a campaign across the United States to improve the conditions and the care. Right now USDA is what we got. State is what we got. So let's use that. Let's use that to our benefit. Let's look at a dog breeder. Let's look at the minimum situation and say if
somebody's got a direct violation, I don't care
whether you have one dog or 500 dogs, if you've
got a minimum--I'm sorry. If you've got a
direct violation, that means something was
wrong with your dog serious enough. I mean
that's something to look at if you're going to
make a barometer. The only number that really
fits in my opinion when you're looking for--
actually, let me digress here for a second.
There's also studies of veterinarians going to
seminars throughout the country defining the
optimal age to begin breeding dogs to stop, at
what age to stop and this is with commercial
breeders at trade shows and educational
seminars, and then the quantity of litters, but
in any event, to go back--I apologize. If
you're looking for the number, by what I'm
hearing today, no disrespect, but the only
number that works today is zero. If there truly
is a desire by the panel to find out what could
be done--it was very well put. Forgive me for
referring to Suffolk County. People are going
to want to buy puppies from pet stores and pet
stores are going to want to sell puppies.

There's business, there's tax, there's revenue. Everybody's got all their reasons. If there truly is desire, \(I\) think it can be met. I might--I'm going to be daring to say this. It's a pretty good bill. There's just a couple things in here that need a little tweak. I don't think you have anybody up here saying, "Oh, this is horrible. Throw it out." But there are a couple things when you're talking about that number and who we're going to say what that pet store who he can buy puppies from because they have a lot of dogs. What's the magic number? The magic number from what \(I^{\prime} m\) hearing from the panel is zero, because then-now, I understand--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing] No one said that.

MICHAEL GLASS: No, no, I apologize. Okay. I apologize. I'm speaking for myself. The magic--the number would be none and then the rescues would dry up. The pet stores would go away and all these bad actors would go away figuratively speaking. You know, I don't know what the--I don't think anyone knows what that
magic number is, but to pick an arbitrary low
number \(I\) think is not sound business practice.
I think it's built on a motion, and that's what
I was saying before about puppy mill. Let's
talk about legal and illegal, not puppy mill
and not puppy mill. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you. I have some more questions for PIJAC. When you say that no responsible pet store is willing to risk its reputation by providing pets from socalled questionable sources, what is your definition of a questionable source?

STEVE LANE: A pet store wants to know if they're coming from a quality breeder that cares about the parents and the animals that they' re providing.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: How is that
defined?

STEVE LANE: Not very well. I mean, honestly, not very well. As I also own a pet store and it does matter where the animals come from, you know, from the hamsters to the fish. It matters.
```
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    CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Who are your
    vendors for your cats and dogs?
STEVE LANE: Cats come from local
people that surrender kittens, and puppies I
buy all of my puppies from Hunt--
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing]
From Hunt?
STEVE LANE: through--from Andrew
Hunt, and I will not buy from any other source.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Why did you
choose Hunt?
STEVE LANE: Because Andrew Hunt is
part of my screening process for puppies
because he's very careful about who he buys
puppies from.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Is a pet store
that sells from a "questionable source" by
definition irresponsible?
STEVE LANE: Yeah, I would say part
of responsibility is knowing where your animals
are coming from.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: But I guess
it's important for us to figure out, since you
didn't give us a definition of what a
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questionable source is. I mean, there's no real
standard or measure, right?

STEVE LANE: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: It's subjective not objective.

STEVE LANE: That is correct. It is-I mean, there is no objective measure and that is certainly one of the issues at hand.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Does your organization believe the city has an interest in addressing the issue of pet overpopulation and reducing the likelihood of the sale of mistreated animals?

STEVE LANE: I don't believe that this bill does anything to--has anything to do with pet overpopulation. It's not at all related. Pet stores account for maybe five to 10 percent of the animals in--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing] But that wasn't the question. Does your organization believe the city has an interest in addressing pet overpopulation and reducing the likelihood of the sale of mistreated animals?

STEVE LANE: I have--I don't know. I don't have any evidence of that.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: To the extent you oppose Introduction 55, what regulations would you recommend to prevent pet shops from selling animals from bad actors? What recommendations do you have for New York City to put in place some type of regulation to stop certain pet stores from buying from bad actors? We know it happens, so what would you suggest?

STEVE LANE: I'm not, frankly, \(I^{\prime} m\) not qualified to answer that question.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Is it possible to operate a successful business in the pet industry while offering dogs and cats sourced from pet shelters or rescues for adoption instead of selling animals from commercial breeders and brokers? Can you still have a successful practice by doing that?

STEVE LANE: It depends how you define successful. What's--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing] Profitable.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: It's possible. You may answer, yeah.

DAVID DIETZ: Sure, David again from Puppy Paradise. Absolutely successful and absolutely profit--and it's actually a win/win situation for the dog, the people, the community, the taxes, the workers. It works if you can readopt. If you allow the pet facilities to gear away from buying puppies and have more friendly usage to get to the adoption agencies, the \(S P C A ' s, ~ t h e ~ A C S--~\)

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: So do you do that at your store? You sell from rescue and from shelter?

DAVID DIETZ: Every opportunity I get, I love to do that.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: But do you do
that?

DAVID DIETZ: I have, yes.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Do you
currently do that?
```
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    DAVID DIETZ: I currently get dogs from people, my customers, my customer base who don't want their pets anymore. They ask us to rehome their dogs for them, not from the shelters.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: But do you work specifically--do you work specifically with any shelter or--
DAVID DIETZ: [interposing] No.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: rescue?
DAVID DIETZ: They are not
interested in a pet facility, pet store to take in an animal and rehome it for them. They want us to recommend over to them for so they generate the income for themselves, which is understandable, but we also have a tremendous customer base in need and want for these rehomed animals. So it can be successful, absolutely.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you.
DAVID DIETZ: And I know how to do that.

```

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you.

ANN LETTIS: \(I^{\prime} d\) just like to ask a question. I could be wrong, but I think that the root of all this is basically people caring about dogs and making sure that they're healthy, that people get, correct? So my question is, and \(I\) don't mean to deviate from the issue of puppy mills and pet shops. How about the dogs that are brought into shelters from other states that \(\mathrm{w}^{\prime}\) re responsible for. A few years ago 33 dogs were brought here to New York shelters from Tennessee. In the whole state of Tennessee they couldn't find room for 33 dogs? This happens all the time. We get dogs from other countries. Not every single dog in the shelters in New York State come from puppy mills or bad breeders.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: I don't think anyone has said that here today.

ANN LETTIS: No, but why isn't their a law to do something--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing] We're happy to look at that as well. We're happy to look at that as well.

ANN LETTIS: Okay, so that any--that
dogs can't come in. There's no health regulations. You know, in other words anything can be imported to our shelters from another state. There's no health checks.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you for raising that point. I have some more questions for PIJAC. How many of your members are USDA licensed breeders and how many dogs and cats did they sell in the last 12 months?

STEVE LANE: I do not know.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Can you provide us that information?

STEVE LANE: Certainly.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: How many cats or dogs do your clients sell in New York City pet stores each year?

STEVE LANE: I do not know.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Can you get us
information? Is there any reason pet shops should not spay, neuter, microchip and process license applications other than costs?

STEVE LANE: No.
take cost out, okay, thank you.

STEVE LANE: Well, I mean the health of the animal is a real concern. We--so that's a--but that wasn't related to the question you asked me, I don't believe.

MICHAEL GLASS: Excuse me, may I add
to that? And \(I^{\prime} m\) not a veterinarian, so \(I\) want
to just give you as much as \(I\) know. There is
recent on the large breeds that's saying
neutering an animal at too young of an age is
inhibiting the natural physiological process
that can lead to early hip dysplasia. That's
the extent of my knowledge on that, but \(I\) would
ask the panel to look into that.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Absolutely.

MICHAEL GLASS: We're absolutely for a spay and neuter program. I have added in my testimony--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing] You want to make sure it's done in a safe way for the animal.

MICHAEL GLASS: I have added in my testimony that the ASPCA as well as, oh my
goodness forgive me. There are two entities in
there that have found mandatory spay and neuter
does not work, although there's a high level of
need for education and encouragement. Thank
you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: I want to thank you all for coming today, for being patient and for answering our questions. I appreciate you taking the time out of your schedules to come and for submitting testimony and \(I\) would ask that if there are questions that you were not able to answer given that you just didn't have the information here today and you want to be accurate and precise, \(I\) would really appreciate the fact that if you could try to get us accurate answers to those questions.

STEVE LANE: Thank you for being willing to listen to us.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very much. The next panel is going to be five people again, Cori Menkin from the ASPCA, Stacey Wolfe from the ASPCA, Michelle Villagomez from the ASPCA, Bill Ketzer from the ASPCA, and John Maher from Companion Animal Protection Society.

May I--I just say to the panel and the folks here. We are of course going to hear from everyone today and we're going to make sure everyone who's signed up has a chance to speak. I must go to the restroom. I've been sitting here for three hours. So I will be right back. We are going to continue. It's not going to be a long break. We are going to resume if folks could please take a seat. We still have to hear from a lot of people today, so we are going to keep moving along because we want to hear from everyone and want everyone to have the ability to answer questions that are relevant. So in any order you would like to go. Is the ASPCA, are each one of you testifying or is--each one of you are testifying? If you could turn your mic on.
: Three ASPCA representatives testifying. We also have our counsel available to answer questions.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Great. So if you could all please raise your right hand? Do you swear and affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in your
```
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    testimony before this Committee and to respond
honestly to all Council Member questions?
[off mic]
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very
much. What did you say?
UNKNOWN: Unsworn declaration please.
That's traditionally what the form that
attorneys use in Federal Court. Hit the
microphone.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: The light has
to be on. The light has to be on.
UNKNOWN: How about an unsworn
declaration?
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: No.
UNKNOWN: Okay, fine. I'll affirm. I
swear then.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very
much. You may go in whatever order you'd like.
CORI MENKIN: I think I'm going to
begin.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: If you could
please announce yourself.
CORI MENKIN: Sure. My name is Cori
Menkin, I'm the Senior Director of the Puppy

```

Mills Campaign at the ASPCA. Thank you for the opportunity to speak here today. I'm going to sort of skip over a lot of the stuff \(I\) was going to cover in leaving more time to answer some of the questions that you asked that I know that we can address, but \(I\) do want to touch upon a couple of things. There's been a lot of talk about the USDA standards and what that means, and \(I\) want to make sure that we're all aware of exactly what it means. Under the Federal Animal Welfare was administered by the USDA, dogs in commercial breeding facilities can legally be kept in wire bottom cages, six inches longer than the dog in each direction, stacked on top of one another for their entire lives. It's completely legal to breed female dogs at every single opportunity. So as you can see the standards leave a lot of room for mistreatment even with full compliance. And then, you know, not even to touch upon the enforcement issues. I know the OIG audit has already been discussed at length. A couple of things that they found that were particularly troublesome to me. At one facility they found
dogs that were so badly starved that they had resorted to cannibalism, yet that facility was allowed to continue to operate. Another was described as having a deep pool and urine and feces under the animal enclosures. The dogs were seen with gaping wounds left untreated and flea and tick infestations that you could barely see the dog's faces. The USDA did not shut these facilities down. They were allowed to continue to operate and sell puppies. To illustrate just how pervasive the issue is, the ASPCA posted over 10,000 photos online on nopetstorepuppies.com, and those are photos taken by the USDA during routine inspections of these facilities. The binder that you have in front of you provides just a few examples of the systemic mistreatment of dogs that is occurring daily at USDA licensed facilities, and as \(I\) said it's important to note that all of the facilities you see pictures of are still in business and still selling puppies across the United States and in New York City. While it seems apparent that USDA licensure does not equate with humane treatment, unfortunately
public perception is that it does. In a recent poll that we conducted, we found that people think USDA licensed means humane.

Unfortunately, they don't really know what USDA license means. And allowing pet stores to sell puppies from these facilities unchecked would be akin to allowing them to mislead consumers. State regulation has not been any better. Historically, they've failed to live up to the purpose for which the law was enacted. The State Department of Ag and Markets has never been provided with the necessary resources to maintain a viable pet dealer inspection program. The administrative costs to operate the program have consistently exceeded licensing revenues derived from enforcement, and over the last five years 800 failed pet dealer inspections resulted in monetary penalties only 49 times and in only one facility being shut down. Moreover the standards of care applied to breeders under New York State law go no further in protecting dogs than the federal standards do. They're essentially equivalent. So in short, neither
state nor federal law provides New Yorkers with any assurance that the puppies they purchase from pet stores come from sources where dogs are raised and maintained in a safe and healthy manner. The City of New York is uniquely poised here to ensure that puppies purchased in pet stores by consumers in New York are raised and maintained in a healthy and safe manner and therefore we urge you to adopt strong, clear and enforceable standards that will result in ultimately keeping puppy mill puppies out of New York City's pet stores.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very much, Ms. Menkin. Next?

BILL KETZER: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, members of the Health Committee. My name is Bill Ketzer, \(I^{\prime} m\) the ASPCA's State Legislative Director for the Northeastern Region. I'm glad to be here today and the opportunity to offer comments and recommendations on Intro 55. You have my testimony, and you've clearly done your homework and \(I^{\prime} m\) very grateful for you and Council Member Crowley for bringing this bill
forward. I'll get right to the chase on Intro 55. The state law passed by Assembly Member Rosenthal provides two key requirements that local laws must meet. They can't be less stringent than the existing state standards of care and they can't essentially ban all sales of dogs and cats raised in healthy and safe manner. Intro 55 correctly seeks to meet the first requirement by incorporating many of the pertinent provisions of the aforementioned state law into the bill, and we'd simply recommend that great care be taken moving forward to make sure that these existing standards are incorporated in their entirety to ensure that the city's indeed fully meeting this not less than stringent and standard. However, there's also a tremendous opportunity to go above and beyond that foundation. The ASPCA's draft proposal for New York City which has been provided to you, Council Member Crowley, and central staff folds in more stringent standards that address some long time flaws in state law to be met by pet sellers in New York City. Again, you have my testimony and
you can look at those later on. But just as
important as creating a good local program for
pet stores is the establishment of sound and
enforceable source breeder standards to inform
the purchasing practices of retail sellers.
This is where we've done the largest amount of
research and analysis and appreciate your
consideration and the approach laid out in our
testimony and draft proposal. Rather than
relying on the volume of animals produced and
whether breeders have had any violations to the
Federal Animal Welfare Act in the past year, we
recommend limiting sale of puppies in New York
City pet stores that come from breeders who do
not meet strong or local requirements that
exceed USDA standards and are already being
enforced in the United States. In our draft
proposal we standards currently enforced in
Pennsylvania. Pet stores doing business in New
York City would then annually require the
store's breeders regardless of where they're
located to then annually require their store's
breeders regardless of--sorry--regardless of
whether located to certify store owners that
these standards are being met. The pet store in
turn acknowledges the DOHMH that they've
obtained this certification from each of their
sources. We've done extensive research in the
viability of this approach, and in a very real
sense while the standards are high, it provides
an even playing field for all breeders looking
to source animals to pet shops in the five
boroughs. That said, we do understand Intro
55's current approach because it's tangible,
but unfortunately will only ever be effective
as the entity enforcing the federal law, USDA
as Cori explained, and the federal law itself.
A violations based mechanism could and perhaps
should be incorporated into a strong care
standard. Taken together, New York City can
then confidently claim its defectively
comprehensively striving toward what the state
legislature's intent was as Assembly Member
Rosenthal discussed in removing the prohibition
on local laws on both the retail and wholesale
ends of the industry in New York. And with
that, once again, it's with great appreciation
and respect that \(I\) submit these recommendations
to you today. We share your enthusiasm and
desire to make New York City's local law the
first and strongest in the state. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very
much for your testimony.
    MICHELLE VILLAGOMEZ: Good
afternoon. I'm Michelle Villagomez, New York
City Legislative Director for the ASPCA. I'd
like to thank Chairman Johnson, Council Member
Crowley and the Health Committee for seizing
the opportunity afforded by the recent passage
of state law allowing municipalities the
authority to regulate pet dealers by
introducing Intros 55, 136 and 146 . As my
colleagues have pointed out and other people
that have testified, state law has restricted
the city from adequately protecting animals and
consumers. This has resulted in a bewildering
regulatory scheme in which the city could only
regulate certain types of pet stores. This
broken system can carry a substantial price.
Consumers, tax payers, the shelter system as
well as other not for profit partners typically
absorb the cost associated with unregulated
breeders and unwanted pet store dogs. Consumers suffer the most when they unknowingly open their homes and their hearts to puppies who suffer from serious illness and congenital malformations that often require costly medical intervention and are left to deal with their puppy's behavioral issues. Puppies may display behavioral problems like extreme shyness, aggression, fear and anxiety. Consumers dealing with these problems may end up surrendering their animals into the shelter system. I'd like to highlight one of our experiences. The ASPCA, our website is a quarter for people to share their stories with us. In February of 2014, Luca [sp?] the Pug was dropped off at the ASPCA. His owners had purchased him from a pet store and then when he was no longer wanted he was left at our shelter. As a result of his puppy mill past he was struggling with behavioral issues. Our behavior and adoptions team had to work very hard with him in order to rehabilitate him and make him available for adoption. He's has a happy ending to his story. He is just one example of many stories that
we've heard and many that we will continue to
see of puppy mill dogs having a profound impact
on consumers and the shelter system. With
regards to Intro 36 , as many of these things
have been mentioned by others that have
testified, we support the spaying and neutering
of dogs, cats and rabbits. Those are the three
largest populations entering the shelter system
in New York City, and we encourage the
requirement of dog licensing. We have some
recommendations. We would like to remove the
sterilization requirement for guinea pigs and
other small animals for reasons mentioned
before. We would also like to remove the
exception allowing a veterinarian to issue a
letter recommending sterilization at a later
date. It's unclear when a consumer's
veterinarian would be able to actually see the
pet prior to purchase to make that
recommendation. We would also like to include
language that would require puppies and kittens
sterilized when they're at least eight weeks
old and weigh at least two pounds. And then
we'd also include language requiring that
rabbits be sterilized when they're at least
four months old. We found that surgery is
riskier on younger rabbits. We support Intro
146 that requires microchipping in animals sold
in pet shops. We offer microchipping clinics
around the city. All animals adopted from our
shelter are adopted out with microchips, and
we've done studies that find that when combined
with visible identification tags on a pet's
collar, it's the most reliable system for
recovering a lost or a stray companion animal.
We think that this is a way to avoid animals
entering the shelter system, and with regards
to log licensing we've been working with the
city for years to try to encourage compliance
and we think that point of sale is a great
resource to get animals into the dog licensing
system.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you for
your testimony today.

JOHN MAHER: Good afternoon. I'm

John Maher, General Counsel for the Companion Animal Protection Society, CAPS. I've been an animal lawyer for 25 years and serve as an
adjunct professor of animal law at Touro [sp?]
Law Center. I will speak really fast. Okay. As
the premier national authority on pet shop and
puppy mill industry, CAPS has conducted under
cover investigations of more than 1,000
commercial breeding facilities or puppy mills,
most of them USDA licensed in 16 states and
we've documented numerous animal welfare act
violations. CAPS has also investigated hundreds
of pet shops around the country and many in New
York State and New York City. In addition to
providing evidence to law enforcement, we also
work with USDA FIS [sic], the Office of the
Inspector General. Their recent report in 2011
was based on CAPS investigative data and
includes much text that we submitted directly
to the USDA FIS and OIG. We have also drafted
and/or supported retail pet store ordinances in
Los Angeles, San Diego, West Hollywood and
Glendale. I'm going to rip through the text so
not to cover material others have covered. CAPS
investigations of New York City pet shops have
been covered that these stores often market and
sell puppies and kittens based upon
misrepresentations. They're in violation of New York State laws and they use almost universal false representations that puppies and kittens do not originate in puppy mills. This allegation is a violation of general business law article 22, section 350 A which prohibits false and misleading statements and deceptive practices. Some stores have restrictions that will legally limit the application of GBL 35D which is the 751 B and C section, the so called lemon law by insisting, for example, that consumers take a sick puppy to only the store's vet for warranty to be valid or refusing to reimburse for vet inspections. Many stores insist they don't have to reveal breeder and broker information prior to sale. This violates lemon law 753 C and so forth. Proof of puppy mill sales, as exhibit \(A\) to our submission we attached a spreadsheet. This is the most damning evidence before the commission today. This is a list of all the breeders that supply to New York City pet stores and all the violations that they have. This is a comprehensive spreadsheet. It's been submitted
to the committee in PDF form. We didn't print
it out for everyone with regrets, but can do
that. It shows that substantially all the
retail pets in New York City pet store buy from
puppy mill with serious animal welfare act
violations. Exhibit \(B\) is three example of our
cases which show three breeders who sell to New
York City pet stores. This is a classic
demonstration of the social hieroglyph, the
phenomenon where a consumer who buys on impulse
sees the cuteness and the wagging tail but not
the widespread institutional abuse and cruelty
inherent in the production of a puppy. Exhibit
B shows that these puppies are sourced from
breeders, puppy mills with AWA violations.
Okay. CAPS supports 73. We support 136 with
comment, should apply to cats and rabbits. We
support 146 and say add rabbits. We support 55
with a few reservations, which can basically be
summarized by certify all links in the puppy
mill supply chain for stores that do end up
selling in New York City. Use ASDA--I'm sorry.
Use USDA AFIS [sic] standards, responsible
public policy requires confirmation to these
```

standards and that would provide meaningful
data and record keeping, particularly in the
form of a cage card listing breeder, broker,
town, etcetera and USDA numbers with photos.
And there should be strict record keeping
requirements for these and so called interstate
health certificates or CVI's, and that would
allow tracking back and tracing. Often these
records are omitted or not kept properly or in
some cases we've observed forged. Clear
enforcement mechanism, we recommend that they
shift--that New York City shift the cost of
enforcement to violators through cumulative
fines. Animal rescue groups should also
encompass organizations that take in rabbits.
Convicted should mean any violation. Industry
criticism, we have a separate sheet responding
to the many misleading statements on PIJAC's
website. I've passed that around to the
Committee.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you sir.
JOHN MAHER: And I'm out of time, so
I'll just thank everybody.

```

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you.

Thank you for your testimony. Thank you for what you have provided to the committee and to the council. I appreciate it. I have some questions and \(I^{\prime} m\) happy to turn it over to Council Member Crowley who has joined us again who may have some questions. Not at this time. So I have some questions. Yep. So a few questions. Do you know what are the five largest puppy or kitten mills that sell to pet shops in New York City? Does the ASPCA have that information?

CORI MENKIN: We don't, but part of the reason we don't is because so many of the pet stores use the Hunt Corporation, and unfortunately, what that results in is the records coming in indicate that the puppies came from the Hunt Corporation. So it's very difficult to trace them back to their original source.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Because Hunt is an intermediary?

CORI MENKIN: Exactly. It's a
man, yeah. What is the role of brokers like
the Hunt Corporation in the larger pet
industry, within that context?
    CORI MENKIN: Sure. So the brokers
generally buy puppies from the breeders
throughout the country, primarily in the
Midwest. They bring them to their facility. The
Hunt Corporation is in Goodman, Missouri.
They're held there usually for about five days.
They're vetted and shipped out on 18 wheelers
across the country and distributed to pet
stores for consumers to purchase.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And do we know where--where does Hunt get its animals from?

CORI MENKIN: We do. We actually have a pretty comprehensive list of breeders that we know have imported puppies to the Hunt Corporation in Missouri. We were able to foyer [sic] that information from the Missouri Department of Agriculture. So I can provide that type of information to you if you want it. I don't, obviously, don't have the list of breeders with me today, but its extensive and
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it is quite a number of breeders that have excessive violations of the Animal Welfare Act.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Are they all

USDA breeders?

CORI MENKIN: Almost all of them. There were a couple of times that we were able to catch the Hunt Corporation purchasing puppies from unlicensed breeders, but that's the anomaly.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And how larger were these breeders? How many breeding females did they have?

CORI MENKIN: It depends on the breeder itself. The largest we were able to see had over 1,000 dogs on their property.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thousand dogs?

CORI MENKIN: And I also, I know you had asked earlier about the number of puppies coming into New York City from the Hunt Corporation. We were able to glean that information through FOYA [sic] request as well. We studied a specific three month time period and FOYA'd [sic] all the puppies that were imported into the city of New York by the Hunt

Corporation, and it rounds out to roughly about 1,200 animals annually that the Hunt Corporation is bringing into pet stores in New York City.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And Hunt claims to be buying pets, animals from small breeders.

CORI MENKIN: No, they don't. They never claim small breeders, \(I\) don't think. They just say they only use USDA licensed or hobby breeders, or AKC registered breeders, I think they say as well.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: So it's a hobby breeder?

CORI MENKIN: A hobby breeder would presumably be a smaller breeder. I think all they're saying is that they're either using licensed breeders or breeders who don't have to be licensed because they don't have enough dogs.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: What is Hunts business model?

CORI MENKIN: Meaning what do they

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: yeah. So how do they specifically--what are they in business to do?

CORI MENKIN: Well, they're in business to make a profit, obviously, but they have a number of drivers that go out throughout primarily like \(I\) said the Midwest, and they pick up puppies from breeders, usually in pockets in like the Ozarks, bring them back to their facility and pay roughly 50 dollars, 50100 dollars per puppy and then those puppies are distributed to pet stores and sold usually for around 400 dollars per puppy.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And if you could explain why the ASPCA believes we should limit the sale of animals obtained from brokers like the Hunt Corporation.

CORI MENKIN: They system is wrought with problems. Through the research that we've done, one of the things that became apparent is that it seems that the Hunt Corporation is not performing the proper veterinarian checks on puppies prior to shipping in interstate commerce. So by law, every puppy has to have a
vet certificate with it when it travels in
interstate commerce, and there's an attestation
at the bottom of that saying that that puppy
has been examined by a licensed veterinarian
and found to not have any communicable
diseases. We FOYA'd [sic] thousands of
documents. Every single one of them was signed
by one of three veterinarians, every single
one. So there are three veterinarians at most
performing all of the vet checks for the Hunt
Corporation.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you.

Council Member Crowley, do you have some questions?

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: I have--the Pet Industry Joint Advocacy Council posted the following comment on their website in advance of today's hearing. It said, "The number of animals a breeder has in their possession has nothing to do with the quality of care the breeder provides. Breeders used by responsible pet stores in the city are thoroughly inspected by the USDA and since local pet stores rely on repeat business no responsible
pet store in the city would knowingly risk
their reputation by providing unhealthy pets
from questionable sources to the public." Could
somebody please comment on the accuracy of this
statement based on your experience and your
investigations with respect to the--between the
number of animals and the quality of care?
    CORI MENKIN: Sure. I think as a
theoretical statement, it's probably true. If
you're treating your dogs humanely, it doesn't
really matter how many dogs you have. That
being said, it becomes exceedingly more
difficult to treat your dogs humanely when you
have more dogs than you can handle. Most of the
operations that we've seen, most of the
facilities that \(w e^{\prime} v e ~ b e e n ~ i n v o l v e d ~ i n ~ s h u t t i n g ~\)
down have gotten that way because they've
spiraled out of control, because they're a
family run operation. There's two adults and
maybe a couple of kids taking care of a huge
number of dogs on a property, you know, on a
large property, and I think it just becomes
much more difficult to do it humanely as your
numbers of dogs go up. Depending on the
facility, like I said.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: The larger
the facility, the larger the number of
population of pets in a facility the likelihood
that they won't have much space grows. Right?
So it's that correlation. The larger the--is
there any?

CORI MENKIN: I think it depends.
I've seen some pretty small operations that
pack a lot of dogs in.
    COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Right,
right, that's what \(I^{\prime} m\) getting at. So like a
larger breeder would have less space. But
that's not--

CORI MENKIN: [interposing] It's a
hard generalization to make.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: as
important as no--can they adequately say that
the USDA is responsibly investigating these
breeders that pet stores buy from?

CORI MENKIN: No, they can't, and I mean, that's been proven on the record time and time again today, that the USDA simply not
enforcing the animal welfare act. Even if the
standards were okay, which they' re not, the
USDA is not adequately enforcing them. There
are quite a few breeders who are not inspected.
USDA uses a risk-based inspection program, so
not every breeder is inspected every year.
There are repeat violators who are inspected
over and over again, but continue not to comply
with the law, and USDA does nothing to shut
them down. They have a back log at USDA of \(I\)
believe, \(I^{\prime} d\) have to check the number, but of
hundreds of cases of noncompliance that they
have not gotten to. So things are not being
processed quickly enough to actually have any
impact on the breeders themselves. There was
recently just some information put out that
it's taking USDA up to four years in some cases
to actually take enforcement action against a
breeder who is found to be in violation, four
years.
                            COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Do you think
that they, the pet stores care deeply about
their reputation? I mean--
                                    CORI MENKIN: [interposing] I--

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY:
[interposing] as for their--

CORI MENKIN: I don't really want to answer that question. I think it's an unfair statement to make.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Now, the question \(I\) asked earlier was about the quality of care, but now when these breeders are breeding so many pets, we have situations where the--you know, whether they' re healthy or not healthy, there are just too many pets entering into our shelter system. So are they causing an overpopulation, an oversaturation of dogs and cats in our city?

CORI MENKIN: I believe they are. I don't have data about that, but \(I\) can tell you that as the Senior Director of the Puppy Mills Campaign I get calls from consumers pretty frequently that are telling me, you know, their puppy that they bought at a pet store is really sick and they don't know if they're going to be able to pay for the vet bills. Those are the dogs like Luca in Michelle's testimony that end up in the shelter system, and you know, I think
if you keep in mind that statistically one in
four shelter dogs is a pure bred, it's a safe
assumption to make that a good chunk of those
dogs are coming from the puppy mill industry.
                            COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Does CAPS
have any testimony as it relates to PIJAC's
statement?
    JOHN MAHER: We've submitted our
sheet. To follow up on your last question,
Council Member, CAPS believes that most puppy
and kitten purchases are impulse purchases due
to a mimetic response in the humans who
essentially want to create a mini me, and that
at some point the concept of responsibility and
caring and loving for your new best friend for
15 years wears off its made on the basis of an
impulse purchase and not a considered
commitment to what it takes to care for and
love and raise an animal, and that's why we've
anecdotally encountered though do not have
statistics for pure bred animals and so called
hybrid animals like Maltipoos or Coccapoos
[sic] or whatever being dumped in the city
shelter system, but we believe that essentially
PIJAC wants to continue basically this
mechanism where it is able to sell animals.
It's able to--it' members are able to sell
animals at a high mark up because of a demand
elasticity for a luxury good, and then have the
city shelters operate as it were as a safety
valve to remove this--to bear the social cost
of this excess supply no longer wanted. In
other words, they're asking the city to
subsidize a social problem that they are
creating and choose to create through what is
in effect an entitlement and we're opposed to
that. \(I^{\prime} d\) also like to add following up on a
question you also asked that we note that there
are only 125 USDA APHIS inspectors, animal
plant health inspection service for 4,000 puppy
mills and brokers, and they're also responsible
for inspecting all the circuses and Sea World
and they rarely get to everybody in the same
year, and that was pretty much the conclusion
of the USDA Office of the Inspector General OIG
report that APHIS division was in effect not
enforcing the Animal Welfare Act, and this has
been the subject of numerous discussions I've
```

personally been--I've personally met with the
USDA APHIS and OIG in Maryland and discussed
this with them over a several year period, and
that's--it's pretty clear that the Animal
Welfare Act provides little or no protection
and that the industry testimony relying upon
that is essentially a--some kind of gloss of
respectability to an otherwise unseemly and
corrupt business.
COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Would you

```
say that they have a minimum level of
standards?

JOHN MAHER: I'm sorry, a minimum?

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: In terms of USDA or New York State standards for adequate care to ensure that the animals are being raised in a safe and healthy environment and manner. Do you think that they could have stricter standards that need to be met in inspections? You know, like for example, the pet industry says that when they've gotten violations that they were not serious violations. So you're saying that, you know, maybe that they're saying that USDA goes a
```

little further and they're really not serious
violations but they get hit with violations. I
understand what you're saying, there are just
two few officers to adequately regulate the
industry, of course, but when they are doing
some level of regulation they're giving
violations and they are--and the response, the
pet stores or the industry is saying, "you
know, I got a violation, but it's not really
that serious." To give the public the idea that
they go so far with their regulations and that
they're really a good provider of care and so
my question is, how far do you think they go
when they have the opportunity to fully inspect
a level of care?
JOHN MAHER: How far does USDA APHIS
go?

```
    COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Like how far
are their standards? Is it minimal? Is it, you
know--
    CORI MENKIN: Can I--
    JOHN MAHER: [interposing] They're
very below minimal. That was the conclusion of
the Inspector General in the case study of
Missouri. Missouri had this convoluted
legislative history of passing successive
legislative reforms, reforming their puppy mill
and retail pet store industry, and you know,
even their modest reforms were far more than
anything the APHIS division enforced under the
Animal Welfare Act. The Animal Welfare Act
basically--I don't know if the committee is
familiar with the history of it and \(I\) won't go
into it in detail, but it essentially puts
again a veneer of respectability upon
commercial animal instrumental use, and really
the whole idea of discussing animal welfare is
a matter of degree and the degree is wholly
inadequate. It's a terrible industry and it
should be regulated more strictly in order to
provide some relief for the misery that is
inherent in the supply chain starting at the
puppy mills and ending up with retail purchases
at pet stores in New York City, and I think our
exhibit B, which is three case studies of
exemplar breeders supplying to New York City
pet shops, gives you some idea of the kind of
violations that are being sold as part of the
cost that consumers pay. When you buy a puppy you're paying not only for the cute puppy for all of the cost levels--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing]

Thank you.

JOHN MAHER: in that.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: I don't mean to--I want to let Cori answer and then we're going to go to the next panel because we still have a lot of people that want to testify.

CORI MENKIN: So, I just want to thank you, Chairman. I just want to jump in real quickly to address one of the direct questions you asked about indirect violations and what PIJAC has to say about them. They say on their website that they are generally administrative, and that is actually not accurate. If you look at USDA inspection reports, attending veterinarian and adequate veterinary care violations are labeled as indirect by the USDA. So what we see is inspection reports with limping animals, with dogs with masses on them, with things that are clearly veterinarian care issues, but that are
```

listed on the inspection reports as indirect
violations. They're seen as administrative if
they're not adequately keeping records on
veterinary care. So that is a really big flaw
in the USDA system, and I also just wanted to
answer one of your other questions, Chairman.
There are, to our knowledge, there are about 73
pet stores in the five boroughs that sell
puppies.

```

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very
much. And \(I\) want to thank you for this as
devastating and horrifying and upsetting as it
is to look at. I think it's important for
people to know what the consequences of these
horrible puppy mills are on these animals. So I
appreciate your testimony and your patience. I
look forward to working with you all as we move
forward and thank you for being here today.
    BILL KETZER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
    JOHN MAHER: Thank you.
    CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Up next we are
going to have Patricia Rose and Tina Dolce from
Pet Land Discounts, and former Council Member
Edward Wallace from Greenberg Traurig
representing PetSmart. Council Member would you
like to begin.

EDWARD WALLACE: First let me thank the Chair and members of the Committee and the-
-
    CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing]
Oh, I have to swear you in. I'm sorry. If you
could raise your right hand. Do you swear and
affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth and
nothing but the truth in your testimony before
this committee and to respond honestly to all
Council Member questions?
    EDWARD WALLACE: I do.
    CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very
much.
    EDWARD WALLACE: So good afternoon
and thank you and you were kind enough to note
that \(I\) once had the privilege of serving in
this house, so \(I\) take it as a very special
honor to be here before you today. I'm the Co-
Chair of the New York Office of Greenberg
Traurig. I'm here with my colleague Will Mack.
Actually who recently joined us and has done
all of the work up on this and what we have to
say. And \(I\) just want to thank everybody for
giving PetSmart an opportunity to express its
support for the effort that you're making to be
sure that we in New York are doing all we can
to look after our pets and our animals. I just
want to note at the outset, PetSmart does not
sell dogs, cats or rabbits. So in large
measure, and I'll go very quickly because I
know there's a lot of people waiting. We're not
affected directly by much of what you're
regulating. They are the largest retailer,
however, of pet and pet supplies in the United
States and they try to be an industry leader in
issues regarding caring for pets and animals in
general. We do have a few technical concerns,
some of which are just a repeat of what people
said earlier. We have the concern that was
expressed about guinea pigs for example. But
PetSmarts in Brooklyn, Manhattan and Staten
Island, they employ about 210 people in New
York and many of them are what we call
associates and really passionate associates who
care about both the animals and the pet
parents. There is an analog not for profit
called PetSmart charities, and they really have
focused on helping saving about five million
cats and dogs nationwide since 1994. While it's
an independent not for profit organization, it
works to save the lives of homeless pets and
reduce shelter intake through spay and neuter
efforts. PetSmart Charities also the leader in
granting money to help pets in need. More than
28 million given in 2012 throughout North
America. So I want to just focus the time that
we have on the pets that we do provide and just
note that we take measures, some certainly
within the FDA requirements, but beyond that to
ensure that the sourcing of those non-dog, cat
and rabbits meet the high standards that
PetSmart sets. And we can get you more
information on that. So let me just say that
one concern we have with your bills is that we
not--what we do is we partner with a lot of the
shelters and allow them at no fee, no money
changes hands to PetSmart, but to provide a
forum. It's probably enlightened self interest,
because if you get your pet at a PetSmart
through one of the shelter programs, maybe
you're likely to come back and buy food for it.
But we just want to be sure that nothing in the
bill would inhibit those shelters and the
partner shelters from continuing that. PetSmart
cannot take on the obligations with respect to
spaying and neutering and chipping and all of
that. So we just hope that the partners who do
that will be enabled to continue to do that.
The rest is in my testimony. Thank you very
much.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: You may take more time, Council Member.

EDWARD WALLACE: Well, you're very
kind. I don't want any privilege here today. I
have a client. It's not me. So the only other
thing that \(I\) think we would ask you to focus on
is that there is a--when we--we'll come back to
you with technical suggestions with regard to
the definition of a pet shop because we are
really a pet supply shop in large measure, and
then with the dogs, cats and so forth, as I
said, that's all a not for profit partnering. I
guess the most, single most important thing is
we believe in the City Council. We would like
it if you would retain jurisdiction over the
definition of which animals and which things
come under the jurisdiction. No disrespect to
the Department of Health and maybe it's my own
personal prejudice, but you respond directly to
the people and if you say something should be
in the bill, we understand. But we've seen
instances, not so much this client, where an
agency decides on its own we're going to expand
the definition and it doesn't have the
accountability you do. So we would just point
that out to you in the bill. And thank you
again on behalf of PetSmart for taking this
leadership role.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you. And I think we like having that role as well. I appreciate that.

EDWARD WALLACE: Good.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Yes, please.

PATRICIA ROSE: Hi, my names Patricia Rose. I'm the Senior VP of Pet Land Discounts, and I'm here today with Tina Dolce whose the Vice President of our Livestock division. Together we have 54 years of experience working
for Pet Land Discounts. We currently operate 65
locations in the city and boroughs of New York
and we have been doing business here for the
past 49 years. We do not sell dogs or cats, but
do sell small animals which include guinea pigs
and rabbits. While well-intended, we believe
this legislation has been founded on the
emotion of a few and is not hearing the voice
of many. I think \(I\) can safely say that as a pet
person if one animal is abandoned on the
streets of New York, it's one too many. We just
disagree with how to go about correcting the
problem. I've attached a website link that says
the AVMA does not support regulations mandating
the spay or neuter of privately owned non-
shelter dogs and cats. Although spaying and
neutering helps control dog and cat
populations, mandatory approaches may
contribute to pet owners avoiding licensing,
rabies vaccination and veterinary care for
their pets. Sometimes we feel we're fixing a
problem when all we're doing is trading it for
a bigger one. There are many options out there
including public education, higher licensing
fees for pets not sterilized and more programs like the Toby Project and ASPCA low cost spay and neuter clinics. Low cost training programs for dogs may prevent so many of them from winding up in shelters, but spaying and neutering is a personal decision for a pet owner that is paying for a pet, not one that should be decided by this board. Finally, the inclusion of rabbits, guinea pigs and any other animal that is designated by rule by the Department is a bit of a broad description. While a case can be made for spaying a rabbit, by the time the animal can safely be sterilized, it'll be a young adult. Guinea pigs are a different story. Sterilizing a guinea pig inherently carries more risk than dogs or cats. They are more susceptible to stress, post op infection and more likely to have a fatal anesthesia reaction. And again, is this something that should be decided by this board? Pet Land Discounts is currently voluntarily working with rabbit rescuers and various dog and cat organizations to promote the adoption of unwanted pets and will continue to do so.
We're willing to work to find solutions to the
overpopulation problems but strongly feel this
is not a legislative issue. Thank you for your
time.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you. Are you testifying? No.

PATRICIA ROSE: No. If you had any questions.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Yes, I do have some questions. So is it your belief that the city should not be trying to in any way control the overpopulation of pets in the city?

PATRICIA ROSE: No, we believe that controlling the overpopulation is important, but even in listening to the testimony we heard here today, a large amount of the animals in shelters are not pure breds, maybe one percent. So those are the animals that causing a pet store to spay or neuter before its being sold, it's not your real problem. It's the ones that are out there roaming the streets. After all of these years we've seen a lot of legislation. I saw the turtle law, the four inch turtles, but I can walk onto the streets of Flatbush and I
can show you the corners where they're just
illegally sold and nothing is done about it. So
I just believe that there are more positive
ways to do it through licensing or permits or
higher fees for someone who wants to have his
dog not spayed or neutered.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: But in the end,
might that position shift the cost of this to
the ASPCA?

PATRICIA ROSE: Not necessarily. I
mean, this is--if you sell a dog, then why not
impose instead of being the one to force the
spay or neuter, impose that the dog be sold
with a voucher to be spayed or neutered where
it's actually prepaid at the point of purchase.
The person can choose to use it or not. That
would be up to the individual who purchases the
dog.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: But that
doesn't control the pet population.

PATRICIA ROSE: There's really not much more that, you know, I can say to that other than, you know, it's not that we're against it. We don't oppose it. I just believe
that it's a decision that if you purchase a
pet, you have a right to make about that pet.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you. I appreciate your testimony here today. I appreciate you coming and thank you for being so patient. Thank you Council Member.

EDWARD WALLACE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Our next panel is Natalie Reeves from Big Apple Bunnies, Vivian Barna [sp?] from All About Rabbits Rescue, Zelda Penzel from the League of Humane Voters of New York, Emily McCoy from People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, and Chelsie Schadt, I want to pronounce it correctly from NYCLASS. Thank you all for being here today and for being patient. Will you please all raise your right hand? Do you swear and affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in your testimony before this committee and to respond honestly to all Council Member questions? Thank you very much. You may proceed in whatever order you'd like. Please identify yourself for the record as you testify.

NATALIE REEVES: No, sorry.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: It's okay.

NATALIE REEVES: I'm Natalie Reeves. I'm with Big Apple Bunnies, which is a rabbit advocacy group that \(I\) founded. I've submitted written testimony and \(I^{\prime} m\) not going to bore you by reading it to you. I'd rather just talk to you and tell you what's important to the people that \(I\) work with. We're rabbit people. We love dogs and cats, but rabbits are the most abused pets out there. They're the only animals that are sold in pet stores that are eaten. They're worn. They're hunted. They're used as key chains. They're really left out. Most big rescue groups don't think of rabbits. Consequently, smaller rescue groups that focus on rabbits spend thousands of dollars caring for them. There have been several articles which I have provided to you showing that the intake numbers are up at the New York City shelter on rabbits for the past few years.

Admittedly they' re much lower than dogs and cats, but they're the third most relinquished animal, but the shelter numbers are a fraction of the numbers of animals being relinquished. Rabbit rescue groups are taking in hundreds, just in the New York City area \(I\) know of hundreds who have been taken in that are not going to the shelter first. Many of these animals if not most of these animals are coming from pet store. We also get some from, you know, people who get them on PetSmart or other situations. But there are also thousands of-well \(I\) don't know if thousands the right number. There are many rabbits, we don't know how to quantify it, who are being abandoned in the parks where they're literally being eviscerated by dogs, cats, any, you know, raccoons and then if we're able to rescue them before they're killed they, you know, have thousands of dollars of veterinary care. So I'm speaking with respect to Intros 55 and 136 as they pertain to rabbits. 130--excuse me. 55 as drafted does not pertain to rabbits, but I'm respectfully requesting that the bill be
amended to pertain to rabbits in several ways.
Number one, the protections. Rabbits should
have every protection that dogs and cats do.
They use liter boxes like cats. They're social
like dogs. None of my rabbits are caged. They
follow me around. They're affectionate. They're
social. One jumps in my bed to wake me up each
morning. They're really amazing animals. There
is no prohibition on your banning sales of
rabbits outright in pet stores, absolutely
none. The state law only pertains to dogs and
cats, prohibiting the outright prohibition. It
does not pertain to rabbits. So you can pur--
you--and there are many cities that do. Los
Angeles, Chicago, San Francisco all ban
rabbits. San Francisco, they haven't yet passed
a law banning the sale of dogs and cats, but
they have for more than 30 years had a ban on
the sale of rabbits because rabbits unlike dogs
and cats are tied to a holiday, mainly Easter,
where they are impulse buys and abandoned
afterwards.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And then abandoned afterwards.

NATALIE REEVES: And \(I\) would say also just very quickly on Intro 136 as drafted right now it's too dangerous for rabbits to be spayed. We would request that it be at least six months, although in practicality that's not going to work because pet stores like to sell underage bunnies. So we prefer that obviously the outright ban.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very much

VIVIAN BARNA: Hi, I'm Vivian Barna, and thank you. I'm very grateful to be here to be able to speak my piece. It's been quite a long time. The number of--number mentioned 382 about the number of rabbits that come into ACC, that's such a segregated number. It's my understanding that a rescue group, a larger one than my own, dealt with 300 rabbits in the last year. I personally prevented about 50 rabbits from coming into ACC. It's also my information which I think is pretty reliable that ACC cannot handle all the rabbits that are coming in and Rabbits are getting doled out not just to rescues in other areas, but to non-rabbit
rescues, dog and cat rescues. That's my
information. I deem it to be correct. I would
not bring rabbits that \(I\) find to ACC. I just--
because \(I\) know that \(I\) will take care of them
and it's okay. Just so you know, I've given up
half of my income basically to--with my own
rescue and in dealing with all these rabbits.
So the number 382 is a very limited number.
Then \(I\) also get calls from 311, Pet Finders,
and I try to help people from surrendering
their rabbits. I deflect people from bringing
their rabbits to \(A C C\) as best as \(I\) can, as
someone for low cost spay and neuter, etcetera.
So I just--if we counted up the number of
rabbits that we probably dealt with that \(I\) just
mentioned, it would be close to 1,000 rabbits
that could come to ACC, and if ACC was as well
known as Northshore Animal League, you would
have 1,000 rabbits there right now. I mean, and
that's not including as she said all the
rabbits that are out there in the parks. I do
not go to the parks anymore. I cannot. I know
that there are tons of rabbits out there dying
of dehydration, predation, fly strike,
etcetera. Okay, moving onto the next thing.
Rabbits are very easy to abuse, and here's one
case. I'm going to show you a picture where the
person just kept it as a cage only animal. A
lot of times pet shop concerns try to make it
seem very easy. There was a pet shop concern
here that focused on talking about dogs, yet
they are selling rabbits at all these
locations, 65 locations, and many of their
rabbits do come to the shelter by virtue of the
number of rabbits that they sell. That's where
they're coming from. And their kind enough and
gracious enough to have started an adoption
program, but sadly it's just not enough. We
can't keep up with it. Rabbits are not really
good pets to sell. They're--if they're not
spayed and neutered, they'll spray on you.
They'll bit you if you don't submit to them,
all different reasons. They chew. They poop and
pee all over the place. If you love them
you'll, you know, it's okay. You'll handle it.
I don't think that rabbits should be sold
period, and if you can work in spaying and
neutering rabbits and that kind of, you know,
prevents pet shops from selling them, all the
better, because they are not easy animals.
They're very high maintenance. One last
question. And then the other thing is, who's to
say that these rabbits don't come from rabbit
mills like dogs and cats? Who knows what kind
of abuse they're also subjected to in these
rabbit mills? What else did I--one more thing.
Yes, and rabbits, females cannot be spayed
really before six months.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you.
VIVIAN BARNA: And the males, four
months.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very much for your testimony and for being patient and for coming today. I know that everyone that's here cares about animals and is very passionate and compassionate for their care and their futures. So thank you. You may go. Does New York CLASS have any written testimony?

CHELSIE SCHADT: I apologize, we don't, but \(I\) will get that to you as soon as possible.
could just email it to us, that would be great.
    CHELSIE SCHADT: Absolutely.
    CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: You may
introduce yourself for the record.
    CHELSIE SCHADT: Sure. My name is
Chelsie Schadt. I am Lead Organizer with
NYCLASS. We wanted to thank the Chairman and
the Health Committee for inviting us to speak
today on Intro Number 136,146 and 55. As some
of you know, NYCLASS is an animal advocacy
organization that believes in the power of
organizing and mobilizing the animal protection
voting block to move humane legislation.
Although we are mostly known for our work to be
on the abuse of horse carriage industry, over
the past year we have expanded the organization
to advocate for cracking down on pet stores and
puppy mills and we were thrilled pass our first
state law regarding puppy mills this year.
NYCLASS supports intro 136 , if it is amended to
include the following recommendations.
Eliminate section \(17-804 B\) which would exempt a
pet from being sterilized if the said animals
```

are veterinarian states the sterilization
should take place at a later date. As was
stated before, it's not entirely clear if the
veterinarian would be required to examine the
animal beforehand. Amend the bill to mandate
that puppies and kitten be sterilized when
they're at least eight weeks old and weight at
least two pounds, and amend the bill to state
that the mandatory sterilization of rabbits is
at least four months old. As stated previously
there's an increased risk when rabbit is
sterilized at a younger age. NYCLASS also

```
supports Intro 146 if it is amended to include
the following recommendations, amend the bill
to clarify that the mandatory microchip
registrations by the pet store must be a
bonafide microchip registration company and
that uses--that the usage instructions would be
then passed along to the purchaser of the
animal. And also amend the bill to increase the
period of time in which the pet store must
maintain the records of the microchipping to be
more than five years presently in the bill.
Regarding Intro 55, we would support the bill
but not in its current form, only if it is
strengthened to do more to protect both
consumer and animals from the abusive
unscrupulous practices of puppy mills. We have
the unique opportunity to regulate pet sellers
in a meaningful way, but we need the City
Council to work closely with experts on the
puppy mills such as the ASPCA, Humane Society
and the Mayor's alliance who are all previously
here today. Last, please stand strong and don't
let PIJAC or the AKC influence you. They have
money on their minds and not the welfare of
these animals. They oppose even the most basic
standards of care. They are the reasons that
New York City is the final stop of puppy mills
pipeline. They are also the reason that our
city shelters are bursting at the seams. Please
don't be swayed by them. Your constituents will
thank you. After all, our community loves
animals and we vote. I want to thank you very
much for having us here today and for working
to make New York City a humane place for all of
your residents, two legged and four legged.

ZELDA PENZEL: Good afternoon. I'm Zelda Penzel, Director of Outreach for the League of Humane Voters of New York and cofounder of SOS, Save our Shelter Animals, and I'm here today basically to oppose the passage of Intro 55 in its present form, and I'll tell you why. It's a terribly flawed bill which endorses the continued sale of puppy mill dogs and cats, except now they're called large-they're large scale breeders who sell as many as 50 animals a year and whose mass commercial breeding operations of virtually indistinguishable from the wretched hell holes we call puppy mills. These are not hobby breeders with animals sleeping on their beds at night. They are by their very nature and definition cruel and indistinguishable from puppy mills. As you heard, USDA standards for breeders and puppy mills are minimal and enforcement is negligible, and surely it's not just the number of animals sold, but rather the conditions under which they are kept generally
ranging from unspeakable to inhumane. That's
unacceptable here. These dogs and cats are
considered nothing more than profitable, easily
replaceable breeding machines, cash cows and
that's how they're treated. The reason we all
fought for home rule was to enable the city to
legally cut off the pipeline of large scale
breeder and puppy mill cats and dogs. And while
any law passed by the Council may not
essentially ban all pet shops sales of dogs and
cats raised and maintained in a healthy and
safe manner, it's our position that none of the
animals coming from breeders as presently
defined in Intro 55 have in fact been raised
and maintained in a healthy and safe manner.
The very nature and purpose of all such mass
breeding facilities make it impractical,
uneconomical and impossible to raise animals in
a healthy and safe manner. And let's not forget
that, you know, cats and dogs really are
household pets. In breeding facilities they're
kept in cages with very little human contact.
They're not treated like pets. They are really
breeding machines. This bill unlike those
passed in Chicago, Los Angeles and Toronto and
other cities which permit the sale in pet
stores only of animals from shelters and
rescues will do nothing to save the precious
lives of animals dying in our shelters, but
will instead ensure a steady supply of kittens
and puppies from mills to pet stores and
continue to add to the glut of animals already
out there. With the playing field that allows
the city for the first time ever to regulate--
pardon me--to regulate conditions and animals
that can be sold in pet stores, Intro 55 has
aimed incredibly low and set the bar far below
what's acceptable to New Yorkers. By setting
down its own definitions and requirements, the
City Council has the power to determine that
animals sold in pet stores come from shelters
and rescue groups rather than these large scale
facilities. My testimony which I've given to
you--
                            CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing]
Yes.
                            ZELDA PENZEL: is a little longer,
but \(I^{\prime}\) ve included what some of us consider to
be the definition of pet--puppy stores. It's at
the very end.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you. And
I appreciate the fact that you took head on
what you believe to be the adequate number or
inadequate numbers around breeding dogs with
these breeders and what the result is, and I
can tell you that, you know, this bill is going
through a legislative process and that's why
we're having this hearing, to understand from
advocates and experts how the bill could be
improved. And so we look forward to doing that
and working with all of you to make this the
strongest possible bill that passes legal
muster. So thank you for coming and testifying
today.
                            ZELDA PENZEL: Thank you for having
this hearing.

EMILY MCCOY: Thank you committee
members for considering four proposed
amendments to the New York City Administrative
code in relation to pet shops. My name is Emily
McCoy and I represent PETA, the world's largest
animal rights organization with more than three
million members and supporters, some 90,000 of
whom are proud New Yorkers. We strongly support
all four life saving measures that are being
heard today, Introduction numbers 55, 73, 136
and 146. Introduction number 73 proposed to
update the definition of pet shop within the
Animal Abuse Registration Act by better
defining the term and including consideration
of the lives of all animals. PETA frequently
fields disturbing complaints about pet shops
that keep and sell sick and injured animals of
all shapes and sizes and species to
unsuspecting customers, deprive many animals of
the basic necessities of life, veterinary care
and leave unsaleable animals confined in
isolated and back rooms hidden from public
view. The pet industry is notorious for taking
short cuts at the expense of animals whose
sales it depends on. In addition of the
substandard deplorable and factory farm like
conditions in which many dogs, cats, rabbits,
birds, guinea pigs, chinchillas, rats, mice and
so many other animals are bred, raised, shipped
and sold. Each animal purchased from a pet shop
goes to a home that could have gone to an animal in a shelter, which could mean a death sentence for a shelter animal. Introduction number 146 proposes requiring pet shops to identify the animals they sell by having them implanted with identification microchips by license veterinarians. Microchips help reunite beloved animal companions with their frantic guardians, help track animals with congenital defects back to a broker, breeder, puppy mill, etcetera, encourage responsible guardianship and eventually reduce the number of animals taken into area shelters identify the owners of animals maintained in violation of animal protection laws and dangerous dog relations and more. Introduction number 136 would require pet shops to sterilize animals and require purchasers to buy a valid animal license before ownership is transferred. The overpopulation of dogs and cats in the \(U S\) results in six to eight million of them euthanized in animal shelters every year, often because no homes exist for them. A 2013 report states that 25 percent of dogs entering animals shelters were pure bred,
produced by breeders and sold at pet stores.
Sterilizing dogs and cats before sale would
help save the lives of countless animals in New
York. Also including small animals such as
guinea pigs and rabbits in this measure is
forward thinking and crucial. Enumerable
rabbits and guinea pigs are sold, given away
and abandoned every year resulting in death
from neglect as well as euthanasia in homes and
overwhelmed animal shelters. These animals are
prolific breeders and have special needs that
are rarely met in inexperienced and uneducated
homes. Their sterilization before sale will
help save countless lives.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: I have read
what you are testifying on in Introduction
Number 55. So you don't have to read. I
appreciate it and that you're here to support
these measures. I would ask given that PETA has
done incredible work with investigations,
undercover investigations and reports on some
of these practices, if in fact your
organization has any reports on puppy mills, we
would love for you to send those to us for the record.

EMILY MCCOY: Yeah, unfortunately, there's no shortage of those kind of reports. There are plenty of them, and \(I\) know you--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing] If you could please send what you have to us that would be helpful.

EMILY MCCOY: Yes, and I know you had asked earlier of another panel about the number of dogs and cats that come into the system from puppy mills and from breeders.

Unfortunately because there is no central oversight agency, there is no way to gauge that number. So there is right now between 2,000 and 3,000 USDA licensed breeders, puppy mills, and could be as many as 10,000 , so.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you.

EMILY MCCOY: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very much. Thank you all for being here today. And our final panel, and again \(I\) want to thank you all for being so patient, Esther Koslow from Shelter Reform Action Committee, Jeffery Drogan
[sp?], Jennifer Panton from United Action for Animals, and Adita Bernkraut from Friends of Animals. Again, \(I\) want to thank you all for being so patient and spending an afternoon here at the City Council. If you would all please raise your right hand. Do you swear and affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in your testimony before this Committee and to respond honestly to all Council Member questions? Thank you very much, and maybe we can start with Esther and then move across. If you could please identify yourself for the record when you testify. Thank you.

ESTHER KOSLOW: My name is Esther

Koslow. I recently said in my statement good afternoon but we're getting into the evening. I'm President of Shelter Reform Action Committee. You have my prepared statement. I'll try to make it even shorter. I'm thrilled that we're here today. I'm thrilled that we have this new City Council. I'm thrilled that Linda Rosenthal made it possible for us to be sitting here today to enact real legislation with teeth
to regulate pet shops. It's great. And I defer
to all the wonderful comments that have been
suggested to revise these bills, but my
particular focus was on Intro 55. So they've
discussed that, and the issue here is who's
going to enforce whatever bills are going to be
passed in whatever form they are, and right now
it's going to be the Department of Health, and
therein lies the problem. The Department of
Health has no mandate to ensure animal health
or wellbeing but rather to protect people from
animals and animal's diseases. So whenever the
Department of Health has to choose between
allotting resources for safeguarding people's
health versus that of animals, the people are
going to win, and that's right for the
Department of Health, but it's not good for
animals. That's why in 1997 Shelter Reform
Action Committee sued for the creation of a
Department of Animal Welfare. It was actually
animal affairs. The lawsuit was dismissed
because of state law, because it gives the
Mayor of New York unfettered power to decide
who's going to be in control of the animal
shelter system. But we now know that this idea
of a new Department of Animal Affairs is being
floated again. But the pet shop animals can't
wait for that to happen. So what are we going
to do in the meantime because \(I\) know that \(\operatorname{Mr}\).
Kass was already asking for he would need more
resources for the Department of Health to do
more inspections of pet shops and more pet
shops? What are the penalties that the
Department of Health, what are they going to
come up with? Are there going to be fines?
Are they going to close pet shops like they do
restaurants? But the real issue more than the
penalties, will they every be enforced? Mr.
Kass talked about dog licensing. The DOH has
been in charge of dog licensing since 1995 and
has done a terrible job at it. In fact,
licensing compliance keeps going down. In 2010
he said it was a 20 percent compliance rate
which was lousy then and over flated. It's much
less now. So here's the issue. Whenever these
new bills get passed the Department of Health
is going to be enforcing them until a new
department is created. So I guess you're going
to have regulate the regulator. I know you can
do it. I know we can figure out an answer, but
I'm telling you there's going to be a problem.
                    CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you. I
understand the problem, and I would say that I
don't think that this is just exclusively the
Department of Health that has this issue on
enforcement. We see it amongst basically every
city agency. We come up with these great laws
and rules and regulations and they're
meaningless if they're not enforced in a
correct way, and many times that comes down to
appropriate staff and resources so that the job
can be done. I mean, I think Deputy
Commissioner Kass mentioned a certain number of
veterinarians that would have to be hired,
clerical workers to work on a new system to
track these things as well as additional
inspectors potentially, and \(I\) know that that
could be a good start, but it may not even be
adequate. So we have to fight for more, and
luckily the City Council has a charter mandate
of oversight over every department in the City
of New York. We've been doing that for a long
time, and \(I\) can tell you under my tenure as
Chair we'll continue to do that on not just
these issues, but any issue that affects public
environmental health in the city of New York.
So your point is well taken. I appreciate your
advocacy and you being here today and being so
patient and \(I\) look forward to working with you
to make this the strongest bill we can possibly
get, again legally. So thank you, Esther,
thank you. Yes, sir. If you could please speak
into the microphone and give your name for the
record.
                            JEFFERY DROGAN: My name is Jeffery
Drogan, \(I^{\prime} m\) a professional engineer and I live
at 27 West \(67^{\text {th }}\) Street, and \(I^{\prime} m\) here
representing myself. This law makes no
provision for the responsible breeder hobbyist
that lives in New York who define me as pet
shop, which I am not. I oppose Introductory
136, the mandatory spaying and neutering of my
litters. I've lived in this city with German
short-haired corners pointers for over 20
years. During that entire time my dogs have
been shown in AKC confirmation and participated
```

in AKC performance and companion events. My
dogs also participated in American field
events. My dogs have won many championships,
titles in obedience, agility and field events.
My dogs participate in the Westminster Kennel
Club show at Madison Square Garden. None of
this could be done with a neutered dog. I
travel to dog events throughout the country but
especially in the metropolitan area. I spend an
excess of 30,000 dollars a year training,

```
showing and running my dogs in \(A K C\) and American
Field events. All of this makes substantial
economic impact in the areas where \(I\)
participate. None of this could be done--none
of this would be done with a neutered dog. I
have bred three litters. My stud dogs have
produced probably another seven or eight
litters in 20 years. All of my dogs go through
very elaborate health and genetic testing prior
to breeding. All of my litters have been
produced by surgical implanting. A litter costs
me approximately 3,000 dollars in veterinarian
fees to produce. I have contract--I have
contacted everyone that has every acquired a
puppy from me. My litter have produced champions in titles in almost every discipline opened to German shorthaired pointers. None of this could be done with a neutered dog. I coown every dog that \(I\) produce until that dog is done in its confirmation or obedience or whatever it is. At which time it is released to the owner and generally they're spayed or neutered once their careers are finished. I have presently about seven dogs that live in New York City that four of them are not neutered. Three of them are because their careers are finished. You have no provision in this law for people like me. I am a responsible--you refer to the responsible, but we're under the same laws if \(I\) sell one dog in the city of New York \(I^{\prime} m\) a pet shop. I am not a pet shop. Did I misunderstand that? Because I hope I did.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: You can finish your testimony and \(I^{\prime} l l\) make a statement.

JEFFERY DROGAN: What was that?

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Are you done with your testimony?
say thank you for being so patient, waiting
'til the very end to testify. Again, we are
here to listen and \(I^{\prime} m\) glad you came today,
because \(I\) do not--you sound like an incredibly
responsible owner who is doing all you can to
take care of the dogs and puppies in your
possession and \(I\) wish we had more people like
you that were as responsible as you are. You
seem to be the model of what we would like to
have, and so we want to take that into account,
and we will look at that. It would be helpful
if you--I don't know if you submitted written
testimony.
                            JEFFERY DROGAN: I emailed to you on
April \(28^{t h}\).

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: To me?

JEFFERY DROGAN: To you, the

Honorable Corey Johnson via District Three at Council.--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing] Okay.

JEFFERY DROGAN: newyorkcity.gov.
then, and \(I\) will check and I'll forward it
along to the Health Committee and the
legislative counsel to ensure that we take that
into account, and I really do appreciate you
being here to explain your circumstances and to
understand more about folks who are in your
situation. Thank you sir. By the way, what
type of dogs do you have?
    JEFFERY DROGAN: German shorthaired
pointers.
    CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Oh, great.
    JENNIFER PANTON: Hello. \(I^{\prime} m\)
Jennifer Panton. I'm President of United Action
for Animals. I want to thank all of you who are
sponsoring this bill and being the voice for
the voiceless victims. I have been rescuing for
over 15 years. I worked at Animal Care and
Control of New York City as a Manhattan New
Hope Coordinator, and I have presided over
United Action for Animals since 2006 . I have
saved dozens of our city's animals from Animal
Care and Control's euthanasia list, through New
Hope alerts and off our city streets. I have
organized low cost and free spay/neuter clinics
throughout the boroughs and \(I^{\prime} m\) now doing \(T N R\),
which is trap, neuter and return for feral
cats. I have and continue to witness the harsh
realities of overbreeding, overbreeding animals
in New York City, things that have given me
nightmares and that had made me question
humanity.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Take your time.
I appreciate you being here.
    JENNIFER PANTON: I can--sorry.
Animal Care and Control has to take over, has
to take in over 86 animals a day. You could
just grasp that 86 animals a day had to either
have been dumped, seized or abandoned. How is
that possible in this sophisticated city like
New York City? Any upstanding citizen who's
against regulated pet shops and puppy mills
needs to volunteer or work in our city's animal
shelters for just one week to educate
themselves. Due to my experience and what I
have seen done, \(I\) can't help but take a
stronger stance regarding pet shops in bill
number 55. Responsible breeding is an oxymoron.

Responsible breeding is an oxymoron. At this stage, with so much euthanasia and thousands of homeless animals, just cutting off puppy mills is not enough. The city of Chicago last month passed a bill that stipulates retailer, aka pet shop, and they offer for sale only those dogs, cats and rabbits that have been obtained from an animal control center, humane society rescue, etcetera, basically, what Pet Co and PetSmarts are currently doing in New York City today. Those same animals are already spayed and neutered as well microchipped. I would like to suggest the council members review Chicago's ordinance which \(I\) have attached to my letter, and \(I\) hope that one day you can replicate that bill. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you.

Thank you very much for your testimony and for all of your compassionate work in saving and helping animals in the city and \(I\) understand how emotional you get. I can't even look at Facebook page every night to see the number of animals who are being put down. It makes me sick to my stomach. So I totally get it. I want
to say that we are simply not allowed by law to
do an outright ban. It's just not legal.
                            JENNIFER PANTON: Eventually, you
can.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Right now-JENNIFER PANTON: [interposing]

That's what \(I\) want the goal to be.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Right now--
JENNIFER PANTON: [interposing] This is a start.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Right now we can't. Right now the City Council cant.

JENNIFER PANTON: I understand. I understand. As of today, I understand.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Yeah, yeah, yeah. So we're doing as \(I^{\prime}\) ve said many times today, we're going to do the best we can. We're going to make it as strong as we can, and we want it to stand up to a potential legal challenge, because it may get challenged by some people who may not like this. So we're going to work hard, and \(I\) really again appreciate you coming to testify today and waiting until the very end. Thank you.

ADITA BERNKRANT: Hi, there. My name's Adita Bernkrant. I'm the New York Director for Friends of Animals, an international 501C3 nonprofit animal advocacy organization founded in 1957 in New York, and we have led the effort to curve the pet overpopulation by running the nation's first and longest running low cost spay/neuter program, and it's one of our long--you know, it's a continual program and we have as of today facilitated over 2.6 million spay/neuter surgeries for people who cannot afford, you know, to do them through traditional vets that will charge whatever they want. So, I'm very happy that, you know, these bills have been introduced and that these topics are now being addressed by the City Council because they have been severely neglected as we all know, and we applaud you for that, but unfortunately as the prior speaker has brought up, we feel that the bar is being set too low in New York. You had a speaker from the Companion Animal Protection Society, CAPS, and we consult with them and their westcoast director who really is the
expert on this issue. They have model
legislation that has been enacted in about 35
other cities. Chicago was mentioned, Los
Angeles, Albuquerque, New Mexico and I think
we're really doing a disservice. I know this is
related to the fact that the state legislation
is flawed, but \(I\) think that we cannot let other
cities be more progressive than New York now
that we have the opportunity to take these
issues head on, and we are doing a big
disservice. So \(I\) would recommend actually that
maybe we hold off on this bill until we can
modify the state legislation so that we can
outright ban the sale, the retail sale of dogs
and cats, and \(I\) do think rabbits need to be
included. You know, \(I\) have a copy of the model
legislation and \(I\) made copies for everyone, but
I want to note also that where, you know--
essentially that model legislation prohibits
commercially bred dogs or cats or rabbits
except for those that come from this municipal
shelters or rescue organizations, and I think
that that's what we need in New York City, and
I want to note that this law has not been
it has become law. Across the country,
thousands of independent pet stores as well
large chains operate profitably with a business
model focused on the sale of pet services and
supplies and not on the sale of cats and dogs.
Many of these local stores collaborate with
local animal sheltering and rescue or to offer
space and support, and \(I\) think when we look at
the numbers of dogs and cats that are being
euthanized every year and across the country
it's in the millions, it's unconscionable to
have breeders--to give breeders the opportunity
to fill pet stores with cat or dogs, with cats
and dogs, and \(I\) think that we have to end the
supply of dogs and cats from breeding
facilities regardless of the number of animals
they are selling and whether or not they are
classified as dog or cat mills, and there is no
city oversight committee qualified to enforce
the providence of the animals that come from
these commercial breeding facilities. Smaller
scale breeders are often indistinguishable from
puppy or kitten mills in regards to the
inhumane conditions the animals endure and the lifelong health issues they suffer from, and we want to encourage leadership in New York to have the political will to be as progressive as Los Angeles and Chicago on this issue.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you.

Thank you very much for your testimony. I want to just say generally \(I\) think that this City Council, \(I^{\prime}\) ve only been here what has seemed like a very long four months, is a progressive council with a progressive Speaker, and I'm a member of the Progressive Caucus, and but we are, if you look at whether it's charter schools or getting traffic cameras around schools, on many, many issues our destiny is controlled by Albany. It's just how the legal framework of the city was set up in relation. ADITA BERNKRANT: Then how did the other 35 cities--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Let me finish. ADITA BERNKRANT: manage to do--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing] Let me finish.

ADITA BERNKRANT: to ban the retail sale, and what can we do? What can my organization do to help change that so that we can be as progressive--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing]

If you let me finish \(I\) would tell you.

ADITA BERNKRANT: as Chicago? Yes, okay.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: I didn't interrupt you when you were speaking. So what we're going to do is--this isn't a perfect bill. So what we heard today were many suggestions on how this bill could be made better, and \(I\) have to say \(I\) disagree with you on saying that we shouldn't take this up now. I actually think taking this up now will save lives of pets, not every life, but it will save lives, and \(I\) think that is important. And also we will be sending a message hopefully that we can do things to improve animal and humane welfare in New York City, the largest city in the country. I think that's an important symbol as well. So what needs to be done? You know, I think Linda Rosenthal did the best she could,
and to provide context, we could be here all
night talking about it, but \(I^{\prime} l l\) end with this.
Albany is considered a pretty dysfunctional
place.

ADITA BERNKRANT: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And until we elect a progressive state senate, I think we're going to see a lot of things held up.

ADITA BERNKRANT: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: So we can't, the City Council can't control the what happens in Albany, but we can continue to do at the local level what we are legally allowed and mandated to do, and \(I\) believe that this bill go as far as it can to accomplish that. I wouldn't give up on your advocacy. I wouldn't give up on your efforts, and \(I\) would focus some more fire power on what happens in Albany. But I look forward to working with you all. I appreciate your passion and your compassion on this issue. We are going to do as best as we can to try to get this fixed up and voted on. It's going to take a little while to go through the process, but I look forward to working with you and
hearing from you and listening to your constructive concerns so that we can make this a better bill. So thank you all for being here today, and this committee meeting is adjourned. [gavel]
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