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CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Good morning, everyone. Thank you for joining us this morning for the second hearing on pet store regulation. My name is Corey Johnson, and I'm Chair of the Council's Committee on Health. Today, the Committee will consider four bills that will regulate the sale of animals in pet shops. All with the common purpose of improving the welfare, health, and safety of both people and companion 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 the bills we will hear today, and to whom I extend my thanks for her leadership on proposed Intros No. 55-A and 136-A, and on this issue over the years. In a moment, she will discuss those bills, but first, let me begin by setting the context for this hearing.

Prior to this year, New York State was the only state in the country that prohibited municipalities from regulating the sale of cats and dogs. That changed in January when Governor Cuomo signed into law legislation sponsored by Assembly Member Linda Rosenthal that authorized the City Council to act. The committee first held a hearing on earlier versions of these bills on April 30, 2014.

At that hearing, we heard loud and clear that the more a pet store owner knows about the source of cats and dogs their store sells, the more likely animals will come from breeders who provide a safe, caring, and healthy environment. Brokers are intermediaries who obtain dogs and cats from breeders, and provide them to pet stores. Several witnesses at our last hearing testified that brokers can be bad actors who obscure the true source of an animal and provider cover for puppy and kitten mills.

As we all are aware by now, puppy and kitten mills are notorious for raising animals in dangerous, overcrowded, dirty and anti-social conditions. The suffering such puppy mills inflict on animals translates to suffering for consumers when the manifest serious behavioral problems and costly medical conditions once at home with a purchaser. Due to the compelling testimony at our first hearing, Intro No. 55 was amended to prohibit pet stores from selling cats or dogs obtained from brokers. Proposed Introduction No. 55-A would require that a pet shops that obtain any dog or cat for sale directly from a breeders licensed by the USDA. The sale of rabbits obtained from any source will also be prohibited.

The bill would prohibit pet stores from obtaining cats or dogs through a breeder found by the USDA to be non-compliant with the Animal Welfare by putting their animals in immediate danger receiving multiple citations by not permitting USDA inspectors to assess the property or records. This bill would also prohibit the sale of dogs or cats obtained from a breeder that according to publicly available USDA records has been subject to any member of enforcement actions at any time during the past five years. Pet shops would also be required to obtain a sworn affidavit from a breeder attesting that such breeder has not been convicted in the past five years of violating the standard of care in New York State law, and has never been convicted of an animal abuse crime.

Pet shops must also be able to supply the two most recent USDA inspection reports for the breeder of a cat or dog, and a written statement certifying information about the breeder, its USDA inspection history, and the animals and the animal's health, any medical treatment the animal has received. Anyone who wants to bring their cat or dog into their home should know their pet was treated in
a humane manner, and pet store owners should be able to stand behind their breeders. Proposed Intro No. 55-A is a major and important step towards making that a reality. Additionally, while shelters spay and neuter the animals they receive, pet shops release unaltered animals to the public, and these animals breed litters that too often end up in the shelter and rescue system.

Proposed Introduction 136-A would require pet stores to spay or neuter any cat or dog before releasing it to a purchaser. And would further require pet shops to obtain the purchaser of that dog with completed license application and any license fees required by law. This bill would help reduce the pet overpopulation problem that is both bad for animals and a drain on the City's resources.

Finally, I am the prime sponsor of two other bills we are hearing today: Proposed Introduction 73-A, which would amend the definition of a pet shop within the Animal Abuse Registration Act to require that all pet shops, including those that sell only cats and/or 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 bill would close that loophole, and expand the registry to cover all pet shop sales in the city.

Proposed Introduction 146-A would prohibit a pet shop from releasing a dog or cat to a purchaser unless the animal is implanted with a microchip for identification, and the microchip is registered with the identification information of the purchaser. This bill will be a boon to the efforts of rescued animals that have been abandoned or lost. Taken together, these bills will enable the city to strengthen its shelter system, and pilot customers [sic], 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.

I want to thank Assembly Member Linda
Rosenthal who shepherded the passage of a State law permitting local municipalities to regulate pet stores. Therefore, making it possible for the Council to consider legislation before us today. I also want to thank all of the advocates who have
worked so hard to get us to this point, many of whom are in the room today.

Finally, I want to acknowledge my colleagues on the Health Committee, Council Member Rafael Espinal and Peter Koo are here this morning, and I want to thank my Legislative Director LouisCholden Brown, Council Member Crowley's Legislative Director, Jeff Mailman, the Health Committee Counsel Dan Hafidz, our Policy Analyst Crystal Pond, our Finance Analyst Crilhien Francisco. And I would especially like to thank Jeff Campagna, who is the Legislative Counsel to handling this package of legislation, and had done a tremendous job getting us to this point today.

Now, I would like to recognize my colleague, and the co-sponsor of today's bill, Council Member Elizabeth Crowley.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Good morning. I want to thank Chair Corey Johnson for convening today's hearing on this comprehensive package of legislation that we have co-sponsored to regulate commercial pet stores. And all the advocates who are here today who have played such an instrumental role in shaping it. For many years now I have been
working with the Council and representatives in
Albany to stop the sale of puppy mill dogs in New York City. And to end pet overpopulation by instituting mandatory spaying and neutering for cats and dogs. Although the State has not authorized used to ban the sale of cats and dogs in pet shops and pet stores, as has been done in 89 other jurisdictions, it has authorized us to take significant measures to improve the welfare of animals and consumers alike. Since our last hearing on these bills, we have thoroughly analyzed all of the testimony that we received and have engaged in extensive discussions with advocates and industry experts in order to produce the amended bills that we will discuss here today. Council Member Johnson and I are confident that given the legal constraints imposed by the state law, and the City's enforcement authority, that we have crafted the strongest most enforceable bill possible to prevent pet shops from selling animals that have been bred under inhumane conditions. Proposed Introduction No. 55-A, the Puppy

Mill Bill, would require all pet shops to obtain a new permit issued by the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene subject to a certification that the
pet shop has not sold any animals obtained from a prohibited source during the previous permitted period. The bill would prohibit pet shops from obtaining dogs and cats from breeders who are not compliant with the Federal Animal Welfare Act. Who are not compliant with the State's Animal Care Standards as set forth in agriculture and market laws. And from breeders who have been convicted of animal abuse crimes.

The bill prohibits the sale of cats and dogs obtained from brokers, who as middle men give pet stores the ability to plead ignorance about the breeders that produce the animals they sell. And make false claims that they are puppy mill free. The bill also requires pet shops to maintain detailed records providing the source and condition of every cat and dog purchased or offered for sale to disclose such information to customers, which will provide the transparency that is currently lacking in the industry. The bill also requires pet shops to adopt standards of care for the cats and dogs in their custody that are more stringent than those required by state law. Additionally, in response to substantial testimony about the over-abundance of
rabbits in shelters and cases of abandonment, this bill prohibits pet shops from selling such animals.

Proposed Introductory 136-A would amend the Animal Shelters and Sterilization Act to provide-- sorry -- to prohibit the sale of any dog or cat in any pet store unless the animal has been spayed and neutered. This bill would dramatically decrease the number of unwanted puppies and kittens that end up in abandoned-- That end up abandoned in shelters. The bill will also prohibit a pet shop from releasing any dog to a customer who resides in New York City unless such customer first completes a dog license application. Remits the application fee to the pet store, which will greatly increase the licensure rate, making every dog traceable not only to its owner, but to the store that sold it. And raise revenues to control pet over-population.

All of the bills in this package impose stiff fines on violators at a rate of $\$ 500$ per animal affected for each day the violation continues. Together with the mandatory microchipping and implementation of the Animal Abuse Registry, these bills are a major step forward towards protecting animals and consumers. I look forward to hearing
more testimony from the Administration, and from advocates. And I hope that we can soon move these bills forward to a vote.

In addition to Chair Johnson, I'd like to thank all the members of the Health Committee and of the Council who have signed on as co-sponsors of these bills, and those who have not, for being here today, and at the previous hearing for hearing them. I would like to thank my Legislative Director, Jeff Mailman, Chair Johnson's Legislative Director, Louis Cholden-Brown, the Health Committee Counsel Dan Hafidz, Policy Analyst Crystal Pond, Finance Analyst Crilhien Francisco, and lastly Jeff Campagna, the Legislative Counsel responsible for this important legislative package. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you, Council
Member Crowley. For our first panel, I would like to call representatives of the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene who are up there, and also Animal Control and Care. Animal Control and Care. I apologize. Typically, we have representatives of the Administration. In this case, DOHMH is on a panel without any non-governmental advocates organizations. But recognizing the important role that $A C \& C$ plays in
helping DOHMH fulfill its animal welfare responsibilities, we have asked both to sit on a panel together in case questions come up for DOHMH that $A C \& C$ may be in a better position to answer. But it's important to know that AC\&C is not part of DOHMH. It's a non-profit contract organization that contracts with DOHMH.

So joining us today is Daniel Kass, the Deputy Commissioner for Environmental Health at DOHMH; Risa Weinstock who is the Executive Director of $A C \& C ;$ and I believe Mario Molino, the Assistant Commissioner for Veterinary Health is also up as well. So I'm going to turn it over to Deputy Commissioner Kass, and he may start today. Oh, and my apologies. I have to swear you all in.

So if you could please raise your right
hand. Do you affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in your testimony before this committee, and respond honestly to all Council Member questions?

COMMISSIONER KASS: We do. RISA WEINSTOCK: I do.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you. Mr.
Kass, you may start.

COMMISSIONER KASS: Thanks very much. Good morning, Chairman Johnson, and the members of the Health Committee that are here. Thank you so much. As you've heard, my name is Dan Kass. I'm the Deputy Commissioner for the Division of Environmental Health, at the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. And I'm joined here by Risa Weinstock, Executive Director from Animal Care \& Control, and by my Assistant Commissioner, Marilyn Molina. On behalf of our Commissioner Mary Bassett thank you for the opportunity to testify today. Since I last testified on these bills in April, the Administration has been working closely with the Council and the Council staff to revise the legislation. And we want to thank them for a very productive process.

To put the legislation into context, I want to just review the Health Department's role with respect to animals. We oversee the sheltering system in the city administered by our contractor Animal Care \& Control of New York City, which provides field rescue services, and accepts, cares for, and temporarily shelters abandoned and unwanted animals. The Department issues dog licenses, and also
administers the Animal Population Fund Spay and Neuter Programs, which funds spay and neuter services for dogs and cats owned by low-income New Yorkers. We receive and respond to reports of animals bites. We coordinate rabies testing and rabies prophylaxis when needed, and we investigate animal nuisance complaints.

The Department monitors both wildlife and domestic animals for diseases such as rabies that can impact human health, and issues permits for the exhibition of wild and exotic animals. Our regulatory work also includes currently permitting and inspecting animal healing establishments for compliance with sanitary standards, and basic care giving. These establishments include other nonprofit shelters besides AC\&C, boarding, grooming and training facilities, and pet shops that sell animals other than cats and dog.

Four bills are under consideration today. Collectively, these bill aim to reduce the population of stray abandoned and homeless animals, and to establish a standard of care for dogs and cats in pet shops. We appreciate your effort to promote safe and humane conditions for dogs and cats. The

Administration supports these bills, and we're here today to offer brief comments, and answer any questions and extend our offer to continue working with the Council on these important issues.

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 the intro establishes a standard of care for dogs and cats in pet stores. The Administration supports Intro 55's effort to influence the acquisition of care and sale of dogs and cats notably by discouraging their over-breeding. The requirements imposed on pet shops are significant, expanding the department's responsibilities to include periodic inspecting establishments that sell dogs and cats including extensive audits of store records and evaluation compliance with detailed standards of care. It will require funding to hire additional staff with veterinary health expertise, and more inspectors. We would develop new protocols for on-site inspections, and for the review of pet shop documents. The Department would need to modify its online permitting system to accommodate this new permit class, and to
adapt its inspectional software. We would work closely to engage and educate pet shops about these new requirements, and on how to comply with them.

We do not know yet how many dogs and cats are purchased in New York City through pet shops. We also do not know how many fewer dogs and cats would be sold if it became more difficult or expensive to acquire them through pet shops. We hope that overall the expanded regulation of pet shops would encourage New Yorkers to adopt from the open admission animal shelters run by Animal Care and Control.

Intro 136 would require pet shops to sell dog licenses, and to report information to the Department about all dogs sold. The Department supports efforts to expand dog licensure. Dog licensing is a key part of responsible pet ownership. Licensing is required by New York State Law, and is required in order to use one of the City's dog parks. As part of its comprehensive efforts to facilitate dog licensing, the Department has just launched a new online licensing system that enables third parties, including pet shops to maintain license inventories, and to issue the licenses at the time and place of sale. This system also offers a free lost dog finder
tool to help lost dogs reunite with their owners.
Anyone can enter a New York City license number on our web page, and the owner will be emailed and called with the contact information of the person who has found the dog. I'm proud to report that the system was recently awarded the Best New Application Award by the Center for Digital Government. The Department fully endorses the law's licensing mandate, and we believe pet shops can readily comply with this requirement. License fees help support the City's animal care efforts, and provide funding for free spay and neuter services for the low and fixedincome New Yorkers, dogs and cats.

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 requirement that the Health Department has at our animal shelters. Animal Care and Control microchips dogs and cats before they are adopted or retuned to their owners. The Department supports this legislation, and believes it will help owners find their lost pets and reduce the population of lost animals in the shelter system.

Finally, Intro 73 would amend the definition of pet shops in the Animal Abuse Registry Act, making the definition consistent with the other bills under consideration today. The Department supports this amendment. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today. I will be here to answer questions.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr.
Kass.
[Pause]
RISA WEINSTOCK: Good morning, Chairman Johnson and members of the Health Committee. My name is Risa Weinstock. I'm the Executive Director and General Counsel of Animal Care \& Control of New York City. Thank you for the opportunity to testify again on these bills, and I thank the Council for including the recommendations that we put forth in the previous hearing on these bills. AC\&C supports the proposed local laws to amend the Administrative Code of New York City with regard to pet shops. The overpopulation of stray, homeless, and abandoned animals in New York City is daunting. Over 30,000 animals come into our shelter system yearly. Nearly two-thirds of these are strays, meaning they have no
identifying information or tags, which could help AC\&C make more timely decisions about the animals' outcomes. AC\&C strongly supports the proposed laws mandating spay and neuter, licensing, and microchipping dogs and cats from pet shops. These measures can help reduce pet overpopulation in New York City as well as the number of animals that enter AC\&C. And can positively impact our ability to seek placement for them outside the shelters sooner.

A brief background because I've said it many, many times before. AC\&C was established in 1995 as a 501(c)(3) not-for-profit organization dedicated to rescuing, caring for, and finding loving homes for homeless and abandoned animals throughout the five boroughs. We are unique in the animal welfare community of New York City because we are the only organization that annually takes in and cares for more than 30,000 animals through a policy of open admission. Meaning that each of AC\&C's facilities accepts any animal that comes through its doors regardless of whether they are stray, abandoned, or surrendered by their owner. And regardless of the behavior they are exhibiting, the condition they are in, or their medical status. We receive animals of
all kinds at each location, but the intake is driven primarily by cats, dogs, and then rabbits.

Let me address Intro 136 and the
Spay/Neuter Provision. On average, AC\&C takes in 600 animals weekly. That's more than 85 everyday. Many of these animals are unclaimed and there is never a shortage of dogs, cats, and rabbits available for adoption at AC\&C. Every animal adopted for AC\&C is required by law to be spayed or neutered barring any special circumstance. By requiring the same for animals sold in pet shops, $A C \& C$ is hopeful that the shelter intake number now over 25,000 cats and dogs since January through October 31 , will start to decline. Without mandatory spay/neuter, pet shops will only continue to exacerbate the current overpopulation of animals in New York City and diminish the spay/neutering initiatives at AC\&C and throughout the City.

With respect to dog licensing, AC\&C supports the dog licensing requirement for pet shops. A license is one of the most effective sources of information that we rely on to help us move a dog out of the shelter more quickly, and back with his family. The licensing requirement will ensure a
quick and efficient way to identify a pet that is lost, and will also expedite the return to owner process. The city revenue derived from licensing of pet shops is another benefit that will provide AC\&C additional resources to care for the city's stray and abandoned animals.

$$
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microchipping, similar to our support of mandatory pet shop dog licensing, AC\&C strongly supports this amendment to require pet shops to microchip a dog or cat. Just like a license, a microchip is very effective as a means for our staff to identify a lost pet. From January 1, 2014 through October 31, 2014, AC\&C took in nearly 5,000 stray dogs, and nearly 12,000 stray cats with no identifying information. By law, a stray dog or cat with no identifying information must be held a minimum of three days at the shelter. If each of these animals had a currently registered microchip, AC\&C could make placement decisions much more quickly. Consequently, the licensing and microchip provisions could help reduce the shelter population and ensure that there are fewer stray animals in our care.

Finally, with respect to Intro 55 to regulate the sale of rabbits in pet shops, AC\&C supports the proposed ban on the sale of rabbits in pet shops. About half of the rabbits surrendered to AC\&C originate from pet shops. While this number is small relative to dogs and cats, approximately 100 rabbits that were surrendered were originally purchased in a pet shop. Prohibiting their sale could significantly reduce their presence in the shelter. I just note that the total rabbit intake owner surrenders plus stray rabbits was 382 in 2013, and we're seeing similar intake results for 2014.

Currently, we are at maximum capacity for rabbits. Yet, there is not a growing demand for rabbit adoptions. More often, AC\&C relies on the rescue community through our New Hope Program to find permanent placement for rabbits in our care. Accommodating the overflow of rabbits strains our resources, impacts other housing areas of the shelter, and adds to the challenge of managing the overall animal population.

In conclusion, $A C \& C$ welcomes the efforts of the City Council to help reduce the overwhelming number of abandoned and stray dogs, cats, and rabbit
through these amendments. The magnitude of this issue not only impacts $A C \& C$. It impacts the health and welfare of the entire city. The proposed amendments promote responsible pet ownership, and community involving 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 City Council to require pet shops to do the same, and make a positive change in pet overpopulation in New York. Thank you for the opportunity to testify, and I'm happy to take any questions.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you, Risa, for being here today, and for all of your work that you all do on a daily basis. My first question is to Deputy Commissioner Kass. How many additional staff do you believe DOHMH will have to hire to be able to inspect pet shops, and verify the information in permanent applications that will be regulated by Intro 55-A?

COMMISSIONER KASS: We are not entirely positive yet. We have been in discussions with the Office of Management and Budget about this. Once the final legislation takes shape, we'll formally routine inspection for a pet shop under the suite of proposals here would take a full day. And we expect to respond significant numbers of complaints. So we think it's going to be a fairly large number of staff. Probably on the order of seven people dedicated to this. That's in addition to those that we currently have that oversee the regulatory affairs for pet shops that do not sell dogs and cats.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And if a consumer believes that a pet shop is selling-- If this is enacted, and the consumer believes a pet shop is selling an animal or animals from a prohibited source or has an issue with the veracity of completeness of the information a pet shop provides about the animal offered for sale, how can the consumer report the expected violation? Will 311 take these complaints? Will pet shops be required to display notice about how a customer can register a complaint with the City, and what are your plans on following up on it and investigating such complaints that are made? COMMISSIONER KASS: So the proposed legislation provides us with rule making authority,
and we'll have to evaluate what will have to be made in rules versus just as a matter of policy. We will certainly set up an 311 complaint process. There is one now for pet shops for other conditions. We would try to have-- We will try to set up scripts in the 311 system that help us understand what precisely the complaint would be. So that we knew whether it was something that we could respond to with a letter, or would it require a full on inspection or a document request? But our intent would be, you know, to fully respond to consumer complaints about any number of things whether it's the condition of animals under the care of a pet shop. Whether it's failure to license or permit? Whether it's a suspicion of acquisition from an unapproved source, or it's a consumer complaint sort of post-purchase about the condition of animals.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you. I want to recognize that we've been joined today by Council member Van Bramer, Council Member Mendez was here, and we are also joined-- They are both members of the committee, and we are also joined by Council Member Gentile, who has been a real leader on these issues. And was the original co-author of the Animal

Abuse Registry Act, and I appreciate that he is here today as well.

I have a question for you, Risa. Some opponents of mandatory spay and neuter say that it will result in potentially the extinction of some domestic pets. Could you comment on that if you find that to be credible?

RISA WEINSTOCK: The fact that we have 30,000 animals coming in every year makes me doubt the validity of that statement.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: How important is mandatory spay and neuter for controlling the pet population, overpopulation?

RISA WEINSTOCK: It's essential. For example, one cat can have a litter of $9,10,11,12$ kittens. If that cat was altered, we would see a reduction. It takes a lot of effort for spay and neuter to have a significant impact. And so, the more members of the community that are required to help with that effort, the more improvement we're going to see.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And for
Introduction 136-A, which would require dog license applications for dogs purchased in pet stores to
include information about where the dog was purchased. If a licensed dog came into $A C \& C$, and you could tell that it has not been sterilized, had not been spayed or neutered, would you report that to DOHMH?

RISA WEINSTOCK: I think I'm going to
refer that to Dan. You mean currently?
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: No, I'm talking
about under the proposed bill if it's enacted.
RISA WEINSTOCK: Well, we would-- I
suppose. Yes, that's a good idea to do that. We absolutely want to make sure that pet shops are being regulated, and being compliant. And, by the way, that $a \operatorname{dog}$ or cat would be altered.

COMMISSIONER KASS: I would just say that
we welcome the reports. There will be a calendaring questions about when a dog was first purchased because this law is not obviously retroactive for spay and neuter for dogs that are sold before its effective date. So we would certainly investigate, but we would have to establish that the dog was actually sold by a pet shop subsequent to the effective date of the bill.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Dan, a lot of advocates are concerned about the specifics of implementation of these proposed bills. For their information and for ours as a Council, how can advocates out of experts, folks here at the Council that are concerned about the implementation make sure that they are included in the rule making process that DOHMH will undertake?

COMMISSIONER KASS: Well, I would say two things. First of all, if we are engaging in rule making that would be an absolutely open process. We will talk to people as we always do before rules get written. And then when they get published, there will be hearings and opportunity to submit written and oral testimony about it, and then it will be reconsidered. But I would also say that where we aren't doing rule making, these bills are fairly prescriptive, and they don't-- Many things don't require rule making. They simply require the development of an inspectional program and a system by which we inform pet shops about their obligations. We will certainly meet with the pet shops, with advocates, with other interested parties to make sure
that we're proposing procedures that are both implementable and observable.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you. I want to mention that we've been joined by Council Member Cornegy and Council Member Barron, who are both members of this committee. I mention Council Member Mendez before, but she stepped out. And I want to see if any of my colleagues have any questions. Yes, Council Member Crowley.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Thank you, Chair Johnson. Pursuant to the regulations in this Bill 136-A, the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene could have the ability to close down a pet shop if they continue to violate the different areas of the bill. You know, they could be misleading in many ways continuing to violate. At what point would the Department of Health say enough is enough? So you are a bad actor. You are not playing by the rules, and you can no longer sell pets in the city?

COMMISSIONER KASS: Sorry. I envision
two kinds of scenarios for that kind of thing relative to what we do in other regulated businesses. The first is that where there are imminent hazards, and where there are such egregious conditions that
requires immediate action, we can pursue a closure order. But that like every other procedure has a due process component to it. For the most part, we don't envision that kind of thing being the case. The permit itself is really the mechanism by which we can hold businesses accountable for ongoing inconsistent compliance with the expectations and the letter of the law or our rules and regulations. That can be done in a variety of ways. Obviously, we issue violations.

Those get adjudicated, and where sustained they become part of a record that will be attached to a pet shop. There are fines that will be paid for those. Failure to pay fines would lead to the inability to renew a permit. Operating without a permit obviously is unacceptable, and not to be remedied rapidly. We would have the opportunity to shutter a facility. It's not something we would take lightly. But for a place that has many animals inside of it, we care deeply about the welfare of the animals within it. So the circumstances where permit violations may exist, but we don't want to sort of really cast animals out into the world. So we would basically evaluate the severity of conditions, and
take action accordingly. The bill authorizes us to seize animals where necessary, and that would be a duty and exercise under those kinds of conditions.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: You could foresee a condition where you would possibly have to close down a shop right away?

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Well, I think they can foresee-- First, let me say that based on what we understand to be the enforcement activity of New York State, we don't-- We're not aware of a large number of violations that relate specifically to animal welfare within the pet shop. I the harder components to comply with are the ones that there may be some resistance to. That would have to do with the acquisition of animals. And so, I don't think the acquisition would result in an immediate closure. That would be something that we would adjudicate, and try to establish a pattern of violations for.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: The process of licensing the pets. Sorry, the dogs, would generate a significant amount of funds for the city?

COMMISSIONER KASS: You mean from pet shops?

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: From the cost of the license.

COMMISSIONER KASS: I don't know that that's the case. Again, as I mentioned, we don't actually know the number of dogs that are sold through pet shops. I know that there are national estimates that about a quarter of dogs are acquired through pet shops. But we don't really know, and we won't know for a while in New York City what that really looks like. We also don't know the number of dogs acquired from pet shops that do end up getting licensed. So I can't comment yet on what the incremental number would be of licenses that would be issued as a result of these. You know, we were hoping to pursue it with the Council once the Governor hopefully signs the law that entitles New York City to modify the fees. And set its own fees for dog licensure. Until that happens, we don't expect any significant revenue to come from the licensure, from the current license fee.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: My last question is for Risa. Each year how many animals, how many pets and cats, dogs and cats dogs does $A C \& C$ have to put down?
intake of over 30,000. We also on our requests for euthanasia in most circumstances $99 \%$ of the time those are completely legitimate. So if you don't count an owner request for euthanasia, the number was a little over 5,000. This year our intake will be higher, and we expect that the euthanasia rate will probably be close to that, or maybe somewhere in the rage of 5,000 to 6,000. And that's the unfortunate reality having so many animals. So while 25,000 had a positive outcome, we look at our live release rate as well. And for cats it was-- Recently, it was about $78 \%$ of live release, and for dogs it was about 84\%. So we're averaging about $82 \%$, and we are very hopeful that with that number of animals, it is, it's very upsetting. And it's not something that AC\&C endorses. But we feel hopeful that out of 30,000 animals if there are 5,000 or 6,000 animals left in the population that have to be euthanized because of health or behavior, we could make an impact. And legislation like this starts. It starts to address the challenge. The challenge is how many animals are coming in? And the other challenge is how do we get them out. But if we start to focus on reducing the
number of animals coming in through spay/neuter, for example, or eliminating rabbits in pet shops, I think we can-- We will start to see a change, which gives us additional resources to provide additional care to the animals that we have. And see a better live release rate in the future.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Do you have an estimate of how many of the animals that you have to put down have been mistreated in some way. Maybe have originated from a puppy mill? Why is it that they fall victims of sickness, and if you have any type of statistic on that, proof of it?

RISA WEINSTOCK: The statistics we have are the number of animals that were purchased in pet shops. And generally those animals are coming to us when they are a little older. And we don't spend a lot of time addressing who came from a puppy mill. But, we do spend a lot of time addressing the needs of that animal.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: The basic question is if an animal appears to have a behavioral problem, can you attribute that to abuse?

RISA WEINSTOCK: A behavior is attributed
to many things. We have a behavior assessment team.

If it's abuse, that's a cruelty issue, and we contact NYPD. They work with the ASPCA. That gets into cruelty, but what we're doing is when we see an animal-- And if we suspect that, we will do the right thin by that animal, but for the most part when we're looking at behavior, if we see some challenges, we're trying to address those challenges. And how can we turn that around so the animal can present better, and hopefully get adopted.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Great. No further questions.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you, Council
Member Crowley. Just one point I want to make after some of the questions that were just asked. 30,000 animals is a tremendous number that is coming into AC\&C every year. And 5,000 animals that are lost, put down, euthanized is devastating. It's an incredibly upsetting tragic number of animals that we're losing. But also being the eternal optimist, I feel slightly hopeful that in a city of over eight million people getting 5,000 New Yorkers who would love companionship. And to save the lives of a very lovable cat or dog or other type of animals that that's something that's doable. We just need to
educate folks, and also enact these measures so that that number isn't as high in the number of animals coming in. So I think we have to continue to promote adoption, and actually getting 5,000 good-hearted animal lovers to come in and adopt and save these lives is something that is imminently doable if we all work together. I want to turn it over to Council Member Rafael Espinal.

COUNCIL MEMBER ESPINAL: Thank you,
Chairman Johnson. I just want to state that I am also a proud co-sponsor of all four bills. And in my time with the Assembly, I was also co-sponsor of the bill that was signed for the Governor. So I am very happy to be here, and thank you Council Members Crowley, and Johnson for bringing these bills to the table. I have a question in regards to microchipping. Who is qualified to microchip an animal?

RISA WEINSTOCK: We have trained staff in
our Medical Department who will microchip an animal. COUNCIL MEMBER ESPINAL: Okay. So when a pet shop-- So now that we're regulating pet shops to have microchip, too, to microchip the animal, do they microchip the animal before or after the purchase?

Before a consumer buys the dog, or after the consumer buys the dog?

RISA WEINSTOCK: Well, our practice is when an animal comes in, on intake we vaccinate them, and we take care of medical needs. But when an animal is adopted that the point where a microchip is inserted, and registered to that person who is adopting the animal. And a dog license is also created for the animal to be associated with that person who adopts.

COUNCIL MEMBER ESPINAL: Who keeps the registry of the microchipped animals?

RISA WEINSTOCK: AC\&C keep records of the animals that are microchipped, and it's also through the company that we partner with who provide the microchips. So if an animal is microchipped, there will be a code number and you look it up, and it says registered to Home Again. And you call Home Again, and they go through their files to see. Because sometimes what responsible pet owners should do is if they move or if let's say they gave their pet away, they should-- That microchip needs to be updated. So what we do is we try to go through the chain to
find who has information about who belongs to this pet.

COUNCIL MEMBER ESPINAL: That was going to be my other question. So how difficult would it be if let's say someone decides to give me their dog or cat, and I want to update that registry. How difficult would it be for me to do that?

RISA WEINSTOCK: It's very simple.
COUNCIL MEMBER ESPINAL: Okay. So what--
RISA WEINSTOCK: [interposing] It's a very simple process.

COUNCIL MEMBER ESPINAL: So where would I
go? What's the process?
RISA WEINSTOCK: You can do it by phone? you can do it online. It's very easy.

COUNCIL MEMBER ESPINAL: Okay, good. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very much, Council Member Espinal. Are there any other--? Yes, Council Member Gentile.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: So just to be clear, the pet shops have to go to you to microchip them before they sell a pet under this bill or is it--?

RISA WEINSTOCK: No. This bill requires
that pet shops--
COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: [interposing]
Right.
RISA WEINSTOCK: --provide the
microchipping.
COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: [interposing]
Right, but they can do it-- They can do it on their own in the shop?

RISA WEINSTOCK: Yes.
COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: And so, that-They're using the same system that you're using, I would imagine, that would be required?

COMMISSIONER KASS: There is more than one system? A pet shop can enter into an agreement with any provider that they want, but there are common aspects to it. So, the purchaser would receive from the pet shop a certificate that basically indicating which organization, with which company the chip is registered. How to update address or ownership information going forward. But yes, the pet shop would be the one who would actually be inserting the microchip.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: Right, and would similar information that goes on the microchip go on the license that's now required before they sell a pet?

COMMISSIONER KASS: There are common elements. Certainly, the owner's name, the dog's name, breed. Basic information would be common to it, but it would be entered separately.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: Right, so you have actually two data sources to try and track an animal, your licensing system and the microchip?

RISA WEINSTOCK: Right.
COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: Okay. Thank you.
[Pause]
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: I think Council

Member Gentile may have another question. [laughter] It's being formulated.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: I thought this might have been off the table, but $I$ guess it's on the table right now. The law that we passed last year on the Animal Abuse Registry, which had an effective date, but has not been put into force yet. Has the Administration decided what agency will be
designated to enforce the Animal Abuse Registry Law, which is already law.

COMMISSIONER KASS: That's a great
question. The answer is no. To date, the Administration has not designated an agency. We're geared for that designation, but it's still under discussion. That's my understanding.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: But if it's still under discussion in this past last year, and I think it was effective some time over the summer, and now we have four new bills that are likely to pass. And likely to be signed into law. You have this expanding responsibility here, and its taking you a year to come up with some kind of regulatory system for the Animal Abuse Registry. So, don't you think there is a lot on your plate? That we're adding a lot more, and you're not responding in a timely manner?

COMMISSIONER KASS: Well, you know, I want to answer for the Health Department, and not the Mayor's Office on this question. The difference between these two is that the Animal Abuse Registry directed the Mayor's Office to designate an agency. That hasn't happened yet. This legislation, these
pieces of legislation direct us to engage in a practice that we are quite comfortable and knowledgeable about how to do it. We regulate lots of businesses. We develop inspectional programs. We do rule making. We inspect. So I don't foresee a delay other than the usual startup, which is a conversation we've been having with the staff of the committee in implementing these bills once they are passed, or if they are passed.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: So would you agree that if these four bills direct your agency to execute the law, and make into the rule making that it would make sense for your agency also to be the designated agency to handle the Animal Abuse Registry.

COMMISSIONER KASS: I don't think they are equivalent, and I want to just be straightforward with you about why I think they are different. Again, these bills would put the Health Department in a position of permitting, of inspecting, of developing inspectional program outreach to industry. It would direct us to develop data systems for the receipt of information from pet shops. It would put us in a role of-- A role that we are used to,
comfortable, and skilled at playing. That's distinct from the Animal Abuse Registry, which really calls for a different set of skills. It requires criminal investigation skills. It requires the development of a criminal registry. It requires a $24 / 7$ ability to respond to checks against identify. That is not a typical function that we at the Health Department play, and I think those are some of the considerations the Administration is factoring in.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: Well, I would agree with you. Other than the fact that the investigation of it. You're taking adjudications that come from the court, and just implementing them and putting them in to the registry.

COMMISSIONER KASS: No, that's actually not the case. We don't receive information about criminal convictions from the court. There is no means by which we are able to--

COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: [interposing]
Well, that's what the rule making was for.
COMMISSIONER KASS: The rule making
directed us to-- or directed the city rather to receive information from an individual about their prior convictions to interview them, and to enter
them into a registry. The source of the information is actually the convicted person and not the courts. COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: Okay. I'm not
sure about that. I will check that, but what is your time table at this point? Can you give us and all of us here some time table? This is a law that is now the effective date has passed, and we still have no enforcement of this law.

COMMISSIONER KASS: All I can do is
direct your question back to the Administration and ask it whether it intends to designate the agency.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: Have you been involved in these discussions about the Animal Abuse Registry Law?

COMMISSIONER KASS: We have been involved
to the extent that we character what the
responsibilities would be, the likely resources necessary, and the skill set that would have to be developed in an agency or at least adopted by an agency in order to be able to do it. That's the extent of our involvement.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: And when was the
last involvement you've had this year with that-with the Administration?

COMMISSIONER KASS: Probably the last
direct conversation I had with the Administration about this other than in anticipation of this question at the hearing was back at the beginning of the summer.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: The beginning of the summer?

COMMISSIONER KASS: Yes.
COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: Mr. Chairman, I
just think we need to really, you know, move on this to-- The effective date has passed, and we really need to establish this. Especially in light of the fact that we are about to pass or likely to pass these four bills.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: I agree with you,

Council Member Gentile. I think it's important to make this point, which is $I$ hope is indisputable. You know, the abuse of animals is a real issue, and now with the advent of You Tube, we see some incredibly deeply upsetting behavior that takes place. And there was an article that the New York Times published about a month ago about animal abuse in New York City, and now these crimes can portend to larger crimes that are committed in our society.

Council Member Gentile and former Council Member Vallone shepherded this through, and we are past the effective date. And we have the ability to legislate which agency it goes to. We didn't do that. We put in the rule making process but if, in fact, the Administration and the Health Department doesn't come up with a plan forward on how to implement this, I think it's well within our purview, our authority, and it's our responsibility to ensure that this gets done. So, that's a conversation that the author of the bill I think would have to lead, and figuring that out. It's his legislation, and it's something that I know he cares deeply about, and has checked in on all year long. And so, we're almost to the end of 2014. We will vote on a veto in January. So it's time to make this reality.

COMMISSIONER KASS: I understand, and I would only say this, which is I don't think there is any question that the Administration and that multiple departments care deeply about the abuse of animals. But since the New York Police Department has adopted the former role of the ASPCA in investigating and prosecuting animal abuse crimes, the number of accused and investigations has really increased significantly. So the concern is there.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very much
for your testimony today. Okay, up next is Michael Glass from the America's Pet Registry, Robert Likens from the Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council, PIJAC, and David Barton from City Pups. I want to just remind folks that we had a previous hearing on these bills. The hearing today, the purpose is to hear comments on the changes to the bills that were made. We're putting everyone on the clock for three minutes. People aren't going to be able to go past three minutes. Three minutes is it. You hit three minutes, you're done, and part of the reason is we only have this room until 1 o'clock. We're out at 1 o'clock. There is no staying over 1 o'clock. So I want everyone to have the opportunity to testify today.

If you get up there, and someone has stated something that you plan on saying, you may skip that portion of your testimony. We won't mind, and you can submit it for the record. We're happy to have it as part of the official record for today's hearing. But it is important for us to stay on the
clock, and also allow everyone the opportunity to testify. I also want to mention that I have to leave in a few minutes to go to another committee hearing, the committee where I'm passing my first bill today. And Council Member Crowley is going to take over to chair this hearing when I leave. So you may sit down, and you may go in whatever order you would like. If you could please identify yourself for the record, and the sergeant will start the clock at three minutes. Thank you very much.

## [Pause]

BOB LIKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and thank you members of the Committee. My Name is Bob Likins. I'm the Government Affairs Director for the Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council. Peter Industry Joint Advisory Council greatly appreciates the opportunity to address New York City Council's Committee on Health on proposed legislation regarding the requirements surrounding animal sales or adoptions. As the world's largest pet trade association representing the interests of all segments of the pet industry throughout the United States, PIJAC counts among its thousands of members, associations, organizations, corporations, and
individuals across the United States involved in the commercial pet trade. More specifically, PIJAC represents manufacturers, distributors, and retailers throughout the State of New York. No one is more interested in the assurance of healthy and safe pets that PIJAC. Our members don't just care about animals, we care for them. Our association has long been recognized as a voice for the responsible pet trade, and we routinely advocate for legislative and regulatory proposals establishing government mandates where appropriate the public interest and welfare of pets.

We would first like to request that the Committee clarify the language in Bill No. 73-Alpha. I'm sorry, 73-A with regard to exempting pet shops posing shelter or rescue animals from the large requirement that they deny possession of animals to a convicted animal abuser. Many of the animals taken in by shelters and rescues have already been the victims of terrible neglect and abuse. These animals above all others deserve the added protection, and deserve not to be victimized again by an unintentional loophole that places them back into the hands of those who would do them harm. We would
request that the City Council add language clarifying
that the responsibility for consultation of the
registry and denial of adoption to anyone found to be
on the registry would rest with the animal shelter or
animal rescue organization offering the animal for
adoption because the pet store is not involved in the
transaction.

PIJAC strong opposes the mandatory spaying and neutering directed by Bill 136-A. Consensus on animal ownership is difficult to come by especially considering the positions of such separate groups as the American Kennel Club, the American Veterinary Medical Association, the ASPCA, and the Humane Society of the United States. In this case, however, these groups have all publicly stated their opposition to the mandatory spaying and neuter laws as mandatory sterilization does not achieve the stated goal of decreasing the number of unwanted and abandoned dogs and cats. Simply put, animals from responsible pet owners represent a small percentage of the shelter and rescue intake. The elimination of the four-month waiver of spay and neutering that 136A eliminates means that it would for owners to comply with veterinary consensus that the earliest stage at
which it is appropriate to spay and neuter dogs is six to eight months depending on the breed and the individual animal. I would next like to speak to Bill 146-A. The proposed law under consideration would [bell]--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: You can submit the rest of your testimony for the record.

BOB LIKINS: Thank you, sir.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you.
[Pause]
MICHAEL GLASS: My name is Michael Glass.
I represent America's Pet Registry, Incorporated. And for the record, if you please, we are accepted as a recognized registry by New York agi [sic] markets as a national kennel registry service. I submitted a brief cover page followed by a list of points that we would like to be addressed. Rather than reading that list of bullet points as you will hearing this in testimony from others later, I would like to share these thoughts. It's no secret that throughout the country these types of legislations are being passed. The bullets are similar in many cases. Similar to many of the bullet points you're going to hear today
and when reading the testimony that has been submitted.

The other similarity when introduced in many other types of legislation are typically those who support and those who may oppose. Sometimes there is a lot of support, and sometimes there is a lot of opposition, and everything in between. One common thread, however, regardless of the support or the opposition is everybody in this room I think can agree is that they have a passion for their opinion. Sometimes we have a passion that is so strong for that opinion that we forget to look to the other side. And that's where a lot of the answers can be found.

Today, I'm asking you, although this may sound redundant, is to hear us again. In this room you have the persons that oppose the bill. We're not here before you today to encourage you to discard the bill. We're here to hopefully see it into a workable bill that can be found accepted by all. Frequently, that doesn't happen, and from what I understand that has been shared by all the legislators that sometimes that's the source or the positive result that you may be looking for. If everybody opposes the bill, you
made it nil. But again, we would like for today to repeat that we would like to be heard, and the experts are in this room to share that information with you. Although I said I was not going to list any bullet points, I would like to raise attention to the mandatory spay or neuter. Although you may have overwhelming evidence that supports mandatory spay or neuter, there are many health risks, health concerns. Myself being a breeder of joint [sic] breed, cannot sell a puppy to someone that enacts mandatory spay or neuter at an early age. There is a lot of data, and many reports showing that. I shared a video with the Council Members regarding that. And that's it. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you for your
testimony. Thanks for being here. I think there was another gentleman that came up and disappeared.

There was the City Pups, David Barton. Okay.
[background conversation]
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: You can testify. I
mean--
DAVID BARTON: [off mic] I'd like to ask
some questions on the --
[Pause]

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: You can testify. I
mean--
DAVID BARTON: [off mic] I have some questions on--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: I can't make the guarantee that someone will answer, but you have the opportunity to testify. You have three minutes to testify, and you may say whatever you want.

DAVID BARTON: [off mic] I would like to--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: You can go ahead and testify if you'd like.
[Pause]
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: If you could please turn the mic on. If you could identify yourself the record.

> DAVID BARTON: Is it on? My name is David Barton from City Pups, and I was just curious if there was any statistics of how many, if our-How many pets are in shelters that do come from pet stores, and also are most of the dogs from shelters in the area? Do they come from this area, or do they come from other areas also? And that's it.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Is there anything else you wanted to testify on today?

DAVID BARTON: No.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Okay, thank you.
Thank you for your testimony. I have a few questions. Okay, I'd like to-- I should have done this at the beginning. If $I$ just may swear you all in. We're swearing everyone in. If you could please raise your right hand. Do you affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in your testimony before this committee, and to respond honestly to Council Member questions?

PANEL MEMBER: Thank you very much.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: So this is for PIJAC. Does your membership uniformly agree with PIJAC's positions on these bills, and how did your organization decide what position to take on these bills? Did you consult with all your members? Was there a vote? How did you all come to take a position on these bills.

ROBERT LIKINS: Sir the-- We do take a census of our entire membership, but our positions are determined largely by a discussion agreement by a Legislative Committee from our Board of Directors.
[Pause]

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Okay, in
following up, how do you go about taking the census?

How many members do you have in your organization that work in New York City?

ROBERT LIKINS: Ma'am, I don't have a count of the number of members we have in New York City. I'm sorry. I can find that information for you.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: How do you take consensus amongst your membership?

ROBERT LIKINS: We do it by conducting surveys of the membership, and we do it by discussions with our full Board and with the Legislative Committee who is appointed to represent our broader membership.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: And you did that regarding all four of these bills?

ROBERT LIKINS: Yes.
COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Remember you are
sworn in to tell the truth.
ROBERT LIKINS: Yes, ma'am, our
Legislative Committee is aware of all of the--

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: [interposing]
No, no, no, consensus among your membership.
SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Quiet, please.
COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Your membership?
ROBERT LIKINS: Ma'am, a lot of these positions have been longstanding and determined before I came into the organization. I couldn't speak to exactly how they were arrived to specifically.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Do you tell your membership and your Legislative Committee that they should oppose it before they went into meeting about the bill on the service. [sic]

ROBERT LIKINS: I'm sorry, ma'am, oppose which?

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: The bills, especially 55-A?

ROBERT LIKINS: Our membership and, of course, our Legislative Committee are well aware of PIJAC's position on these, our position, ma'am.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: And who is on the Legislative Committee, and what is their affiliation?

ROBERT LIKINS: Ma'am, I don't have a list of the entire Legislative Committee here. You will see on the first page of our bill, we've got a--

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: [interposing]
Are you on the Legislative Committee?
ROBERT LIKINS: I am not, ma'am. I'm an employee, not a member.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: I find it hard
to believe that you do not know who is on the Legislative Committee if you are coming to speak to a legislative body about a proposed bill that would affect your membership.

ROBERT LIKINS: Ma'am, I would be happy to get you the list of membership.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Who did you talk to before you came here today?

ROBERT LIKINS: With regard to this specifically I spoke to my President, our Executive Vice President and the Legislative Committee.
[Pause]
COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Right. I'm trying to figure out whom you spoke to on the Legislative Committee, and how you don't-- You know, you say you have a consensus, and the Legislative

Committee spoke with your membership, but it's not a matter of fact. It's just, you know, you come here today and not prepared to tell us who amongst your membership opposes the legislation.

ROBERT LIKINS: Ma'am, as a trade
association, it's important that those discussions that while they happen within our membership, that the trade association-- Excuse me, the trade association speak with a unified voice.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Right. Would a broker provide animals from a questionable source? ROBERT LIKINS: By questionable source, ma'am, you mean puppy mill as defined in the most-COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: [interposing] Right, by breeders that have been violating laws that are regulated by the USDA?

ROBERT LIKINS: No, ma'am, a licensed dealer, a licensed broker with a USDA license should not be sourcing from what the-- what your language as you previously referred to as puppy mills. They are required just as our breeders are USDA licensed to meet certain requirements. And, in fact, the brokers that we've got as members actually pay a
premium for animals that are raised in conditions and
handled in conditions that exceed USDA requirements.
COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: You say that the
largest breeder no longer says it sells animals
obtained from hobby breeders. But it sells animals
from sources that meet all federal requirements?
ROBERT LIKINS: Could you repeat that,
ma'am?
COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: You say that
your animals, you know, that come from the largest
breeders, and selling that meet all federal
requirements? You're saying that animals could come
from breeders that aren't subject to the Animal
Welfare Act?

ROBERT LIKINS: Animals could come from an unlicensed breeder if that breeder handles less that-- has less than five breeding females. If they--

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: [interposing]
Is that where the majority of your animals are coming from?

ROBERT LIKINS: No, ma'am. It would vary obviously from store to store depending on who they decided to source through. But as far as the brokers
are concerned, they source from a variety of places, whether it be from smaller hobby breeders, breeders that deal in things like giants that are not common to larger commercial breeders that would be USDA licensed.
[Pause]
COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Do you sell from breeders that have non-compliance on their inspection reports from the USDA?

ROBERT LIKINS: Ma'am, I don't sell dogs.
COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Right. I know, but I'm talking about your members?

ROBERT LIKINS: There are classes of violations within USDA. We do not dictate to our members, to any retail store what they may or may not do. We encourage them to follow best practices as well as obviously comply with the laws. But I--

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: [interposing] So you sell--

ROBERT LIKINS: --can't speak for the store, ma'am.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: --puppies to pet shops that may be bred in puppy mills that are non- stores know?

ROBERT LIKINS: Ma'am, I am--
COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: [interposing]
Because you said before that you could be aware of violations, but you do not let these pet stores know.

ROBERT LIKINS: Ma'am, I am not broker. I represent the--

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: I'm talking about your membership.

ROBERT LIKINS: Okay. But my membership is the stores as well. With regard to the brokers, the mandatory microchipping law that you've got proposed here, for example, most animals arrive to the pet store already microchipped. That is a standard practice for those brokers to ensure that they can track which breeder it came from. So that they can know if they are non-compliance issues, if there are violations. That's actually our only real sticking point with the Mandatory Microchip Law that you propose. We strongly support it. We would actually like to see it strengthened. Our only concern is--

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: [interposing]
And then don't you think that customers purchasing animals from pet stores have a right to know as much information about the breed, and how their particular puppy that they're purchasing was bred--

ROBERT LIKINS: [interposing] Yes, ma'am.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: --and from where.

ROBERT LIKINS: Absolutely, we do, which his why using a broker is the best way to get that information because the broker actually tracks which specific breeder--

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: [interposing] Is it a broker or just another person in between the pet shop and the breeder?

ROBERT LIKINS: Ma'am, if the requirement is that the information be available to the consumer, then whether the broker provides the information or the breeder provides the information, it's the same information.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: I think you answered one of my questions earlier that as a broker, you have the right to not disclose currently
information to pet shops about breeders that may be violation the U.S. Agricultural Laws.

ROBERT LIKINS: No, ma'am. I didn't say
that. I did not--
COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: [interposing]
You do not have to. It is up to the breeder at this particular-- It's up to the broker at this particular point if this legislation is not to be passed.

ROBERT LIKINS: No, ma'am because it already requires that all animals being sold have their-- Have the information on the breeders provided. So that information has to come from both.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: [interposing]
But you still are brokering puppies that come from breeders that may have violations from USDA.

ROBERT LIKINS: Not violations that would
preclude them being in business, or the USDA would have taken action on them. I--

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: [interposing]
The consumer is not given that information when they are purchasing a dog from a pet shop.

ROBERT LIKINS: Ma'am, they're given the same information whether it comes through a broker or not.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Okay. I'm going to move onto America's Pet Registry, Michael Glass. Who founded America's Pet Registry?

MICHAEL GLASS: [off mic] APR-- Excuse me, APR was founded by a group of breeds, distributors, brokers in the Midwest to organize and make an additional support system for dog breeders throughout the United States.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Does APR have any financial relationship to any Class B dealers?

MICHAEL GLASS: A Class B dealer, the answer to that would be yes in part. A Class B dealer can also be a breeder. So if a breeder also employs themselves as a broker, they would be a Class B. So as a broker-- No, I apologize. As a broker we may assist in paperwork, in the paperwork process, but the direct relationship is with the breeder. So again, a Class B breeder-- I apologize. A Class B dealer may be a broker and a breeder.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Does APR have any financial relationship with any breeders that would be prohibited sources under Intro 55-A?
[Pause]
MICHAEL GLASS: I want to make sure I answer that question, and $I$ understand it correctly. You want to know that if we have any financial relationships--

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: [interposing] If you deal with just breeders and not brokers, then they wouldn't be prohibited?

MICHAEL GLASS: Oh, no, we do deal with brokers also. However, the relationship there has to be an approval with the breeder in the event of the paperwork process needed. There would have to be an agreement with the broker and the breeder to deal with us. So that we can support and deliver--

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: [interposing] Do you have any relationship with breeders that would be prohibited in this bill?

MICHAEL GLASS: If this bill-- Again, forgive my ignorance. For some reason, and I'm sure this is a very simple question. For some reason, I
feel stupid because it's just not clicking. Do we have-- Rephrase that question, please. COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Do you have brokers that are not dealers that would have breeders? [sic]

MICHAEL GLASS: I would have to look into
that. I don't have that information at hand? [Pause]

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Do you deal with breeders that are in direct violation with the Animal Welfare Act?

MICHAEL GLASS: There could be cause that a breeder employs our company for paperwork, and that they may have violations. Yes. Again, there are different levels of a violation. We are not a governing entity in the event there is-- I apologize. We are not a governing entity to enforce the USDA. So if somebody isn't in compliance with USDA, it's not our--

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: [interposing] If somebody is not, and if somebody is not in compliance with the Animal Welfare Act and they are still a part of your registry, and they still have financial
relationships with them, it doesn't say a whole lot for America's Pet Registry.

MICHAEL GLASS: Well, that's a leading
question, with all due respect.
COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: I have no
further questions of the panel.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you, Council
Member Crowley. Before our April hearing on Introduction No. 55, PIJAC posted on its website that its members should oppose the legislation as unnecessary that that, quote, "Breeders used by responsible pet stores in the city are thoroughly inspected by the USDA. No responsible pet store in the city would knowingly risk their reputation by providing unhealthy pets from questionable sources to the public. Would a responsible broker sell pets from a questionable source?" And what the PIJAC mean by questionable source?

ROBERT LIKINS: Sir, as I told the Councilwoman, I wasn't actually with the organization. So I can only offer conjecture. I believe what they were talking about with regard to responsible source is someone who handles the animals responsibly. Someone who is USDA compliant. Someone
who is treating the animals humanely, and caring for them in a healthy manner.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Would a broker
provide animals from a questionable source?
ROBERT LIKINS: A broker should not provide animals from a questionable source, but here--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing] You do work brokers, right, PIJAC?

ROBERT LIKINS: We have brokers that are members, yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And do you think any of them are questionable, or take animals from questionable sources?

ROBERT LIKINS: Sir, our membership that I have seen, and I've been out to visit them, I have not see that.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: How you been to any places that are supposed puppy mills? Have you ever visited one?

ROBERT LIKINS: I don't-- I am going to say, no sir because I have not-- I'm not familiar with which particular breeders you're talking about.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: I'm just asking
generally. No, you have never been to a--?
ROBERT LIKINS: I have not been to
anywhere that I would consider to be a puppy mill
that had its animals in inhumane conditions.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Isn't it true that the law just... Broker long advertised that it's obtaining animals-- That it obtaining animas from so-called hobby breeder who are not required to hold USDA licenses, or be inspected by federal inspectors? Aren't those questionable sources? So if they don't have USDA license, and they're not inspected by federal inspectors, couldn't that be considered questionable?

ROBERT LIKINS: Sir, I can't speak to the specific statement because I'm not familiar with it, but with regard to hobby breeders, it's not possible to license them with USDA. Because a hobby breeder is someone who has less than five breeding animals. I believe that's actually what your law would encourage the stores to go directly to as a source for their animals.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: The largest breeder
no longer says it sells animals obtained from hobby
breeders. But it can sell animals from sources that quote "meet our federal requirements" unquote. Isn't that a way of saying that animals could come from breeders that aren't subject to the Animal Welfare Act.

ROBERT LIKINS: I can't speak to what they were trying to say, sir.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: So, I have a question for Mr . Glass. Have these already been asked? Oh, these were already asked. Okay.
[Pause]
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Is Petco a member of PIJAC?

ROBERT LIKINS: Yes, sir.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: And do they agree with your position on this bill today, on these bills?

ROBERT LIKINS: I don't know with regard to their corporate policy, but I do know that they are members of ours and whatever our policies, and support PIJAC's efforts.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Do they support

```
your efforts today testifying on this bill?
```

ROBERT LIKINS: Yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you very much for your testimony here today.
[Pause]
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: All right, next up
is Michael Gill from We Love Rescue Pets, and a former member of this body, former Council Member Ed Wallace who is representing Pet Smart.
[Pause]
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: If you could raise your right hand. Do you affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in your testimony before this committee, and to respond honestly to Council Member questions?

PANEL: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very much. So you may begin in whatever order you would like. If you could just make sure the red light on the mic is on, and if you could identify yourself for the record.

ED WALLACE: My colleagues have been kind enough to let me go first. Let me just introduce Will Mack, Counsel to our Law Firm Greenberg Traurig of which I'm the Co-Chair in New York. We represent Pet Smart. I am always honored to be back in this
body, but I am particularly grateful for the openness and responsiveness that this committee has shown over the months that it has considered the bill. And specifically, I want to thank your counsel who have been terrifically energetic in informing us and letting us express our view. So, we are her to provide testimony primarily on Intros 55, 136, and 146, as amended. Just to remind you, Pet Smart is the largest specialty pet retailer services solutions for the lifetime needs pets. Pet Smart is an industry leader in pet supplies, pet care, and active in the pet adoption space. But as we stated previously, they have a strong presence in New York. They create many jobs in New York, and they applaud the Council's efforts to protect animals, and to make New York City a safer place for our pets.
We do not that we do not sell-- Peat

Smart does not sell cats or dogs. So in some respects these laws will not have the same impact on us as it might on others. Through an in-store pet adoption partnership with independent non-profit organizations, Pet Smart charities both here and in Canada have helped save the lives of more than 400,000 homeless pets. And since 1994, they have
helped save the lives of six million pets. We appreciate the changes made to Intro 55, 136, and 146 to allow these adoptions to continue to take place in our stores. Just as a side note for Intro 73, we do have some concerns only really about the practical effects, and how we can achieve the impact that you intend in a manner consistent with how the retail clerks in the stores are doing their jobs. So we understand the purpose, and we would probably look to the agency once it's designated to try to work through the rule making process. So that you get a practical and effective result, not merely one that's written on paper, but that isn't being enforced.

Chairman Johnson and the entire Committee we thank you for your attention to this issue, and we just want to reassure that we share you commitment to the wellbeing of pets, and look forward to continuing to work with the Committee and the Council to improve the quality of life for all New York City's residents large and small. And if you have any questions, I'll gladly answer them, but we are really here to support both those three bills.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very
much. Mr. Gill.

MICHAEL GILL: Good morning. I want to first thank Chairman Johnson, Council Member Crowley, and members of the Committee for inviting me to speak here today on this important issue and overdue legislation. My name is Michael Gill. I've worked in the pet industry for more than 20 years and currently own and operate We Love Rescue Pets based in Media, Pennsylvania, formerly We Love Pets. Fore more than ten years our store has sold animals and puppies primarily supplied by brokers including the Hunte Corporation, the largest in the country. These brokers purchase puppies directly from breeders and sell them throughout the United States and other countries either online or through pet stores. Sadly, unknown to most pet stores, by the critical history it's concerning, and medications, treatments, and ailments of the animals prior to delivery. Often these issues are concealed within falsified vet records, and paperwork provided to the stores prior to delivery. This abusive practice overseen at the Hunte Corporation by Dr. Oxford, DVM To help you better understand, I have an example of Exhibit $A$ of a puppy that an early exam summary which accompanied a puppy I purchased last years, and there are
thousands of other. All with the same heartbreaking ending, and each one signed off by Dr. Oxford.

Before I continue, allow me to say a few words about Dr. Oxford, according to Hunte's records. Each week, he examines more than 1,000 incoming animals, 1,000 outgoing animals and he receives all vet services more than 2,000 in-house animals including performing all surgeries with the animals that are housed at Hunte's facilities. If he worked 24/7, Dr. Oxford would only have 20 seconds with each animal, and obviously, this is impossible.

With regards to Exhibit A puppy that an exam summary shows as having this puppy re-examined upon arrival, Dr. Oxford on October 10, 2013, arrived at Hunte. This dog had not become for sale until nearly two months later on December 2, 2013, one listed for sale on their website with no issue of any ailments or treatments. When I purchased this puppy, I asked my sales associate Ray Rothman why the puppy had been held, and was told it was for size. I think proceeded with the purchase of the puppy, and it was invoiced again examined by Dr. Oxford on December 12. Upon delivery, the puppy was weak, showed no interest in food. Concerned, I asked the drivers how the
puppy had behaved in transit, and I was told it was fine, ate well, and he was probably nervous. Not satisfied with their answers I asked specifically if the puppy was being treated for any illness. They said no. With 48 hours the puppy had to be taken to the veterinary hospital. Upon examination, the puppy not only had pneumonia, but had scarred lungs from long-term pneumonia. Because the dog was also not eating, we were concerned with having been given medications. When I called Hunte to inquire, my sales person assured me this puppy had been given no medications. The following week the drivers arrived with another shipment of dogs. I asked about medications. At that point $I$ was told they had been given an injectable medication to give the puppy in route during delivery. When I reviewed the accompanied paperwork, once again Dr. Oxford conducted the exam on December 8 and found the dog healthy with no mention of past care treatments and medications or instructions to send any sick animal to us. In fact, [bell]-[Pause] [background conversation]

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you for your testimony. I have questions for you. So if you need to elaborate on what you weren't able to mention in your opening statement, you can get to those in some of the questions. So Mr. Wallace, I wanted to ask some questions about Pet Smart. Is it fair to say that Pet Smart is the second largest pet store chain in the country?

ED WALLACE: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Is Pet Smart a
member of PIJAC?
ED WALLACE: Yes, they are.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Would you characterize Pet Smart's position on these bills as distinct from PIJAC's.

ED WALLACE: Council Member, I'm going to
leave it to you to infer from judging the two testimonies, the difference, if any, between us. I appreciate the question, and what you're intending to show. But $I$ think it's not our role on behalf of Pet Smart to fight or not fight with them. I think the testimony stands for itself.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very
much. For Mr. Gill from We Love Pets. Is there
anything about brokers that's been said in today's hearing that is contradicted by your experience as a pet shop owner?

MICHAEL GILL: I think the biggest thing would be the term USDA inspected or hobby breeder or whatever I think sometimes gets misconstrued on both ends. The biggest problem with the broker that I noticed that PIJAC saying about how they tried to sell or the broker was trying to sell animals from breeders that were in compliance or whatever. The brokers actually do the complete opposite. Their main goal is to deceive the pet store to the point where they are given falsified records about who the breeder really is. They also instruct breeders to break up their operations to have less than a certain amount of breeding females, but have under the same address. So if all four of you were to live at the same address, you would each register your dog separately to sell to the broker. So that it is seen as if you are small time operation. When in a sense you're not, you're commercial kind of hiding below the radar.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you. I'm going to turn it over to Council Member Crowley, and
then I'm going to have some further questions as well.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Okay, Mr. Gill, how can a veterinarian inspect a dog in ten seconds. MICHAEL GILL: They can't and to be quite honest with you, I had several confrontations with Hunte Corporation, which is the largest broker in the country with both their head Veterinarian Dr. Oxford and with Andrew Hunte, the owner of the company, about how this was possible. And after a while, the way it was explained to me was that below Dr. Oxford there were others who do the examinations, and that the health records and exam sheets that are preapproved the signatures on them are basically what is done is overseen, and he is okaying that that work was done. So basically, you have no idea if the animal has even been checked at all.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: And do you run like a pet shop called We Love Pets? MICHAEL GILL: Basically for 11 years, we sold 20,000 puppies between both of our stores. We were We Love Pets. This December that just passed, we had an incident with the broker where we became almost like the first pet store mini-shelter. And
this year, we will adopt and rescue about 5,000 animals with one location. We had to downsize locations to fit all the animals.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Where are your locations?

MICHAEL GILL: In Media, Pennsylvania.
COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Okay, and do any of your pets come to New York?

MICHAEL GILL: We have had animals that have come to New York. However, we d-- All of our animals are owner's surrenders or rescues, or from shelters, and are already spayed and neutered when we adopt them out. And they are microchipped, licensed and everything if they have to be.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: And how reliable do you feel that USDA is in inspecting these types of large scale breeders such as Hunts, or actually the breeders that give their dogs to that program?

MICHAEL GILL: We were the only store in the country that for over a decade pulled every inspection report on every breeder we ever purchased from. So we have a library of records and inspection reports on thousands of breeders. To go through them to see what is acceptable by the USDA and was not
acceptable, I would just say that if you knew your best friend was living in a chicken hutch with his eyes sealed shut from wiring poking him, and with expired medication to treat them, and they are given
a free pass in order to make changes lat, I would say
no. The problem is that the breeders that we thought, we were trying to screen out that were not mills and going through the brokers for some of that information that it was deliberate-- We were deliberately given information that was false. So we had no way of knowing which was what. So the investigation had to be done all on our own. So all the stores in New York if they're relying on the information they're getting directly from the broker, you might as well rub a magic lamp.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Do you think the stores of New York do investigations like you've done investigations?

MICHAEL GILL: I can't speak for everyone in the country. I can say that I was told many, many, many times by both Hunte Corporation and Lanbar [sic] who was the second largest broker, who has since closed, that our point of inspection and giving them the no list of puppy mills and the yes list of who passes. But, unfortunately, the USDA thinks somebody passes when they're not home to answer the door.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: How many sick pets have you purchased over the years from what you believe to be puppy mills?

MICHAEL GILL: Both me and my staff and Media Veterinary Hospital and Old Marple [sic] Veterinary Hospital, which were the two veterinary hospitals that we use, used to have an ongoing thing where we could track if an animal came into us, within two weeks it was probably 70 to $80 \%$ likely to break with many ailments upon delivery that were hidden because there animals were-- Nothing was ever disclosed to us. If the animal was at our facility for more two weeks, it was a complete turnaround where less than $20 \%$ of the animals would go home and have a cold, worms, running nose, and things like that. But if it was directly upon coming in, it would be 70 to $80 \%$.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: I have some
questions for Mr. Wallace. Now, Pet Smart is a part
of PIJAC as stated earlier, and PIJAC when they testified, I believe they said that Pet Smart agreed with their stance on these bills.

ED WALLACE: I didn't actually hear that. I don't recall hearing that.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Well, Pet Smart adopts pets out?

ED WALLACE: We sponsor a not-for-profit program, and the legislation as currently drafted, I think accommodates the idea that for these high quality not-for-profits that are facilitating the adoption of pets, in conjunction with the store but not through the store and not through the cash register of the store.

WILLIAM MACK: Certainly not through the cash register.

ED WALLACE: Right.
WILLIAM MACK: We allow these not-forprofits to take space in the store temporarily for the right.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: You have to identify yourself for the record.

WILLIAM MACK: I'm sorry. I'm William
Mack of Greenberg Traurig. We allow these high
quality non-profits to take space in the store on a temporary basis in order to conduct these adoptions.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: And how many
stores do you have in New York?
WILLIAM MACK: In New York there are
five stores, in New York City.
COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: And over the
years, you've saved the lives of millions of pets? WILLIAM MACK: Yes, that's true,
nationally. Not just in New York.
COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: And you support all four of these intros.

ED WALLACE: We support three that we've commented on. With respect to the checking of the Abused Register, we always are looking at the Abuse Register. It's a good idea. I think we have practical concerns and only practical concerns to assure that an entry level associate, retail associate is capable of confronting somebody with the information that would be in the registry being sure it's accurate, being sure that if that person who is an animal abuser is at all difficult when they're told they can't but. And I think just to say it for the record, and again $I$ think there's a rule making of this out.

We don't sell dogs, cats, or rabbits. So in some sense all the testimony we've heard today, frankly this doesn't have any impact on us either way. So it's easy for us, frankly, to support those bills that do address those issues. With this one, we just hope that the agency that is enforcing it kind of gets it right, to certainly dogs, cats, and rabbits, and maybe some other mammals that seems easier to enforce than when you get down to smaller fish, reptiles, and such where we're just concerned that as a practical matter an associate sales person-- I don't be ageist, but maybe young and new to the workforce confronting somebody who is on a registry. I think that needs some thought in the regulatory process.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Can you put a price tag on how much you're giving in the source of helping to adopt out pets every year, Pet Smart?

ED WALLACE: First of all, I would paraphrase Master Card and say when you're finding a home for a pet it's priceless. But I don't have any
statistic here, but if you wanted one we could certainly get back to you on it.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: So these bills could possibly reduce the number of pets that come into Pet Smart that then to--

ED WALLACE: [interposing] Yes, and absolutely, and while we're eager and happy to do the charitable good works that we do, I note just so the record is clear, this is done through Pet Smart Charities, which is the companion charity to the corporation. But in the space of the stores. So we're happy to do it, but the smaller the problem the better.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Okay. No further questions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr.--
ED WALLACE: [interposing] I want to clarify something for the record because of the wonders of email. Apparently, we are not a PIJAC member. So they're watching on your podcast. So obviously we disagree with what PIJAC was saying [laughter] with respect to us.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you for your clarity, Mr. Wallace. I have a couple further
questions for Mr. Gill. Mr. Gill, in your experience how reliable is an Interstate Health Inspection Certificate when it's supplied by a broker?

MICHAEL GILL: An Interstate Health
Certificate supplied by a broker is simply a preprinted certificate with every animal that you are getting shipped to you with their either microchip or ID number and sex. If they are old enough for a rabies vaccine that will be noted, but there is not a single thing on that that says anything either past or present that the animal has. So really, it doesn't-- It says that the veterinarian who examined the animal at the time of the shipment is deemed healthy. However, it doesn't say if there was any issue prior to shipment, and the fact that they are, quite frankly, all falsified by these brokers that there is really no way to go by what they say. CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: So I think you just answered my final question, which was given your experience with brokers, do you actually believe brokers' representations about the-- that the source of their pets are reliable. MICHAEL GILL: If I sold electronics, I
wouldn't have driven up here today. I came up here to take stand when there is something wrong. The broker aspect of the pet industry is a complete nightmare for the animal and for the consumer, and for the pet store. It has caused and facilitated a relationship that has basically broken down any kind of communication between humane groups like the ASPCA and pet stores where we should be working together rather than against each other. And brokers, speaking quite honestly, lie so horribly and could care less. And I know that for a fact because they killed over-- Pretty much over ten of our dogs roughly at Christmas because they wanted to save a buck, and didn't want to communicate the truth to us. CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr.

Gill, for driving up here today from Pennsylvania-MICHAEL GILL: [interposing] Thank you. CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: --to testify. Your testimony is very, very helpful. Thank you, Mr. Wallace, for being here.

ED WALLACE: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very
much. Our next panel, and again, we have an hour and 15 minutes, and a lot of people to hear from. Sheila

Goffe, Ann Ledez, Dr. Linda Jacobson, Randie Blumhagen, and Bob Yarnall. [Pause] [background conversation] CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Mr. Yarnall, yes, you can take that chair, and you guys can just go in order. Hopefully, make room for each other when you're going to testify. You may star with whoever you would like. You have three minutes on the clock. Please identify yourself for the record. And let me please swear you in. Will you please raise your right hand, all five of you. Do you 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? SHEILA GOFFE: I do.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very
much. You may begin.
SHEILA GOFFE: I'll begin since $I$ was the
first mentioned. Mr. Chairman and members of New York City Council Committee on Health. My name is Sheila Goffe and I'm Director-CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Come closer.

SHEILA GOFFE: Is that better. Okay, I'm the Director of Government Relations for the American Kennel Club. As you may know, the American Kennel Club is a not-for-profit organization that has been devoted to the advancement and wellbeing of dogs for more than 130 years. We're headquartered here in Manhattan. Together with our more than 5,000 dog clubs throughout the country including 20 in New York City, the AKC works actively to promote responsible dog ownership, advocate for the pure bred dog as a family and working companion. Advance the health and wellbeing of all dogs, and protect the rights of responsible dog owners.

We're here today because we love dogs. Probably everybody in this room is here for that very same reason. Everything the AKC does is focused towards protecting the health and wellbeing of dogs, and promoting responsible dog ownership. On behalf of the American Kennel Club, and our local New York City dog clubs, we would like to thank you for the many changes that you've made to Introductions 136, 55 and 146 that protect responsible hobbyists, breeders, and pet owners in the city. In particular, we want to thank you for listening to our concerns
regarding the initial definition of pet shop in these measures. Many of these changes have improved the bills, and we believe will protect both dogs and the rights of responsible dog owners in New York City. However, we also have some concerns on several items, and we respectfully ask for additional changes. As currently written, Introduction 136-A mandates that dogs sold by pet shops in certain areas [sic] must be sterilized before being transferred to their new homes. This measures removes previous exemptions to this policy, which were designed to protect the health of a dog. This proposal is extremely disturbing because it will negatively impact the long-term health and wellbeing of dogs in New York City. It deprives dog owners and future dog owners of the opportunity to make the best possible healthcare decisions for their pets, and has the effect of mandating major sterilization surgeries on pets at a very young age. In some cases as young as eight weeks old.

We are also very concerned that this proposal mandates juvenile spay and neutering policies when recent scientific evidence increasingly indicates that these procedures may result in serious
long-term harm to the health of the pet. Recent scientific studies have found that spaying and neutering when $a \operatorname{dog}$ is too young can lead to cancers such as osteosarcoma, hemangiosarcoma, and lymphosarcoma, to hip dysplasia, ligament damage, and to shorter life spans. It can even result in chronic incontinence, which people may say hey that's not so important, but consider this. A large number of the animals that end up in shelters come there because of host-training problems. [bell]

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you for your testimony. Well, you can submit the rest of it for the record.

SHEILA GOFFE: Okay, thank you. CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very much.
[Pause]
DR. LINDA JACOBSON: Hi, my name is Dr. Linda Jacobson. I am here representing the American Veterinary Medical Association, the New York State Veterinary Medical Society, of which I was President in 2012, and myself as a practitioner in Brooklyn, New York. With respect to time, thank you, thank you, thank you. [laughs] I would like to
respectfully start my testimony by really defining the words "spay" and "neuter." A spay refers to the surgical removal of the ovaries and the uterus in a female animal. For our species, humans, we used the words "total hysterectomy". I am sure that we all know someone or perhaps one of us have had this surgery and know what is involved in terms of hospitalization, anesthesia, surgery, recuperation and pain control to name a few.

Imagine this procedure being done on a six-month-old baby girl or a one to two-year-old female child. Similarly, a neuter is the surgical removal of the testicles in a male animal. It is, therefore, a castration. Imagine the same for a baby boy, or a one to two-year-old baby girl. A boy. Sorry. These procedures are complex, and I am relieved to see the current proposal requiring that licensed veterinarians do these procedures. However, I am concerned, and is my societies that I am representing that New York City is mandating these surgeries for pets purchased from pet shops. My reasons are twofold.

First, it is becoming increasingly more evident that early or pediatric spaying of female
dogs can adversely affect the health and longevity of
these pets Studies done by Dr. David Mortars and his
team at the Center for Exceptional Longevity Studies
and Joe P. Murphy Cancer Foundation at Purdue
University in Indiana show a direct correlation
between exceptional longevity and the longer a female
dog has her ovaries. The risk of cancer is decreased
as well.

Secondly, when a potential owner
purchases a pet from a pet shop, it is done as an emotional investment for an individual or a family so as to care for this pet and in return receive the love and joy that this pet can give. The individual or family would hope that this pet would live a long and healthy life. They would also seek preventive medical care from a veterinarian to ensure the good health of this animal. It is during this professional relationship that the decision should be made as to the timing of the spaying or neutering. Paraphrasing Dr. Waters, elective spaying of female dogs should be individualized to optimize each dog's chance of achieving healthy longevity. It is possible if the spaying or neutering, the mandatory spaying or neutering of pets is enacted, we are
curtailing the life of these animals as well as increasing health costs for the owners. Owners will do these surgeries anyway because a female in heat will discharge blood all over there house. That is a mess, and now when he becomes intact can demonstrate signs of marking, peeing all over the place, as well as aggressive behaviors towards other dogs and the tendency to run away.

While the AVMA and the New York State Veterinary Medical Society group [bell] agreed that dog and cat-- Thank you. [laughs]

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you for your testimony.

DR. LINDA JACOBSON: Any questions?
[Pause]
ANN LEDEZ: Chairman and members of the New York City Council Committee on Health. Good morning. My name is Ann Ledez [sp?], and I'm Director of Responsible Dog Owners of New York. I live in Staten Island, and I'm here this morning in opposition to the provisions in Introduction 136, which would require that pets sold in pet shops to be spayed and neutered prior to transfer. But first, I would like to thank the Committee for changes in the
definition of pet shop from anyone who transfers one pet to those that transfer more than 25 . This is a significant improvement. But with all due respect I believe there is still an inaccurate definition of pet store, as many breeders can sell more than 25 pets in a year. And $I$ just want to interject that recently Ten Ten Wings [sic] talked about the Great Dane that had 19 puppies in one litter. So, you know, things have to be put into perspective.

I am also extremely concerned about the detrimental health impacts about early spay and neuter. It is known to have health on dogs. I am submitting copies of documentation that presents factual information with regard to the many numerous health problems that can occur when early neutering and spaying is inflicted upon them. Although early neutering and spaying seems to be the number one preventative to counteract overpopulation in the USA, this practice is actually against the law in Sweden. And it is very uncommon practice in progressive Western European countries where there is no animal over-population problem.

Rather than going into all the
documentation, I would just like to focus on Staten

Island where I live. There is a holding shelter, but there is no actual shelter for the borough. I understand the situation isn't unique. It isn't unique to Staten Island, but even so, I cannot see stray animals roaming on the street on a daily basis. In my daily travels around New York City, I see very few pet shops. I find it hard to believe that pet sold in pet shops are from breeders that are causing a huge over-breeding population in New York City. If there is a pet population issue in New York City, why aren't we focusing on the resource and study of the problems, and enforcing the animal laws we have. I see absolutely no enforcement of animal control or pain unrelated laws in the city. Thankfully, we know enforcement of animal control or pain unrelated laws in the city. Thankfully, these dogs are extremely rare. That is one good thing because if I see one, my only recourse is to put it in my car and drive it to the holding shelter.

Well, let me just go on to why more people don't license. Because people are not checked for licensing. With regard to overpopulation in shelters, why don't we have laws preventing dogs being brought into our New York State shelters from
other states? While strict regulations on pet shops and breeders are continually being proposed, the fact remains all of the rescues in shelters, which are importing dogs into the City from outside are totally exempt from these restrictions. If we have an overpopulation problem in New York, why are we importing dogs from outside the City? New York has enough issues. It's not our job to worry about other cities, other state's issues, and fixing other dog problem is certainly isn't something I want my New York taxes to paying for. [bell] Okay.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very much.
[Pause]
RANDIE BLUMHAGEN: Good morning, Council
Members--
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: If you could, please speak closer to the mic.

RANDIE BLUMHAGEN: Sorry.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Can you get closer?
Yep. There you go.
RANDIE BLUMHAGEN: Good morning, Chairman
Johnson and fellow Council Members. Thank you very
much for inviting us and allowing us to speak today.

For the record, my name is Randie Blumhagen. I'm here today to speak on behalf of the National Animal Interest Alliance, NAIA, and for our New York City members regarding the animal welfare proposals we are considering here today. Our members and Board of Directors are veterinarians, rescuers, shelter workers, breeders, pet enthusiasts, scientists, and educators. All people who work with animals and animal welfare issues as part of their daily lives. People on all sides of the issues you are considering care deeply about improving animal wellbeing, and we thank you for taking up this awfully highly contentious issues. Hopefully, our recommendations can aid in securing an outcome that avoids unintended consequences.

We wrote to you back in May about these issues, and thank you so much. Thank you so much for the many changes you have already made. But there are still some problems that need to be addressed, and that's what I want to talk to you about now. Where issues of animal wellbeing are concerned, we urge you not to provide an exemption to any outlet large enough to fall under this law. While it may be the Council's intent to reward pet stores that switch
to the shelter rescue model, such rewards should not be given at the expense of the animals involved. The purpose of the underlying ordinance is to prevent abusers from acquiring more animals. That objective is worthy of support regardless of who is doing the selling or as the ordinance refers to it, transferring. It is important to note that unless New York City differs significantly from major cities and neighboring states, the sellers transferring the highest number of dogs in the New York City marketplace are rescues and shelters. And to these that are already exempt from many of the laws that pet stores and other small scale sellers must abide by. I might be wrong, and please correct me, but I believe there are 17 pet stores in New York City. That's 30,000, and like I said--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing] I
believe they sell more than that.
RANDIE BLUMHAGEN: I'm sorry?
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: I think there are a
lot more than that? I think.
RANDIE BLUMHAGEN: Okay, and like I said-

RANDIE BLUMHAGEN: 18?
[background conversation]
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Just keep
testifying. Go ahead. That way you will be able to say everything you want to say.

RANDIE BLUMHAGEN: Finally, we ask you to
review an ordinance passed back in 2000 that requires pet stores to neuter pets before transferring them. Several veterinary studies conducted since the passage of the law confirm that neutering dogs at young ages shortens their life spans and contributes to other health problem. This new knowledge is a dramatic-- Is having a dramatic impact on the veterinary medicine and ideas of how best to reduce unwanted pet burdens, and promote responsible pet ownership. I have attached a list of sources and resource that you can review at your leisure. The most effective ordinances, therefore, are ones that hold similarly situated pet sellers when transferring more than 25 pets per year [bell] to the same standards.

> CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very
much. Mr. Yarnall.

BOB YARNALL: Hi, my name is Bob Yarnall, and I'm with the American Canine Association. Much of our testimony has already been said. We also oppose the early spaying and neutering of pets for the foresaid reasons. We do applaud you and others for putting forth a bill to address a problematic issue. One of the fastest growing sectors of the society of the industry nationwide is now the rescue shelters. They're going into malls all over the country. They're exempt from the lemon laws of the state, and it's something that we think you really also need to address in these bills. If you look at the 990 forms of the amounts of money that's being made by these rescues is in the millions, by their own reporting on the 990 forms. And they are far outstripping sometimes by tenfold what the stores are making. And this came up with the Committee in New Jersey going over with the Monmouth County Humane Society, and the millions that they were making. And they have taken over the pet shop place in the Raceway Mall there in Freehold. This is a trend that we now see nationwide. It's not pet stores going into malls, it's the shelters, the non-profit shelters going in and charging them the mandatory
donation fees. So we feel that they should have the same responsibilities as the pet stores, and dealing with the same type of regulatory laws. We hope you will consider that. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very
much. Thank you to all of you for being here today. Thank you. I'm going to call up the next panel just because we have to get through. Okay, up next is Melanie Lynn Kahn, Brian Shapiro, Deborah Howard, and Jane Hoffman. Melanie Lynn Kahn, Brian Shapiro, Deborah Howard, and Jane Hoffman.

## [Pause]

CLERK: Okay, raise your right hand. CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: If you could, please raise your right hand. Do you affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in your testimony before this committee, and to respond honestly to Council Member questions? JANE HOFFMAN: We do. CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very much.

> JANE HOFFMAN: Hi, my name is Jane

Hoffman. I would like to thank the Committee for the opportunity to testify. I'm the President of the know as you asked. But my sentiment here is that we have made amazing progress in New York City with respect to adoption and spay and neuter. But that has come at tremendous cost from the animal rescue and shelter community including animal care and control. And frankly, it's time, it's past time for the pet industry to become part of the solution to pet overpopulation, and ending unnecessary euthanasia at our city shelters, and now part of the problem. We have approve of and fully support, since it's one of our core objectives of our strategic plan for spaying and neutering. We approve of microchipping. We approving of dog licensing at pet stores, and we fully support the 55-A.

I would also just like to say that all of the animal rescue groups and shelters that belong to the Alliance -again 150 of them including Animal Care and Control -- either by law or voluntarily already spay and neuter every pet they put out for adoption.

They microchip almost every single pet, and I welcome a requirement for them to have to do that. They try to the best of their ability to get the dogs licensed, but they are vaccinated, they are spayed and neutered. They are microchipped, and they are put up for adoption, and they do a great job. I really resent any implication that they are not already pulling their weight and then some.

The other thing I would like to do is to thank Petco and Pet Smart for the adoption centers in their stores. We also do our mega adoption events with Petco. They make a tremendous difference in what we're doing in new York City, and since then-Let me just put it that in 2003, since 2003, we've saved more than a quarter million lives in New York City. That's tremendous progress, but we should not be carrying this burden by ourselves. So, for all of these reasons, I respectfully ask that the Committee to help us sustain and continue the animal welfare community's life saving work, and we support all of these four bills, 55-A, 73-A, 136-A, and 146-A. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you, Jane,
for being here and for all you do.

MELANIE KAHN: Good morning, Chair. [off mic] Good morning, Chairman Johnson and members of the Health Committee. My name is Melanie Kahn. I'm the Senior Director of the Puppy Mills Campaign for the Humane Society of the United States. And we would like to thank you for the opportunity to testify on proposed ordinance 55-A. I am pleased to offer the following comments no behalf of the Human Society of the United States.

As you know, the HSUS opposes the sale of puppies bred in inhumane conditions everywhere that they are sold including right here in New York City pet shops. To be clear, a puppy mill is an inhumane commercial dog breeding operation where dogs are typically kept in small wire cages for their entire lives. They are given just enough food and water to stay alive. They are typically denied veterinary care. They are bred continuously, and when they can no longer breed any more, they are usually discarded or killed. For perspective, for a female dog that typically happens at about six years old.

The Human Society of the United States estimates that there are about 10,000 of these facilities in the country pumping out about two
million dogs a year for the pet trade primarily for sale in pet stores. And just to give you an idea, this is about how many dogs are unnecessarily euthanized in our nation's shelter every year. So it is very clear that puppy mills are significantly contributing to pet overpopulation in our country, including here in New York City.

As a result, more than 60 localities across the United States have responded by addressing this problem by passing bans or restrictions on sales of dogs and cats in pet stores. Let's be clear. Prohibiting puppy brokers from selling to New York City pet stores can curb this problem significantly. Class B dealers also known as puppy brokers are middleman dealers who obtain puppies from puppy mills, and then transport and resell them all over the country. Based on several studies, and investigations conducted by the HSUS, it is apparent that the majority of pet stores source their puppies from large brokers. Many of which are located in the Midwest part of this country. For consumers, the benefit of prohibiting pet stores from purchasing from these brokers is significant. The use of puppy mill brokers often makes it difficult, if not
impossible, for the public to know who a puppy's breeder actually was. And since many pet stores will only disclose the broker information, if the provide the information at all, the actual source of the puppy is completely obscured. We thank the ordinance-- the Council for considering this incredibly important ordinance today.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very
much.
BRIAN SHAPIRO: Good morning Chairman Johnson, Council Member Crowley, and members of the Health Committee. My name is Brian Shapiro. I'm the New York State Director for the Human Society of the United States, the nation's largest animal protection organization. I am very pleased to offer the following comments on behalf of the HSUS regarding our support for 55-A. As Melanie mentioned, in all places where puppies are sold, the HSUS opposes the sale of puppies bred in inhumane conditions. This obviously includes New York City pet shops. Most pet stores in New York City do sell puppies from inhumane sources. But we have conducted an investigations and various investigations. One in particular looking 100 New York State pet stores and many in New York

City. The employees at these pet stores stated quite clearly that the puppies only came from small scale private breeders, and not from the notorious puppy mills, which is completely nonfactual. When The HSUS investigators filmed some of these breeding facilities, you can imagine the conditions were absolutely horrendous. And we heard testimony earlier today attesting to such conditions.

During this particular investigation, transport records were looked at, and in many of the stores that were buying puppies from these suppliers were known to have Animal Welfare Act violations, and that's no secret. Many of us are very well aware of that, and the industry itself knows that. We have found that pet shops that switch to a human business model that refuse to sell dogs acquired from inhumane sources have been very successful and are proud to rejected the unnecessary cruelty of puppy mills. And
as the State Director for the HSUS speaking for the members and supporters, I ask you to please support 55-A, and we support it. I have to also echo the sentiments express by Jane Hoffman to try to obfuscate this issue by looking at the rescue groups
in the shelters. It serves no constructive purpose whatsoever. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr.
Shapiro.
[Pause]
DEBORAH HOWARD: Good afternoon. I'm
Deborah Howard, founder and President of the Companion Animal Protection Society, a national nonprofit that investigates the pet shop and puppy mill industry. CAPS submitted compelling evidence of the April 30th hearing including a comprehensive spreadsheet, which demonstrated that almost all of New York City retail pet shops purchase puppies from commercial breeding facilities with USDA violations. CAPS reiterates its support for all of the proposed ordinances, especially Ordinance 55. With dog workers, there is limited accountability. This is contrary to the public policy intent of Ordinance 55. Brokers often never see the breeding facilities from which they purchase puppies and kittens. If a law requires pet shops to purchase directly from breeders, then there is a direct accountability for animals sold in the pet shop. When a pet shop buys directly from the breeder, then the breeder's name
and address will show up on the Certificate of Veterinary Inspection. Direct purchases by pet shops also prevents co-mingling of puppies by the brokers during transport, which can lead to increased risk of illness, and even identification issues. Ordinance 55 will allow more responsible breeders without violations to operate, and will not shut down industries, or take away jobs especially in New York City.

Why is CAPS so familiar with the brokerage industry in particular the Hunte Corporation? A six-month undercover employment investigation by CAPS, a CAPS investigator revealed that Hunte used a booking agents to select puppies and kittens from breeders, and deliver these animals to the Hunte facility. In fact, we have two documentaries on our website for you to view. I'll give you an example of what we uncovered. A federally accredited vet's name was rubber stamped on the Certificates of Veterinary Inspection. A kennel worker was examining some of the animals, and the owner of a flea market in Texas came up every week to pick up his own dogs and do his own vet exams of these animals for the purpose of Certificates of

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you, Ms.
Howard, for being here. Thank you all for being here, and for your testimony today.

BRIAN SHAPIRO: Thank you, sir.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: So next up we are
going to have Assembly Member Linda B. Rosenthal, Joel Bhuiyan from NYCLASS, Christine Mott from the New York City Bar Association, and Sandra De Feo from the Human Society of New York.
[Pause]
[background conversation]

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: So, I want to thank you all for being here today. I want to particularly recognize and thank Assemblywoman Linda Rosenthal, who is a very close friend of mine. But she is also just the biggest champion in the state of New York for animals, for humane legislation. And there is not a bigger champion in Albany. It doesn't exist. No one is going to find one. She is sitting here in front of us. [applause] And we all need to be grateful for her tireless advocacy day in and day out. And because of her legislation, she allowed Council Member Crowley, who had been wanting to do things for years in the city for us to be able to have our hearing earlier this year, and have it today. So I want to just thank her, and recognize her, and ask her to kick us off today.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Okay. Thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Oh, let me swear you in.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ROSENTHAL: I've got to be sworn in.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Raise your right hand. Do you 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?

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ROSENTHAL: Yes. CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you. ASSEMBLY MEMBER ROSENTHAL: I don't think I've ever been sworn in before except to take my oath of office as an Assembly Member. So, it's great to be here. Thank you, Corey, for your kind words. My two cats came from $A C \& C$, and I'm very happy living on the Upper West Side. Thank you, and the same for Council Member Crowley for all of your hard work over the years on animal issues. So I represent the Upper West Side, parts of Clinton, Hells Kitchen and neighborhoods in Manhattan. As a long-time champion for animal welfare and the prime sponsor of the State Law. Which is Chapter 5 of the Law of 2014, which provides New York City and other municipalities across the State the ability to regulate local sales of animals by pet dealers. I am pleased that the City Council is holding this hearing today.

While I and many of those presenting testimony today have been working on animal welfare issues for years, until very recently they were
largely considered as not serious or even fringe by the vast majority of legislators across the county. And even many members of the public. It's taken years of education and advocacy to create what is nothing less than to see change in attitudes when it comes to animal welfare and the law. The issues we are addressing at this hearing have emerged as the result of the tireless work of advocates, elected officials, and animal lovers who for years have given voice to the voiceless animals who have suffered at the hands of humans in charge of them.

Even with changing attitudes, however, introducing and passing strong legislation to protect animals continues to be a struggle. Passage of Chapter 5 popularly referred to as the Puppy Mill Bill is no exception. My staff and I and many of the advocates in this room, and many more statewide who are not here today struggled for more than a year over every single word contained in the final law. To ensure that it would provide municipalities with broader authority to crack down on sales of animals from puppy mills, among other things.

Puppy mills are large scale commercial breeders who place profit above generally accepted
veterinary practice and the humane treatment of animals. The vast majority of puppy mill dogs are kept in filthy, over-crowded cages. Are provided little, if any, medical care, or exercise, are not socialized with humans or other animals. The breeding females are forced to give birth to litter after litter throughout the duration of their short and tortured lives. Sadly, the abuse does not end there. Pet stores unwittingly or not are integral in promoting puppy mills. The vast majority of dogs offered for sale in pet stores across the country come from puppy mills. The dogs suffer from all manner of congenital defects, and their medical problems are usually latent, typically expensive, and sad often deadly.

Chapter 5 was intended to help municipalities to protect animals and the unsuspecting public by taking steps to end the puppy mill to pet store pipeline. To that goal, it provides municipalities with a panoply of tools to regulate pet dealers and to ensure that animals sold or offered for sale are from reputable non-puppy mill sources among other things. Including requiring sterilization of dogs or cats prior to their sale.

Into No. 136-A will have a profound impact on a number of healthy animals that are needlessly euthanized in New York City. Though New York City has taken steps to reduce the number of animals it euthanizes each year, our goal is a no kill future in which no healthy and adoptable animal is killed. Overcrowding in the City's municipal shelter system in addition to contributing to the rapid spread of communicable yet easily treatable diseases, requires that otherwise healthy and adoptable animals be killed to make room for the ever-growing number of animals coming in each day. Requiring that each dog or cat be spayed or neutered by a licensed veterinarian prior to sale will not only contribute to a decline in the number of animals euthanized, it will also ease the burden on New York City Animal Care and Control, the City's animal shelter system. Hopefully, enabling it to better care for all the animals in its charge.

Despite massive opposition to the spay and neuter requirements of Chapter 5, I fought hard to maintain that language in the final bill understanding well its significance. And actually, around ten, more than ten years ago, it was the law
in New York City that animals sold in pet stores be spayed or neutered prior to sale. But then, the State came and preempted the City's ability, and that stopped that. But that was already in place years ago. So I applaud the Council for taking the critically important and desperately needed step to require mandatory spay and neuter in New York City. And I hope that other municipalities across the state will follow its lead.

Combined with mandatory spay and neuter programs requiring that all dogs and cats be microchipped prior to sale, would also help to reduce the number of stray and homeless animals. A functioning microchip increases substantially the likelihood that lost animals will be reunited with their owners. To that end, Intro No. 146-A is a common sense measure that should be implemented immediately. And I know we have all seen heartwarming stories about people who are reunited with their lost animals even years later because they were microchipped.

Intro No. 73-A broadens the definition of pet shops thus ensuring that the Council can require all pet shops regardless of the kinds of animals it
sells to obtain a permit to operate under Section 161.09 of the City Health Code. My intent in drafting Chapter 5 was to ensure that municipalities have the authority to require all pet shops to obtain licenses the revenue from which could be used to fund enforcement of the new sections of law.

Finally, Intro No. 55-A makes strides toward ensuring that animals that are sold or offered for sale in New York City pet shops are from reputable law abiding sources. Importantly, Intro. No. 55-A allows New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene to require all pet shops to obtain an operating permit before doing business in New York City. Requirements for licensure include the disclosure of comprehensive personal financial and business information. Information related to the source of all animals offered for sale, and certification that the business has not sold an animal from any prohibited source. A comprehensive permit system will enable DOHMH to track the source of all animals sold in the city, which will ultimately with strong future source regulations in place prevent the sale of dogs from disreputable sources such as puppy mills. My hope is that this
fee will be used by the City to fund animal related enterprises such as enforcement of this section, municipal spay and neuter programs, or the operation of AC\&C. Lastly, DOHMH is empowered to order any business not in compliance with the requirements of this section or operating without a license, until such license is obtained or compliance is achieved. Requiring that pet shops only sell animals from sources that are licensed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and further that these sources have not received the stated direct or indirect violations of federal law dealing with the humane treatment of animals, accessing inspection of premises and recordkeeping, to name a few, will ensure that pet shops are selling animals from sources that comply with at least the minimum standards of care required by federal law. Pet shops will be required to obtain from source dealer certification that the source dealer has never been convicted of an animal abuse crime, that they have not within the last five years been convicted of violating minimum standards of care provided for in Section 401 of New York State Ag Markets Law. To be clear, Chapter 5 provided that existing state law was
the floor and not the ceiling. While I have been working on legislation to improve the statewide standards contained in Section 401, with the authority granted it under Chapter 5, the City could have increased and improved upon those standards itself.

Intro No. 55's most significant accomplishment is its prohibition against pet shops purchasing animals from Class B brokers. The dark middlemen of the pet industry, brokers shroud the source of animal sold in mystery preventing municipalities from protecting consumers and animals. This prohibition is critically needed to ensure that New York City can effectively implement the requirements of this section. Importantly, the prohibition does not run afoul of Chapter 5's prohibition against an essential ban on all sales of animals that are raised and maintained in healthy and safe environments since at a minimum the source of animals sold by brokers cannot be confirmed.

These four bills represent a victory for animals and people who love them even though the Council did not act to exercise the totality of the authority granted it by Chapter 5, in particular with
respect to tough source regulations. To be sure, more needs to be done in the City, State, and Federal levels to address the serious ills created by puppy mills both to the innocent animals and to the public. But with committed partners working together on all levels of government, I am confident that we will continue to make great progress. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very much, Linda, for being here. Whoever wants to go next may go next.
[Pause]
CHRISTINE MOTT: Well, good afternoon.
My name is Christine Mott, and I'm here on behalf of the New York City Bar Association's Animal Law

Committee, which I chair. I want to thank you for the opportunity to testify. And just for your reference, our full report is on each of the three bills that we have submitted testimony on are attached to my own testimony. I'm here testifying in support of Intro 55-A, 136-A, and 146-A.

With respect to $55-A$, we support this bill. The ability of the city to prohibit the sale of dogs and cats sourced from the worst offending
puppy and kitten mills. And to require pet shops to disclose to consumers information on the source and background of the animals offered for sale by these pet stores will ultimately result in a greater public demand for animals bred in compliance with more humane standards, as well as increase adoption of the city's homeless animals. We also support a ban on the sale of rabbits by the pet stores. Rabbits are the third most commonly surrendered animal in city shelters. They are difficult to identify by sex at a young age, can reproduce in great numbers in short periods of time. And are commonly sold in pairs by pet stores. As a result, we have unwanted rabbits frequently being dumped in city shelters and parks. We have a number of recommendations to strengthen 55-A. First, we want to recommend that pet shops be prohibited from charging a fee to consumers or prospective consumers with respect to obtaining copies of the most recent USDA inspection reports. We think that such a fee could deter consumers from obtaining information that they would otherwise be entitled to under this bill, and we also feel that such a fee should be borne as a cost of
doing business by pet stores and not passed onto the consumer.

Next, we note that as many animals sold in pet stores are obtained from out-of-state sources, we recommend that they will be expanded to require that the source of animals obtained by pet stores certify that they have not been convicted of a violation of any minimum standard of animal care contained in any local, state, or federal law in any jurisdiction in which it operates, and not just the New York State Animal Cruelty Laws.

We also recommend a requirement that pet shops certify compliance with the City's Animal Abuse Registry and including with respect to the owner, operator or employer or agent of any such pet store. And that the department be prohibited from issuing or renewing a permit to any pet store that is unable to comply. [sic] We also recommend that pet stores be prohibited from selling dogs or cats to Class B dealers, or any other person or entity for the purpose of animal research or testing. And we also recommend that pet stores be prohibited for selling animals to any person that fails to satisfy the criteria of Section 1702 of the bill, which is the
minimum criteria established for the sources that pet stores may buy dogs or cats from.

Lastly, we just want to note that the proposed minimum standards of care contained in the bill are a codification of those contained in State law, which are already to City pet stores and, therefore, we encourage you to pass enhanced standards. [bell].

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very much, Ms. Mott.

SANDRA DE FEO: Hi, my name is Sandra De Feo. I'm the Executive Director at the Human Society of New York. We were founded in 1904, and we have a hospital and an adoption center. We're open seven days a week. We have almost 200 animals under our roof. We are very-- I would like to say, first of all, thank you so much to the New York City Council Health Committee for this opportunity to testify, and also thank, of course, Corey Johnson and Elizabeth Crowley. I think what I would like to say is we are very supportive of 55-A, 146-A, 136-A, and 73-A, but I think what $I$ could really add to at this hearing, which is very important is spaying and neutering. I
heard some people say some things before I just could not believe.

It's imperative to spay and neuter
animals, and the reason it is, is every single day-and I've got ten veterinarians, and if I had known, I would have had them here today--to say that every single day we are saving some animal's life who is not spayed or neutered. They come in. They don't have any money. Their animal wasn't spayed. It's going to die from Pyometra, and male dogs have a problem where their prostate enlarges, and they get internal abscesses. I mean it's just horrible, and if any of these people saw these things every single day that we get to see, then they would feel that way. We do 5,000 spay or neuters a year. And more, really, but that's like a number $I$ can pick up off the top of my head. So it's really important to pass the spay and neuter aspect of this. It's really important to microchip animals because microchipping can be the only way someone is, as Linda Rosenthal explained.

I think HSUS, Linda Rosenthal, everyone has explained all these things over and over and they have made very good points, and you all get them.

I'm just backing them up on that. And, the other thing that I think that is really important is licensing. We have no idea how many animals there are in this city. We need to license the animals, and I think doing that-- We do it at the Humane Society of New York. Every single animal is microchipped, and licensed, spayed or neutered, vaccinated. We want to be responsible pet owners. We want to help animals to get homes, and the way we do that is we all stand up and be good citizens and help other animals. So $I$ think that is basically all I need to say, but I just want to make sure that everyone knows how important spaying and neutering is. And I'm really, really for getting this back to the pet shops. Because we originally had it, and now we need it again. Okay. Thank you so much, everyone.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you, Ms. De Feo.

JOEL BHUIYAN: Hi. Good afternoon. My name is Joel Bhuiyan. I'm testifying on behalf of NYCLASS OR NY CLASS. We want to thank the Health Committee for the opportunity to testify on Intros 55-A, 73-A, 146-A, and 146-A. NYCLASS is a 501 (c)(4)
a non-profit animal advocacy organization committed to ending the inhuman New York City horse carriage industry. And we recently expanded our animal protection issues for which we advocate to include that in puppy mills regulating the breeding practices of pet dealers that sell to New York City shops and increasing the funding of animal care and control among others. Founded in 2008, by a coalition of prominent animal lovers and business leaders, NYCLASS has grown to over 110,000 supporters with activist chapters in all five boroughs.

I'll be brief. NYCLASS supports Intros. 55-A, 73-A, 136-A, and 146-A. Collectively, this package of legislation will protect animals from the horrors of cruel and abusive puppy mills. And protect consumers from unwittingly supporting unscrupulous breeders. It is time to stop puppy mill pipelines in New York City, which contributes to pet overpopulation and over crowding in our city's taxpayer funded animal shelter system.

I would like to applaud Chairman Johnson
and Council Member Crowley for their commitment to building a more humane New York City for animals and consumers. And we encourage the members of the

Committee on Health to approve all four pieces of legislation. And we look forward to working with the City Council to make sure they become law. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you all for testifying and being here today, and a special thanks again to my friend and colleague Linda Rosenthal.

Thank you. Next up we're going to have Natalie Reeves from Big Apple Bunnies, Emily McCoy from PETA, Vivian Barna from All About Rabbits Rescue New York, and Marilyn Galfin [sp?] from New Yorkers Against Puppy Mills.
[background conversation]
[Pause]
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: So you may begin in whatever order you'd like. You will be on the clock, and I have to swear you in. Do you affirm-- If you could please raise your right hand. Do you affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in your testimony before this committee, and respond honestly to all Council Member questions?

PANEL MEMBERS: We do.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very
much. Whoever wants to begin, may begin. Three
minutes on the clock. Thank you. Please identify yourself.

VIVIAN BARNA: Greetings everyone. My name is Vivian Barna, and I run All About Rabbits Rescue, a $501(\mathrm{c})(3)$ organization based in Queens, New York. My appreciation and thanks to the City Council members for $55-\mathrm{A}$ and for their hard work in proposing that rabbit sales be banned in New York City. My testimony is based on interacting with hundreds of rabbit owners, rabbit adopters, owner surrenders, the general public, and my volunteer experience at Animal Care and Control. The vast gap between public perception of the rabbit versus proper rabbit care and what it actually entails make the rabbit an unsuitable pet for the general public. Conversely, the general public is unsuited for pet rabbits.

Petco and Pet Smart acknowledged this and ceased rabbit sales. In 2012, Tractor-Trailer Supply also ceased rabbit sales. These companies realized that they could no longer continue the lie that rabbits are easy starter pets whose care is simply water and pellets in an undersigned starter cage. I believe it's time to stop the lie, and block pet shops from making a buck off the backs and lives of
rabbits leaving the shelter, taxpayers, and rescues holding the bag.

New York City shelter rabbit intake numbers are increasing every year. About five years ago, when I was caretaking the rabbits, there were approximately four to eight rabbits to take care of everyday. Today, there are 35 to 45 every day, and they have actually crept into the small dog room. That's about an approximate $700 \%$ increase. At a rate of $700 \%$ increase in five years from now, what will the numbers be? The numbers will be well over 2,000 in 2019 according to my math. We won't be able to bring home all these rabbits fast enough as we are not able to do that even today with our numbers that we have. Even at today's numbers rescues are overburdened, and do not have the financial staff and the housing resources. We can't handle the numbers.

Now is the time to be proactive, to prevent New York City from euthanizing rabbits, and spending more and more taxpayer dollars to house homeless rabbits. Furthermore, ACC rabbit numbers do not accurately reflect rabbit abandonment and owner surrenders. Much of the public doesn't know that they can bring their rabbits to ACC. I talk to them
on a daily basis, and I don't actually tell them about ACC if $I$ can avoid it. If they did, ACC numbers right now would be about 300 I figure. As far as the statistic, I heard that ACC reported that they had records that a hundred of the 380 rabbits brought in last year were from pet shops. We all know that the people lie, and they say that the rabbit was a stray. I speak to these people. They do not want to pay for the vet care for the rabbits, and they certainly don't want to pay for the surrender fee at ACC. So sometimes I direct those people to ACC if I have to. It's better than dumping them on the street or worse.

Rabbits arrive at ACC in terrible shape. Some starved, some with broken legs, some abused and neglected. Reports of children stepping on or dropping [bell] the rabbit are common.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you, Vivian, for your testimony.

VIVIAN BARNA: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: You can submit the rest of it for the record. MARILYN GALFIN: I'm on. Hi, my name is Marilyn with the New Yorkers against Puppy Mills. We
are not an official organization. We are just a group of concerned individuals who have come together to do peaceful protest and outreach to educate people about the puppy mill/pet store connection.

Hopefully, I'll be saying what's-- You know, I have some-- First of all, I really thank you all for attempting to do something finally for these animals. If this is the proper place, hopefully I'm allowed to add other suggestions? This is the--

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: [interposing] Yes. MARILYN GALFIN: --proper platform for that. Okay. First, of all the whole model on relationship to domestic dogs and cats is not working. And part of the problem with the puppy mills that comes in, too, is that how can we have a system in place where we make it easy for anyone to breed, anyone to sell, anyone to buy, and anyone to dump. So we have a problem right there. Okay, I have to say also I just feel ironically as we're sitting here speaking right now more puppies than ever are being pumped out and sold for the holidays in these pet stores. This is absolutely appalling. The very idea of mass production of live, feeling creatures for profit. What kind of insane business
model is this? How can we allow a business that includes such things as puppy auctions? What kind of insane business model is one that includes when a breeding female in a mill that can no longer produce puppies that are supplied to a pet store, she can be legally shot dead. And this is legal? This whole industry is appalling. And then the other thing is we try to curb it on this end with loopholes. Which means we are going to have to tag it on the Internet as well. The way to make any of this work is going to be everything coming together including Internet sales, backyard breeders, people on the Internet. This has to be attacked from every angle. But first of all, I'm even surprised that the stores are even allowed to be operating at this point, when we're not even talking about the mills. When the business practices include lying to the consumers. The whole industry is based on lies, deception, manipulation, exploitation, and greed. We have presented to Council Corey with something we call the Puppy Disclosure Act, which people are sort of talking about. And that is the public needs to know before they buy the dog everything related to where the dog is front, so on and so forth. It should also
include, and this is part of the problem, it's the illusion that's created. And this is that people need to know that AKC, which pet stores talk about all the time oh, AKC, AKC, AKC. The public needs to know it means nothing. It doesn't indicate anything about proper care or health of the animal. That he Animal Welfare Act is anything but humane. People think AKC means something. They think it's a status symbol. So the truth needs to be told to deglamorize this AKC concept, and people need to understand this industry and what it's about. And the Puppy Disclosure, what I've said, and the people have to know beforehand everything, every aspect.

Now, definitely support the rescues being in there because this model has been used in other places, and it's been very, very successful. There would be no reason at all not to do it except the stores are greedy, and that's the whole bottom line is making their money off the backs of breeding females. [bell] [groans] Okay. Much more to come, and I will send this to you in the email with other suggestions, which include mandatory screening. I can't understand how this was left out.

MARILYN GALFIN: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Marilyn is my
neighborhood. So I see her in front of my building all the time.

MARILYN GALFIN: At least now you've seen
me a little more well dressed. I'm not in my sweat pants.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: She catches me in
my sweat pants. [laughter] You may proceed.
SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Quiet, please.
EMILY MC COY: 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 which are proud New Yorkers. While we oppose changes to the language of proposed Introductions No. 55-A and 136-A, which were heard by the committee on April 30, 2014, and would have prohibited the sale of puppies and kittens by the mills. And also require the sterilization of small animals such as rabbits sold for profit, we support the four measures that are being heard today,

Introductions 55-A, 73-A, 136-A, and 146-A. Intro No. 73 proposes to update the definition of pet shop within the Animal Abuse Registration Act by better defining the term, and including the 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. They deprive many animals of the basic necessities of life, including vital species-specific necessities and desperately needed veterinary care. And leave unsalable animals confined and isolated in back rooms hidden from public view. The pet industry is notorious for taking shortcuts at the expense of animals whose sale it depends on. In addition to the substandard, deplorable, and factory farm like conditions in which 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 means it's a death sentence for the shelter animal.

Introduction No. 146 proposes requiring
pet shops to identify the animals they sell by having
them implemented with identification microchips by licensed veterinarians. Microchips help to reunite beloved animals, animal companions with the friends or guardians. Help track animals with congenital defects back to a broker, breeder, puppy mill, et cetera, encourages responsible guardianship, eventually reducing the number of animals take into area shelters. Identify the owners of animals maintained in violation of animal protection laws, and dangerous dog regulations and more.

Introduction 136-A would require pet shops to sterilize animals and require purchasers to buy a valid animal license before ownership was 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 $25 \%$ of dogs entering animal shelters were pure bred produced by breeders and sold at pet stores. Sterilizing dogs and cats before sale would save the lives of countless animals in New York. Small animals such as rabbits were covered by the requirements in a previous of the introduction, and
we urge that those requirements be reinstated in the measure.

Innumerable rabbits are sold, given away
[bell] or 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 home. So sterilization before sale would have saved countless lives.

> CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very
much.
EMILY MC COY: The last paragraph is in the paper from me.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you.
EMILY MC COY: Thanks.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you.
NATALIE REEVES: Hi, there. My name is Natalie Reeves. I'm an attorney. I'm an animal advocate and I'm here on behalf of Big Apple Bunnies, which is the rabbit advocacy group that I founded. When I was back before you guys in April I testified regarding the package, and I told you that the dream would be for you to take Intro 55 and add a ban to
rabbits. At that time, Intro 55 did not address rabbits at all, and some of the other bills did. And I've got to thank you from the bottom of my heart on behalf of the rabbits. You guys did exactly what myself and other rabbit lovers asked you to do, and we are very, very grateful.

Ms. Weinstock from AC\&C earlier today testified as to the numbers of rabbits that are taken into $A C \& C$ every year. She said that the $A C \& C$ is at maximum capacity for rabbits. That's absolutely true. But that didn't take into account that there are also countless rabbits, hundreds that we know about that are abandoned each year in city parks. Now, most of these rabbits aren't rescued because most of them get eviscerated by dogs, cats, raccoon, hawks, and killed by parasites before they can be rescued. But unlike $A C \& C$, which may be the front line for dogs and cats, rabbits often go directly to rescue groups without going through the shelter.

So the numbers are enormous, and with
dogs and cats there is not really a holiday that somebody testifies-- Excuse me. Somebody testified that there are a lot of puppies sold during the Christmas holiday, but for rabbits they're tied with

Easter. And there are huge number of Easter sales. So by banning them, you're going to be saving many, many lives, and we are very appreciative. We also noticed that not many people given the number of people we've had testifying today have spoken on behalf of rabbits. Rabbits don't get the attention of the well-funded organizations most of the time. There aren't many of us who frankly think about rabbits. So for that reason, we're very grateful that you're going to do what-- Or, what we hope that you will do what Los Angeles and San Francisco and Chicago and other cities have done, which is ban the sale of rabbits. Thanks very much.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you, Ms.
Reeves. We care about all of our four-legged friends. So we are happy to be addressing rabbits as well. Thank you very much.

NATALIE REEVES: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Next up, we have a
panel of four folks from the ASCPA, Cori Menkin, Michelle Villagomez, Bill Ketzer, and Matt Bershadker.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you. You can
begin in whatever order you would like. I am going to swear you in. If you could please raise your right hand. Do you 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?

PANEL MEMBER: We do.
CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very
much. You may begin.
MATT BERSHADKER: Good morning or good afternoon.

COUNCIL MEMBER: [off mic] You have to turn on your mic.

MATT BERSHADKER: Yes, I've got it. Good afternoon. My name is Matt Bershadker, and I'm the President and CEO of the ASPCA, the nation's animal welfare organization. I'd like to thank Chairman Johnson and members of the Health Committee for the opportunity to testify in support of Intro 55-A. The provisions of this bill when taken together would achieve two important goals. First, Intro 55-A would prevent some of the country's worst breeders from
selling puppies to New York City pet stores. Second,
it will increase transparency about the origin of puppies that do enter the city for resale. Affording prospective buyers with the ability to make informed choices. The ASPCA applauds the City Council for taking this action to improve animal welfare, promote public health, and to protect New York City consumers.

Prior to being appointed as CEO, I served as the Senior Vice President of the Anti-Cruelty Group overseeing programs that confront cruelty across the country including our puppy mill campaign. The data we've amassed reveals that the problems in the commercial breeding industry are severe and systemic. And not merely the result of a few bad actors. Many commercial breeders rely by design on inhumane practices to serve their primary objective of increasing profit. In 2010, I launched our Field Investigations and Response Team, which provides expert investigative animal handling and sheltering support to municipal, state, and federal agencies during large scale dog fighting, animal hoarding, and puppy mill cases. This team has seen first hand the suffering of abused animals, and knows all too well the enormous financial and emotional cost incurred
with the rescuing and re-homing of animals seized in large scale cruelty cases.

I oversaw the development of the ASPCA
Behavioral Rehabilitation Center, a facility
dedicated to treating dogs who suffer from severe behavioral problems, including victims of puppy mills. Forcing dogs to live in severe confinement, isolated from social interaction with people has devastating behavior consequences for a species that is by its nature highly social. Adult breeding dogs in puppy mills usually have very limited contact with people and few if any experiences outside of their cages. After years of abuse, dogs who are rescued often exhibit fearful responses to normal, everyday situations like being petted or the feel of a collar around their neck. These types of experiences can cause panic, catatonia, and even defensive
aggression. Without intensive behavioral rehabilitation many dogs rescued from puppy mills are not adoptable. So they languish in shelters or face euthanasia.

Given our experience with addressing the aftermath and damage inflicted on dogs by puppy mills, we believe in trying to prevent this form of
cruelty. The ASPCA has spearheaded legislation in states like Pennsylvania and Missouri resulting in some of the country's most stringent standards of care for dogs in commercial breeding facilities. The ASPCA has dedicated countless resources to the goal of eliminating puppy mill cruelty. While no legislative measure the Council can enact on this issue will solve the problem overnight, the ASPCA believes that Intro 55-A is a critical step in the right direction. On behalf of those animals and the ASPCA, I urge you to vote in favor of 55-A. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very much.

CORI MENKIN: Good afternoon. I'm Cori Menkin, Senior Director of the Puppy Mills Campaign at the ASPCA. Thank you Chairman Johnson and committee members for the opportunity to testify today. I oversee the ASPCA's Puppy Mill work, which includes our No Pet Stores Puppies Campaign. The campaign's website provides over 17,000 photos taken by USDA inspectors during routine inspections of USDA
licensed breeders. That represents more than 600 licensed breeding facilities or about $35 \%$ of the USDA
licensed breeders. They document violations of the Federal Animal Welfare Act, as well as conditions that legal, but that we consider inhumane. This is a clear indication that the problems documented in the photos are systemic, not merely the result of a few bad actors. It's also important to note that the photographs are only representative of those facilities that were both inspected and photographed by USDA. Not every facility is inspected every year, and not every inspection is photographed. Based on USDA's own inspection reports, we know that at any given time about one-fifth of the industry is in direct violation of the federal law. The common used of Class B dealers by the breeder and pet store industries is also problematic. These middle men make it possible for some of the worst breeders in the country to get their puppies to pet stores without having to risk opening their kennel doors to consumers or disclosing the conditions of their facilities to pet stores.

We have researched Class B dealers extensively with particular attention to the largest broker in the country, the Hunte Corporation in Goodman, Missouri. Aside from the fact that Hunte
sources puppies from puppy mills as documented in the photos attached to my testimony, we have been able to produce reliable data that indicates that Hunte is not adequately performing legally required data checks on its puppies prior to shipping then interstate commerce. Every puppy shipped must be accompanied by a Certificate of Veterinary Inspection indicating that it has been examined by a licensed vet prior to shipment and found to be healthy. This exam is critical to ensure that puppies are not shipped with communicable diseases or other ailments that may cause harm to the public, other animals, or the dogs themselves.

A close review of certificates accompany dogs exported out of Missouri by Hunte in January of this year indicates that three Hunte staff vets attested to having examined over 1,700 puppies in just eight days. One vet claimed that he examined 695 dogs in a single day giving him just . 69 seconds to examine each dog before approving it for shipment. A second Hunte vet claimed that she examined 572 dogs in one day giving her just .84 seconds with each dog. And the third staff vet claimed that he examined 640 dogs in one day giving him just .75 seconds for each
dog. Of the 1,700 puppies exported by Hunte in January, we know that at least 111 of them ended up in New York City pet stores.

It is evident from this data that the
puppies are either not being examined at all or simply being grand stamped by a vet before loaded onto trucks and sent to pet stores across the country. This information seriously calls into question the integrity of the Hunte Corporation and of the Class B dealer system overall. We estimate that Hunte ships about 70,000 puppies in interstate commerce annually with 1,200 to 1,500 of them coming into New York City pet stores. That's 1,200 to 1,500
puppies being marketed to New Yorkers without having been adequately checked by a vet, and without any assurance that the information about them is reliable. The evidence is fact based, and it is clear there are big problems in the commercial breeding industry [bell] and with the brokering system. [laughs]

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you, Cori. MICHELLE VILLAGOMEZ: Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Michelle Villagomez, New York City Legislative Director for the ASPCA. I'm going to
jump around in my testimony a little bit for the sake of time. The ASPCA supports Intro 55-A, 136-A, 146-A and 73-A. We think that taken together this legislative package will address many of the problems created by the State Preemption, which kept New York City from adequately protecting animals and consumers. Consumers, taxpayers, and the shelter system as well as other not-for-profit partners typically absorb the cost associated with unwanted pet store dogs. I'm going to address one thing that was brought up earlier. People said that the ASPCA is opposed to mandatory spaying and neutering. That's not necessarily the case when we're talking about commercial entities. So we do support it in this case. As people mentioned a law going back to 2001 required pet stores to spay and neuter their animals upon on sale. That same law made that same request of shelters and the shelter community has complied.

With regards to Intro 55-A, I just want to piggyback on some things that my colleague Cori mentioned. It's going to ensure that dogs and cats offered for sale are not sourced from breeders who fail to meet even the most basic care standards.

It's going to increase transparency for both the pet stores, and the consumer. Statistically, at any give time at least 15 to $20 \%$ of Class A dealers have significant violations of the federal law. I have attached some photos to the testimony showing some common violations. It's one thing to talk about it, but it's another thing to see it. So when you have time please look through the photos. They really do leave an impact.

Not all of the violations of the Animal Welfare Act are even documented by inspectors. With only 120 inspectors to oversee 7,000 licensed entities, USDA inspectors are stretched thin. Without constant oversight, there is no way for us to know just how pervasive the abuses within the industry may be. The Class A provisions in Intro 55A will keep puppies from some of the worst breeders out of the pet stores. The prohibition on Class B dealers is also critical in order to make this legislation its most effective. Brokers are not required to disclose to pet stores information about the breeders they source from.

So there is little to no opportunity for
pet stores to scrutinize those breeders to ensure
that the puppies come from legally sound sources. Pet stores simply indicate to the brokers what breeds of puppy they want and how many. They have little to no access to information about the original sources of those puppies. When pet stores use Class B dealers as a puppy source, the transparency that is critical for consumers disappears. Under state law, a pet store is not required to investigate or even know the breeders of the puppies. They are only required to disclose the animal's source $a / k / a$ the broker.

If the pet store is unable or chooses not to obtain accurate information about the breeder, then the consumer will not be able to obtain the information either. This coupled with the fact that information provided by brokers may be inaccurate or misleading shows why class $B$ dealers should not be a permissible source for local pet stores that sell puppies. So I am just going to reiterate that the ASPCA is supportive of this package. As people have said, spaying and neutering is the most important key way to control overpopulation. Microchipping is important, and we've worked with the City long and hard [bell] to increase dog licenses and compliance.

So we're really excited about that as well. Thank you, Michelle. Bill.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you.
BILL KETZER: Mr. Chairman and Council
Members Crowley, thank you very much for the opportunity to speak to you today about 55-A. I'm not going to give you my entire testimony. I'm the ASPCA's State Legislative Director for the Northeast Region of the United States. I was the ASPCA's Principal Lobbyist at the State level, and was a primary coordinator in New York for the Coalition of Municipal and Legal Welfare Interests that champion Assembly Member Rosenthal's legislation repealing the preemption on local pet dealer laws. So the purpose of my testimony here is going to be to talk about-to support the need for the portions of the bill that establish a regulatory program for the retail pet sellers at that level. And also to provide some historical context in terms of what the State Pet Dealer Licensing Inspection Program does or doesn't do. However, given the time and also that that information is going to be readily available in my written testimony, I would just like to thank you for taking the time to hear everyone's opinions today.

Of course, we are all just a phone call away, should you desire any information. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very much
to the ASPCA for all of your help, hard work and what you do on a very regular basis. The photos are devastating. It is hear breaking to see what is going on. Thank you for bringing it to light. We are going to try to get our last panel in very quickly. Thank you very much. Okay, last panel. This is it. Another committee has to come in. Gordon Strum, Roxanne Delgado, Monica Wright, and William Sutton. Okay, we have to speed it up. [background conversation] [Pause]

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Okay. Someone who is up there may start because we have to go. There is another committee that needs this room. I have to swear you in. I'm sorry. Please raise your right hand. Do you affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in your testimony before this committee, and to answer all Council Member questions honestly? ROXANNE DELGADO: Yes, I do.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very
much. You may begin.
ROXANNE DELGADO: Thank you. Hopefully
the end of pets in windows sold as property will arrive one day soon. Hopefully, this bill leads heads in the right direction to address the issue that has been neglected too long. This affects me directly in my community in the Bronx. Not only have I borne the financial burden of rescuing pets dumped on the streets, but also the emotional pain of taking them to AC\&C shelters. Yes, I have tried placing them in no-kill shelters, but they are often full to capacity. The breeders and pet dealers are profiting off the misery of all pets in this city while those with little resources are emotionally and financially drained rescuing just a few of many strays on our streets because we don't have a shelter in the Bronx. Every pet that is killed, kills a shelter pet's chance of a forever home. Worst of all, anyone can buy a pet and often it's on impulse. After the novelty wears off, the pet is dumped and added to a large pool of homeless pets. It's not only a pet, it's a lack of respect for a living being. It promotes animal abuse as they are viewed as items
sold on the front of windows. It also reinforces racism and low self-esteem by promoting a pure breed as superior to others. In fact, mutts are better since they are not in-bred with genetic defects as those pure breeds. There is nothing better that sharing your home with a mutt. Adopt those mutts, and save a life. The above testimony is based on real life experience. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you. What's

```
your name?
```

ROXANNE DELGADO: Roxanne. I'm sorry. CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: You are not by yourself. Roxanne and--?

COURTNEY STOMAR: Courtney Stomar. [sp?] CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: I'm sorry. What's your full name?

ROXANNE DELGADO: Delgado. CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you, Roxanne. ROXANNE DELGADO: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very much for your testimony.

ROXANNE DELGADO: Thank you for your time.

COURTNEY STOMAR: Council members, my
name is Courtney Stomar. I'm here today on behalf of myself and as a committee member of Friends of Finn. Friends of Finn is a committee made up of next generation leaders dedicated to ending the inhumane treatment of dogs in puppy mills. How much is that doggie in the window? For me, that doggie turned out to be upwards of $\$ 35,000$ in medical bills. Giardia, Coccidia, fevers, hypoglycemia, exophytic liver shunts, a stroke, two seizures, multiple bouts with pancreatitis, and life ending hepatic encephalopathy. I have often joked that I have earned an honorary degree in veterinary medicine over the course of Charlotte's nine-year life. She was a victim of irresponsible breeding practices that are standard in puppy mills, and I unknowingly contributed money to the industry. I am here today to honor Charlotte and advocate for the approximately two million doggies sold annually in the window, many to New York City consumers. These purchasers are unintentionally supporting mills by funneling thousands of dollars per puppy back into the system, and perpetuating a cruel and inhumane cycle. In the gleaming window, the puppies often appear energetic, happy, and
coiffed to perfection. Little do passers-by and perspective owners know the grim places from which the animals came, and the deplorable conditions they suffer through.

I recently accompanied the Humane Society of the United States on their way to Mississippi where over 170 dogs were rescued and vetted. The majority had never been touched by human hands, seen the sunlight, been on a walk, or let out of their filthy dilapidated metal cages. All were improperly nourished, and showed obvious signs of mistreatment and neglect. Our pets become our companions, our family, our children. How could we let them suffer like this. Along with all the members of Friends of Finn, I am urging the Council to consider this important animal welfare and consumer protection ordinance to prohibit pet store owners in New York City from purchasing puppies from mills just like the one in Mississippi. And prevent prospective owners from inadvertently partaking in the process. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration of this important matter. Lastly, I have presented a letter from Amanda Hurst, the Founder of Friends of Finn who was unable to be here today.

## CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you very

much, Courtney. You may proceed.
GORDON STROM: Good morning. I would say
it's afternoon now. I'm going to conserve my
thoughts. Most of what I wanted to say has been spoken about and articulated much better than I could do it. I'm a resident of New York City. I support numerous animal welfare organizations many of which are here. I'm also a registered voter. I just want to say a special thanks to Assemblyperson Rosenthal, Councilperson Crowley and Johnson for your groundbreaking work here. Improving the welfare of animals in New York City is a huge task, and your support of these four bills will really make a difference. Thank you.

MONICA WRIGHT: Good morning. My name is
Monica Wright. I'm here to submit testimony on behalf of my employers and friends, Melissa Milne [sp?]and Dave Dezinko [sp?], who unfortunately are not able to be here today. Many times-- Melissa's testimony is as follow:

Many times I walk by Le Petit Puppy always thinking it was an upscale pet store. On August 7, 2011, my boyfriend Dave and I decided to go
in. My eyes met this little puppy in the back of the store, crated and all by herself. There was no doubt in my mind that Le Petit Puppy was a reputable pet store located in the West Village and offering dogs for thousands of dollars. I would soon learn that I could not have been more wrong. The pet store employees assured us, that they only buy puppies from private breeders, and that our little Bee was a designer dog at the rice of $\$ 3,000$. They said the dog had papers, and that she was from a champion line of Bulldog and Beagle often claiming that she wouldn't shed. I remember them saying Hugh Jackman has her older brother, which I thought was strange as they pointed out an image of him on their wall. On a side note, I repeatedly asked for those papers showing lineage. Yet, to this day, they have never been given to me.

Le Petit Puppy removed the little puppy from the crate so we could play with her, and she was very lethargic. It stood out to me. So I commented thinking the young curious puppy would have much more energy. The shop employee told me that she was exhausted from playing with other puppies. Within just 72 hours we learned this was the furthest thing
from the truth. I wanted to bring her home right away, but Dave thought it best we slept on it. Le Petit Puppy immediately offered a discount for us to take her home that day in lieu of waiting. They reduced her value immediately and without hesitation. The feeling of this sleazy sales tactic was over shadowed by my love for this little puppy. I have now had many times to reflect on this experience. In hindsight, I was a soft target. I was full of excitement for this little animal with big eyes, and big floppy ears. I didn't do any research on Le Petit Puppy. I trusted them, believing them to be honest and ethical, but they were not. The next day, August 8, we brought our new puppy home, but she was motionless. I had dogs growing up, and they were very active so I knew something was wrong. Over the next 72 hours after her not eating much, having loose stools and vomiting notwithstanding the lethargy, we raced to Greenwich Village Animal Hospital. I will never forget the moment her vet, Dr. Tracy Sane showed me the x-rays of her lungs, which were full of infection. She was diagnosed with pneumonia and had had it for some time indicating that she was sick while under the care of the pet store, and perhaps
even before her arrival there. Bee endured an intensive medical treatment plan, which entailed us going to the vet hospital multiple times over the course-- Multiple times that day-- Sorry. Multiple times for over 15 nebulization treatments. Soon after, Bee's health took a turn for the worse when she started convulsing. We rushed her back to our vet where she was directed to another hospital that put her in total isolation where she underwent 24hour care for five full days. The vet bills amounted to more than $\$ 5,000$. Her condition was grave, and we were told that she may not make it. This puppy we just brought home was now fighting for breath and fighting for life. The breeder in this case had a broker's license. They were not-- [bell] They were a broker, and they had violations at the time. CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you for being here to testify. MONICA WRIGHT: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON JOHNSON: Thank you all for waiting and being patient. Thank you to everyone for being here today. This hearing is adjourned. [gavel]
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