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AN ACT to amend the agriculture and markets law and the general business law, in relation to the sale of dogs, cats and rabbits.

THIS LEGISLATION IS SUPPORTED WITH RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation (A.6298-A/S.4234-A)\(^1\) would prohibit retail pet shops\(^2\) from selling, offering to sell, bartering, auctioning, or otherwise transferring ownership of any dog, cat or rabbit.\(^3\) Each violation would be subject to a penalty of $100-$1000.\(^4\) In addition, the bill allows the Commissioner of Agriculture to deny or revoke non-profit registration to any applicant or registrant previously licensed as a pet dealer.\(^5\) The bill further allows the Commissioner of Agriculture to make available to police agencies and officers and district attorneys information regarding this ban on pet shop sales.\(^6\)

The proposed legislation would enable New York to join the hundreds of jurisdictions across the country that have already enacted pet store dog, cat, and/or rabbit sales bans; as of January 2019, more than 300 cities, local governments, and states across the country have enacted pet store animal sales bans. See II.F for a list of U.S. jurisdictions with similar laws.

II. BACKGROUND: THE PIPELINE BETWEEN PUPPY MILLS AND PET STORES.

Puppy mills and kitten and rabbit factories are large-scale commercial breeding facilities that mass-produce animals for sale with little regard for animal welfare, primarily through retail pet stores.\(^7\) The United States has at least 10,000 puppy mills, which collectively produce 2.4 million puppies annually.\(^8\) The vast majority (approximately 90\%) of all pet store companion animals come from mills and factories.\(^9\) In USDA-licensed facilities alone, nearly two hundred thousand dogs are kept solely for breeding.\(^10\)

New York State has a high concentration of pet stores: with about 95 pet stores, it holds approximately 10\% of dog-selling pet stores in the nation.\(^11\) These stores, like most pet stores
across the nation, secure a vast majority of their inventory from puppy mills. In addition, New York State has a significant number of puppy mills, many of which have been cited for repeated Animal Welfare Act violations.

Animal mills and factories have generally been regulated in two ways: by regulating the mills and factories themselves, an approach which the federal government has taken but which has not been effective; and by attempting to regulate the distributors, particularly pet stores, that serve as middle-men between the mills and the public. The proposed legislation addresses the intractable problem of puppy mills and kitten and rabbit factories more directly: by eliminating retail pet shops as a primary source of sales. This legislation would protect animals where federal and state regulation and enforcement have been ineffective (see Sections III. D and E below). The federal standards of care for commercially bred, dogs, cats and rabbits are nominal and have been deemed deficient by major veterinary organizations. In addition, the federal government has failed to enforce these low standards. To further exacerbate matters, USDA enforcement has declined significantly under the current administration. Current New York State and New York City laws are also insufficient to protect animal welfare.

### III. REASONS FOR SUPPORT

The New York City Bar Association’s Animal Law Committee supports the proposed legislation because it (i) eliminates a primary source of sales for puppy mills and kitten and rabbit factories, which in turn benefits animals, the environment, and the public; (ii) promotes animal adoption and reduces euthanasia of homeless animals; (iii) protects consumers; (iv) protects animals where federal regulation and enforcement have been ineffective; and (v) is necessary because New York State does not effectively regulate puppy mills. Notably, hundreds of U.S. jurisdictions have already banned pet store animal sales.

#### a. The Bill Eliminates a Primary Source of Sales for Puppy Mills and Kitten and Rabbit Factories — Which Benefits Animals, the Environment, and the Public.

1. **Animals in mills and factories suffer inhumane conditions.**

   Commercial breeding facilities treat companion animals like commodities, prioritizing profits over the animals’ wellbeing. These facilities regularly house animals in overcrowded and unsanitary conditions without adequate food, water, socialization and/or veterinary care. USDA inspection reports contain numerous violations for ill animals that received no veterinary care. Companion animals in mills also often do not receive nutritious and adequate food and are regularly malnourished. In many cases they lack regular access to clean water. Companion animals in mills often live in unsanitary conditions with feces-saturated pens, cages in disrepair, rusty feeders caked with hair and dirt, broken glass in cages, and vermin and rodent infestation. Many do not receive adequate protection from the cold or heat.

   Breeding dogs in particular can spend their entire lives in cramped cages with little to no personal attention. And when dogs can no longer breed, they are abandoned or killed.
ii. Animals in mills and factories suffer health and behavioral problems.

As a result of these inhumane conditions, the physical, behavioral, and psychological needs of the dogs, cats and rabbits are not met sufficiently to provide a reasonably decent quality of life for the animals.24 Mill and factory animals often suffer from an array of health and behavioral problems including communicable diseases, behavioral issues, and genetic disorders due to overcrowded and unsanitary conditions, lack of preventative veterinary care, and breeding practices.25 Conditions common to puppy mills — like the use of stacked, wire cages to house the maximum number of animals and continual exposure to feces and urine of other animals — cause frequent parasites and increased risk of infectious diseases.26 In addition, a lack of regular veterinary care, basic grooming, and clean food and water often cause injuries and infections to fester until they become severe. These disorders cause undue suffering and often result in premature death and shortened life span for the animals.27

Dogs from puppy mills also suffer from extensive behavioral issues and receive significantly worse behavioral and medical scores than dogs from other sources.28 A review of seven published studies on dogs born in high-volume commercial breeding establishments revealed an increased incidence of behavioral and emotional problems compared with dogs from noncommercial breeders.29 A study published in the Journal of American Veterinary Medicine similarly concluded that obtaining dogs from pet stores represented a significant risk factor for the development of a wide range of undesirable behavioral characteristics, especially aggressive behavior.30 The most consistent finding among studies is that early life stimulus deprivation and inadequate housing, handling and raising practices cause an increase in aggression, separation anxiety, and sensitivity to touch.31

Breeding dogs particularly suffer from serious psychological and behavioral issues due to prolonged confinement to cages and deprivation, including minimal to no human interaction.32 After removal from canine commercial breeding establishments, former breeding dogs display persistent behavioral and psychological abnormalities including extreme fears and phobias, compulsive and repetitive behavior, learning deficits and lower trainability, high sensitivity to noises in their surroundings, higher rates of house-soiling, and difficulty coping with normal existence.33

Like dogs, rabbits from rabbit factories suffer from similar health and behavioral issues due to inadequate care in mills and pet stores.34 Such rabbits are particularly prone to illness, disease and death due to lack of necessary specialized care in factories, early weaning at 3-4 weeks (and resulting underdeveloped immune systems), lack of quarantine procedures, and inadequate housing and veterinary care.35 Similarly too, cats bred in kitten factories suffer from behavioral issues, including aggressive behavior due to minimal human interaction, litter box problems due to lack of basic litter box training, anxiety, and light sensitivity.36

iii. Mills and factories harm the environment.

Companion animal mills cause substantial pollution to the water, soil, and air.37 State and federal inspection reports show that many puppy mills engage in improper and illegal waste disposal of feces, urine and carcasses in violation of environmental law.38 Pathogens from dog
Feces at puppy mills cause water pollution by seeping into the ground, draining into wet-dry streams and making their way into major rivers that serve as public drinking water sources. Feces accumulation in soil — typical at animal mill facilities — causes production of methane, a greenhouse gas responsible for air pollution as well as global warming.

A detailed environmental impact analysis of the Whispering Oaks puppy mill in Parkersburg, West Virginia serves as just one example of the environmental hazards of puppy mills. That mill was cited for violating West Virginia water pollution and solid waste statutes and, according to the researcher, is representative of the environmental impacts of puppy mills generally based upon its canine husbandry practices and size.

iv. Mills and factories are a public health risk.

The release of pathogens into water, soil and air also presents a public health risk to humans. In particular, large numbers of dogs in facilities with improper waste management create significant risks for disease transmission. Puppy mill dogs are regularly infected with pathogens excreted and transferred to the soil and capable of infecting animals or humans coming into contact with the soil. The Centers for Disease Control (CDC) has reported that numerous zoonotic diseases are transmitted from dogs to humans through improper waste handling as well as soil and water contamination. In May 2019, for instance, an outbreak of canine Brucellosis, a type of zoonotic disease that is incurable in dogs and spreadable to humans, was reported in Knoxville, Iowa, with origination at a commercial dog breeding facility. In addition, the CDC linked a recent outbreak of antibiotic resistant disease in humans to pet stores sourcing from puppy mills. This outbreak of Campylobacter jejuni impacting 118 people in 18 states and resulting in 26 hospitalizations was traced to puppies from Petland pet stores and five other pet store chains.

Because companion animal mills often have suboptimal vaccination and disease protection procedures, the mills also put animals and humans at risk for canine distemper, which is capable of infecting humans. And indeed, recent canine distemper outbreaks at pet stores have been linked to commercial breeders. Further, pet overpopulation that stems from the animal mill industry may also increase human exposure to other serious public health risks, such as rabies.

v. Mills and factories create costs for New York, but few financial benefits.

Mass production of companion animals in commercial breeding facilities is a major cause of pet overpopulation which in turn results in significant costs for taxpayers in housing and euthanizing animals. In fact, the State of New York expends approximately $50 million annually to house and euthanize animals. Meanwhile, puppy mills typically do not provide financial benefits to states, since they often do not pay required licensing fees or taxes and employ few employees.

b. The Bill Promotes Animal Adoption and Reduces Euthanasia of Homeless Animals.

A ban on pet store sales of dogs, cats and rabbits would significantly increase adoption of homeless animals and reduce shelter euthanasia. Jurisdictions that have banned sales of companion
animals have reported substantial increases in shelter pet adoption rates. Similarly, pet store conversion programs, which work with pet stores to stop selling animals and instead showcase homeless animals for adoption, have shown great success in increasing adoption rates.

A ban on pet store sales of dogs, cats and rabbits would also significantly reduce euthanasia rates. In particular, the number of commercially produced companion animals from mills is a major cause of pet overpopulation. While many rescue organizations are part of Petfinder — one of the largest pet adoption websites in North America — many lack the resources and space needed to conduct large-scale adoption events. Accordingly, euthanasia of healthy, adoptable animals is prevalent. Indeed, even though 80% of euthanized animals are healthy and adoptable, around 56% of dogs and 71% of cats that enter animal shelters are euthanized, with approximately 3 million cats and dogs euthanized in shelters each year.

Not surprisingly then, jurisdictions that have passed ordinances banning the sale of companion animals have reported a significant decrease in euthanasia of shelter animals. Veterinarians are also increasingly advocating for pet store sales bans as a mechanism to decrease shelter euthanasia. Notably, these bans benefit not just the animals themselves but also those working in the shelter, as shelter euthanasia can have a severe negative psychological impact on shelter workers.

c. The Bill Protects Consumers.

Reducing the pipeline of companion animals from mills and factories to pet stores also protects consumers. Retail pet stores that sell companion animals from mills generally provide little information or misleading information to consumers about the origin of these animals and the conditions of their breeding. Accordingly, consumers are often unaware of the source of pet store animals. When consumers unwittingly purchase from pet stores animals that suffer from illnesses resulting from breeding and rearing practices, lack of preventative care, and unsanitary conditions at commercial breeding facilities, they can incur expensive veterinary bills and emotional trauma. And in fact, pet stores face frequent consumer lawsuits for selling sick companion animals from commercial breeding facilities.

While New York, like many other states, has a “pet lemon law” designed to protect consumers who buy sick animals from pet stores, New York’s law — and pet lemon laws more generally — provide minimal protection in practice. For instance, a consumer seeking remedies under New York’s law must return the animal within a short time (potentially just 14 days) and even then would be entitled to only limited remedies: exchange of the animal or a refund or reimbursement up to the animal’s purchase price, with no compensation for pain or suffering.

d. The Bill Protects Animals Where Federal Regulation And Enforcement Have Been Ineffective.

The federal government regulates commercial breeding operations under the Animal Welfare Act (AWA), which is one of the few federal laws that govern humane treatment of commercially bred companion animals. The AWA sets forth requirements regarding the transportation, purchase, sale, housing, care, handling, and treatment of commercially bred animals.
and authorizes the Animal and Plant Inspection Service (APHIS), a division within the USDA, to promulgate associated standards and implement and enforce the AWA.77 Relevantly here, the USDA requires commercial breeding facilities with five or more breeding females that sell to pet stores or consumers that do not see the animals prior to purchase to be licensed and comply with all regulations including regular inspections.78

Yet the standards of care for commercially bred animals outlined in the AWA and associated USDA regulations79 are minimal. For instance, current standards provide just six inches of space above and around each dog80 and allow for harmful wire flooring and stacked cages.81 Current regulations also do not require that dogs receive daily exercise82 or that continuous access to clean water be provided.83 Current requirements leave significant discretion in the hands of puppy mill owners to decide what constitutes an adequate level of care with respect to living environment, cleanliness and sanitation, feeding, veterinary care, housing structure, and comfort, and contain vague specifications for “adequate” requirements.84

Current federal law is particularly lacking with respect to breeding animals. For instance, they do not provide for annual hands-on veterinary examinations and preventative care for such animals.85 Commercial breeding facilities are permitted to breed female dogs every time they are in heat without limitation, which has significant negative health implications and is contrary to guidelines issued by a number of organizations and breeding clubs.86 And no regulation governs how commercial breeding facilities treat adult dogs or cats who no longer reproduce, or puppies and kittens they cannot sell.87 Commercial breeding facilities are therefore free to euthanize animals, even without a veterinarian.88 Commercial breeding facilities regularly discard older cats and dogs that are less marketable as well as animals with physical irregularities or health issues.89

These standards have been deemed deficient by veterinary organizations.90 In September 2015, for instance, The Humane Society Veterinary Medical Association, Humane Society of the US, and ASPCA submitted a rulemaking petition to the USDA calling for ten reforms in basic care standards for dogs at commercial breeding facilities.91 These changes have not yet been made.92 Given the limited nature of the USDA’s care requirements, the fact that a pet breeder is USDA-licensed is no endorsement of humane care.93 Many other authorities have likewise deemed the Animal Welfare Act requirements inadequate to protect covered animals, including commercially bred cats, dogs and rabbits, and ripe for significant reform.94

Further, the federal government has failed to enforce even these nominal and inadequate standards of care for commercially bred companion animals.95 First, many commercial breeders fail to obtain licensing. For instance, a 2010 audit by the Office of Inspector General at APHIS found that 81% of sampled commercial breeders were unlicensed due to evasion of licensing or loopholes in licensing.96 Inspectors also regularly fail to cite violations accurately.97 A 2010 audit by the Office of the Inspector General at APHIS concluded that APHIS was ineffective in the inspections and enforcement process.98 Specifically, auditors found that the enforcement process was ineffective against problematic dealers,99 that inspectors did not cite or document violations properly,100 and that APHIS misused guidelines to lower penalties for AWA violators and was lenient toward dealers that violate the AWA.101 APHIS enforcement is also impaired due to minimal resources and staffing for a large volume of responsibilities.102

To further exacerbate matters, USDA enforcement has declined under the current administration.103 The USDA launched 92% fewer enforcement cases in 2018 compared to 2016
and documented 60% fewer violations at licensing facilities in 2018 compared to 2017. Inspectors are advised to treat commercial breeders and others regulated by the agency as partners rather than potential offenders and to consider violations as “teachable moments” in lieu of issuing citations. Furthermore, due to the USDA’s ongoing redaction practices, it is difficult for consumers purchasing companion animals (and the public generally) to monitor the USDA’s enforcement of the AWA. Although the USDA has restored animal welfare inspection reports and enforcement actions on its website after removing them in 2017, the agency continues to redact breeder names, addresses, and license numbers on its public Animal Welfare Act records online. The continued availability of online inspection and enforcement records is uncertain since the USDA has argued that it not legally required to publish its inspection and enforcement records. Additionally, APHIS has not been responsive to Freedom of information Act (FOIA) requests and appeals by non-profit organizations during the last three years.

In March 2019 the USDA proposed a rule that would prevent commercial animal breeders with egregious animal care violations from renewing USDA licenses. While this represents a positive step for enhanced enforcement, it would be effective only if the USDA accurately cites breeders for egregious violations in the first place. Additionally, the USDA has made recent changes that serve to further reduce effective enforcement of the AWA for commercial breeding facilities, including launching a pilot program that would alert some facilities about inspections in advance along with a new incentive program that allows commercial breeding facilities to avoid citations by self-reporting violations (including serious violations that result in animal deaths). Despite the USDA’s poor enforcement record, courts have generally not interfered in the USDA’s decisions unless they are “arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law.

**e. The Bill Is Necessary Because New York State Does Not Effectively Regulate Puppy Mills.**

As with federal law, state commercial breeding regulations and animal cruelty laws have been inadequate to effectively regulate New York State companion animal mills and protect consumers.

While New York commercial breeding guidelines slightly exceed the minimum standard of care set by the federal government, the standards remain insufficient to protect animal welfare. For one, enforcement of state commercial breeding laws (in New York and generally) is inadequate. In addition, New York commercial breeding laws regulate companion animal mills only within the state. Yet most pet stores regularly source animals from out of state, particularly from states with large concentrations of commercial breeding facilities and little regulation. Most states that have companion animal commercial breeding laws do not significantly raise the standard of care or inspection requirements provided by the federal government, and 16 states have no commercial breeding laws at all.

And while state animal cruelty law may also serve as a mechanism to police commercial breeding facilities, there is significant under-enforcement of such laws. This is compounded by the difficulty in enforcing laws against an industry that is hidden from public view and by the fact that pet stores have little incentive to report animal cruelty at their supplier of companion
animals. More generally, New York has relatively weak animal protection laws as compared to other states.

While New York City has enacted pet shop sourcing laws to address this issue, those laws alone cannot solve the problem. In particular, those laws apply only to New York City, and they rely on USDA enforcement records to determine whether a sale of dog or cat is prohibited. Yet as noted in Section III.D above, the USDA has a poor enforcement record.


As of January 2019, more than 300 cities, local governments, and states across the country have enacted pet store animal sales bans. States with retail pet sales bans include California and Maryland. Several states have similar pending bills. Major U.S. cities that have passed such legislation include Albuquerque, Atlanta, Austin, Boston, Chicago, El Paso, Ft. Lauderdale, Los Angeles, Nashville, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Providence, Sacramento, Salt Lake City, San Diego, San Francisco, and St. Paul.

IV. COUNTERARGUMENTS AND REBUTTALS


Pet stores in New York State can continue to remain profitable without animal sales. Across the country, pet stores are updating their business models, no longer selling animals from commercial breeding facilities and instead showcasing homeless pets for adoption and focusing sales on a range of pet-related products and services. The U.S. retail pet store market is continuing to thrive and experience significant growth despite increased competition by online sellers.

This alternative business model is viable in part because of increased market demand for high quality pet food and grooming and boarding services. In fact, live animal sales comprise only a small fraction of money spent in the pet industry. The two most successful pet stores in the United States, Petco and PetSmart, no longer sell dogs, cats and rabbits but rather partner with rescue organizations and shelters to show adoptable animals; and they have maintained successful financial models while doing so. And only one of the top 25 pet store chains in the United States still sells dogs from commercial breeders. Pet stores that work with rescue groups and shelters derive positive publicity and draw customers in for products and services.

b. “Banning Animal Sales At Pet Stores Denies Consumer Choice, Particularly For Purebred Animals.”

Consumers appear to increasingly prefer adopting and rescuing animals rather than buying them. And purebred companion animals can be obtained regularly from shelters and rescue organizations. In fact, the estimated percent of purebred dogs in shelters is 25%, and the availability of purebred animals in animal shelters is expected to rise. Breed-specific rescue
organizations are on the rise as well.\textsuperscript{154} Notably too, the legislation does not ban sales of purebred animals by private breeders.

c. “Pet Store Animal Sales Bans Will Not End Puppy Mills.”

The pet store animal sales ban is one integral part of a solution to end companion animal mills. In order to eradicate these mills entirely, the proposed legislation should be supplemented with consumer education, additional local and state pet store sales bans, stronger federal and state laws to govern commercial breeding conditions, and enhanced enforcement of existing state and federal laws.

d. “A Pet Store Animal Sales Ban Will Be Struck Down.”

Several courts have held that local governments have authority to enforce ordinances that ban or restrict retail sale of dogs and cats and that such laws are a legitimate exercise of police power based upon the correlation between prohibition on the retail sales of companion animals and increased adoption, decreased euthanasia, and reduction in the prevalence of homeless animals.\textsuperscript{155} Local government pet store animal sales bans have survived several legal challenges from the pet industry including dormant commerce clause, equal protection, and substantive due process challenges.\textsuperscript{156}

V. RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends that the bill provide for stronger penalties for repeat violators; as currently drafted, penalties for a violation can be as low as $100, which could allow pet stores to build the cost of violations into their prices and pass those costs on to consumers. Further, the Committee recommends adding language in Section 16 of the Agriculture and Markets law regarding provision of training for those statutorily charged with enforcing the ban in order to ensure an adequate mechanism for enforcement.

VI. CONCLUSION

Puppy mills and kitten and rabbit factories exist because there is a demand for their “goods” from pet retailers who seek to purchase animals at the lowest possible cost. Barring pet stores from selling dogs, cats and rabbits will eliminate a primary source of sales for puppy mills and kitten and rabbit factories, which benefits animals, the environment, and the public. In addition, the bill promotes animal adoption and reduces euthanasia of homeless animals, and protects consumers. The bill is necessary because federal regulation and enforcement have been ineffective, while New York State likewise does not effectively regulate puppy mills. In addition, hundreds of U.S. jurisdictions have already banned pet store animal sales.

For the reasons above, the New York City Bar Association’s Animal Law Committee supports the proposed legislation.

Animal Law Committee
Christopher Wlach, Chair

December 2019
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