

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
Report for the Village
1/8/2019

SUBJECT:	SUBMITTED BY:
Research options for regulating the sale of dogs, cats and rabbits	David Fieldman Village Manager

SYNOPSIS

At the request of the Village Council, staff was directed to research options for regulating the sale of dogs, cats and rabbits in the Village of Downers Grove.

STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT

The goals for 2017-2019 include *Exceptional Municipal Services*.

FISCAL IMPACT

N/A

RECOMMENDATION

Action at the discretion of the Council. Options for potential next steps are included in the Background section below.

BACKGROUND

At the October 9th meeting, the Village Council directed staff to research options for regulating the sale of dogs and cats.

Federal Regulations

The Animal Welfare Act (AWA), established in 1966, is the only Federal law in the United States that regulates the treatment of animals. The AWA requires that minimum standards of care and treatment be provided for certain animals bred for commercial sale.

Nationally recognized animal welfare organizations such as the Humane Society of the United States and The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals have identified that these minimum standards of care are survival standards, and that these standards are far below what the organizations would consider humane, or even acceptable.

State Regulations

The State's [Animal Welfare Act](#) contains regulations regarding the breeding and sale of animals. The Act was amended in 2014 by [Public Act 098-0509](#), which contains regulations for animal sale warranties and remedies.

In early 2018, the Illinois General Assembly began consideration of [Senate Bill 2280](#) which includes regulations for the sale of dogs, cats and rabbits in DuPage and Will Counties. On January 10, 2018, the bill was referred to Senate assignment and no further action has been taken.

On January 1, 2019, the State of California became the first state to prohibit the retail sale of dogs, cats and rabbits unless the animal comes from designated shelters and non-profit organizations.

Options for Village Council Discussion

Staff has identified the following three options for Council consideration. The third option, which would require Village Council to adopt regulations, provides a subset of three options to explore. Village Council should be aware that any decision to regulate pet sales will affect the business operations of existing stores selling pets in Downers Grove.

Options for Regulating the Sale of Dogs, Cats and Rabbits			
Council Options		Effectiveness	Administrative Burden
Option 1	No New Regulations	<i>None</i>	<i>None</i>
Option 2	Support for approval of Senate Bill 2280	<i>High</i>	<i>Low</i>
Option 3 A	Prohibit the retail sale of dogs, cats and rabbits	<i>High</i>	<i>Moderate</i>
Option 3 B	Restrict the retail sale of dogs, cats and rabbits to breeder suppliers meeting certain identified standards	<i>Low</i>	<i>High</i>
Option 3 C	Establish mandatory warranty periods after the purchase of a dog, cat or rabbit	<i>Low</i>	<i>Moderate</i>

Option 1 - No New Regulations - Under this option, the Village Council would not regulate the sale of dogs, cats and rabbits. There would be no impact to current pet sale practices, and no impact to Village of Downers Grove operations.

Option 2 - Support for approval of Senate Bill 2280 - Under this option, the Village Council would support the approval of Senate Bill 2280, which includes regulations for the sale of dogs, cats and rabbits in DuPage and Will Counties. This bill would allow pet shop operators to offer a dog, cat or rabbit for sale only if the pet shop operator has obtained the dog, cat or rabbit from an animal facility operated by a subdivision of local, state or federal government, or a specified animal rescue organization.

The provisions do not prohibit the county or a municipality in Will County or DuPage County from adopting requirements that are more protective of animal welfare than those set forth, and home rule units in Will County or DuPage County may adopt an ordinance explicitly exempting itself from the provisions.

There is no timetable for consideration of Senate Bill 2280. This Bill has been referred to Senate assignment and no further action has been taken.

Option 3 - Establish Village of Downers Grove regulations

A. Prohibit the retail sale of dogs, cats and rabbits in the Village of Downers Grove

Under this option, Village Council would prohibit the retail sale of dogs, cats and rabbits in the Village of Downers Grove. Village staff would conduct inspections to ensure compliance with this ordinance.

Similar ordinances that other municipalities adopted have allowed the following exceptions:

- Coordinated adoption events with animal rescue organizations at pet store locations
- Non-commercial breeders selling dogs or cats that they have produced and raised, provided the person owns four or less females capable of reproduction. The USDA recognizes commercial breeders as any breeder who owns five or more females capable of reproduction.
- Veterinary hospitals or licensed clinics pursuant to the Veterinary Medicine and Surgery Practice Act of 2004.

These exceptions would necessitate the pet shop operator to comply with additional requirements and maintain specific documentation for each animal, and would also necessitate Village staff to conduct more in-depth inspections, increasing the administrative burden for the Village.

B. Restrict the retail sale of dogs, cats and rabbits to breeder suppliers meeting certain identified standards

Under this option, Village Council would only allow the retail sale of dogs, cats and rabbits if they were sourced from a breeder supplier meeting certain identified standards. There is a high administrative burden for this option. Village staff would require regular inspections to facilities. Documentation of the source of the animals and the verification of those documents would need to be reviewed on an ongoing basis. Determining the extent to which the breeder suppliers meet the established standards would likely be challenging.

Additionally, it is difficult to define what the standards are for a quality or responsible breeder. According to the Humane Society, 96% of the National Breed Clubs representing dog breeds recognized by the American Kennel Club include statements in their code of ethics that the breeder should not and/or do not sell their animals to pet stores. The ASPCA defines a “responsible breeder” as breeders that take lifetime responsibility for the animals they have bred. According to the ASPCA, any breeder that sells animals to commercial pet stores relinquishes the responsibility of caring for an animal throughout the animal’s lifetime, meaning any breeder that sells to commercial pet stores fails to meet the ASPCA standard of a “responsible breeder.”

C. Establish mandatory warranty periods after the purchase of a dog, cat or rabbit

Under this option, the Village would establish mandatory warranty periods after the purchase of a dog, cat or rabbit, which would entitle consumers to be reimbursed if a licensed veterinarian determines the animal was unfit for purchase due to illness or disease. The consumer must notify the pet store where the animal was purchased during a specified period of time, and the pet store may contest the veterinarian’s diagnosis and has the right to consult a second veterinarian. If an agreement is not met, a lawsuit may be filed or the matter may go to arbitration if both parties agree to it. While this option gives consumers an avenue for

reimbursement if the animal was unfit for purchase, it does not provide regulations to restrict current pet sale practices.

The State of Illinois passed a similar amendment to the Animal Welfare Act, by adopting [Public Act 098-0509](#) in 2014; however, pet store operators can have consumers opt out of this warranty upon purchase.

ATTACHMENTS

Safe Pets for Joliet - Council Information Packet

Information Packet for Proposed Companion Animal and Consumer Protection Ordinance for Joliet, Illinois

November 17, 2017

Submitted by Safe Pets for Joliet

A Concerned Citizens Group in Support of a Joliet Companion Animal and Consumer Protection Ordinance

Prepared with Assistance from The Puppy Mill Project

A Chicago-Based Nonprofit Group Raising Awareness of Puppy Mills and Their Connection to Pet Stores

Contact: Morgan Drdak, SafePetsForJoliet@gmail.com, 815.557.4081, SafePetsForJoliet.org

Information Packet for Proposed Companion Animal and Consumer Protection Ordinance for Joliet, Illinois

Table of Contents

Section	Page
Introduction.....	1
Key Facts	2
City of Joliet Pet Store Fact Sheet	4
Companion Animal and Consumer Protection Ordinance Questions and Answers	9
Puppy Mill and Broker Fact Sheet.....	15
Pet Store Alternatives Fact Sheet.....	16
Regulations for Animal Control Facilities/Shelters/Rescues vs. Pet Stores	17
Animal Welfare Act and United States Department of Agriculture Enforcement Fact Sheet.....	21
Retail Pet Sale Ban Fact Sheet.....	23

Information sources are listed in the endnotes beginning on page 32.

Appendices

1. Breeder/Broker Information for Dogs Sold to Furry Babies in 2016
2. Breeder Information for Dogs Available for Purchase at Furry Babies (as of February 7, 2016)
3. Breeder/Broker Information for Dogs Sold to Furry Babies in 2015
4. Breeder/Broker Information for Dogs Sold to Furry Babies in 2013-2014

Introduction

The following information packet has been developed to provide you with a comprehensive understanding of the background, rationale, and implications of the proposed Companion Animal and Consumer Protection Ordinance regulating the retail sale of dogs and cats in Joliet.

Section 1, Key Facts, provides an overview of the information provided in this document, noting the most important facts and rationales in support of this ordinance.

Section 2, City of Joliet Pet Store Fact Sheet, provides a detailed synopsis of the current pet store environment in Joliet, including an analysis of pet store regulation and information about the pet store that operates within the city. This section also includes data from the Joliet Township Animal Control, which serves the animal control needs of Joliet and is impacted by the city's pet store industry.

Section 3, Companion Animal and Consumer Protection Ordinance Questions and Answers, addresses commonly asked questions about the purpose of such legislation, its impacts to pet stores, and its impacts to consumers.

Section 4, Puppy Mill and Broker Fact Sheet, provides definitions and data for the commercial pet breeding industry that is integral to pet store operation.

Section 5, Pet Store Alternatives Fact Sheet, explains how responsible pet breeding contrasts with the commercial breeding of puppy mills and kitten mills, and provides a list of options for consumers to obtain a pet without patronizing a pet store.

Section 6, Regulations for Animal Control Facilities/Shelters/Rescues vs. Pet Stores, provides a detailed comparison of the state regulations for the two types of facilities, which are very similar.

Section 7, Animal Welfare Act and United States Department of Agriculture Enforcement Fact Sheet, details the current federal legislation regulating the commercial pet breeding industry and identifies its insufficiency.

Section 8, Retail Pet Sale Ban Fact Sheet, provides information about how local legislation eliminating commercially bred pet sales is effective and includes a list of jurisdictions in North America that have already adopted this legislation.

Appendix 1, Breeder/Broker Information for Dogs Sold to Furry Babies in 2016, is a breakdown of breeders and brokers reflected on veterinary certificates that details their locations, number of dogs they house, and number and types of non-compliances of the Animal Welfare Act documented in inspection reports on file with the United States Department of Agriculture. **Please note that this information is incomplete because the USDA has eliminated public access to its inspection records and has failed to respond to the Freedom of Information Act request that Safe Pets for Joliet filed in February.**

Appendix 2, Breeder/Broker Information for Dogs Available for Purchase at Furry Babies (as of February 7, 2016), is a breakdown of breeders and brokers reflected on store "official disclosure forms" that details their locations, number of dogs they house, and number and types of non-compliances of the Animal Welfare Act documented in inspection reports on file with the United States Department of Agriculture.

Appendix 3, Breeder/Broker Information for Dogs Sold to Furry Babies in 2015, is a breakdown of breeders and brokers reflected on veterinary certificates that details their locations, number of dogs they house, and number and types of non-compliances of the Animal Welfare Act documented in inspection reports on file with the United States Department of Agriculture.

Appendix 4, Breeder/Broker Information for Dogs Sold to Furry Babies in 2013-2014, is a breakdown of breeders and brokers reflected on veterinary certificates that details their locations, number of dogs they house, and number and types of non-compliances of the Animal Welfare Act documented in inspection reports on file with the United States Department of Agriculture.

Key Facts*

The purpose of a Companion Animal and Consumer Protection Ordinance is to protect pets, consumers, and taxpayers in the City of Joliet from the consequences of having local business support the inhumane commercial pet breeding industry (puppy and kitten mills).

The City of Joliet does not currently perform any licensing or regulation of pet stores.

Joliet Township Animal Control performs animal control functions for the City of Joliet, the City of Crest Hill, and the Village of Rockdale. In 2016, JTAC housed 1,024 dogs and 858 cats that were surrendered by owners, brought in as strays by citizens, seized by Animal Control Officers, returned by adopters, or transferred in from other shelters. Of those 1,882 animals, 36% were adopted out, 25% were returned to owners, 18% were euthanized, and 14% were transferred to other shelters/rescues. JTAC spent \$36,430.38 in 2016 on veterinary care, animal care and supplies, and euthanasia.

Puppy, kitten, and rabbit mills are commercial breeding operations that value profit above the well-being of the animals. The conditions in these facilities are widely documented as inhumane.

Joliet has one pet store, Furry Babies, which purchases the dogs it sells from puppy mills or puppy brokers.

(Joliet had a second store, Puppy in the Window, which also purchased its dogs from puppy brokers until it closed in mid-August 2016. This store had replaced the Petland which held the same retail space until December 2015. Puppy in the Window re-opened in Crest Hill in June 2017 and closed in October 2017. The City of Crest Hill adopted a Companion Animal and Consumer Protection Ordinance in October 2017.)

Furry Babies is a chain retail pet store with four locations in Illinois and one location in Wisconsin. The dogs that this chain purchases in Illinois have historically been delivered to its Bloomingdale and Rockford locations, then distributed to the other locations, including the Joliet store in the Louis Joliet mall.

The Illinois Department of Agriculture (IDA) retains copies of veterinary certificates for dogs brought into the state for sale in pet stores. (The IDA does not regulate the importation of cats or rabbits.) The stores themselves are also required by the Illinois Animal Welfare Act to post on or near the cages of dogs information about the breeder of that dog. Joliet's pet store has not complied with this requirement. Furry Babies has a binder of "official disclosure forms" for the dogs currently available for purchase in the store; however, they have stopped allowing store visitors to view that binder if the visitor is not purchasing a dog.

Safe Pets for Joliet has obtained breeder information for dogs purchased by Furry Babies from both the IDA and in-store records dating back to 2012. Furry Babies purchases directly from breeders and also through brokers.

Brokers purchase dogs from breeders and re-sell them, making it difficult or impossible for consumers to identify the dogs' actual breeders. On IDA records, only the broker information is included, not the actual breeder information.

The federal Animal Welfare Act (AWA) sets minimum standards of care and treatment to be provided for animals bred for commercial sale, as well as licensing requirements for breeders. The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) is responsible for inspecting breeders' operations. A small number of USDA inspectors (most recently reported at 120) are responsible for inspecting all USDA licensed facilities under the USDA's Animal Care unit, not just commercial breeders (in 2010, the Animal Care Unit had 8,782 regulated facilities under its supervision).

The minimum standards of care mandated by the AWA are in themselves inhumane. A breeding facility could have hundreds of dogs stacked in cages in a barn, continually bred, and confined in spaces only six inches larger

than their bodies for their entire lives and this would not violate the AWA. However, despite these low standards, breeders utilized by Joliet's pet stores are consistently found by inspectors to be non-compliant with them.

Seventy-two percent of the licensed breeders used by Furry Babies in 2015 and 2014 were found to be non-compliant with the AWA from 2012-2015. Of these, 22% had committed "direct" non-compliances, defined by the USDA as having "a high potential to adversely affect the health and well-being of an animal."

The AWA requires that "anyone breeding pets for the wholesale trade must be licensed" but Furry Babies still purchases dogs from unlicensed breeders – 15% of Furry Babies' breeders in 2015 and 2014 were unlicensed.

Consumers purchasing dogs or cats from pet stores are frequently purchasing a pet with significant health and/or behavioral issues. Such issues have been reported by consumers from Furry Babies and several have resulted in small claims lawsuits against the stores. In 2016, one of the Furry Babies stores and its CEO, Roger Trolinger, settled a consumer fraud lawsuit in LaSalle County alleging that it sold sick and mistreated dogs to five consumers. Although the financial details of the settlement have not been disclosed, Furry Babies was required to make changes to its business practices including researching and disclosing information about its breeders and brokers. However, Furry Babies' contract now requires customers to opt out of Illinois' statewide "Puppy Lemon Law" and requires them to waive their right to file an individual or class action lawsuit against the stores.

The currently proposed ordinance does not aim to shut down local businesses. Instead, it requires Joliet's pet store to adopt a "humane" model, in which the store sells dogs or cats obtained from local animal control centers, humane societies, and rescue organizations. Locally, Dog Patch in Naperville has made this conversion without being legally compelled, and management has stated that the transition has been very successful.

Alternatively, Joliet's pet store may convert to a pet supply store. Both large chains (such as Petco and PetSmart) and small, locally-owned businesses are running thriving pet supply stores without selling dogs or cats. In fact, of the \$60.28 billion that Americans spent on their pets in 2015, 66% was spent on products sold at pet supply stores. A mere 3.5% was spent on live animal purchases such as those from Furry Babies.

Pet store alternatives for customers include responsible breeders, breed-specific rescues, and local shelters. As of November 17, 2017, there were more than 1,200 adoptable dogs within just 25 miles of Joliet. Of these, nearly half were puppies or young dogs.

In the U.S. and Canada, more than 250 other local governments have enacted bans on the sale of puppy and/or kitten mill dogs and cats, including Chicago, Austin, Pittsburgh, Boston, El Paso, and Philadelphia. More than half of these ordinances have been passed since January 2016. This legislation impacts more than 40 million people, having been adopted by municipalities with populations ranging from 847 to 5.2 million people. The state of California passed a state-wide ban on the sale of commercially bred animals in pet stores in October 2017.

As of November 17, 2017, there had been seven lawsuits challenging retail pet sale ordinances brought in federal courts that raise claims under the United States Constitution, and one lawsuit brought in state court in Florida. One of the federal lawsuits was dropped. All of the other lawsuits challenging a retail pet sale ordinance have been decided in favor of the cities that have passed the ordinances and the federal courts have upheld the ordinances as constitutional. Five of the federal courts' decisions were appealed; of these, three – including the City of Chicago's – were affirmed on appeal and two – including Cook County's – were dismissed.

**Sources for the information provided above are cited throughout the remainder of this document and specified in the endnotes.*

City of Joliet Pet Store Fact Sheet

Pet Store Regulation

- The City of Joliet does not license or regulate pet stores (stores that perform the retail sale of dogs and cats) within the city.¹ Other Illinois municipalities, including the City of Chicago, Cook County, City of Waukegan, and City of Warrenville, do license and regulate pet stores within their jurisdictions.
- The Illinois Department of Agriculture (IDA) licenses and regulates all Illinois pet stores; however, the IDA employs only six inspectors to oversee 1,973 dog dealers, kennel operators, pet store operators, and other licensees in the state.²
- The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) does not regulate pet stores.

Pet Stores in Joliet

- One pet store currently operates in the City of Joliet that would be impacted by the proposed Companion Animal and Consumer Protection Ordinance:
 - Furry Babies, located in the Louis Joliet Mall at 3340 Mall Loop Drive.
- Joliet had a second store, Puppy in the Window, which would have also been impacted until it closed in mid-August 2016. This store had replaced the Petland which held the same retail space until December 2015. Puppy in the Window re-opened in Crest Hill in June 2017 and closed in October 2017. The City of Crest Hill adopted a Companion Animal and Consumer Protection Ordinance in October 2017.

Furry Babies

- Furry Babies is a chain retail pet store with four locations in Illinois and one in Wisconsin. The Joliet store is located in the Louis Joliet Mall.
- Furry Babies sells dogs exclusively.
- In 2016, the Joliet Furry Babies sold 355 dogs, according to its IDA pet shop operator license for 2017.³ In 2015, the store sold 414 dogs, according to its IDA pet shop operator license application for 2016.⁴ In 2014, the store sold 322 dogs, according to its IDA pet shop operator license application for 2015.⁵ In 2013, the store sold 300 dogs, according to its IDA Pet Shop Operator license application for 2014.⁶
- Furry Babies has been the subject of numerous customer complaints, several resulting in lawsuits, regarding the dogs it has sold. In 2016, one of the Furry Babies stores and its CEO, Roger Trolinger, settled a consumer fraud lawsuit in LaSalle County alleging that it sold sick and mistreated dogs to five consumers, and an ABC 7 News investigation aired in April 2015 focused on Furry Babies' history of selling sick dogs.⁷
- Furry Babies' contract now requires customers to opt out of Illinois' statewide "Puppy Lemon Law" and requires them to waive their right to file an individual or class action lawsuit against the stores. Safe Pets for Joliet brought this to the attention of ABC 7 News, which aired a story on May 11, 2017 about how these business practices impacted a customer of the Joliet store.⁸
- An investigation of the IDA and USDA records for brokers/breeders that sold dogs to Furry Babies in 2016 revealed that:⁹
 - Dogs were obtained from commercial breeding facilities housing up to 353 dogs.
 - 15% of the breeders were not listed in the USDA's licensee database, despite the federal AWA requirement that "anyone breeding pets for the wholesale trade must be licensed."¹⁰

- 54% of the USDA licensed breeders were found by USDA inspectors to not be in compliance with the AWA in 2012-2015.
 - Two of the licensed breeders were found to be non-compliant with the AWA 15 times between 2012 and 2015.
 - Three of the licensed breeders committed “direct” or “critical” non-compliances, defined by the USDA as having “a high potential to adversely affect the health and well-being of an animal.”
 - Two of the breeders from Kansas and Missouri were listed in The Humane Society of the United States Report, *101 Puppy Mills: A Sampling of Problem Puppy Mills in the United States*, dated May 2014.¹³
 - One of the breeders from Kansas was listed in The Humane Society of the United States Report, *A Horrible Hundred: Problem Puppy Mills in the United States*, dated May 2013.¹²
 - One breeder that sold dogs to Furry Babies in 2016, TLC Breeds (Bob Mackey, USDA license #73-B-1857) of Missouri, had been found by USDA inspectors to be non-compliant with the AWA 15 times in 2013-2015, with one “critical” non-compliance. Mackey’s non-compliances include: having a dog with eye disease and bleeding cut on leg that was not examined by a vet; three dogs with dental disease that were not examined by a vet; a dog with eye disease that was unnoticed; a dog with eye disease that was not examined by vet; using medication not approved for dogs; using expired and unlabeled medication; having insufficient drainage and unsanitary living conditions; providing food contaminated with rodent waste; having holes in enclosure floors with dogs’ legs falling through; having broken wires with sharp edges in enclosures; using enclosures in disrepair; and having a rodent infestation. Mackey still retains his USDA license, and as of March 2015, housed 209 dogs in his facility.⁹ Furry Babies has been purchasing dogs from Mackey since at least 2013.
 - See Appendix 1 for a list and details of breeders of dogs sold to Furry Babies in 2016 according to IDA records.
 - **Important Note:** In January 2017, the USDA eliminated public access to its Animal Care Information Search Tool, which was the only way for the public to access breeder/broker inspection and violation records. In August, the USDA reinstated a portion of the tool but continued to redact any identifying information about breeders/brokers, including license numbers, names, and addresses, so there is still no way to access the inspections. A Freedom of Information Act request filed by Safe Pets for Joliet in February 2017 has yet to be fulfilled as of October 2, 2017. Therefore, breeder information for 2016 is incomplete.
- An investigation of the USDA records for breeders of the dogs available for purchase in the Joliet Furry Babies store on February 7, 2016 revealed that:⁹
- Breeder information was not posted on or near the cages of the dogs, in violation of the Illinois Animal Welfare Act.
 - There were discrepancies between breeder information on the store’s “official disclosure forms” and in license records on file with the USDA.
 - Dogs were obtained from commercial breeding facilities housing up to 300 dogs.
 - One of the 7 breeders was not listed in the USDA’s licensee database, despite the federal Animal Welfare Act (AWA) requirement that “anyone breeding pets for the wholesale trade must be licensed.”¹⁰ Another was using a license under another person’s name that was canceled.

- Four of the 5 USDA licensed breeders were found by USDA inspectors to not be in compliance with the AWA in 2013-2015. The other licensed breeder had no inspections on file with the USDA.
 - One of the licensed breeders was found to be non-compliant with the AWA 6 times in 2014-2015.
 - One of the licensed breeders committed a “direct” non-compliance, defined by the USDA as having “a high potential to adversely affect the health and well-being of an animal.”
 - One breeder that had one dog available for purchase, Lester Wagler (USDA license #48-A-1932) of Kansas, has been found by USDA inspectors to be non-compliant with the AWA ten times since 2013, with one repeat non-compliance. Wagler was inspected six times in 2014-2015; because the USDA utilizes a “risk-based inspection system”¹¹ that averages one inspection per year for standard breeding facilities, this would indicate ongoing USDA concerns about Wagler’s operation, despite his having less than 20 dogs in his care.

In April 2013, a USDA inspector found Wagler to have an “incomplete” veterinary program as well as an English mastiff with a “cauliflower looking growth of tissue protruding from the right side” that had not been examined by a veterinarian.

Wagler has also been cited for having an accumulation of rodent droppings in the dogs’ feed area, having gaps and holes in enclosures that create the opportunity for “potential injury” (a repeat offense), having “sharp, jagged” edges on a water receptacle, and not providing inspectors with access to the property or records, according to reports.

Wagler still retains his USDA license, and as of July 2015, housed 18 dogs in his facility.⁹ Furry Babies also purchased dogs from Wagler in 2015.
 - See Appendix 2 for a list and details of breeders of dogs available for purchase at the Joliet Furry Babies as of February 7, 2016.
- An investigation of the IDA and USDA records for brokers/breeders that sold dogs to Furry Babies in 2015 revealed that:⁹
- Dogs were obtained from commercial breeding facilities housing up to 378 dogs.
 - 17% of the breeders were not listed in the USDA’s licensee database, despite the federal AWA requirement that “anyone breeding pets for the wholesale trade must be licensed.”¹⁰
 - 67% of the USDA licensed breeders were found by USDA inspectors to not be in compliance with the AWA in 2012-2015.
 - One of the licensed breeders was found to be non-compliant with the AWA 15 times in 2013.
 - Five of the licensed breeders committed “direct” non-compliances, defined by the USDA as having “a high potential to adversely affect the health and well-being of an animal.”
 - Three of the breeders from Iowa and Missouri were listed in The Humane Society of the United States Report, *101 Puppy Mills: A Sampling of Problem Puppy Mills in the United States*, dated May 2014.¹³
 - One of the breeders from Kansas was listed in The Humane Society of the United States Report, *A Horrible Hundred: Problem Puppy Mills in the United States*, dated May 2013.¹²
 - One breeder that sold at least two dogs to Furry Babies in 2015, Rafter “G” Kennel (Ruth Ann and Gary Goostree, USDA license #43-A-5677) of Missouri, had been found by USDA inspectors to be non-compliant with the AWA six times in 2013-2016, with one “direct” non-compliance and one repeat non-compliance.

In January 2014, USDA inspectors found a husky with a “hard mass on the left side of her mammary area” that had not been inspected by a veterinarian. Ruth Ann Goostree admitted that she was “unable to handle the dog.” The lack of veterinary care was a repeat non-compliance, as inspectors had previously found a dog with severely matted hair, eye disease, and dental disease, as well as a dog with skin disease, neither of which had been examined by a veterinarian.

Other non-compliances the Goostrees have accumulated include having the building ventilation turned off resulting in high levels of ammonia in the air, as well as having holes in the dog enclosures with sharp exposed edges, and not providing inspectors with access to the property or records, according to reports.

The Goostrees were listed in The Humane Society of the United States 2014 report, *101 Puppy Mills: A Sampling of Problem Puppy Mills in the United States*.

The Goostrees still retain their USDA license, and as of April 2016, housed 79 dogs in their facility.⁹ Furry Babies also purchased dogs from the Goostrees in 2014.

- See Appendix 3 for a list and details of breeders of dogs sold to Furry Babies in 2015 according to IDA records.
- An investigation of the IDA and USDA records for brokers/breeders that sold dogs to Furry Babies in 2014 revealed that:⁹
- Dogs were obtained from commercial breeding facilities housing up to 1,176 dogs.
 - 10% of the breeders were not listed in the USDA’s licensee database, despite the federal AWA requirement that “anyone breeding pets for the wholesale trade must be licensed.”¹⁰
 - 81% of the USDA licensed breeders were found by USDA inspectors to not be in compliance with the AWA in 2012-2015.
 - One of the USDA licensed breeders was found to be non-compliant with the AWA 21 times in 2013-2015.
 - Nine of the USDA licensed breeders committed "direct" non-compliances, defined by the USDA as having "a high potential to adversely affect the health and well-being of an animal."
 - Seven of the breeders from Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska were listed in The Humane Society of the United States Report, *101 Puppy Mills: A Sampling of Problem Puppy Mills in the United States*, dated May 2014.¹³
 - Four of the breeders, all from Kansas, were listed in The Humane Society of the United States Report, *A Horrible Hundred: Problem Puppy Mills in the United States*, dated May 2013.¹²
 - One breeder that at least sold six dogs to Furry Babies in 2014, Rainbow Ranch Kennel (Charlene and Darlene Koster, USDA license #48-B-0271) of Kansas, had been found by USDA inspectors to be non-compliant with the AWA 23 times since 2013, with three direct non-compliances and seven repeat non-compliances.

In June 2015, a USDA inspector found a wheaten terrier and a husky with lesions on their ears consistent with fly bites, along with a Yorkshire terrier with eye disease, none of which had been examined by a veterinarian. In March 2015, a USDA inspector found a shih tzu that had been injured in a fight with another dog and had not been examined by a veterinarian. In February 2014, a USDA inspector found food in three enclosures for puppies that had feces visibly mixed in, and one puppy was witnessed urinating near the

food. During that same inspection, 43 dogs were found to be housed in outdoor enclosures with “insufficient bedding” in weather with temperatures below freezing. In addition, enclosure gates were frozen closed and feces covered 50-70% of the floor space in six outdoor enclosures.

The Kusters have also been cited for having dogs with unattended medical issues, including growths with blood and tissue visible, as well as using medication on dogs that is prescribed for cattle, using expired medications, not providing wind and rain breaks in outdoor shelters, not maintaining housing facilities including holes in the floors of enclosures, providing unsanitary living conditions such as having feces on shelter walls and floors, and not providing inspectors with access to the property or records, according to reports.

The Kusters were listed in The Humane Society of the United States’ 2013 report, *A Horrible Hundred: Problem Puppy Mills in the United States*¹², and in the 2014 report, *101 Puppy Mills: A Sampling of Problem Puppy Mills in the United States*¹³, in the 2015 report, *The Horrible Hundred 2015: Puppy Mills Exposed*,¹⁴, and in the 2016 report, *The Horrible Hundred 2016: A Sampling of Problem Puppy Mills in the United States*¹⁵.

The Kusters still retain their USDA license, and as of November 2015, housed 111 dogs in their facility.⁹

- See Appendix 4 for a list and details of breeders of dogs sold to Furry Babies in 2013-2014.

Joliet Township Animal Control

- The Joliet Township Animal Control (JTAC) performs animal control functions for the City of Joliet, the City of Crest Hill, and the Village of Rockdale.¹⁶
- In 2016, JTAC housed 1,024 dogs and 858 cats that were surrendered by owners, brought in as strays by citizens, seized by Animal Control Officers, returned by adopters, or transferred in from other shelters.¹⁷
 - Of those 1,882 animals, 36% were adopted out, 25% were returned to owners, 18% were euthanized, and 14% were transferred to other shelters/rescues.
 - JTAC spent \$36,430.38 in 2016 on veterinary care, animal care and supplies, and euthanasia.
- In 2015, JTAC housed 1,110 dogs and 826 cats that were surrendered by owners, brought in as strays by citizens, seized by Animal Control Officers, returned by adopters, or transferred in from other shelters.¹⁸
 - Of those 1,936 animals, 39% were adopted out, 24% were returned to owners, 22% were euthanized, and 11% were transferred to other shelters/rescues.
 - The JTAC spent \$56,502.72 in 2015 on veterinary care, animal care and supplies, and euthanasia.

Companion Animal and Consumer Protection Ordinance Questions and Answers

Q. What has motivated other municipalities to pass companion animal ordinances?

- A.** While each municipality has its own individual considerations, most of the ordinances ending the retail sale of companion animals have cited one or more of the following reasons:
- **Economic considerations.** Passing companion animal legislation is likely to reduce the costs incurred by municipal animal control facilities, which are often open admission shelters that use taxpayer dollars to house, feed, provide veterinary care for, and euthanize stray and relinquished animals. A retail pet sale ordinance could reduce the burden on its municipal shelters by decreasing the number of animals coming into the municipality’s care and increasing the number of animals adopted out of its facilities.
 - **Animal welfare.** The vast majority of the dogs (many estimate as high as 99 percent) and many of the cats sold in pet stores are born in commercial breeding facilities, commonly referred to as puppy and kitten mills (further defined below) – this includes facilities licensed by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA).¹⁹ Permitting the sale of dogs and cats in stores supports such large-scale animal cruelty, and instituting a retail sales ban is a necessary step in ending these inhumane practices.
 - **Consumer protection.** Consumers purchasing dogs or cats from pet stores are unknowingly supporting puppy and kitten mills and may be purchasing a pet with significant health and/or behavioral issues.²⁰ Consumers rarely spend less than \$1,000 on an animal from a pet store, and can then be faced with several thousand dollars in veterinary costs to care for their ill pet. In extreme cases, the puppy or kitten may be so ill that it does not survive. Illinois had the third highest rate of complaints from consumers about puppies from pet stores in 2007-2011 reported to The Humane Society of the United States.²¹
 - **Pet overpopulation and euthanasia.** When there are already thousands of animals being relinquished to shelters and euthanized, it does not make sense to continue importing thousands of animals into local communities. Moreover, dogs and cats sold in pet stores are not spayed or neutered. Shipping in even more animals capable of reproduction when there is already an oversaturation only contributes to pet overpopulation and increased euthanasia rates.

Q. What is a “puppy mill” or “kitten mill”?

- A.** The term “puppy mill” or “kitten mill” describes any commercial breeding operation that values profit above the well-being of the animals. While there is likely variation across facilities and some breeders may be better or worse than others, our position is that any breeder that sells to pet stores – including those licensed by the USDA – is a commercial breeder that operates solely to make a profit under minimal standards of care for the animals. They are typically large-scale operations, often with hundreds of dogs/cats that produce puppies/kittens at a high volume. In contrast, small private breeders that follow breed club guidelines carefully screen buyers and never sell to pet stores. Extensive industry research and investigation, government reports, breed club guidelines, and the personal experiences of those familiar with commercially-bred dogs and cats support the conclusion that any commercial facility that sells to pet stores prioritizes profit over the welfare of the animals in their care.²⁶

Q. What is a “puppy broker” and how is that relevant?

- A. “Puppy brokers” are pet dealers that obtain puppies from breeders, transport them, and then re-sell them to pet stores (in other words, a “middle man”).²⁸ While there is much discussion about commercial breeders, it is very important to understand that many pet stores obtain their puppies from brokers, and not directly from the breeders. In fact, Illinois Department of Agriculture (IDA) records demonstrate that Furry Babies obtains some of its puppies from brokers. Brokers often ship large quantities of puppies at a time for long distances in crowded conditions, creating a significant risk for the spread of illness.

Q. Are there other laws that protect consumers?

- A. There is no pending or enacted legislation that adequately protects consumers or that requires pet stores to source their animals from responsible breeders. The following portions of the Illinois Animal Welfare Act (225 ILCS 605) were enacted to protect consumers but are insufficient in doing so.
- An addition to the Illinois Animal Welfare Act made in 2017 was initiated as an effort by a lobbyist group representing pet store owners and commercial breeders to revoke Illinois communities’ home rule powers with regard to regulating the sourcing of animals by pet stores. A statewide outcry resulting in the reinforcement of home rule powers in an amended version of the bill, which also includes four requirements for breeders permitted to sell to Illinois pet stores based on USDA inspection reports. However, the law faces the same problem as any legislation that relies on the federal government’s animal welfare regulations and their enforcement by the USDA; the regulations are weak, biased toward profit, and largely unenforced. One of the added stipulations in the state law regarding the use of unlicensed breeders actually conflicts with federal regulations. In addition, the state law includes a requirement that pet stores disclose information from inspections “as posted on the Animal Care Information System online search tool maintained by the United States Department of Agriculture,” but the bill was introduced AFTER the USDA revoked access to said search tool, making it unenforceable before it was even passed.
 - The Illinois Puppy Lemon Law provides a remedy only in certain circumstances when a consumer has purchased a dog that becomes ill. It limits the consumer’s reimbursement to the purchase price of the animal (or double in some cases). Not only does that amount fail to cover the veterinary bills in many cases, but it does not compensate the consumer for their emotional loss. It also allows pet stores to require consumers to waive the law’s protections and accept the store’s warranty instead, which Furry Babies does.
 - The Illinois Pet Store Disclosure Act does not inform consumers that the pet they are about to purchase comes from a commercial breeding facility. A consumer would still be required to do considerable research to learn about the type of facility from which their pet was bred, especially with regard to whether it complies with the federal Animal Welfare Act, and such research is now impossible since the USDA has eliminated public access to breeder inspection and violation reports.
 - House Bill 4410, passed in 2014, simply increased penalties for violations of the Illinois Animal Welfare Act (a first violation fine increased from \$200 to \$500; a second violation fine increased from \$500 to \$1000; and a third violation fine increased to \$2,500 and probation).

Q. What type of legislation have other cities passed?

In the U.S. and Canada, more than 250 other local governments have enacted bans on the sale of puppy and/or kitten mill dogs and cats, including Chicago, Austin, Pittsburgh, Boston, El Paso, and Philadelphia.³³ More than half of these ordinances have been passed since January 2016. (See a

comprehensive list on pages 24-34.) This legislation impacts more than 40 million people, having been adopted by municipalities with populations ranging from 104 to 5.2 million people. The state of California passed a state-wide ban on the sale of commercially bred animals in pet stores in October 2017. These laws ban the retail sale of dogs and cats (and rabbits in some cases) exempting out animals sourced from shelters or rescue organizations. An ordinance that prohibits the retail sale of commercially bred animals is practical to enforce because it is not contingent upon standards that are onerous and impossible to monitor. In addition, it addresses the problem of large-scale commercial breeders directly by eliminating their primary sales outlet.

Q. Have there been legal challenges in other jurisdictions?

A. Of the more than 250 ordinances in North America, we are aware of seven (3%) that have been the subject of legal challenges in federal district courts: Chicago, Illinois; Cook County, Illinois; East Providence, Rhode Island; Phoenix, Arizona; San Diego, California; New York City, New York; and Sunrise, Florida. All of the lawsuits contain similar claims, including Commerce Clause, Equal Protection Clause, and state/federal law preemption claims. All seven federal suits were upheld by the courts with the exception of San Diego, in which the lawsuit was dropped by the plaintiff without ruling. Five of the federal courts' decisions were appealed; three were affirmed on appeal and two appeals were dismissed. Below are brief descriptions of each challenge and its outcome.

Chicago, Illinois – Ordinance upheld; affirmed on appeal (7th Circuit)

Chicago's Companion Animal and Consumer Protection Ordinance was upheld when the Court granted the City's motion to dismiss. The two pet stores and Missouri breeder challenging the ordinance filed an appeal. Although they asked for a stay of enforcement pending the appeal, the Court denied this request. In September 2017, the 7th Circuit affirmed on appeal.

East Providence, Rhode Island – Ordinance upheld; affirmed on appeal (First Circuit)

The Court upheld the city of East Providence's retail pet sale ordinance on summary judgment. The pet store that challenged the ordinance, Perfect Puppy, filed an appeal to the First Circuit Court of Appeals. The First Circuit affirmed on appeal, though the appeal was narrow, only raising one issue (a federal and state law Takings claim).

New York City, New York – Ordinance upheld; affirmed on appeal (2nd Circuit)

The Court granted the City's motion to dismiss, upholding New York City's ordinance against a challenge from a pet store industry group. The losing parties appealed but the Court's ruling was affirmed on appeal.

Cook County, Illinois – Ordinance upheld; appeal dismissed with no decision on merits of ordinance (7th Circuit)

The Court upheld Cook County's ordinance by granting Cook County's motion to dismiss for a failure to state a claim. The Court first dismissed the lawsuit in May, but gave the plaintiffs one last opportunity to amend their complaint. The plaintiffs amended their complaint, and after consideration, the Court again dismissed the complaint because it failed to state a claim. The plaintiffs appealed the District Court's decision but the appeal was dismissed with no decision on the ordinance's merits.

Phoenix, Arizona – Ordinance upheld; appeal dismissed with no decision on merits of ordinance (9th Circuit)

Phoenix’s retail pet sale ordinance was upheld on summary judgment. The pet store that brought the lawsuit, Puppies ‘N Love, appealed the decision to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. The appeal was dismissed with no decision on the ordinance’s merits.

Sunrise, Florida – Ordinance upheld; no appeal

Sunrise’s ordinance was upheld on summary judgment. This decision was not appealed and is now final.

San Diego, California – Lawsuit dismissed; no decision on merits of ordinance

There was a lawsuit in San Diego brought against the city and various animal welfare groups and advocates involved with passing the ordinance, but the claims against animal welfare groups were dismissed and the pet store owner bringing the suit ultimately dropped it against the city of San Diego.

Q. Why pass legislation directed at pet stores instead of breeders?

- A. Eliminating the sales outlet for commercially-bred puppies and kittens is essential to addressing puppy/kitten mill cruelty. Regulating the retail sale of commercially-bred animals is a practical and enforceable course of action that can address the problem at the local level. In contrast, regulating the source of the animals – or regulations imposed on breeding operations – are difficult to legislate and almost impossible to enforce. To ensure that an animal is sourced from quality breeding stock and humane conditions, any regulation would have to go beyond what is currently required by the USDA. The entity imposing the regulation would then be tasked with enforcing it, which would require inspections of hundreds of breeders, most of which are out of state.

Q. Isn’t the problem the breeders, and not the pet stores?

- A. Pet stores are the primary sales outlet for commercially-bred puppies and kittens. Pet stores are necessary to sustain and perpetuate the industry, and are therefore a significant contributor to puppy/kitten mill cruelty. Further, pet stores often misrepresent the true origins of their animals and mislead consumers into believing that they are purchasing a responsibly and humanely bred pet.

Q. Are consumers better protected purchasing a dog or cat from a pet store?

- A. No. In addition to unknowingly supporting animal cruelty, consumers are more likely to purchase an ill pet from a pet store. The inhumane conditions in commercial breeding facilities often lead to health and behavioral issues.²⁰⁻²¹ Many consumers are unaware of this when purchasing a pet from a pet store due to a lack of education on the source of pet store puppies and incomplete or misleading information pet stores often provide. One example of this can be found in Furry Babies’ “Breeder Information Book” – this binder, on display in the Joliet store, purports to provide information about the breeders Furry Babies uses, including inspection reports. However, in 2015, more than 63% of the dogs sold by Furry Babies were not purchased from the breeders in that book, and Furry Babies did not purchase dogs from nearly 80% of the breeders in that book. Additionally, the book does not include inspection reports with non-compliances. The book also correctly states that pet stores are required to purchase their dogs from USDA licensed breeders; however, 17% of the breeders Furry Babies purchased from in 2015 were not listed in the USDA’s licensee database.

The Illinois Pet Store Disclosure Act does not inform consumers that the pet they are about to purchase comes from a commercial breeding facility. However, when a consumer obtains a pet from a rescue organization, that animal has been carefully vetted, temperament tested, and treated for any illnesses. Further, rescues often carefully match potential adopters with animals that will be a good long-term fit for their family and offer post-adoption counseling and assistance with training or behavioral questions.

In fact, animal control facilities/shelters/rescues and pet stores are regulated by the same legislation (the Illinois Animal Welfare Act, 225 ILCS 605), and the majority of the regulations are identical or only slightly different. (See the Regulations for Animal Control Facilities/Shelters/Rescues vs. Pet Stores section on pages 17-20 for details.) Both types of facilities are subject to the same licensure requirements, very similar disclosure requirements, and the same facility conditions requirements. Unlike pet stores, animal control facilities/shelters/rescues are also required by law to sterilize and microchip their animals prior to adoption.

Although pet stores have stricter regulation with regard to consumers' financial remedy for sick dog/cat purchases, this is because pet stores are for-profit businesses that need additional regulation to protect consumers. However, pet stores can require their customers to opt out of these consumer protections, which Furry Babies does, in addition to requiring customers to waive their right to pursue remedy in a court of law. Instead of financial remedy, non-profit animal control facilities/shelters/rescues have a return policy that extends for the full life of the pet.

Q. What if a breeder is licensed by the United States Department of Agriculture?

- A.** USDA licensing and standards do not ensure that pet stores are sourcing their animals from reputable breeding facilities. USDA standards are minimal; they do not require any level of humane care or treatment, nor do they ensure healthy animals. A breeding facility could have hundreds of dogs stacked in cages in a barn, continually bred, and confined in spaces only six inches larger than their bodies for their entire lives and this would not violate USDA regulations.³¹

A small number of USDA inspectors (most recently reported at 120) are responsible for inspecting all USDA licensed facilities under the USDA's Animal Care unit, not just commercial breeders (in 2010, the Animal Care Unit had 8,782 regulated facilities under its supervision).²² The USDA and the Illinois Department of Agriculture – with only six inspectors responsible for inspecting 1,973 pet dealers, kennel operators, pet stores, and other facilities in Illinois – do not have the capacity to adequately inspect the thousands of commercial breeders currently in operation nationwide.^{23,24} According to the USDA, facilities determined to be lower risk may only be inspected once every 2-3 years; facilities that are a moderate or average risk may only be inspected once a year.²²

Q. Do pet stores need to sell animals in order to be successful?

- A.** No. In fact, most pet stores in Joliet and the surrounding areas run highly successful businesses by only selling pet supplies and offering pet services, such as grooming. Of the estimated \$60.28 billion that Americans spent on their pets in 2015, 66% was spent on products sold at pet supply stores. A mere 3.5% was spent on live animal purchases such as those from Furry Babies.²⁵ Both large chains (such as Petco and PetSmart) and small, locally-owned businesses are running thriving pet stores without selling dogs or cats, or by offering adoption programs.

Q. If a pet store wishes to continue selling animals, how will it operate if an ordinance prohibiting the retail sale of dogs and cats is passed?

- A.** If an ordinance exempts out animals sourced from shelters and rescues, pet stores may continue selling animals under a "humane" model, where the store sells cats or dogs obtained from an animal control center, humane society, or rescue organization. Dog Patch in Naperville has successfully converted to a humane model, without being legally compelled, and the management has stated that the transition has been very successful. Pet stores may also host adoption events where rescues and shelters bring in adoptable pets, as PetSmart and many other smaller, locally-owned stores do. Stores that convert to a

humane model will likely see an expansion of their customer base as there are many consumers who will not shop at any pet store that sells animals other than those sourced from shelters or rescues.

Q. What if one of my constituents wants to buy a specific breed of cat or dog?

- A.** Any retail pet sale ordinance similar to those passed in Chicago and Los Angeles will not affect responsible breeders. Responsible breeders never sell to pet stores or pet brokers. These ordinances do not affect a consumer's ability to obtain a cat or dog of his/her choice directly from a breeder, a breed-specific rescue, or a shelter (an estimated 25% of dogs in shelters are purebred)²⁷. There are many comprehensive resources, including www.pupquest.org, that educate consumers on how to find a healthy puppy from a responsible source.

Puppy Mill and Broker Fact Sheet

- Puppy mills are commercial breeding facilities that breed dogs for profit without regard to the health or welfare of the animal. They are essentially puppy factories where the dogs are living in cruel and inhumane conditions. Puppy mills are distinct from responsible breeders who carefully screen buyers, care for the health of their animals, and never sell to pet stores or over the Internet.²⁶
- The conditions in puppy mills are well-documented and include: over-breeding; inbreeding; minimal to non-existent veterinary care; insanitary conditions; lack of adequate food, water and shelter; lack of socialization; lack of adequate space; and the euthanasia of unwanted animals.
- Puppy mills are a problem in every community. There are an estimated 10,000 puppy mills in the United States and over 2 million puppies bred in mills each year, while an estimated 3 million dogs and cats are euthanized in shelters every year.²⁷ Every puppy born in a mill leaves behind two parents to suffer for often their entire lives. Hundreds of commercially-bred puppies are sold from Joliet’s pet store each year.^{2,4,5}
- Puppy mills can be large or small; some house hundreds or thousands of dogs. An estimated 165,474 dogs are currently living in USDA-licensed commercial facilities for breeding purposes.²⁷
- Mothers are bred every heat cycle and are often killed when they can no longer produce.
- Breeding parents often spend their lives in 24-hour confinement to wire cages that are frequently stacked on top of each other without adequate protection from heat, cold, or inclement weather. Dogs living in puppy mills often receive little to no veterinary care and live in unsanitary conditions.
- Puppies are taken from their mothers too young and are more likely to develop serious health or behavioral issues due to the conditions in which they are bred and shipped, leading to expensive veterinary bills, heartbreak, and stress for their owners.²⁶
- While commercial breeders are regulated by the USDA and sometimes state departments of agriculture, oversight is insufficient and regulations do not come close to providing adequate protection for the safety or well-being of the dogs.
- Puppy brokers, which are “middle men” that purchase dogs from puppy mills to sell to pet stores, supply more than two-thirds of the dogs to stores. The use of puppy brokers makes it difficult for consumers to find information about the breeders of dogs they are purchasing from pet stores.²⁸

Pet Store Alternatives Fact Sheet

People have a number of alternative options to pet stores, including:

- **Responsible breeders.** Responsible breeders offer dogs that are healthier and better socialized than dogs sold in pet stores for a similar or sometimes lower price. Kennel clubs or organizations are a helpful resource and can often recommend responsible breeders, as can veterinarians.
- **Breed-specific rescues.** Nearly every breed has a rescue and it is easy to locate breed-specific rescues. There are at least 150 breed-specific rescue groups servicing the greater Chicago area.
- **Local shelters or rescue groups.** The Humane Society of the United States estimates that there are 6-8 million dogs and cats entering shelters each year, and that 25 percent of the dogs in shelters are purebred.²⁹ Mixed breeds found in shelters often do not suffer from the same genetic and hereditary issues that plague purebred dogs. Local shelters and rescue groups in the Joliet area include Joliet Township Animal Control, Will County Humane Society, All Breed Rescue and Adoption, Wags 2 Wishes Animal Rescue, Hopeful Tails Animal Rescue, Tender Loving Care Animal Shelter, and dozens more. As of November 17, 2017, there were more than 1,200 adoptable dogs within just 25 miles of Joliet. Of these, nearly half were puppies or young dogs.

In contrast to puppy mills, responsible breeders:

- Do not sell their puppies to pet stores or to pet brokers.
- Do not sell their puppies over the Internet.
- Provide appropriate food, water, shelter, and veterinary care for their animals, as well as sanitary conditions.
- Carefully screen potential buyers and take care to place their puppies in loving homes.
- Take proper care of breeding dogs. Mothers are only bred a limited amount of times and receive appropriate veterinary care.
- Typically specialize in one or two breeds and care about the breed. They are knowledgeable about their breeds' genetic and health issues. They test and screen their breeding dogs to try to improve the breed and ensure healthy puppies.
- Maintain only a small number of dogs. Responsible breeders are typically hobby breeders and are almost always too small to require USDA licensure, which prohibits them from selling to pet stores.
- Operate with transparency. Responsible breeders allow potential purchasers to tour the property to see the living conditions of the dogs and meet the breeding parents.
- Properly socialize their puppies and ensure that puppies are with their mothers for an adequate amount of time.
- Participate in breed competitions and are often members of national and local breed clubs.
- Breed clubs strongly discourage consumers from purchasing puppies from pet stores and their ethical guidelines often do not allow for breeders to sell to pet stores.³⁰

Regulations for Animal Control Facilities/Shelters/Rescues vs. Pet Stores
Illinois Animal Welfare Act (225 ILCS 605)

Animal Control Facility/Shelter/Rescue	Pet Store
Licensing	
<p>Sec. 3. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this Section, no person shall engage in business as a pet shop operator, dog dealer, kennel operator, cattery operator, or operate a guard dog service, an animal control facility or animal shelter or any combination thereof, in this State without a license therefor issued by the Department. Only one license shall be required for any combination of businesses at one location, except that a separate license shall be required to operate a guard dog service. (Source: P.A. 95-613, eff. 9-11-07.)</p> <p>(Secs. 5-16 and 19-22, regarding license requirements, violations, discipline, fines, fees, revocation, etc., are also the same for both types of facilities.)</p>	
Sterilization	
<p>Sec. 3.3. Adoption of dogs and cats.</p> <p>(a) An animal shelter or animal control facility shall not adopt out any dog or cat unless it has been sterilized and microchipped. However, an animal shelter or animal control facility may adopt out a dog or cat that has not been sterilized and microchipped if:</p> <p>(1) the adopting owner has executed a written agreement agreeing to have sterilizing and microchipping procedures performed on the animal to be adopted within a specified period of time not to exceed 30 days after the date of the adoption, or</p> <p>(2) the adopting owner has executed a written agreement to have sterilizing and microchipping procedures performed within 14 days after a licensed veterinarian certifies the dog or cat is healthy enough for sterilizing and microchipping procedures, and a licensed veterinarian has certified that the dog or cat is too sick or injured to be sterilized or it would be detrimental to the health of the dog or cat to be sterilized or microchipped at the time of the adoption. (Source: P.A. 96-314, eff. 8-11-09.)</p>	<p>No requirements for sterilization.</p>
Information Disclosure	
<p>Sec. 3.5. Information on dogs and cats available for adoption by an animal shelter or animal control facility.</p> <p>(a) An animal shelter or animal control facility must provide to the adopter prior to the time of adoption the following information, to the best of its knowledge, on any dog or cat being offered for adoption:</p> <p>(1) The breed, age, date of birth, sex, and color of the dog or cat if known, or if unknown, the animal shelter or animal control facility shall estimate to the best of its ability.</p> <p>(2) The details of any inoculation or medical treatment that the dog or cat received while under the possession of the</p>	<p>Sec. 3.15. Disclosures for dogs and cats being sold by pet shops.</p> <p>(a) Prior to the time of sale, every pet shop operator must, to the best of his or her knowledge, provide to the consumer the following information on any dog or cat being offered for sale:</p> <p>(1) The retail price of the dog or cat, including any additional fees or charges.</p> <p>(2) The breed, age, date of birth, sex, and color of the dog or cat.</p> <p>(3) The date and description of any inoculation or</p>

animal shelter or animal control facility.

(3) The adoption fee and any additional fees or charges.

(4) If the dog or cat was returned by an adopter, then the date and reason for the return.

(5) The following written statement: "A copy of our policy regarding warranties, refunds, or returns is available upon request."

(6) The license number of the animal shelter or animal control facility issued by the Illinois Department of Agriculture.

(b) The information required in subsection (a) shall be provided to the adopter in written form by the animal shelter or animal control facility and shall have an acknowledgement of disclosures form, which must be signed by the adopter and an authorized representative of the animal shelter or animal control facility at the time of the adoption. The acknowledgement of disclosures form shall include the following:

(1) A blank space for the dated signature and printed name of the authorized representative handling the adoption on behalf of the animal shelter or animal control facility, which shall be immediately beneath the following printed statement: "I hereby attest that all of the above information is true and correct to the best of my knowledge."

(2) A blank space for the dated signature and printed name of the adopter, which shall be immediately beneath the following statement: "I hereby attest that this disclosure was posted on or near the cage of the dog or cat for adoption and that I have read all the disclosures. I further understand that I am entitled to keep a signed copy of this disclosure."

(c) A copy of the disclosures and the signed acknowledgement of disclosures form shall be provided to the adopter and the original copy shall be maintained by the animal shelter or animal control facility for a period of 2 years from the date of adoption. A copy of the animal shelter's or animal control facility's policy regarding warranties, refunds, or returns shall be provided to the adopter.

(d) An animal shelter or animal control facility shall post in a conspicuous place in writing on or near the cage of any dog or cat available for adoption the information required by subsection (a) of this Section 3.5.

(Source: P.A. 96-1470, eff. 1-1-11.)

medical treatment that the dog or cat received while under the possession of the pet shop operator.

(4) The name and business address of both the dog or cat breeder and the facility where the dog or cat was born. If the dog or cat breeder is located in the State, then the breeder's license number. If the dog or cat breeder also holds a license issued by the United States Department of Agriculture, the breeder's federal license number.

(5) (Blank).

(6) If eligible for registration with a pedigree registry, then the name and registration numbers of the sire and dam and the address of the pedigree registry where the sire and dam are registered.

(7) If the dog or cat was returned by a customer, then the date and reason for the return.

(8) A copy of the pet shop's policy regarding warranties, refunds, or returns and an explanation of the remedy under subsections (f) through (m) of this Section in addition to any other remedies available at law.

(9) The pet shop operator's license number issued by the Illinois Department of Agriculture.

(10) Disclosure that the dog or cat has been microchipped and the microchip has been enrolled in a nationally searchable database. Pet stores must also disclose that the purchaser has the option to list the pet store as a secondary contact on the microchip.

(a-5) All dogs and cats shall be microchipped by a pet shop operator prior to sale.

(b) The information required in subsection (a) shall be provided to the customer in written form by the pet shop operator and shall have an acknowledgement of disclosures form, which must be signed by the customer and the pet shop operator at the time of sale. The acknowledgement of disclosures form shall include the following:

(1) A blank space for the dated signature and printed name of the pet shop operator, which shall be immediately beneath the following statement: "I hereby attest that all of the above information is true and correct to the best of my knowledge."

(2) A blank space for the customer to sign and print his or her name and the date, which shall be immediately beneath the following statement: "I hereby attest that this disclosure was posted on or near the cage of the dog or cat for sale and that I have read all of the disclosures. I further understand that I am entitled to keep a signed copy of this disclosure."

(c) A copy of the disclosures and the signed acknowledgement of disclosures form shall be provided to the customer at the time of sale and the original copy shall be maintained by the pet shop operator for a period of 2 years from the date of sale. A copy of the pet store operator's policy regarding warranties, refunds, or returns shall be

	<p>provided to the customer.</p> <p>(d) A pet shop operator shall post in a conspicuous place in writing on or near the cage of any dog or cat available for sale the information required by subsection (a) of this Section 3.15.</p> <p>(Source: P.A. 98-509, eff. 1-1-14; 98-593, eff. 11-15-13.)</p>
<p>Remedy for Illness or Disease</p>	
<p>Sec. 3.3. Adoption of dogs and cats.</p> <p>... (b) An animal shelter or animal control facility may adopt out any dog or cat that is not free of disease, injury, or abnormality if the disease, injury, or abnormality is disclosed in writing to the adopter, and the animal shelter or animal control facility allows the adopter to return the animal to the animal shelter or animal control facility.</p> <p>(Source: P.A. 96-314, eff. 8-11-09.)</p>	<p>Sec. 3.15. Disclosures for dogs and cats being sold by pet shops.</p> <p>... (f) A customer who purchased a dog or cat from a pet shop is entitled to a remedy under this Section if:</p> <p>(1) within 21 days after the date of sale, a licensed veterinarian states in writing that at the time of sale (A) the dog or cat was unfit for purchase due to illness or disease, the presence of symptoms of a contagious or infectious disease, or obvious signs of severe parasitism that are extreme enough to influence the general health of the animal, excluding fleas or ticks, or (B) the dog or cat has died from a disease that existed in the dog or cat on or before the date of delivery to the customer; or</p> <p>(2) within one year after the date of sale, a licensed veterinarian states in writing that the dog or cat possesses a congenital or hereditary condition that adversely affects the health of the dog or cat or requires either hospitalization or a non-elective surgical procedure or has died of a congenital or hereditary condition. Internal or external parasites may not be considered to adversely affect the health of the dog unless the presence of the parasites makes the dog or cat clinically ill. The veterinarian's statement shall include:</p> <p>(A) the customer's name and address;</p> <p>(B) a statement that the veterinarian examined the dog or cat;</p> <p>(C) the date or dates that the dog or cat was examined;</p> <p>(D) the breed and age of the dog or cat, if known;</p> <p>(E) a statement that the dog or cat has or had a disease, illness, or congenital or hereditary condition that is subject to remedy; and</p> <p>(F) the findings of the examination or necropsy, including any lab results or copies of the results.</p> <p>(g) A customer entitled to a remedy under subsection (f) of this Section may:</p> <p>(1) return the dog or cat to the pet shop for a full refund of the purchase price;</p> <p>(2) exchange the dog or cat for another dog or cat of comparable value chosen by the customer;</p> <p>(3) retain the dog or cat and be reimbursed for reasonable veterinary fees for diagnosis and treatment of the dog or cat, not to exceed the purchase price of the dog or cat; or</p>

	<p>(4) if the dog or cat is deceased, be reimbursed for the full purchase price of the dog or cat plus reasonable veterinary fees associated with the diagnosis and treatment of the dog or cat, not to exceed one times the purchase price of the dog or cat.</p> <p>**Exemption Clause**</p> <p>... (m) If a pet shop offers its own warranty on a pet, a customer may choose to waive the remedies provided under subsection (f) of this Section in favor of choosing the warranty provided by the pet shop. If a customer waives the rights provided by subsection (f), the only remedies available to the customer are those provided by the pet shop's warranty. For the statement to be an effective waiver of the customer's right to refund or exchange the animal under subsection (f), the pet shop must provide, in writing, a statement of the remedy under subsection (f) that the customer is waiving as well as a written copy of the pet shop's warranty. For the statement to be an effective waiver of the customer's right to refund or exchange the animal under subsection (f), it shall be substantially similar to the following language:</p> <p>“I have agreed to accept the warranty provided by the pet shop in lieu of the remedies under subsection (f) of Section 3.15 of the Animal Welfare Act. I have received a copy of the pet shop's warranty and a statement of the remedies provided under subsection (f) of Section 3.15 of the Animal Welfare Act. This is a waiver pursuant to subsection (m) of Section 3.15 of the Animal Welfare Act whereby I, the customer, relinquish any and all right to return the animal for congenital and hereditary disorders provided by subsection (f) of Section 3.15 of the Animal Welfare Act. I agree that my exclusive remedy is the warranty provided by the pet shop at the time of sale.”.</p> <p>(Source: P.A. 100-322, eff. 8-24-17.)</p>
--	---

Facility Conditions

Sec. 18. The licensee shall:

- a. Maintain sanitary conditions.
- b. Insure proper ventilation.
- c. Provide adequate nutrition.
- d. Provide humane care and treatment of all animals under his jurisdiction.
- e. Take reasonable care to release for sale, trade, or adoption only those animals which are free of disease, injuries or abnormalities. A health certificate, meeting the requirements of the Department and issued by a licensed veterinarian for any such animal within 5 days before such sale, trade or adoption is prima facie evidence that the licensee has taken reasonable care, as required by this paragraph.
- f. Inspection of the premises of a licensee to determine compliance with this Act may be made only by the Department.

(Source: P.A. 78-900.)

Animal Welfare Act and United States Department of Agriculture Enforcement Fact Sheet

- The standards governing the care of dogs and cats in commercial breeding facilities are set forth in the Animal Welfare Act (AWA), 7 U.S.C. § 2131 *et. seq.* and its accompanying regulations, 9 C.F.R. § 1 *et. seq.*³¹
- According to the AWA, breeders that sell to pet stores must be licensed by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA).
- USDA licensure and standards are not sufficient to protect commercially bred dogs. The AWA's standards are too minimal to ensure humane care or treatment and the USDA does not effectively enforce the AWA.
- Even if enforced to its fullest extent, the AWA only requires the bare minimum in housing facilities and care for the animals. The standards are far below what most would consider humane.
- The AWA leaves significant discretion in the hands of commercial breeders to define what constitutes an adequate level of care for the dogs with respect to living environment, cleanliness and sanitation, feeding, veterinary care, housing structures, and comfort.

Under the AWA and its regulations:

- Dogs may be caged 24 hours a day. There is no exercise requirement if dogs are housed with other dogs and certain minimal size requirements are met for the dog's enclosure.
- Dogs may be caged in a space with only six inches of space on each side, not including the tail.
- Dogs may be kept in stacked cages. Mesh or wire flooring is allowed.
- There is no limit to the number of dogs on the premises.
- Human interaction with the animals is not required.
- Breeding females at the first heat cycle and at every heat cycle is permissible.
- Unwanted animals may be euthanized or auctioned off.

The USDA enforcement of the AWA is insufficient due to the following:

- Even if standards were sufficient to ensure humane treatment of dogs and cats, the USDA is overburdened and has a demonstrated record of leniency towards commercial breeders resulting in a failure to protect the animals under its care.
- The USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service's (APHIS) Animal Care Unit is responsible for inspecting licensed facilities and enforcing the AWA. In 2010, the Animal Care Unit had 8,782 licensed facilities under its jurisdiction. Recent sources indicate that the Animal Care Unit has 120 inspectors on staff to inspect all of the facilities under its supervision, not just commercial dog breeders and brokers. This includes animal exhibitors (including circuses, zoos, educational displays, animal acts, petting farms/zoos, wildlife parks, marine mammal parks, and some animal sanctuaries), research facilities (including hospitals, colleges and universities, and pharmaceutical firms), and animal transporters (such as airlines and trucking companies).²⁴
- USDA oversight is limited and inspections are often infrequent. While the Animal Care Unit inspects every new licensee, subsequent inspection is based on a "Risk Based Inspection System." According to the USDA, facilities considered at the discretion of inspectors to be lower risk may only be inspected once every 2-3 years; facilities that are a moderate or average risk may only be inspected once a year.²²
- In 2010, the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) conducted an audit of the Animal Care Unit and found numerous inadequacies in its enforcement of the AWA, including the following:³²
 - APHIS took little or no enforcement action against most violators of the AWA. A total of 2,416

- violators had repeat violations, some of which ignored minimum care standards.
- APHIS did not properly cite or document violations.
 - APHIS did not accurately report repeat or direct violations, leading to less frequent inspections and leaving the animals at higher risk for neglect and illness.
 - Some serious direct violations were incorrectly reported as indirect violations. Examples included significant tick infestations on the dogs, cockroach infested food sources, and excessive accumulations of feces and waste. (The USDA defines a direct violation as one that “has a high potential to adversely affect the health and well-being of the animal.” An indirect violation is one that “does not have a high potential to adversely affect the health and well-being of the animal.”)
 - APHIS assessed minimal penalties that did not deter violators.
 - APHIS misused its guidelines to lower the penalties for violations, including miscounting violations and changing the gravity of violations.
- In 2016, APHIS revised its Animal Welfare Inspection Guide to allow inspectors the discretion to avoid citing facilities with violations by deeming them “teachable moments,” which are not documented on inspection reports.³¹

Retail Pet Sale Ban Fact Sheet

- In the U.S. and Canada, more than 250 local governments have enacted ordinances banning the sale of puppy and/or kitten mill dogs and cats.³³ More than half of these ordinances have been passed since January 2016. (See a comprehensive list on the following pages.)
- This legislation impacts more than 40 million people in the U.S. and Canada, having been adopted by municipalities with populations ranging from 104 to 5.2 million people.
- California passed the first statewide ban in October 2017.
- In Illinois, Chicago, Cook County, Waukegan, Warrenville, and, most recently, Crest Hill have passed this type of legislation.
- The majority of the retail pet sale ordinances on record provide for a complete prohibition on the retail sale of dogs and cats (and rabbits in some cases) in pet stores unless the animal is sourced from a shelter, humane society, or rescue organization.
- Extensive industry research and investigation, government reports, breed club guidelines, and personal experience of those familiar with commercially-bred dogs demonstrate that commercial breeders who sell to pet stores prioritize profit over the well-being of their animals. Reputable breeders do not sell to pet stores.³⁰ Accordingly, many jurisdictions have eliminated sales from all commercial breeders even though conditions may vary across facilities.
- Ordinances prohibiting the retail sale of commercially-bred animals are effective because they focus on fighting puppy mills by eliminating the sales outlet.
- Retail sales prohibitions are easy to enforce. Under Illinois law, pet stores are already required to disclose the source of their animals. Under a general retail prohibition that ends the sale of all dogs or cats other than those sourced from rescues or shelters, it is easy for local officials to verify that the animal has been obtained from a permissible source.
- Attempting to impose legislation on breeders, rather than retail sales, under municipal law is impractical and ineffective because it is impossible to enforce and therefore would be unlikely to have any impact on the puppy mill industry. There are no state-licensed dog breeders in Joliet.

List of Municipalities with Retail Pet Sale Bans³³

Name of City/Town/County	Population	Effective Date
Albuquerque, New Mexico	552,804	Enacted June 2006 Effective August 2007
South Lake Tahoe, California	21,403	Enacted April 2009 Effective May 2011
Flagler Beach, Florida	4,999	Enacted June 2009 Effective immediately
West Hollywood, California	34,399	Enacted February 2010 Effective March 2010
Hermosa Beach, California	19,506	Enacted March 2010 Effective April 2010
Turlock, California	70,365	Enacted May 2010 Effective June 2010
El Paso, Texas	672,538	Enacted October 2010 Effective January 2011
Richmond, British Columbia, Canada	205,133	Enacted November 2010 Effective April 2011
Austin, Texas	842,592	Enacted December 2010 Effective immediately
Opa-Locka, Florida	15,219	Enacted 2011
Coral Gables, Florida	50,815	Enacted 2011
North Bay Village, Florida	8,262	Enacted 2011
Lake Worth, Florida	35,786	Enacted February 2011 Effective immediately
Fountain, Colorado	26,891	Enacted May 2011 Effective immediately
Glendale, California	191,719	Enacted August 2011 Effective August 2012
Toronto, Ontario, Canada	2,790,000	Enacted September 2011 Effective September 2012
Irvine, California	212,375	Enacted October 2011 Effective immediately
Rosemont-La Petite Patrie, Canada	105,813	Enacted December 2011 Effective immediately
Dana Point, California	33,351	Enacted January 2012 Effective March 2012
Chula Vista, California	243,916	Enacted March 2012 Effective April 2012
Hallandale Beach, Florida	38,327	Enacted April 2012 Effective immediately
Laguna Beach, California	22,723	Enacted May 2012 Effective immediately

Name of City/Town/County	Population	Effective Date
Point Pleasant, New Jersey	4,665	Enacted May 2012 Effective immediately
Aliso Viejo, California	47,823	Enacted May 2012 Effective immediately
Waukegan, Illinois	88,826	Enacted June 2012 Effective immediately
Huntington Beach, California	189,992	Enacted June 2012 Effective immediately
Mississauga, Ontario, Canada	741,443	Enacted July 2012 Effective January 2013
Brick, New Jersey	75,431	Enacted July 2012 Effective immediately
Manasquan, New Jersey	5,871	Enacted September 2012 Effective immediately
Los Angeles, California	3,929,000	Enacted October 2012 Effective June 2013
Point Pleasant Beach, New Jersey	4,665	Enacted October 2012 Effective immediately
New Westminster, Canada	65,976	Enacted November 2012 Effective immediately
Burbank, California	103,340	Enacted February 2013 Effective August 2013
Rancho Mirage, California	17,799	Enacted February 2013 Effective March 2013
Bernalillo County, New Mexico	676,685	Enacted February 2013 Effective August 2013
Hoboken, New Jersey	52,034	Enacted May 2013 Effective immediately
San Diego, California	1,381,000	Enacted July 2013 Effective August 2013
Kingston, Ontario	159,561	Enacted August 2013 Effective November 2013
Oceanport, New Jersey	5,832	Enacted August 2013 Effective immediately
Margate, Florida	53,284	Enacted October 2013 Effective immediately
Pinecrest, Florida	18,223	Enacted October 2013 Effective immediately
North Brunswick, New Jersey	40,742	Enacted October 2013 Effective November 2013
Palmetto Bay, Florida	23,483	Enacted December 2013 Effective immediately
Ventura County, California	825,378	Enacted December 2013 Effective December 2014
Toledo, Ohio	286,966	Enacted December 2013 Effective January 2014
Coconut Creek, Florida	52,909	Enacted January 2014 Effective immediately

Name of City/Town/County	Population	Effective Date
Wellington, Florida	56,508	Enacted January 2014 Effective immediately
Surfside, Florida	5,744	Enacted February 2014 Effective February 2014
Aventura, Florida	35,762	Enacted March 2014 Effective immediately
Chicago, Illinois	2,722,000	Enacted March 2014 Effective March 2015
Wilton Manors, Florida	11,658	Enacted March 2014 Effective immediately
Greenacres, Florida	37,676	Enacted April 2014 Effective immediately
Cook County, Illinois	5,246,000	Enacted April 2014 Effective October 2014
North Lauderdale, Florida	41,163	Enacted April 2014 Effective immediately
Bay Harbor Islands, Florida	5,644	Enacted April 2014 Effective immediately
Sunrise, Florida	90,116	Enacted April 2014 Effective October 2014
Vaughan, Ontario, Canada	238,865	Enacted April 2014 Effective immediately
Pompano Beach, Florida	100,085	Enacted May 2014 Effective immediately
Miami Beach, Florida	88,110	Enacted May 2014 Effective January 2015
North Miami Beach, Florida	41,665	Enacted May 2014 Effective immediately
Sunny Isles Beach, Florida	13,416	Enacted May 2014 Effective immediately
East Providence, Rhode Island	47,037	Enacted June 2014 Effective March 2015
Dania Beach, Florida	29,639	Enacted June 2014 Effective immediately
Palm Beach Gardens, Florida	48,582	Enacted July 2014 Effective immediately
Juno Beach, Florida	3,287	Enacted July 2014 Effective immediately
Bal Harbour, Florida	2,613	Enacted May 2014 Effective immediately
Sunny Isles Beach, Florida	13,416	Enacted May 2014 Effective immediately
Cutler Bay, Florida	43,328	Enacted August 2014 Effective immediately
North Palm Beach, Florida	12,348	Enacted August 2014 Effective immediately
Randolph, New Jersey	24,847	Enacted September 2014 Effective immediately

Name of City/Town/County	Population	Effective Date
Hypoluxo, Florida	2,657	Enacted September 2014 Effective immediately
Hudson, Quebec, Canada	5,135	Enacted September 2014 Effective immediately
Waterloo, Ontario, Canada	104,986	Enacted September 2014 Effective January 2015
Jupiter, Florida	58,298	Enacted October 2014 Effective immediately
Homestead, Florida	64,079	Enacted October 2014 Effective immediately
Chino Hills, California	76,572	Enacted October 2014 Effective November 2014
Tamarac, Florida	60,427	Enacted December 2014 Effective immediately
Palm Beach, Florida	10,468	Enacted January 2015 Effective immediately
Oceanside, California	167,086	Enacted January 2015 Effective September 2015
Montgomery County, Maryland	1,016,677	Enacted March 2015 Effective June 2015
Long Beach, California	462,257	Enacted March 2015 Effective October 2015
Garden Grove, California	170,883	Enacted March 2015 Effective March 2016
North Miami, Florida	61,007	Enacted April 2015 Effective immediately
Lauderhill, Florida	69,813	Enacted April 2015 Effective immediately
Mount Royal, Quebec, Canada	19,503	Enacted May 2015 Effective immediately
Encinitas, California	61,588	Enacted July 2015 Effective immediately
Fernandina Beach, Florida	11,952	Enacted July 2015 Effective immediately
Jacksonville Beach, Florida	21,823	Enacted August 2015 Effective immediately
Beverly Hills, California	34,658	Enacted August 2015 Effective September 2015
Eastpointe, Michigan	31,627	Enacted September 2015 Effective January 2016
Camden County, New Jersey	512,854	Enacted September 2015 Effective immediately
Memphis, Michigan	1,184	Enacted September 2015 Effective immediately
Vista, California	96,929	Enacted September 2015 Effective October 2015
Salt Lake County, Utah	1,029,655	Enacted October 2015 Effective October 2015

Name of City/Town/County	Population	Effective Date
Voorhees, New Jersey	28,126	Enacted October 2015 Effective immediately
Brooklawn, New Jersey	1,944	Enacted October 2015 Effective immediately
Audubon, New Jersey	8,771	Enacted October 2015 Effective January 2016
Palm Springs, California	42,281	Enacted October 2015 Effective immediately
Waterford, New Jersey	10,494	Enacted October 2015 Effective January 2016
Deerfield Beach, Florida	78,041	Enacted November 2015 Effective May 2016
West Melbourne, Florida	19,667	Enacted November 2015 Effective immediately
Cherry Hill, New Jersey	71,417	Enacted November 2015 Effective immediately
Casselberry, Florida	26,566	Enacted November 2015 Effective immediately
Merchantville, New Jersey	3,806	Enacted November 2015 Effective immediately
Oakville, Ontario, Canada	182,520	Enacted November 2015 Effective immediately
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	305,841	Enacted December 2015 Effective June 2016
Runnemede, New Jersey	8,436	Enacted December 2015 Effective March 2016
Laurel Springs, New Jersey	1,895	Enacted December 2015 Effective March 2016
Somerdale, New Jersey	5,261	Enacted December 2015 Effective March 2016
Oaklyn, New Jersey	4,015	Enacted December 2015 Effective immediately
Fraser, Michigan	14,602	Enacted December 2015 Effective immediately
Westville, New Jersey	4,250	Enacted December 2015 Effective March 2016
Haddon Heights, New Jersey	7,428	Enacted December 2015 Effective March 2016
Gloucester Township, New Jersey	64,350	Enacted December 2015 Effective immediately
Glassboro, New Jersey	18,953	Enacted December 2015 Effective March 2016
Beaconsfield, Quebec, Canada	19,115	Enacted December 2015 Effective immediately
Magnolia, New Jersey	4,299	Enacted December 2015 Effective March 2016
Neptune Beach, Florida	7,124	Enacted January 2016 Effective February 2016

Name of City/Town/County	Population	Effective Date
San Marcos, California	89,387	Enacted January 2016 Effective July 2016
Sarasota County, Florida	390,429	Enacted January 2016 Effective January 2017
Bellmawr, New Jersey	11,540	Enacted January 2016 Effective immediately
South Miami, Florida	12,088	Enacted January 2016 Effective immediately
Cathedral City, California	52,977	Enacted January 2016 Effective February 2016
Warrenville, Illinois	13,358	Enacted February 2016 Effective immediately
Truckee, California	16,165	Enacted February 2016 Effective immediately
Berlin Township, New Jersey	5,290	Enacted February 2016 Effective May 2016
Mamaroneck Village, New York	19,237	Enacted February 2016 Effective immediately
Boston, Massachusetts	645,966	Enacted March 2016 Effective immediately
Delray Beach, Florida	64,072	Enacted March 2016 Effective immediately
Clementon, New Jersey	4,976	Enacted March 2016 Effective June 2016
Pine Hill, New Jersey	10,496	Enacted March 2016 Effective immediately
Haddon Township, New Jersey	14,651	Enacted March 2016 Effective immediately
Winslow, New Jersey	34,611	Enacted March 2016 Effective immediately
Jackson, New Jersey	42,816	Enacted March 2016 Effective immediately
Mount Pleasant, New York	43,724	Enacted March 2016 Effective immediately
Collingswood, New Jersey	13,850	Enacted April 2016 Effective immediately
Audubon Park, New Jersey	1,017	Enacted April 2016 Effective immediately
Indio, California	83,539	Enacted April 2016 Effective immediately
La Quinta, California	39,331	Enacted April 2016 Effective May 2016
Mount Ephraim, New Jersey	4,663	Enacted April 2016 Effective immediately
Barrington, New Jersey	6,878	Enacted April 2016 Effective immediately
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	1,553,000	Enacted April 2016 Effective July 2016

Name of City/Town/County	Population	Effective Date
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada	883,391	Enacted April 2016 Effective immediately
Berlin Borough, New Jersey	7,600	Enacted April 2016 Effective immediately
East Brunswick, New Jersey	46,756	Enacted April 2016 Effective May 2016
Gloucester City, New Jersey	11,402	Enacted April 2016 Effective July 2016
Carlsbad, California	110,972	Enacted May 2016 Effective June 2016
Chesilhurst, New Jersey	1,637	Enacted May 2016 Effective August 2016
Greenwich, New Jersey	847	Enacted May 2016 Effective June 2016
Pennsauken, New Jersey	35,737	Enacted May 2016 Effective June 2016
Mesquite, Nevada	16,439	Enacted May 2016 Effective June 2016
Clayton, New Jersey	8,216	Enacted May 2016 Effective August 2016
Mantua, New Jersey	14,217	Enacted May 2016 Effective immediately
Beverly, New Jersey	2,565	Enacted May 2016 Effective immediately
Hollywood, Florida	146,526	Enacted June 2016 Effective December 2016
Colton, California	53,243	Enacted June 2016 Effective July 2016
Gibbsboro, New Jersey	2,257	Enacted June 2016 Effective September 2016
Little Ferry, New Jersey	10,806	Enacted June 2016 Effective September 2016
Wyckoff, New Jersey	17,039	Enacted June 2016 Effective immediately
Washington Township, New Jersey	47,114	Enacted June 2016 Effective July 2016
Lindenwold, New Jersey	17,501	Enacted June 2016 Effective immediately
Hackensack, New Jersey	44,113	Enacted June 2016 Effective September 2016
Bordentown, New Jersey	3,914	Enacted June 2016 Effective immediately
Hi-Nella, New Jersey	865	Enacted June 2016 Effective September 2016
Mount Holly, New Jersey	10,728	Enacted July 2016 Effective October 2016
Pitman, New Jersey	8,943	Enacted July 2016 Effective October 2016

Name of City/Town/County	Population	Effective Date
Camden City, New Jersey	76,903	Enacted July 2016 Effective August 2016
Maywood, New Jersey	9,687	Enacted July 2016 Effective immediately
Yorktown, New York	36,081	Enacted July 2016 Effective immediately
Solana Beach, California	13,236	Enacted July 2016 Effective immediately
East Rutherford, New Jersey	8,913	Enacted July 2016 Effective October 2016
St. Petersburg, Florida	249,688	Enacted July 2016 Effective immediately
Union City, New Jersey	68,247	Enacted July 2016 Effective immediately
Glen Rock, New Jersey	11,838	Enacted July 2016 Effective October 2016
Woodlynne, New Jersey	2,961	Enacted July 2016 Effective October 2016
Woodcliff Lake, New Jersey	5,830	Enacted August 2016 Effective immediately
Saddle Brook, New Jersey	13,155	Enacted August 2016 Effective November 2016
Key West, Florida	25,550	Enacted August 2016 Effective immediately
Miramar, Florida	130,288	Enacted August 2016 Effective immediately
Rye Brook, New York	9,507	Enacted August 2016 Effective immediately
Upper Saddle River, New Jersey	8,326	Enacted September 2016 Effective immediately
Portland, Maine	66,318	Enacted September 2016 Effective immediately
Eatontown, New Jersey	12,262	Enacted September 2016 Effective December 2016
Swedesboro, New Jersey	2,630	Enacted September 2016 Effective December 2016
Ridgefield, New Jersey	11,218	Enacted September 2016 Effective December 2016
Fanwood, New Jersey	7,510	Enacted September 2016 Effective immediately
Fairview, New Jersey	14,237	Enacted September 2016 Effective December 2016
Wallington, New Jersey	11,545	Enacted September 2016 Effective immediately
New Milford, New Jersey	16,572	Enacted September 2016 Effective immediately
Palm Beach County, Florida	1,398,000	Enacted September 2016 Effective November 2016

Name of City/Town/County	Population	Effective Date
Hamilton Township, New Jersey	88,464	Enacted September 2016 Effective October 2016
Ridgewood, New Jersey	25,352	Enacted October 2016 Effective November 2016
Edgewater, New Jersey	12,148	Enacted October 2016 Effective January 2016
Woodbury Heights, New Jersey	3,020	Enacted October 2016 Effective immediately
Cambridge, Ontario, Canada	120,375	Enacted October 2016 Effective immediately
Marlboro, New Jersey	36,398	Enacted October 2016 Effective January 2017
Fair Lawn, New Jersey	32,998	Enacted October 2016 Effective immediately
Port Chester, New York	29,410	Enacted October 2016 Effective immediately
Ocean, New Jersey	26,959	Enacted October 2016 Effective November 2016
Safety Harbor, Florida	17,139	Enacted November 2016 Effective immediately
North Arlington, New Jersey	15,632	Enacted November 2016 Effective immediately
Watchung, New Jersey	5,865	Enacted November 2016 Effective immediately
Frenchtown, New Jersey	1,356	Enacted December 2016 Effective March 2017
North Las Vegas, Nevada	226,877	Enacted December 2016 Effective immediately
Palisades Park, New Jersey	20,288	Enacted December 2016 Effective immediately
Union Beach, New Jersey	5,805	Enacted December 2016 Effective immediately
Cliffside Park, New Jersey	23,594	Enacted December 2016 Effective immediately
Bradley Beach, New Jersey	4,298	Enacted January 2017 Effective immediately
Stratford, New Jersey	7,040	Enacted February 2017 Effective May 2017
San Francisco, California	852,469	Enacted February 2017 Effective March 2017
Burlington, New Jersey	9,799	Enacted February 2017 Effective March 2017
Haddonfield, New Jersey	11,411	Enacted February 2017 Effective March 2017
Bound Brook, New Jersey	11,116	Enacted February 2017 Effective immediately
Holmes Beach, Florida	4,098	Enacted February 2017 Effective immediately

Name of City/Town/County	Population	Effective Date
Livingston, New Jersey	27,391	Enacted March 2017 Effective June 2017
Roseville, Minnesota	35,319	Enacted March 2017 Effective September 2017
Canton, Georgia	24,801	Enacted March 2017 Effective immediately
Franklin, New Jersey	4,906	Enacted March 2017 Effective June 2017
Secaucus, New Jersey	18,416	Enacted March 2017 Effective immediately
Manalapan, New Jersey	38,872	Enacted April 2017 Effective immediately
Scotch Plains, New Jersey	22,732	Enacted April 2017 Effective immediately
Lodi, New Jersey	24,654	Enacted April 2017 Effective immediately
East Newark, New Jersey	2,835	Enacted April 2017 Effective July 2017
Rio Rancho, New Mexico	93,820	Enacted April 2017 Effective November 2017
Stoneham, Massachusetts	21,437	Enacted May 2017 Effective immediately
Roselle Park, New Jersey	13,595	Enacted May 2017 Effective immediately
Harrison (Gloucester County), New Jersey	12,417	Enacted May 2017 Effective immediately
Sacramento, California	485,199	Enacted May 2017 Effective immediately
St. Joseph County, Indiana	266,931	Enacted May 2017 Effective immediately
Holly Springs, Georgia	10,237	Enacted May 2017 Effective immediately
Waleska, Georgia	871	Enacted May 2017 Effective immediately
Brielle, New Jersey	4,759	Enacted May 2017 Effective immediately
South Pasadena, California	26,156	Enacted June 2017 Effective July 2017
Woodstock, Georgia	27,823	Enacted June 2017 Effective immediately
Fort Lauderdale, Florida	176,013	Enacted June 2017 Effective immediately
Caldwell, New Jersey	7,239	Enacted June 2017 Effective immediately
Maple Shade, New Jersey	19,079	Enacted June 2017 Effective immediately
North Plainfield, New Jersey	22,029	Enacted June 2017 Effective July 2017

Name of City/Town/County	Population	Effective Date
Bainbridge Island, Washington	23,293	Enacted June 2017 Effective July 2017
Asbury Park, New Jersey	15,778	Enacted June 2017 Effective July 2017
Matawan, New Jersey	8,718	Enacted June 2017 Effective immediately
Leonia, New Jersey	8,937	Enacted July 2017 Effective immediately
Warwick, Rhode Island	82,672	Enacted July 2017 Effective August 2017
De Soto County, Florida	34,862	Enacted July 2017 Effective immediately
Hopewell Borough, New Jersey	1,922	Enacted August 2017 Effective immediately
Cambridge, Massachusetts	110,651	Enacted August 2017 Effective November 2017
Del Mar, California	4,365	Enacted August 2017 Effective September 2017
Bremerton, Washington	40,675	Enacted September 2017 Effective immediately
Springfield, New Jersey	15,817	Enacted September 2017 Effective December 2017
Cranford, New Jersey	22,578	Enacted October 2017 Effective immediately
Nutley, New Jersey	27,362	Enacted October 2017 Effective January 2018
Delta, British Columbia, Canada	99,863	Enacted October 2017 Effective November 2017
Crest Hill, Illinois	21,169	Enacted October 2017 Effective January 2018
Moorestown, New Jersey	19,017	Enacted October 2017 Effective November 2017
Fraser, Iowa	104	Enacted October 2017 Effective immediately
Senoia, Georgia	4,137	Enacted November 2017 Effective immediately

¹ Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) response from City of Joliet City Clerk's Office (October 6, 2014).

² FOIA response from Illinois Department of Agriculture (IDA) (January 20, 2015).

³ FOIA response from IDA (November 7, 2017).

⁴ FOIA response from IDA (August 10, 2016).

⁵ FOIA response from IDA (January 29, 2016).

⁶ FOIA response from IDA (October 16, 2014).

⁷ ABC 7 News, Sick Puppy Complaints (April 23, 2015). <http://abc7chicago.com/pets/sick-puppy-complaints/679150/>

⁸ ABC 7 News, Puppy Heartbreak: State's "Lemon" Law May Not Be in Contracts (May 11, 2017).

<http://abc7chicago.com/pets/puppy-heartbreak-states-lemon-law-may-not-be-in-contracts/1982413/>

⁹ United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Animal Care Information System Search Tool.

<https://acis.aphis.edc.usda.gov/ords/f?p=116>

-
- ¹⁰ USDA, Licensing and Registration Under the Animal Welfare Act. <http://www.shsu.edu/dept/office-of-research-and-sponsored-programs/documents/LicensingandRegistrationUndertheAWA.pdf>
- ¹¹ USDA, Questions and Answers: Regulation of Dog/Cat Breeders and Dealers. https://www.aphis.usda.gov/publications/animal_welfare/content/printable_version/faq_animal_dealers.pdf
- ¹² The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), A Horrible Hundred: Problem Puppy Mills in the United States (May 2013). http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/pets/puppy_mills/100-puppy-mills-report.pdf
- ¹³ HSUS, 101 Puppy Mills: A Sampling of Problem Puppy Mills in the United States (May 2014). http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/pets/puppy_mills/101-puppy-mills-report-2014.pdf
- ¹⁴ HSUS, The Horrible Hundred 2015: Puppy Mills Exposed (May 2015). <http://www.humanesociety.org/news/news/2015/05/horrible-hundred-2015-problem-puppy-mills.html>
- ¹⁵ HSUS, The Horrible Hundred 2016: A Sampling of Problem Puppy Mills in the United States (May 2016). http://www.humanesociety.org/horrible-hundred-2016-puppy-mills-exposed.html?credit=web_id359552774
- ¹⁶ Joliet Township Government, Animal Control. <http://www.joliettownship.net/animalcontrol.html>
- ¹⁷ FOIA response from Joliet Township Animal Control (February 1, 2017).
- ¹⁸ FOIA response from Joliet Township Animal Control (March 22, 2016).
- ¹⁹ Humane Society of the United States, Puppy Mills: Frequently Asked Questions. http://m.humanesociety.org/issues/puppy_mills/qa/puppy_mill_FAQs.html?credit=web_id80597225
- ²⁰ University of Pennsylvania, Penn Vet Study Finds Pet Store Puppies Come with Increased Risk (May 2013). <http://www.upenn.edu/pennnews/current/2013-05-16/latest-news/penn-vet-study-finds-pet-store-puppies-come-increased-risk>
- ²¹ HSUS, Puppy Buyer Complaints: A Five Year Summary, 2007-2011 (September 2012). http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/pets/puppy_mills/puppy_mill_buyer_complaints.pdf
- ²² USDA, Risk Based Assessment System. http://www.aphis.usda.gov/wps/portal/aphis/home/?urile=wcm%3apath%3a%2Faphis_content_library%2Fsa_our_focus%2Fsa_animal_welfare%2Fsa_awa%2Fct_awa_risk_based_inspection_system
- ²³ FOIA Response from IDA (January 20, 2015).
- ²⁴ FOIA Response from USDA (September 2013). *Current FOIA Request Pending.*
- ²⁵ American Pet Products Association, Pet Industry Market Size & Ownership Statistics. http://www.americanpetproducts.org/press_industrytrends.asp
- ²⁶ ASPCA, A Closer Look at Puppy Mills. <https://www.aspc.org/animal-cruelty/puppy-mills/closer-look-puppy-mills>
- ²⁷ HSUS, Puppy Mills: Facts and Figures (December 2016). http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/pets/puppy_mills/puppy-mills-facts-and-figures.pdf
- ²⁸ HSUS, Puppy Mill Brokers. http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/pets/puppy_mills/fact_sheet_puppy_brokers_dealers.pdf
- ²⁹ HSUS, U.S. Pet Ownership, Community Cat and Shelter Population Estimates. http://www.humanesociety.org/issues/pet_overpopulation/facts/pet_ownership_statistics.html
- ³⁰ Best Friends Animal Society, AKC Breeder Code of Ethics re: Pet Store Puppies. Information for report obtained from https://www.apps.akc.org/apps/clubs/search/index.cfm?action_national&display=on.
- ³¹ USDA, Animal Welfare Act and Animal Welfare Regulations. https://www.aphis.usda.gov/animal_welfare/downloads/Animal%20Care%20Inspection%20Guide.pdf
- ³² USDA, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service Animal Care Program Inspections of Problematic Dealers. <http://www.usda.gov/oig/webdocs/33002-4-SF.pdf>
- ³³ Best Friends Animal Society, Jurisdictions with Retail Pet Sale Bans. <http://bestfriends.org/Resources/Jurisdictions-With-Retail-Pet-Sale-Bans/>

Appendix 1: Breeder/Broker Information for Dogs Sold to Furry Babies in 2016

According to Veterinary Certificates Received by the Illinois Department of Agriculture and Inspection Reports on File with the United States Department of Agriculture

Business	State	USDA #	Business/Animal Welfare Act Non-Compliance Information	Non-Compliance Details
Balentine, Sandra (Balentines Kennel)	AR	71-A-1199	2 non-compliances in 2014-2015 (2 indirect) - veterinary care and access/inspection of records/property. 60 dogs in July 2015. Listed as "Hobby" breeder on veterinary certificate despite being large-scale breeder. Furry Babies breeder since at least 2013.	Dog "wobbles when he walks," not examined by vet; responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Blaylock, James	AR OK		Breeder located in Oklahoma but using Arkansas veterinary certificate. No USDA license number on veterinary certificate.	
Brasher, Linda (Elite Puppies)	AR	71-A-0762	1 non-compliance in 2013 (1 indirect) - cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 183 dogs in October 2014. Furry Babies breeder since at least 2013.	Excessive feces and discarded building materials in housing.
Burch, Holly	OK	73-A-2706		
Evans, Shawnie	OK	73-A-2693	Previously licensed as 73-A-1553 (cancelled August 2014, new license issued September 2014). Under previous license, 1 non-compliance in 2013 (1 indirect) - housing. Under new license, 1 non-compliance in 2014 (1 indirect) - access/inspection of records/property. 47 dogs in December 2014. Furry Babies breeder since at least 2013.	Enclosures in disrepair; licensee not present to allow inspection.
Fromm, Linda/John	KS	48-A-1294	165 dogs in February 2015. Furry Babies breeder since at least 2015.	
Graber, Levi (Blue Ribbon Morgans and Puppies)	IN	32-B-0182	Broker license, cancelled in January 2016. Still shipping dogs as of April 25, 2016. Furry Babies breeder since at least 2015.	
Hewitt, Gary (Licks are Kisses Kennel)	AR	71-A-1126	1 non-compliance in 2013 (1 indirect) - veterinary care. 79 dogs in April 2014. Furry Babies breeder since at least 2014.	Dog limping, not examined by vet.
Holden, Gary	AR OK		Breeder located in Oklahoma but using Arkansas veterinary certificate. No USDA license number on veterinary certificate.	
Hynes, Kelli	KS	48-B-0346	Broker license.	
Ireland, Kim	MO	N/A	Not listed in USDA licensee database. Furry Babies breeder since at least 2015.	
Lansdown, Tammy/Terry (Lansdown Kennel)	MO	43-A-1268	1 non-compliance in 2016 (1 indirect). 246 dogs in January 2016. Furry Babies breeder since at least 2014.	Details of non-compliance pending FOIA.

Business	State	USDA #	Business/Animal Welfare Act Non-Compliance Information	Non-Compliance Details
Mackey, Bob (TLC Breeds)	MO	73-B-1857	Broker license. 15 non-compliances in 2013-2015 (15 indirect, 1 critical) - veterinary care, housing, enclosures, and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 209 dogs in March 2015. Furry Babies breeder since at least 2013.	Dog with eye disease and bleeding cut on leg, not examined by vet; 3 dogs with dental disease, not examined by vet; dog with eye disease, unnoticed; dog with eye disease, not examined by vet; using medication not approved for dogs; using expired and unlabeled medication; insufficient drainage and unsanitary living conditions; food contaminated with rodent waste; holes in enclosure floors with dogs' legs falling through; broken wires with sharp edges in enclosures; enclosures in disrepair; rodent infestation.
Marlin, Jerri/Wayne	MO	43-A-5210		
Michel, Clinton/Marlene	MO	43-A-3817		On veterinary certificate for two Shiba Inu sent to Furry Babies in June 2016, one dog listed as having "Bilateral Grade 1 med patellar luxation" (a defect in which the kneecap pops out of place intermittently, which may progress and cause arthritis and/or require surgery) with note "The puppy in this shipment is a satisfactory pet quality animal."
Parish, Kathy /Caleb Nichols (Purple Circle Bulldogs, K&J Kennel)	AR	71-A-1329	15 non-compliances in 2012-2014 (15 indirect, 4 repeat) - veterinary care, housing, enclosures, exercise, and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 105 dogs in May 2014. Furry Babies breeder since at least 2013.	2 dogs with dental disease, not examined by vet; veterinary care program incomplete; doors with accumulation of "dirt and grime" and rust (R); enclosures in disrepair (R); machinery and "junk" in housing; waste drainage system clogged; broken wire fencing with sharp edges; openings in floors with dogs' legs falling through; unsanitary living conditions; fly infestation; exercise program incomplete.
Ponting, Brenda/Ted ¹	MO	43-A-5133	Cited and fined \$4,679 for 8 non-compliances in 2012-2013 (1 direct, 7 indirect, 2 repeat) - outdoor housing, enclosures, and watering. 118 dogs in June 2015. Furry Babies breeder since at least 2013.	Enclosures with inadequate shelter (D); enclosures without wind/rain breaks (R); water receptacles not cleaned/sanitized (R); enclosures without sufficient bedding in temps near freezing; enclosures without floors covered in mud and snow causing wet and muddy coats in temps near freezing; torn/rusted metal in enclosures with sharp edges.
Rottinghaus, Sandra ^{1,2}	KS	Unlicensed	Unlicensed on veterinary certificate, but sold 7 puppies of 4 different breeds to FB in just 2 weeks in 2014, indicating that she is exceeding the limit of dogs for unlicensed breeders established by USDA. Furry Babies breeder since at least 2013.	N/A
Schindler, Herman (Tony) (QD Kennels)	MO	43-B-0415	Broker license. Large-scale commercial puppy broker that ship puppies across US. 70 dogs in April 2015. Furry Babies breeder since at least 2013.	

Business	State	USDA #	Business/Animal Welfare Act Non-Compliance Information	Non-Compliance Details
Sobrad LLC (Pinnacle Pet)	MO	43-B-3750 43-T-0063	Previous broker license 43-B-3725 cancelled in May 2015. Current broker license issued 5 days later. Also licensed as transporter. 353 dogs at time of pre-license inspection in May 2015. No inspections of facilities/animals on file since issuance of new license. Furry Babies breeder since at least 2015.	
Tiffanie’s LLC	MO	43-B-3731	Broker license. 3 non-compliances in 2014-2016 (2 indirect, 1 repeat) – access/inspection of records/property. 17 dogs in October 2015. Furry Babies breeder since at least 2015.	Responsible adult not present to allow inspection twice in 2014.
Walles, Judy/Dennis	MO	43-A-3787	1 non-compliance in 2015 (1 indirect) – access/inspection of property/records. 288 dogs in October 2015. Furry Babies breeder since at least 2015.	Responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Warren, Deborah	MO	43-A-3278	4 non-compliances in 2015-2016 (1 direct, 1 indirect, 1 repeat). Received official warning from USDA for direct violations of veterinary care requirements in October and November 2015. Furry Babies breeder since at least 2016.	Details of violations pending FOIA.
Watts, Vanessa (Rock Springs Kennel)	AR	71-A-1213	1 non-compliance in 2013 (1 indirect) - veterinary care. 119 dogs in April 2015. Furry Babies breeder since at least 2014.	Dog with eye disease, not examined by vet.
Whitman, Darlene (O' My Heart Kennel)	MO	43-A-2517	3 non-compliances in 2013 (1 direct, 2 indirect) - veterinary care and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 200 dogs in October 2015. Furry Babies breeder since at least 2014.	Dog so thin that hip and back bones were easily observed, not examined by vet (D); dog with excessively long toenails and twisted toe, not examined by vet; using expired medications; dogs being sprayed with water during cleaning of outdoor shelter in temps near freezing.
Wilson, Sharon	AR	71-A-0822	21 dogs in May 2015. Furry Babies breeder since at least 2015.	

Inspection information pending USDA FOIA submitted in February 2017. (All other breeder information is also pending update from USDA FOIA.)

Not listed in USDA licensee database. Only USDA-licensed breeders are permitted to sell animals for the wholesale trade (i.e., to pet stores).

Not compliant with the Animal Welfare Act according to inspection performed by USDA.

(D) = Direct non-compliance of the Animal Welfare Act, defined by the USDA as “currently (at the time of the inspection) having a serious or severe adverse effect on the health and well-being of the animal, or has the high potential to have that effect in the immediate future.” However, many of the non-compliances currently having a serious adverse effect on the animals included in these breeders’ records were not designated as “Direct.” (Definitions retrieved from the USDA’s *Animal Welfare Inspection Guide*, https://www.aphis.usda.gov/animal_welfare/downloads/Animal-Care-Inspection-Guide.pdf.)

(R) = Repeat non-compliance of the Animal Welfare Act, defined by the USDA as non-compliances “cited in the same section and subsection as on the last inspection or on the last full inspection if the previous inspection was a Focused Inspection.” According to the USDA, designation of a “Repeat” non-compliance is at the discretion of the inspector; many of the non-compliances included in these breeders’ records were cited multiple times without being designated as “Repeat.”

Breeder/Broker Details Source: USDA Animal Care Information System Search Tool (unavailable since January 2017)

View the veterinary certificates of dogs sold to Furry Babies in 2016 online:

http://www.safepetsforjoliet.org/uploads/1/3/7/9/13796189/fb_veterinarycertificates_ida_2016.pdf

(Note: All dogs are sent to the Bloomingdale and Rockford store locations, then delivered to other area stores.)

¹ Listed in The Humane Society of the United States Report, *101 Puppy Mills: A Sampling of Problem Puppy Mills in the United States*, May 2014,

http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/pets/puppy_mills/101-puppy-mills-report-2014.pdf.

² Listed in The Humane Society of the United States Report, *A Horrible Hundred: Problem Puppy Mills in the United States*, May 2013,

http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/pets/puppy_mills/100-puppy-mills-report.pdf.

Appendix 2: Breeder Information for Dogs Available for Purchase at Furry Babies Joliet (as of February 7, 2016)

According to "Official Disclosure Forms" in Store and Inspection Reports on File with the United States Department of Agriculture

Breeder	State	USDA #	# Dogs	Business/Animal Welfare Act Non-Compliance Information	Non-Compliance Details
Burkholder, Eddie (Walnut Creek Pups)	OH	31-A-0461	1	1 non-compliance in 2013 (1 indirect) - enclosures. 49 dogs in July 2015.	Mesh flooring in enclosures with dogs' legs falling through.
Graber, Henry*	IN	?	1	Listed with USDA license #32-B-0182 on Furry Babies' "official disclosure form," but that is a broker license that was registered to Levi Graber (Blue Ribbon Morgans and Puppies) at a different address and has been cancelled.	
Hershberger, Willis (Pine Ridge Puppies)	OH	31-A-0257	1	1 non-compliance in 2013 (1 direct) – veterinary care. 64 dogs in October 2015.	Dog with eye disease and open sore on paw, not examined by vet (D).
Knepp, Marcus*	IN	"Hobby"	1	Not listed in USDA licensee database; however, was licensed under #32-A-0399 until September 2013.	
Lone Oak Kennel*	OH	31-A-0567	4	No inspections on file with the USDA.	
Miller, David	OH	31-A-0428	1	2 non-compliances in 2013-2014 (2 indirect) - veterinary care. 300 dogs in July 2015.	Dog with open wound in paw, not examined by vet; 2 dogs with eye disease, not examined by vet.
Wagler, Lester	KS	48-A-1932	1	10 non-compliances in 2013-2015 (10 indirect, 1 repeat) – veterinary care, housing, cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control, watering, access/inspection of property/records. 18 dogs in July 2015.	Dog with "cauliflower looking growth of tissue" without vet examination; inadequate parasite control program; holes and gaps in enclosure flooring (R); rodents in feed; water receptacles with "sharp, jagged edge," responsible adult not present to allow inspection.

Not listed in USDA licensee database. Only USDA-licensed breeders are permitted to sell animals for the wholesale trade (i.e., to pet stores).

Not compliant with the Animal Welfare Act according to inspection performed by USDA.

Furry Babies records are inaccurate.

*Not in Furry Babies' in-store "Breeder Information Book."

(D) = Direct non-compliance of the Animal Welfare Act, defined by the USDA as "currently (at the time of the inspection) having a serious or severe adverse effect on the health and well-being of the animal, or has the high potential to have that effect in the immediate future." However, many of the non-compliances currently having a serious adverse effect on the animals included in these breeders' records were not designated as "Direct." (Definitions retrieved from the USDA's *Animal Welfare Inspection Guide*, https://www.aphis.usda.gov/animal_welfare/downloads/Animal-Care-Inspection-Guide.pdf.)

(R) = Repeat non-compliance of the Animal Welfare Act, defined by the USDA as non-compliances "cited in the same section and subsection as on the last inspection or on the last full inspection if the previous inspection was a Focused Inspection." According to the USDA, designation of a "Repeat" non-compliance is at the discretion of the inspector; many of the non-compliances included in these breeders' records were cited multiple times without being designated as "Repeat."

Breeder Details Source: USDA Animal Care Information System Search Tool (unavailable since January 2017)

Appendix 3: Breeder/Broker Information for Dogs Sold to Furry Babies in 2015

According to Veterinary Certificates Received by the Illinois Department of Agriculture and Inspection Reports on File with the United States Department of Agriculture

Business	State	USDA #	Business/Animal Welfare Act Non-Compliance Information	Non-Compliance Details
Bagwell, Pat*	AR	71-A-1193	129 dogs in December 2015.	
Baker, Karen K. (Kute Kozy K) ^{1*}	IA	42-A-1508	New license issued May 2015: 1 non-compliance in 2015 (1 indirect) – access/inspection of records/property. Previous license 42-A-1383 cancelled in October 2014: 7 non-compliances in 2012-2014 (7 indirect, 1 repeat) - access/inspection of records/property, housing, enclosures, and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 36 dogs in April 2015.	New license: Responsible adult not present to allow inspection (first post-license inspection). Previous license: Enclosures without wind/rain breaks; shelters not large enough for dogs to enter, sit, stand, lie, or turn about; enclosures with no floor; buildup of “grime” on enclosure doors; responsible adult not present to allow inspection (R).
Balentine, Sandra (Balentines Kennel)*	AR	71-A-1199	2 non-compliances in 2014-2015 (2 indirect) - veterinary care and access/inspection of records/property. 60 dogs in July 2015.	Dog “wobbles when he walks,” not examined by vet; responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Bixenman, James/Marilyn (Circle B Farms)*	MO	43-A-4396	2 non-compliances in 2013-2015 (2 indirect) – veterinary care and access/inspection of records/property. 224 dogs in December 2015,	Usage of medications not labeled for use in dogs, expired medications, and unlabeled medications; responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Bonnette, Sheree/Randall	MO	43-A-2151	2 non-compliances in 2013-2016 (2 indirect) – access/inspection of records/property. 117 dogs in January 2015.	Responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Boyd, Benita*	AR	71-A-1049	1 non-compliance in 2013 (1 indirect) – veterinary care. 82 dogs in September 2015.	Dog with red, swollen front paws with open sores, not examined by vet.
Bundy, Marlene (Hollow Tree Kennel)*	MO	43-A-4893	120 dogs in August 2015.	
Burkholder, Eddie (Walnut Creek Pups)	OH	31-A-0461	1 non-compliance in 2013 (1 indirect) - enclosures. 49 dogs in July 2015.	Mesh flooring in enclosures with dogs' legs falling through.
Cox, Shelly/Lonnie (Big Creek Kennel)*	AR	71-A-0960	276 dogs in March 2015.	
Dismang, Lorna	MO	N/A	Not listed in USDA licensee database.	
Doherty, Marie (Doherty's Family Pets)*	KS	48-B-0321	Broker license. 1 non-compliance in 2015 (1 indirect) – access/inspection of records/property. 378 dogs in October 2015.	Responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Fetters, Betty (Fetters Furry Friends)	MO	43-B-3484	Broker license. 2 non-compliances in 2012 (2 indirect) - housing, outdoor housing. 139 dogs in October 2015.	Accumulation of feces in enclosures; 8-10-inch hole in enclosure floor; inadequate rain/wind breaks.
Fromm, Linda/John	KS	48-A-1294	165 dogs in February 2015.	
Gillum, Sherri	MO	43-B-3701	Broker license. 87 dogs in September 2015.	

Business	State	USDA #	Business/Animal Welfare Act Non-Compliance Information	Non-Compliance Details
Goostree, Ruth Ann/Gary (Rafter "G" Kennel) ^{1*}	MO	43-A-5677	6 non-compliances in 2012-2015 (1 direct, 5 indirect, 1 repeat) - veterinary care, access/inspection of records/property, enclosures, and housing. 79 dogs in April 2016.	Dog with severely matted hair, eye disease, and dental disease, not examined by vet (D); dog with skin disease, not examined by vet (D); dog with mammary mass/infection, not examined by vet, licensee could not "handle the dog" (R); ventilation turned off resulting in high ammonia levels in shelter; holes in enclosures with sharp edges; responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Graber, Levi (Blue Ribbon Morgans and Puppies)*	IN	32-B-0182	Broker license, cancelled in January 2016.	
Hershberger, Willis (Pine Ridge Puppies)	OH	31-A-0257	1 non-compliance in 2013 (1 direct) – veterinary care. 64 dogs in October 2015.	Dog with eye disease and open sore on paw, not examined by vet (D).
Ireland, Kim*	MO	N/A	Not listed in USDA licensee database.	
Kastning, Scott/Janice*	MO	N/A	Not listed in USDA licensee database.	
Kinnamon, Bill*	KS	N/A	Not listed in USDA licensee database.	
Kinnamon, Danny*	KS	N/A	Not listed in USDA licensee database.	
Knapp, Pamela*	AR	71-A-1067	5 non-compliances in 2012-2013 (5 indirect) - access/inspection of records/property, housing, enclosures, and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 77 dogs in July 2014.	Wire flooring in enclosures with dogs' legs falling through; accumulation of "grime" on flooring and walls in housing; food and water receptacles not cleaned/sanitized; fly infestation; responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Knepp, Marcus*	IN	N/A	Not listed in USDA licensee database; however, was licensed under #32-A-0399 until September 2013.	
Lansdown, Erika	MO	43-A-5968	9 dogs at time of pre-license inspection in May 2015. License issued June 2015 – no inspections on file since issuance of license.	
Lansdown, Tammy/Terry (Lansdown Kennel)	MO	43-A-1268	246 dogs in January 2016.	
Madison, Shonda/Heath (Madison Kennels)*	MO	43-B-3499	3 non-compliances in 2013-2015 (3 indirect) – housing. 121 dogs in December 2015.	No wind/rain breaks or shade areas in outdoor housing; lack of sufficient bedding in temperatures below freezing; high level of ammonia in housing facility presenting health risk.
Mayfield, Tammy*	MO	N/A	Not listed in USDA licensee database.	
McFadin, Doug*	MO	43-A-5733	58 dogs in December 2015.	
Miller, Ann (Miller's Kennel)	MO	43-A-3384	4 non-compliances in 2013 (4 indirect, 1 repeat) – veterinary care, housing, cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 238 dogs in December 2015.	Dog with dental disease, not examined by vet (R); dog with eye disease, no documentation of vet's diagnosis of "bad eyes" (R); dog with abnormal mass, not examined by vet in 12 months (R); toxic substances stored on shelf above enclosure; accumulations of hair/dirt/feces in and on housing facilities.

Business	State	USDA #	Business/Animal Welfare Act Non-Compliance Information	Non-Compliance Details
Miller, David	OH	31-A-0428	2 non-compliances in 2013-2014 (2 indirect) - veterinary care. 300 dogs in July 2015.	Dog with open wound in paw, not examined by vet; 2 dogs with eye disease, not examined by vet.
Moore, Melanie/Mike (M.A.M. Kennel)	MO	43-A-5625	3 USDA violations in 2014 (3 indirect) - access/inspection of records/property. 275 dogs in February 2015.	Responsible adult not present to allow inspection three times in 2014.
Ponting, Brenda/Ted ¹	MO	43-A-5133	8 non-compliances in 2012-2013 (1 direct, 7 indirect, 2 repeat) - outdoor housing, enclosures, and watering. 118 dogs in June 2015.	Enclosures with inadequate shelter (D); enclosures without wind/rain breaks (R); water receptacles not cleaned/sanitized (R); enclosures without sufficient bedding in temps near freezing; enclosures without floors covered in mud and snow causing wet and muddy coats in temps near freezing; torn/rusted metal in enclosures with sharp edges.
Rottinghaus, Audrey (Wendy Pets) ^{1,2*}	KS	48-B-0313	Broker license. 5 non-compliances in 2012-2015 (1 direct, 4 indirect, 2 repeat) - access/inspection of records/property, veterinary care, housing, and feeding. 99 dogs in January 2016.	Dog's head entrapped in unsecured enclosure cover (D); 2 dogs with dental disease, not examined by vet (R); dog with limp, not examined by vet (R); food receptacles not cleaned/sanitized (R); responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Sixth Day Kennels*	AR	71-A-1214	2 non-compliances in 2014-2015 (2 indirect) – cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control; access/inspection of records/property. 47 dogs in September 2015.	Water bowls with accumulations of green algae; responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Schindler, Herman (Tony) (QD Kennels)*	MO	43-B-0415	Broker license. 70 dogs in April 2015.	
Schneiders, Terri/Johanna Abernathy*	OK	73-A-2671	Previously licensed as 73-A-2444 (cancelled April 2013, new license issued July 2013). Under new license, 15 non-compliances in 2012-2013 (15 indirect, 4 repeat) - veterinary care, dog identification, record keeping, housing, exercise, feeding, watering, and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 86 dogs in February 2015.	Food storage with rodent droppings and insects; feces surrounding enclosures; loose metal with sharp edges in enclosures; no exercise program; food and water receptacles not cleaned/sanitized; fly infestation.
Snidow, Julie/Jay Blackburn*	MO	43-A-3124	2 non-compliances in 2013-2015 (2 indirect) – veterinary care, access/inspection of records/property. 217 dogs in October 2015.	Dog with eye disease, not examined by vet; responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Sobrad LLC (Pinnacle Pet)*	MO	43-B-3750 43-T-0063	Previous broker license 43-B-3725 cancelled in May 2015. Current broker license issued 5 days later. Also licensed as transporter. 353 dogs at time of pre-license inspection in May 2015. No inspections of facilities/animals on file since issuance of new license.	
Tiffanie's LLC	MO	43-B-3731	Broker license. 2 non-compliances in 2014 (2 indirect) – access/inspection of records/property. 17 dogs in October 2015.	Responsible adult not present to allow inspection twice in 2014.

Business	State	USDA #	Business/Animal Welfare Act Non-Compliance Information	Non-Compliance Details
Troyer, Monty/Darci/Melissa/Ron (Riverside Kennel)*	NE	47-A-0547	3 non-compliances in 2013-2014 (3 indirect) – veterinary care, access/inspection of property/records. 133 dogs in November 2015.	Dog with dental disease despite documentation of dental cleaning 6 months prior; responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Wagler, Lester	KS	48-A-1932	6 non-compliances in 2014-2015 (6 indirect, 1 repeat) – housing, cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control, access/inspection of property/records. 18 dogs in July 2015.	Holes and gaps in enclosure flooring (R); rodents in feed; responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Walles, Judy/Dennis	MO	43-A-3787	1 non-compliance in 2015 (1 indirect) – access/inspection of property/records. 288 dogs in October 2015.	Responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Watts, Vanessa (Rock Springs Kennel)*	AR	71-A-1213	1 non-compliance in 2013 (1 indirect) - veterinary care. 119 dogs in April 2015.	Dog with eye disease, not examined by vet.
Whitelaw, Fred D.*	AR	71-A-1283	6 non-compliances in 2014-2015 (6 indirect) - veterinary care, housing, enclosures, and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 218 dogs in July 2015.	Puppy that was returned with matted eye, dull coat, and slow movements, not examined by vet; dog with leg disorder, not examined by vet; accumulation of feces in enclosures; rusted metal doors with sharp edges; metal doors with sharp edges.
Whitman, Darlene (O' My Heart Kennel)*	MO	43-A-2517	3 non-compliances in 2013 (1 direct, 2 indirect) - veterinary care and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 200 dogs in October 2015.	Dog so thin that hip and back bones were easily observed, not examined by vet (D); dog with excessively long toenails and twisted toe, not examined by vet; using expired medications; dogs being sprayed with water during cleaning of outdoor shelter in temps near freezing.
Williamson, Sharon*	AR	N/A	Not listed in USDA licensee database.	
Wilson, Sharon	AR	71-A-0822	21 dogs in May 2015.	

Not listed in USDA licensee database. Only USDA-licensed breeders are permitted to sell animals for the wholesale trade (i.e., to pet stores).

Not compliant with the Animal Welfare Act according to inspection performed by USDA.

*Not in Furry Babies' in-store "Breeder Information Book."

(D) = Direct non-compliance of the Animal Welfare Act, defined by the USDA as "currently (at the time of the inspection) having a serious or severe adverse effect on the health and well-being of the animal, or has the high potential to have that effect in the immediate future." However, many of the non-compliances currently having a serious adverse effect on the animals included in these breeders' records were not designated as "Direct." (Definitions retrieved from the USDA's *Animal Welfare Inspection Guide*, https://www.aphis.usda.gov/animal_welfare/downloads/Animal-Care-Inspection-Guide.pdf.)

(R) = Repeat non-compliance of the Animal Welfare Act, defined by the USDA as non-compliances "cited in the same section and subsection as on the last inspection or on the last full inspection if the previous inspection was a Focused Inspection." According to the USDA, designation of a "Repeat" non-compliance is at the discretion of the inspector; many of the non-compliances included in these breeders' records were cited multiple times without being designated as "Repeat."

Breeder/Broker Details Source: USDA Animal Care Information System Search Tool (unavailable since January 2017)

View the veterinary certificates of dogs sold to Furry Babies in 2015 online: http://www.safepetsforjolie.org/uploads/1/3/7/9/13796189/fb_veterinarycertificates-ida_2015.pdf

(Note: All dogs are sent to the Bloomingdale and Rockford store locations, then delivered to other area stores.)

¹ Listed in The Humane Society of the United States Report, *101 Puppy Mills: A Sampling of Problem Puppy Mills in the United States*, May 2014, http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/pets/puppy_mills/101-puppy-mills-report-2014.pdf.

² Listed in The Humane Society of the United States Report, *A Horrible Hundred: Problem Puppy Mills in the United States*, May 2013, http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/pets/puppy_mills/100-puppy-mills-report.pdf.

Breeder/Broker Information for Dogs Sold to Furry Babies in 2013 and 2014

According to Veterinary Certificates Received by the Illinois Department of Agriculture and Inspection Reports on File with the United States Department of Agriculture

2013

Business	State	USDA #	# Dogs	Business/ Animal Welfare Act Non-Compliance Information	Non-compliance Details
Abernathy, Johanna/Terri Schneiders	OK	73-A-2671	1	Previously licensed as 73-A-2444 (cancelled April 2013, new license issued July 2013). Under new license, 15 non-compliances in 2012-2013 (15 indirect, 4 repeat) - veterinary care, dog identification, record keeping, housing, exercise, feeding, watering, and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 86 dogs as of February 2015.	Food storage with rodent droppings and insects; feces surrounding enclosures; loose metal with sharp edges in enclosures; no exercise program; food and water receptacles not cleaned/sanitized; fly infestation.
Baker, Linda (Okie Pets)	OK	73-B-0204	2	Broker license. 6 non-compliances in 2014-2015 (1 direct, 5 indirect, 1 repeat) - veterinary care, housing, outdoor housing, and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 135 dogs in January 2015.	3 dogs with swelling and lesions on paws, not examined by vet (D); 2 dogs with eye disease, not examined by vet (D); 2 dogs with dental disease, not examined by vet (D); dog with excessively long toenails curling into pad (R); dog with severely matted hair, not groomed (R); shelters not large enough for dogs to enter, sit, stand, lie, or turn about; rusted metal with sharp edges in housing; enclosures in disrepair; buildup of "grime" on doors; fly infestation.
Balentine, Sandra (Balentines Kennel)	AR	71-A-1199	1	1 non-compliance in 2014 (1 indirect) - veterinary care. 47 dogs in May 2014.	Dog "wobbles when he walks," not examined by vet.
Brasher, Linda (Elite Puppies)	AR	71-A-0762	1	1 non-compliance in 2013 (1 indirect) - cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 183 dogs in October 2014.	Excessive feces and discarded building materials in housing.
Canterbury Tails Pets	KS	48-B-0319	1	Broker license. 2 non-compliances in 2012-2013 (2 indirect) - veterinary care and housing. 360 dogs in May 2014.	Dog with skin disease, not examined by vet; dog with eye disease, not examined by vet; rusted metal in enclosures with sharp edges.

Business	State	USDA #	# Dogs	Business/ Animal Welfare Act Non-Compliance Information	Non-compliance Details
Clarke, Kathy/William (Clarke's Hillside Kennel) ^{1,2}	KS	48-A-1275	3	10 non-compliances in 2012-2013 (2 direct, 8 indirect, 4 repeat) - access/inspection of records/property, veterinary care, housing, outdoor housing, watering, and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 81 dogs in August 2014.	3 dogs with tick infestations on face and ears (1 died, 1 euthanized), unnoticed (D, R); dog with open wound on face, unnoticed (D, R); 2 dogs limping, unnoticed (D, R); dog with skin disease, not examined by vet (D, R); dog with dental disease, not examined by vet (D, R); 2 dogs with foot swelling, unnoticed (D, R); water receptacles not cleaned/sanitized (R); unsanitary living conditions (R); feces on doors and shelter walls (25-50% coverage); responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Evans, Shawnie	OK	73-A-2693	2	Previously licensed as 73-A-1553 (cancelled August 2014, new license issued September 2014). Under previous license, 1 non-compliance in 2013 (1 indirect) - housing. Under new license, 1 non-compliance in 2014 (1 indirect) - access/inspection of records/property. 47 dogs in December 2014.	Enclosures in disrepair; responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Hart, Delinda	MO	43-A-4783	6	6 non-compliances in 2013-2014 (6 indirect, 1 repeat) - access and inspection of records/property, feeding, watering, and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 22 dogs in October 2014.	Food and water receptacles not cleaned/sanitized; responsible adult not present to allow inspection (R).
Hedgpeth, Allison (Lonewolf Pets LLC)	MO	43-B-3435 43-T-0048	4	Operates under two licenses - broker and transporter. 2 non-compliances in 2013-2014 (2 indirect) - access/inspection of records/property and housing. 75 dogs in April 2014.	Inadequate wind/rain breaks in shelters; responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Holden, Pam	AR	Unlicensed	1	Not listed in USDA licensee database.	N/A
Hurliman, Dwayne ^{3,4}	OK	73-A-2621	26	9 non-compliances in 2012-2014 (1 direct, 8 indirect) - veterinary care, access/inspection of records/property, enclosures, and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 1,176 dogs in December 2014.	Dog limping, unnoticed (D); 4 dogs with dental disease, unnoticed (D); dog with infected foot, unnoticed; 3 dogs with eye disease, not examined by vet; dog with dental disease, not examined by vet; heat lamps in enclosures with no guards to protect against thermal injury; shelters not large enough for dogs to enter, sit, stand, lie, or turn about; holes in enclosure floors with dogs' legs falling through; food contaminated with wild rodent feces and cockroaches; cockroach infestation, including enclosures; 100 dogs without identification; responsible adult not present to allow inspection.

Business	State	USDA #	# Dogs	Business/ Animal Welfare Act Non-Compliance Information	Non-compliance Details
Knapp, Pamela	AR	71-A-1067	2	5 non-compliances in 2012-2013 (5 indirect) - access/inspection of records/property, housing, enclosures, and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 77 dogs in July 2014.	Wire flooring in enclosures with dogs' legs falling through; accumulation of "grime" on flooring and walls in housing; food and water receptacles not cleaned/sanitized; fly infestation; responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Mackey, Bob	OK	73-B-1857	2	Broker license. 15 non-compliances in 2013-2015 (15 indirect) - veterinary care, housing, enclosures, and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 209 dogs in March 2015.	Dog with eye disease and bleeding cut on leg, not examined by vet; 3 dogs with dental disease, not examined by vet; dog with eye disease, unnoticed; dog with eye disease, not examined by vet; using medication not approved for dogs; using unlabeled and expired medication; insufficient drainage and unsanitary living conditions; food contaminated with rodent waste; holes in enclosure floors with dogs' legs falling through; broken wires with sharp edges in enclosures; enclosures in disrepair; rodent infestation.
Moore, Melanie/Mike (M.A.M. Kennel)	MO	43-A-5625	1	2 non-compliances in 2014 (2 indirect) - access/inspection of records/property. 275 dogs in February 2015.	Responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Morfin, Jesus	AR	71-A-1152	1	1 non-compliance in 2014 (1 indirect) - veterinary care. 285 dogs in June 2014.	Dog with dental disease, not examined by vet.
Parish, Kathy (Purple Circle Bulldogs, K&J Kennel)	AR	71-A-1329	2	15 non-compliances in 2012-2014 (15 indirect, 4 repeat) - veterinary care, housing, enclosures, exercise, and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 105 dogs in May 2014.	2 dogs with dental disease, not examined by vet; veterinary care program incomplete; doors with accumulation of "dirt and grime" and rust (R); enclosures in disrepair (R); machinery and "junk" in housing; waste drainage system clogged; broken wire fencing with sharp edges; openings in floors with dogs' legs falling through; unsanitary living conditions; fly infestation; exercise program incomplete.

Business	State	USDA #	# Dogs	Business/ Animal Welfare Act Non-Compliance Information	Non-compliance Details
Ponting, Brenda/Ted ²	MO	43-A-5133	7	8 non-compliances in 2012-2013 (1 direct, 7 indirect, 2 repeat) - outdoor housing, enclosures, and watering. 162 dogs in April 2014.	Enclosures with inadequate shelter (D); enclosures without wind/rain breaks (R); water receptacles not cleaned/sanitized (R); enclosures without sufficient bedding in temps near freezing; enclosures without floors covered in mud and snow causing wet and muddy coats in temps near freezing; torn/rusted metal in enclosures with sharp edges.
Roberts, Ellen (Rocky Top K-9s) ^{3,4}	MO	43-A-5445	1	16 non-compliances in 2013-2014 (16 indirect, 6 repeat) - veterinary care, access/inspection of records/property, housing, enclosures, and dog identification. 116 dogs in October 2014.	4 puppies with respiratory illness, not examined by vet (R); dog so thin that hip bones, vertebrae, and rib bones were easily observed, with hunched posture, not examined by vet (R); 2 nursing dogs so thin their ribs and spinal arches were prominent, not examined by vet (R); dog so thin that ribs were easily observed (R); 4 dogs with mange, treatment was stopped, not examined by vet (R); 2 dogs with eye disease, not examined by vet (R); dog with mange, unnoticed (R); dog with skin disease, not examined by vet (R); shelters without wind/rain breaks (R); holes in metal fencing large enough for dogs' heads with sharp edges (R); shelters with insufficient bedding in near freezing temps; enclosures in disrepair; 12 dogs with no identification; responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Rottinghaus, Audrey (Wendy Pets/Windy Hill Pets) ^{1,2}	KS	48-B-0313	3	Unlicensed on veterinary certificate, but is large-scale breeder with USDA broker license. 5 non-compliances in 2012-2015 (1 direct, 4 indirect, 2 repeat) - access/inspection of records/property, veterinary care, housing, and feeding. 135 dogs in December 2013.	Dog's head entrapped in unsecured enclosure cover (D); 2 dogs with dental disease, not examined by vet (R); dog with limp, not examined by vet (R); food receptacles not cleaned/sanitized (R); responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Rottinghaus, Sandra ^{1,2}	KS	Unlicensed	2	Unlicensed on veterinary certificate, but sold 7 puppies of 4 different breeds to FB in just 2 weeks, indicating that she is exceeding the limit of dogs for unlicensed breeders established by USDA.	N/A

Business	State	USDA #	# Dogs	Business/ Animal Welfare Act Non-Compliance Information	Non-compliance Details
Schindler, Herman (Tony) (QD Kennels)	MO	43-B-0415	8	Broker license. Large-scale commercial puppy broker that ship puppies across US. Sells over 5,000 puppies/year. 48 dogs in March 2014.	
Smith, Mary	MO	N/A	1	Not enough information provided on veterinary certificate to identify breeder.	
Taylor, Allene (Taylors Kennels)	MO	43-A-0826	2	License cancelled in April 2015. 16 non-compliances in 2013-2015 (1 direct, 15 indirect, 3 repeat) - veterinary care, housing, and enclosures.	Dog with "mass of hair entangled in his bottom front teeth" and dental disease, noticed the year prior as "severe," not examined by vet (D, R); using expired and improperly stored medications (D, R); "several" dogs with severely matted hair, not groomed (D, R); dog with dental disease, not examined by vet; shelters with insufficient bedding in near freezing temps; accumulation of feces in enclosures (R); shelters without wind/rain breaks (R); exposed wires and broken flooring with sharp edges; openings in floors with dogs' legs falling through; enclosures too small for dogs to "make normal postural adjustments"; buildup of "grime" on doors; enclosures in disrepair.
Willmann, Tammy/Dennis (Hickory Inn Kennels)	AR	71-A-0759	2	License cancelled June 2014. 2 non-compliances in 2013 (2 indirect, 1 repeat) - access/inspection of records/property. 99 dogs in April 2013.	Responsible adult not present to allow inspection (R).

2014

Business	State	USDA #	# Dogs	Business/Animal Welfare Act Non-Compliance Information	Non-Compliance Details
Abernathy, Johanna/Terri Schneiders	OK	73-A-2671	1	Previously licensed as 73-A-2444 (cancelled April 2013, new license issued July 2013). Under new license, 15 non-compliances in 2012-2013 (15 indirect, 4 repeat) - veterinary care, dog identification, record keeping, housing, exercise, feeding, watering, and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 86 dogs in February 2015.	Food storage with rodent droppings and insects; feces surrounding enclosures; loose metal with sharp edges in enclosures; no exercise program; food and water receptacles not cleaned/sanitized; fly infestation.

Business	State	USDA #	# Dogs	Business/Animal Welfare Act Non-Compliance Information	Non-Compliance Details
Baker, Karen K. (Kute Kozy K) ²	IA	42-A-1383	3	License cancelled in October 2014. 7 non-compliances in 2012-2014 (7 indirect, 1 repeat) - access/inspection of records/property, housing, enclosures, and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control.	Enclosures without wind/rain breaks; shelters not large enough for dogs to enter, sit, stand, lie, or turn about; enclosures with no floor; buildup of "grime" on enclosure doors; responsible adult not present to allow inspection (R).
Baker, Linda (Okie Pets)	OK	73-B-0204	4	Broker license. 6 non-compliances in 2014-2015 (1 direct, 5 indirect, 1 repeat) - veterinary care, housing, outdoor housing, and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 135 dogs in January 2015.	3 dogs with swelling and lesions on paws, not examined by vet (D); 2 dogs with eye disease, not examined by vet (D); 2 dogs with dental disease, not examined by vet (D); dog with excessively long toenails curling into pad (R); dog with matted hair, not groomed (R); shelters not large enough for dogs to enter, sit, stand, lie, or turn about; rusted metal with sharp edges in housing; enclosures in disrepair; buildup of "grime" on doors; fly infestation.
Bratcher, Betty	KS	48-A-2158	3	Previously licensed as 48-A-2127 (cancelled May 2014, new license issued August 2014). Under previous license, 6 non-compliances in 2012-2013 (6 indirect, 1 repeat) - veterinary care, access/inspection of records/property, enclosures, and housing. 19 dogs in February 2015.	Using expired medication; broken wire in run with sharp edges (R); shelters without wind/rain breaks; responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Brown, Kathy	MO	48-B-0313	1	Broker license. 250 dogs in July 2014.	
Clarke, Kathy/William (Clarke's Hillside Kennels) ^{1,2}	KS	48-A-1275	1	10 non-compliances in 2012-2013 (2 direct, 8 indirect, 4 repeat) - access/inspection of records/property, veterinary care, housing, outdoor housing, watering, and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 81 dogs in August 2014.	3 dogs with tick infestations on face and ears (1 died, 1 euthanized), unnoticed (D, R); dog with open wound on face, unnoticed (D, R); 2 dogs limping, unnoticed (D, R); dog with skin disease, not examined by vet (D, R); dog with dental disease, not examined by vet (D, R); 2 dogs with foot swelling, unnoticed (D, R); water receptacles not cleaned/sanitized (R); unsanitary living conditions (R); feces on doors and shelter walls (25-50% coverage); responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Cox, Shelly/Lonnie (Big Creek Kennel)	AR	71-A-0960	2	Missouri veterinary certificate. 276 dogs in March 2015.	
Eastwood, Marjorie	OK	73-A-2629	1	License cancelled in December 2014. 3 non-compliances in 2012-2014 (3 indirect) - access/inspection of records/property, housing, and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control.	Syringes, needles, and empty vaccine vials in housing; overgrowth of weeds around outdoor enclosures; responsible adult not present to allow inspection.

Business	State	USDA #	# Dogs	Business/Animal Welfare Act Non-Compliance Information	Non-Compliance Details
Evans, Shawnie	OK	73-A-2693	1	Previously licensed as 73-A-1553 (cancelled August 2014, new license issued September 2014). Under previous license, 1 non-compliance in 2013 (1 indirect) - housing. Under new license, 1 non-compliance in 2014 (1 indirect) - access/inspection of records/property. 47 dogs in December 2014.	Enclosures in disrepair; responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Goostree, Ruth Ann/Gary (Rafter "G" Kennel) ²	MO	43-A-5677	2	6 non-compliances in 2012-2015 (1 direct, 5 indirect, 1 repeat) - veterinary care, access/inspection of records/property, enclosures, and housing. 55 dogs in March 2015.	Dog with severely matted hair, eye disease, and dental disease, not examined by vet (D); dog with skin disease, not examined by vet (D); dog with mammary mass/infection, not examined by vet, licensee could not "handle the dog" (R); ventilation turned off resulting in high ammonia levels in shelter; holes in enclosures with sharp edges; responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Hedgpeth, Allison (Lonewolf Pets LLC)	MO	43-B-3435 43-T-0048	8	Operates under two licenses - broker and transporter. 2 non-compliances in 2013-2014 (2 indirect) - access/inspection of records/property and housing. 75 dogs in April 2014.	Inadequate wind/rain breaks in shelters; responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Helms, Nancy	OK	73-A-2688	1	6 non-compliances in 2014-2015 (6 indirect) - veterinary care, access/inspection of records/property, housing, and record keeping. 19 dogs in March 2015.	No veterinary care program; broken fiberglass inserts with sharp edges in enclosures; insufficient waste drainage; unsanitary living conditions; records missing for 25 dogs; responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Hewitt, Gary (Licks are Kisses Kennel)	AR	71-A-1126	5	1 non-compliance in 2013 (1 indirect) - veterinary care. 79 dogs in April 2014.	Dog limping, not examined by vet.
Hurliman, Dwayne ³	OK	73-A-2621	2	9 non-compliances in 2012-2014 (1 direct, 8 indirect) - veterinary care, access/inspection of records/property, enclosures, and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 1,176 dogs in December 2014.	Dog limping, unnoticed (D); 4 dogs with dental disease, unnoticed (D); dog with dental disease, not examined by vet; 3 dogs with eye disease, not examined by vet; dog with infected foot, unnoticed; heat lamps in enclosures with no guards to protect against thermal injury; shelters not large enough for dogs to enter, sit, stand, lie, or turn about; holes in enclosure floors with dogs' legs falling through; food contaminated with wild rodent feces and cockroaches; cockroach infestation, including enclosures; 100 dogs without identification; responsible adult not present to allow inspection.

Business	State	USDA #	# Dogs	Business/Animal Welfare Act Non-Compliance Information	Non-Compliance Details
Jones, Brenda (Kountry Lane Kennel)	MO	43-A-5709	3	10 dogs in November 2014.	
Koster, Charlene/Darlene (Rainbow Ranch Kennel) ^{1,2,3,4}	KS	48-B-0271	6	Broker license. 21 non-compliances in 2013-2015 (2 direct, 19 indirect, 6 repeat) - veterinary care, access/inspection of records/property, housing, enclosures, feeding, and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 96 dogs in March 2015.	Feces and urine in food (D); insufficient bedding for dogs in outdoor enclosures in temps below freezing (D); dog with growth on head with blood and tissue visible, not examined by vet; dog with fight wound, not examined by vet; dog with severely matted hair, not groomed (R); using medication for cattle on dogs; using expired medication; ripped metal in enclosures and holes in fences with sharp edges; feces on walls and floors in enclosures; holes in floors of enclosures; excessive feces in enclosures (50-70% of floor space); enclosures frozen shut; shelters without wind/rain breaks; responsible adult not present to allow inspection (R).
Lansdown, Tammy/Terry (Lansdown Kennel)	MO	43-A-1268	2	215 dogs in September 2014.	
Mackey, Bob	OK	73-B-1857	3	Broker license. 15 non-compliances in 2013-2015 (15 indirect) - veterinary care, housing, enclosures, and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 209 dogs in March 2015.	Dog with eye disease and bleeding cut on leg, not examined by vet; 3 dogs with dental disease, not examined by vet; dog with eye disease, unnoticed; dog with eye disease, not examined by vet; using medication not approved for dogs; using expired and unlabeled medication; insufficient drainage and unsanitary living conditions; food contaminated with rodent waste; holes in enclosure floors with dogs' legs falling through; broken wires with sharp edges in enclosures; enclosures in disrepair; rodent infestation.
Mayfield, Tammy	MO	Unlicensed	1	Not listed in USDA licensee database.	N/A
McVay, William	AR	Unlicensed	1	Not listed in USDA licensee database.	N/A

Business	State	USDA #	# Dogs	Business/Animal Welfare Act Non-Compliance Information	Non-Compliance Details
Miller, Lizann/Daniel, Rebecca Eiler ²	NE	47-A-0607	2	Kansas veterinary certificate. Previously licensed as 47-A-0564 (cancelled September 2014, new license issued October 2014). Under previous license, 18 non-compliances in 2013-2014 (4 direct, 14 indirect, 5 repeat) - veterinary care, access/inspection of records/property, housing, exercise, watering, dog identification, and record keeping. Under new license, 1 non-compliance in 2014 (indirect) - access/inspection of records/property. 151 dogs in October 2014.	For license 47-A-0564: 5 dogs with open sores, not examined by vet (D, R); dog with eye, tooth, and skin disease, not examined by vet (D); shelters for 20 dogs with no bedding in temps near freezing, dogs shivering (D); majority of water receptacles completely frozen with no water available for dogs (D, R); using medication not approved for dogs (R); using unlabeled and expired medication (R); unapproved outdoor housing in temps below freezing; shelters without wind/rain breaks; feces on doors and walls in enclosures; records missing for 31 dogs; no exercise program for 102 dogs; water receptacles not cleaned/sanitized; responsible adult not present to allow inspection (R).
Pickett, Amanda/Greg (Picket's Puppies)	KS	48-A-2133	1	56 dogs in December 2014.	
Ponting, Brenda/Ted ²	MO	43-A-5133	1	8 non-compliances in 2012-2013 (1 direct, 7 indirect, 2 repeat) - outdoor housing, enclosures, and watering. 162 dogs in April 2014.	Enclosures with inadequate shelter (D); enclosures without wind/rain breaks (R); water receptacles not cleaned/sanitized (R); enclosures without sufficient bedding in temps near freezing; enclosures without floors covered in mud and snow causing wet and muddy coats in temps near freezing; torn/rusted metal in enclosures with sharp edges.
Ragland, Cindy (Ragland's Kennel)	AR	71-A-1296	2	No license number listed on veterinary certificate, but is large-scale breeder licensed by the USDA. 4 non-compliances in 2013-2014 (4 indirect) - veterinary care, access/inspection of records/property, enclosures, and identification. 25 dogs in November 2014.	Dog with eye disease, not examined by vet; enclosures in disrepair; records missing for 2 dogs; responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Rottinghaus, Audrey (Wendy Pets/Windy Hill Pets) ^{1,2}	KS	48-B-0313	5	No license number listed on veterinary certificate, but is large-scale breeder with USDA broker license. 5 non-compliances in 2012-2015 (1 direct, 2 repeat) - access/inspection of records/property, veterinary care, housing, and feeding. 135 dogs in December 2013.	Dog's head entrapped in unsecured enclosure cover (D); 2 dogs with dental disease, not examined by vet (R); dog with limp, not examined by vet (R); food receptacles not cleaned/sanitized (R); responsible adult not present to allow inspection.

Business	State	USDA #	# Dogs	Business/Animal Welfare Act Non-Compliance Information	Non-Compliance Details
Rottinghaus, Sandra ^{1,2}	KS	Unlicensed	7	Unlicensed on veterinary certificate, but sold 7 puppies of 4 different breeds to FB in just 2 weeks, indicating that she is exceeding the limit of dogs for unlicensed breeders established by USDA.	N/A
Schindler, Herman (Tony) (QD Kennels)	MO	43-B-0415	9	Broker license. Large-scale commercial puppy broker that ship puppies across US. Sells over 5,000 puppies/year. 48 dogs in March 2014.	
Veitschegger, Violet	MO	43-A-5775	1	14 non-compliances in 2012-2014 (14 indirect) - veterinary care, notification of name/address/control/ownership of business, access/inspection of records/property, compatible grouping, feeding, enclosures, housing, and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 88 dogs in November 2014.	2 dogs with skin disease, not examined by vet; dog with limp, unnoticed; facility was moved without USDA notification; dog attack witnessed during inspection; food contaminated with gravel; enclosures in disrepair; buildup of "dark matter" on enclosure walls; holes in enclosures with sharp wire edges; responsible adult not present to allow inspection.
Watts, Vanessa (Rock Springs Kennel)	AR	71-A-1213	1	1 non-compliance in 2013 (1 indirect) - veterinary care. 145 dogs in April 2014.	Dog with eye disease, not examined by vet.
Whitelaw, Fred D.	AR	71-A-1283	1	4 non-compliances in 2014 (4 indirect) - veterinary care, housing, enclosures, and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 270 dogs in August 2014.	Dog with leg disorder, not examined by vet; accumulation of feces in enclosures; metal doors with sharp edges.
Whitman, Darlene (O' My Heart Kennel)	MO	43-A-2517	2	3 non-compliances in 2013 (1 direct, 2 indirect) - veterinary care and cleaning/sanitation/housekeeping/pest control. 194 dogs in August 2014.	Dog so thin that hip and back bones were easily observed, not examined by vet (D); dog with excessively long toenails and twisted toe, not examined by vet; using expired medications; dogs being sprayed with water during cleaning of outdoor shelter in temps near freezing.

Not listed in USDA licensee database. Only USDA-licensed breeders are permitted to sell animals for the wholesale trade (i.e., to pet stores).

Not compliant with the Animal Welfare Act according to inspection performed by USDA.

(D) = Direct non-compliance of the Animal Welfare Act, defined by the USDA as "currently (at the time of the inspection) having a serious or severe adverse effect on the health and well-being of the animal, or has the high potential to have that effect in the immediate future." However, many of the non-compliances currently having a serious adverse effect on the animals included in these breeders' records were not designated as "Direct." (Definitions retrieved from the USDA's *Animal Welfare Inspection Guide*, https://www.aphis.usda.gov/animal_welfare/downloads/Animal-Care-Inspection-Guide.pdf.)

(R) = Repeat non-compliance of the Animal Welfare Act, defined by the USDA as non-compliances "cited in the same section and subsection as on the last inspection or on the last full inspection if the previous inspection was a Focused Inspection." According to the USDA, designation of a "Repeat" non-compliance is at the discretion of the inspector; many of the non-compliances included in these breeders' records were cited multiple times without being designated as "Repeat."

Broker Details Source: The Humane Society of the United States Report, *Petland in Illinois: Where Do They Get Their Puppies?*, November 2008.

http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/pets/puppy_mills/petland_state_data_illinois.pdf

Breeder/Broker Details Source: USDA Animal Care Information System Search Tool (unavailable since January 2017)

View the veterinary certificates of dogs sold to Furry Babies in 2013 online: http://www.safepetsforjoliet.org/uploads/1/3/7/9/13796189/foia_furrybabies-stratford_vetcertificates_2012-13.pdf

View the veterinary certificates of dogs sold to Furry Babies in 2014 online: http://www.safepetsforjoliet.org/uploads/1/3/7/9/13796189/foia_furrybabies-stratford_vetcertificates_2014.pdf

(Note: All dogs are sent to the Bloomingdale store location, then delivered to other area stores.)

¹ Listed in The Humane Society of the United States Report, *A Horrible Hundred: Problem Puppy Mills in the United States*, May 2013,

http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/pets/puppy_mills/100-puppy-mills-report.pdf.

² Listed in The Humane Society of the United States Report, *101 Puppy Mills: A Sampling of Problem Puppy Mills in the United States*, May 2014,

http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/pets/puppy_mills/101-puppy-mills-report-2014.pdf.

³ Listed in The Humane Society of the United States Report, *The Horrible Hundred 2015: Puppy Mills Exposed*, May 2015,

<http://www.humanesociety.org/news/news/2015/05/horrible-hundred-2015-problem-puppy-mills.html>.

⁴ Listed in The Humane Society of the United States Report, *The Horrible Hundred 2016: A Sampling of Problem Puppy Mills in the United States*, May 2016,

http://www.humanesociety.org/horrible-hundred-2016-puppy-mills-exposed.html?credit=web_id359552774.