

Dog and Cat Data Transparency Bill

2024 Minnesota Legislative Session | SF. 3458 Westlin/H.F. 3410 Freiberg

Why the bill is needed

A decade ago, Minnesota adopted legislation to provide oversight of large-scale commercial dog and cat breeders in response to public concerns about animal welfare. But a last-minute addition to the 2014 law classified nearly all dog and cat breeder data as non-public, restricting access to critical information the law was designed to collect and disseminate. The Dog and Cat Data Transparency Bill makes this data public and requires state inspection data for licensed dog and cat breeders and nonprofit animal shelters to be posted online.

Information on state-licensed dog and cat breeders is more restricted than nearly all other state licensees

There are more than 100 state-licensed commercial dog and cat breeding businesses operating in Minnesota, and these businesses sell thousands of puppies and kittens each year. Summary data from the Board of Animal Health indicates that state inspectors issued 47 violations to licensed breeders in the last five years. But current laws prevent Minnesota consumers from seeing any meaningful data about them — including which breeders were found to have violations, the nature of those violations, or how the violations were addressed.

In contrast, consumers can easily find important information on most other licensed professionals and businesses, including nonprofit animal shelters, because the state classifies that data as public information.

Current law obscures the size of breeding operations

There are no limits on the size of dog and cat breeding operations in Minnesota. One breeder reported 885 dogs and puppies to the USDA in 2023.

Yet Minnesota consumers are limited in their ability to verify the size of breeding operations because current law restricts public access to this important information. Minnesota only licenses breeders with 10 or more intact adults that also produce more than five litters a year, but some licensed breeders create the impression they raise only a handful of puppies and kittens in their homes each year.

Buyers make significant financial investments with limited information

Puppies and kittens purchased from a breeder can cost thousands of dollars, and most breeders require a large non-refundable deposit. Often, only buyers who have paid a deposit and signed a purchase contract are allowed to meet the puppy or kitten in person — usually at the time of pick-up.



Animal Humane Society is an independent, local 501(c)(3) companion animal welfare organization. Each year AHS cares for thousands of animals in need across Minnesota.

What the bill does

The Dog and Cat Data Transparency Bill ensures that Minnesotans have access to essential information about commercial breeders, including inspection reports and population data. Making this data public and requiring breeder and shelter data to be posted online increases transparency, reduces the burden on consumers, and aligns with the current practice of most other state boards.

Protects consumers

The Dog and Cat Data Transparency Bill allows consumers to verify breeder and shelter claims about their size (number of animals), animal health, and facility conditions before making a significant financial and emotional investment in a new pet.

Establishes trust

The public has entrusted the Board of Animal Health with enforcing minimum animal health and welfare standards set by the state. Many commercial breeders advertise their BAH licensure to instill faith in their business. The Dog and Cat Data Transparency Bill will help increase trust in the BAH's oversight of large-scale breeders and nonprofit shelters by providing public access to important inspection information.

Aligns with state data transparency standards

State law has established all data collected by the state is public data — with some very limited, narrow exceptions. Public expectations of transparency within both the public and private sectors has also increased. The Dog and Cat Data Transparency Bill aligns information requirements for commercial breeders with state data practices, reflects current public expectations on data transparency, and creates the same level of transparency for breeders that is currently required for nonprofit shelters.

For more information about this legislation, visit animalhumanesociety.org/transparency

Most state boards in Minnesota publish licensing data online

25 state boards license more than 115 categories of businesses and professionals:

- 23 of those state boards publish licensee names on their website.
- 21 publish information about the type of violations licensees have incurred.
- 18 publish violation and enforcement records on their websites.
- 24 publish a public process for complaints about licensees.

None of this information is available for licensed dog and cat breeders except for the licensee's name. It's time for that to change.

Feb. 2024 data



Data Practices of Minnesota State Boards

Minnesota State Board	Licenseses	Licensee name on website?	Type of violation on website?	Records of violations/enforcement on website?	Complaint process/form on website?
Board of Animal Health	Commercial breeders (cats/dogs) Kennels, "shelters" & dealers (cats/dogs) 3 agriculture-related businesses	✓	✗ Currently classified as private	✗ Currently classified as private	✗
		✗	✗ Public data, not posted	✗ Public data, not posted	✗
		✗			✗
Board of Accountancy	Accountants & firms	✓	✓	✓	✓
Board of Architecture, Engineering, Land Surveying, Landscape Architecture, Geoscience, and Interior Design	12 job titles	✓	✓	✓	✓
Board of Barber Examiners	Barber shops & barber schools Barbers	✓	✓	✓	✓
Board of Behavioral Health and Therapy	Counselors & firms	✓	✓	✗	✓
Board of Cosmetology Examiners	Salons & schools Cosmetology practioners	✓	✓	✓	✓
Board of Dentistry	Dentistry firms Dentistry professionals	✓	✓	✓	✓
Board of Dietetics and Nutrition Practice	Dietitians Nutritionists	✓	✓	✗	✓
Board of Executives for Long-Term Services and Supports	Nursing home administrators Health services executives Assisted living directors	✓	✓	✓	✓
Board of Marriage and Family Therapy	Therapy firms Therapists	✓	✓	✓	✓
Board of Medical Practice	Medical firms Physicians Physician assistants Other medical practioners	✓	✓	✓	✓
Board of Occupational Therapy Practice	Occupational therapists Occupational therapy assistants	✓	✓	✓	✓

Minnesota State Board	Licensees	Licensee name and location on website?	Type of violation on website?	Records of violations/enforcement on website?	Complaint process/form on website?
Board of Optometry	Optometry firms Optometrists	✓	✓	✓	✓
Board of Peace Officer Standards and Training	Police officers	✓ Must know license # or name	✓	✓	✓
Board of Pharmacy	Pharmacy facilities Pharmacists Pharmacy technicians	✓	✓	✓	✓
Board of Podiatric Medicine	Podiatric firms Prosthetists Orthotists Prosthetist-orthotists Pedorthists Assistants & fitters	✓	✓	✓	✓
Board of Psychology	Psychology firms Psychology providers Superintendents Principals	✓	✓	✓	✓
Board of School Administrators	Directors of special ed programs Directors of community education programs	✗	✗	✗	✓
Emergency Medical Services Regulatory Board	Ambulance services Emergency medical personnel	✓	✓	✓	✓
Gambling Control Board	Nonprofit organizations that conduct gambling Sellers of gambling equipment Distributors Bingo services	✓	✗	✗	✓
MN Board of Chiropractic Examiners	Chiropractic firms Chiropractors	✓	✓	✓	✓
MN Board of Nursing	RNs & LPNs	✓	✓	✗	✓
MN Board of Private Detective and Protective Agent Services	Private detective businesses Private detectives	✓	✗	✗	✓
MN Board of Social Work	Social worker firms Social workers	✓	✓	✓	✓
MN Board of Veterinary Medicine	Veterinary practices Veterinarians	✓	✓	✓	✓



Date: March 18, 2024

To: Chair Becker-Finn and members of the House Committee on Judiciary Finance and Civil Law

From: Elaine Hanson, Legislative Liaison, Minnesota Pet Breeders Association

This letter highlights the most prominent reasons why HF3410 is unnecessary, inadvisable, and unreasonably intrusive into the private business details of licensed commercial dog and cat breeders.

No one who raises selectively chosen, health-tested purpose-bred dogs or cats is denigrating shelters that import thousands of unowned, unwanted dogs (and dozens of cats) of unknown backgrounds from random sources to be sold to Minnesota consumers without warranties. We do have concerns about the diseases and parasites they sometimes bring along to share with our home-grown dogs, but we are working with the Board of Animal Health to address that more effectively.

Questions have been raised as to why licensed breeders' addresses and other sensitive data were classified as private or nonpublic when this law was passed. Requiring owners of businesses involving pet animals to disclose their addresses and pet inventories to the public, rather than just to potential customers they have screened, makes breeders and their property vulnerable to damage, theft, breach of biosecurity measures, and physical attacks by intruders. Several of our members have woman-owned businesses, and it is common knowledge that women are perceived as easier targets for criminal behavior.

Saying that public disclosure of breeders' records will level the playing field, since shelters' data are already public, is a false comparison. This provision is a problem looking for a solution. No one is clamoring to see shelter data; many shelters already publish much of it on their websites and annual reports. Requiring the Board of Animal Health to publish it will not enlighten the public about what nonprofit animal shelters do; that is already known for the most part, and what is not self-published is required by the IRS on their 990 reports.

By contrast there are several often-stated reasons why certain groups (generally not animal shelters) want to see breeders' data.

- *“The public has no way of knowing who the bad breeders are because we don’t know what violations they have committed and whether they were resolved.”* Please see attached summary data from the Board of Animal Health regarding breeders' violations of environmental and care standards. Many are not aware that the standards of care and environmental requirements are essentially the same for shelters and breeders – see attached inspection report forms, and note that this is a Pass/Fail yardstick; there is no Good-Better- Best or other grading system. Either an inspected facility meets a standard or it doesn't, and if it doesn't, there will be a Notice of Violation and a Correction Order and reinspection to confirm it. If a breeder is not meeting standards, they will no longer be “in good standing” and not on the list published by the Board on its website.

- *“To tell the public who they should not buy puppies from”* [see attached report forms for shelters and breeders, and the Board’s summary data on violations by licensed breeders]. Note that in the past two years there have been ZERO violations that jeopardized the health or welfare of any licensed breeder’s animals (2 years is the Board’s records retention schedule).
- *“To help consumers who bought unhealthy puppies/kittens from breeders”* [see attached explanation of Minn Stat 325F.791, the “Puppy Lemon Law”]. Consumers are protected by warranties that require replacement, reimbursement or refund in the event a pet is found to have been “unfit for sale” at the time of purchase due to undisclosed health issues or omission of other documentation. Nonprofit pet sellers are exempt from such obligations.
- *“To help with enforcement of cruelty laws and breeder regulations by telling law enforcement when a breeder has too many dogs and where to look for violations”* There are several variations on this theme. The Board is responsible for making such determinations, and has been doing so successfully for ten years, up to and including revoking the licenses of the few breeders who persisted in noncompliance with licensing standards.

We are also opposed to the requirement to post a list of those whose licenses expired. This provision exposes the most basic of motives for this legislation: the opportunity to smear even formerly licensed breeders (who may still be breeding pets on a smaller scale) based on no adverse information whatsoever. The anti-breeding groups can freely peddle their imaginary reason as “breeder let license expire so they would not be monitored and required to care for animals properly.” It is unimaginable that the legislature would demand that people divulge their reasons for retiring from breeding or choosing to continue at less than the commercial licensing level, and without that reason they can always be portrayed in negative terms by those who oppose the intentional breeding of owned animals.

Finally, the claim that it would be necessary, and comparable to other businesses for licensed breeders to disclose data such as street address, "product" inventory, and customer identity is not, in fact, a valid comparison. Other businesses, for example, are not:

- seen as subject to rumored misdeeds, harassment, theft, violence and other criminal behavior
- required to disclose documentation that professional standards are met
- named on a public list as professionals who have retired
- required to publicly identify their customers

Among professions the Animal Humane Society has listed, many would not be seen as jeopardizing human health or quality of life if they failed to meet professional standards, and could, like licensed breeders, be faulted for technical violations that would not suggest they are “bad actors” in their profession.

Further, the Board of Animal Health, the administrative agency for licensing and monitoring animal enterprises, will provide summary data showing categories of failure to meet standards on request (note there were ZERO in the past two years that would affect the health and welfare of animals in their care). The Board also publishes, as required, a list of licensed breeders "in good standing"; those listed have been found to meet licensing standards.

For these reasons, the Minnesota Pet Breeders Association emphatically opposes HF3410, the so-called “Breeder Transparency Bill,” and requests that you vote No on the motion to approve it.



Minnesota Pet Breeders Association

- Nonprofit, volunteer organization involved in both the science and social perspectives of the human/animal interface
- Emphasis on animal health and support of relationships between companion animals and people
- Focus on selective breeding to produce healthy purpose-bred pets suited to the needs and interests of families
- Members include professional and hobbyist pet breeders; some exhibit at shows or compete in performance events
- Education for pet breeders and owners including annual 2-day seminar and periodic health clinics
- Advocacy for legislation and agency programs to protect and promote animal health and the rights and responsibilities of ownership
- Collaboration with other groups focused on animal health and roles of domestic animals in our lives
- Working with BAH to develop standards of care, control of diseases and parasites, public education on zoonotic diseases

Minn. Stat 325F.791 summary (“Puppy Lemon Law”)

Every pet seller (*except nonprofit groups*) must provide buyer with

- Name, address, and USDA number (and *Minnesota license number if USDA and/or state licensed*) of the breeder and any broker who has had possession of the animal; date of birth; date the seller received the animal; breed, sex, color, and identifying marks of the animal; individual identifying tag, tattoo, or collar number (*or microchip number*); name and registration number of the sire and dam and the litter number (*if eligible for registration*); and a record of inoculations, worming treatments, and medication received by the animal while in the possession of the seller.
- A statement signed by the seller that the animal has no known health problem, or a statement signed by the seller disclosing any known health problem and a statement signed by a veterinarian that recommends necessary treatment. The disclosure shall be made part of the statement of consumer rights set forth in subdivision 10. The disclosure required in paragraph (a) need not be made for mixed breed animals if the information is not available and cannot be determined by the seller.
- *[paraphrased]* A seller who sells an animal eligible for registration shall provide the buyer within 90 days the documents necessary for registration. If they are not received the buyer may retain the animal and receive a refund of 50 percent of the purchase price, or return the animal and receive a full refund. The seller shall not be responsible for delays in registration which are the result of persons other than the seller.
- No animal may be offered for sale to a retail buyer until the animal has been examined by a veterinarian. If the seller is not the breeder of the animal, each animal shall be examined within two days after receipt of the animal by the seller and within four days of delivery of the animal to the buyer by the seller. The cost of the examination shall be paid by the seller.

Responsibilities of buyer.

To obtain the remedies provided in subdivision 6, the buyer shall notify the seller, within two business days, of the diagnosis by a veterinarian of a health problem and provide the seller with the name and telephone number of the veterinarian and a copy of the veterinarian's report on the animal. If the buyer wants to receive a full refund for the animal, (*they must*) return the animal no later than two business days after receipt of a written statement from a veterinarian indicating the animal is unfit due to a health problem. With respect to a dead animal the buyer must provide the seller a written statement from a veterinarian, indicating the animal died from a health problem which existed on or before the receipt of the animal by the buyer.

- If, within ten days after receipt of the animal by the buyer, a veterinarian states in writing that the animal has a health problem which existed in the animal at the time of delivery, or if within one year after receipt of the animal by the buyer, a veterinarian states in writing that the animal has died or is ill due to a hereditary or congenital defect, or is not of the breed type represented, the animal shall be considered to have been unfit for sale at the time of sale.
- In the event an animal dies due to a health problem which existed in the animal at the time of delivery to the buyer, the seller shall provide the purchaser with one of the following remedies selected by the buyer: receive an animal of equal value, if available, and reimbursement for reasonable veterinary fees, such reimbursements not to exceed the original purchase price of the animal; or receive a refund of the full purchase price.
- In the event of a health problem which existed at the time of delivery to the buyer, the seller shall provide the buyer with one of the following remedies selected by the buyer: return the animal to the seller for a refund of the full purchase price; exchange the animal for an animal of the buyer's choice of equivalent value, providing a replacement is available; or retain the animal, and receive reimbursement for reasonable veterinary fees, such reimbursements not to exceed the original purchase price of the animal.

Rights of seller. No refund, replacement, or reimbursement of veterinary fees shall be required if any one or more of the following conditions exist: a) The health problem or death resulted from maltreatment, neglect, or a disease contracted while in the possession of the buyer, or from an injury sustained subsequent to receipt of the animal by the buyer. (b) A veterinarian's statement was provided to the buyer pursuant to subdivision 1, paragraph (b), which disclosed the health problem for which the buyer seeks to return the animal. (c) The buyer fails to carry out recommended treatment prescribed by the examining veterinarian, pursuant to subdivision 1, paragraph (b).

Contest. (a) In the event that a seller contests a demand for the relief specified in subdivision 3 or 6, the seller may require the buyer to produce the animal for examination or necropsy by a veterinarian designated by the seller. The seller shall pay the cost of this examination or necropsy. The seller shall have a right of recovery against the purchaser if the seller is not obligated to provide a remedy under subdivision 6. (b) If the seller does not provide the relief selected by the buyer set forth in subdivision 3 or 6, the buyer may initiate a court action. (c) The prevailing party in the court action shall have the right to recover costs and reasonable attorney fees not to exceed \$500.

[The following is verbatim from the Revisor's website]

Posted notice. Every pet dealer (*seller*) shall post in a prominent location of the facility, a notice, in 48-point boldface type, containing the following language:

"Information on all dogs and cats is available. You are entitled to a statement of consumer rights. Make sure you receive this statement at the time of purchase."

Subd. 10. Statement of consumer rights. Every pet seller shall provide the buyer a written notice of rights, which shall be signed by the purchaser, acknowledging that the purchaser has reviewed the notice, and signed by the pet dealer certifying the accuracy of the information contained in it. A signed copy shall be retained by the pet dealer and one given to the purchaser. The notice shall be in 16-point boldface type and shall state as follows:

"A STATEMENT OF MINNESOTA LAW GOVERNING THE SALE OF DOGS AND CATS

"The sale of dogs and cats is subject to consumer protection regulations. Minnesota law also provides safeguards to protect pet dealers and animal purchasers. Attached is a copy of Minnesota Statutes, section [325F.79](#). Contained within this law is a statement of your consumer rights."

The statement of consumer rights shall also contain or have attached the disclosures required under subdivision 1.

Subd. 11. Limitation. Nothing in this subdivision shall limit the rights or remedies which are otherwise available to a purchaser under any other law. Any agreement or contract by a purchaser to waive any rights under this chapter shall be null and void and shall be unenforceable.

[end of statute quotation]

History: *This was enacted in 1992 by the Minnesota Legislature and has not been amended. It does not have an official informal title but is often referred to as the "Puppy Lemon Law." Minor editing of the original language was done for clarity, replacing "pet dealer" with "seller" and "purchaser" with "buyer," and to reduce repetitive language and confusing construction. The meaning was not altered by this editing.*

This law is not administered by the Board of Animal Health or any state agency. To secure a remedy the buyer must file a private action or bring the matter before the County Attorney of the county where the sale took place.

Please note that the seller of a pet must provide a remedy to the buyer if it is found within one year of the purchase that the pet has a hereditary or congenital (present at birth) defect from which the pet dies or becomes ill, even if it would not have been possible to identify the condition at the time of sale. There are many hereditary conditions for which no genetic test exists, and many conditions not evident in juvenile animals which may become apparent by 14-15 months of age, yet the seller (breeder) must warranty the pet against those conditions for a year after the sale even if they cannot have been known at the time of sale.

Request for summary data on inspection reports of Licensed Commercial Dog and Cat Breeders

Data is provided by the Board of Animal Health

Submitted by Minnesota Pet Breeders Association, March 2024

Note: BAH records retention schedule is two years; data below is from March 11, 2022 to March 11, 2024

- how many violations involved record keeping/paperwork? (one of our members told me she had such a violation, was cited for it, issued a correction order, and had a reinspection days or weeks later, despite the fact that the signed copy of her veterinary protocol could have been found in her back-up record book and shown to the inspector in less than 5 minutes): **Please see list below.**
- how many were violations that jeopardized the health/welfare of the breeder's animals; were the affected animals adults or neonates or juveniles? (if your data includes that detail): **Zero**
- how many were technical violations? (such as expired medication found in a cabinet, though current medication for same purpose was also seen and appeared to be in use per breeder's records): **Please see list below.**
- how many violations escalated to administrative action - fines? Did any require repeat correction orders for issue not addressed per the first order?: **Please see list below.**
- how many violations escalated to suspension of license?: **Two due to failure to submit license renewal fee by license renewal deadline.**
- how many violations escalated to revocation? and did that involve holding a public hearing, or did the licensee just give it up when told license was being revoked?: **Zero**
- how many violations involved conditions so severe as to warrant notifying law enforcement of an apparent violation of animal cruelty statutes? Or advising USDA of the situation if a dually-licensed breeder?: **Zero**
- and one of the biggies of "what the public needs to know about breeders" - how many breeders had multiple violations in the past 5 years? Were violations of same/similar standard, or some technical and others health/welfare?: **Please see list below.**

Commercial Breeder Notice of Violation and Correction Orders (NOV/COs)

Date range: 3/11/22 – 3/11/24

Total NOV/COs Issued: **31**

NOV/COs issued breakdown:

Records and Veterinary Health Certificates – **1 NOV/CO issued**

Registration/License/Permit – **1 NOV/CO issued**

Annual Report of inventory – **26 NOV/COs issued**

Veterinary Protocol – **2 NOV/COs issued**

Veterinary Health Certificates, Adequate Staff, Enrichment and Positive Physical Contact – **1 NOV/CO issued**

Commercial Breeder Civil Penalties (CP)

Date range: 3/11/22 – 3/11/24

Total Civil Penalties Issued: **9**

Fee – **4 CPs issued** (this amount is half of their license renewal fee amount)

Records – **1 CP issued**

Veterinary Protocol – **1 CP issued**

Annual Report – **2 CPs issued**

Moving without Notice – **1 CP issued**

Number of commercial breeder repeat offenders: **5**

Three commercial breeders received NOV/COs **two years in a row for Annual Reports**

One breeder received NOV/CO for **records and moving without notifying the Board**

One breeder received NOV/CO **twice for the same veterinary protocol** and then an **administrative penalty for failure to submit their veterinary protocol by the first NOV/CO deadline**

The Board is not required to create new data in response to a data request; so, if any of your questions were not answered, it is because we would need to create new data.

Please let us know if you have any other questions.

Sincerely,

Stacey Eissinger | General Counsel

Minnesota Board of Animal Health

www.mn.gov/bah

MnPBA note:

Additional information regarding USDA breeder licenses: several years ago the Supervisor of Inspections told us during a seminar presentation that Minnesota licensees had the “cleanest inspection results” of any in her multi-state territory – fewest violations and all “indirect” (USDA category of violations that don’t jeopardize health or welfare of animals).

Dear Members of the Judiciary Finance and Civil Law Committee,

I implore you to oppose HF3410. This bill was just brought to my attention this morning so will very briefly address my concerns regarding this bill. Please feel free to contact me if you would like to go into more detail regarding my opposition to this bill.

To give you a little background about myself, I am third generation dog breeder. I am in the process of retiring from the breeder profession and passing this profession and passion down to my daughter and son and daughter-in-law to become the fourth generation to take immense pride and passion for this profession. This is not only a business for my family, but also a privilege and honor to provide outstanding puppies to our customers.

I am also a founding member of the Minnesota Pet Breeders Association and was one of our key members to negotiate the original language of the Commercial Dog and Cat Breeders program. The language regarding protecting the breeders' data was probably the number one factor in finalizing and approving the bill to become law. All breeders are very susceptible to becoming targets of animal rights activists which can completely destroy the reputation of even the very best breeders. As someone who is also in the profession of working at a law enforcement agency, I see on a daily basis harassment of innocent people from people with mental illness, an underlying agenda, and truly misguided individuals.

I am very concerned for the safety of my daughter and daughter-in-law who both have newborn babies and are at home with them the majority of the time. There is already so much caution and concern in screening their customers to be comfortable with releasing information to them and allowing home visits. This release of protected information would raise those concerns to an extreme level which may very well discourage them from continuing on our family tradition and would end this generation and future generations in my family from providing quality puppies to welcoming homes.

Please oppose HF3410 so my generation will not be the final one to provide this service to the public.

Sincerely,

Teri Franzen

<https://marketplace.akc.org/breeder/woodlandterriers>

Chair Becker-Finn and Members of the House Judiciary Finance and Civil Law Committee:

A large number of licensed dog breeders in Minnesota are primarily women. I am concerned about their safety having their names and addresses posted on any public websites or any type of social media. I myself am a women dog breeder, I require a phone call with every interested buyer and only after that, if I feel comfortable do they get my address to come and visit the puppies. And even then I often invite a neighbor to stop over during that time.

I am concerned about puppy stealing, harassment, mine and my family's safety and even violence! Our world is full of all kinds of crazy people and I see no reason for putting innocent dog breeders at risk of animal rights groups or the crazy people out there. There was a dog breeder in MO. Murdered in her own kennel in 2017. She was tortured! Her teeth were pulled out, finger nails pulled out, breast cut off and beaten before she was stabbed multiple times! Her murder is still unsolved.

Our buyers have been doing a fierce job at doing their own research before buying, social media is at their finger tips and they are capable of doing their own research! We are being inspected EVERY TIME a customer comes to our property to pick up their puppy, most often my buyers meet the parents, sit in a lawn chair and observe the pups and their surroundings, visit with me and we get to know each other a bit, and then if we are both comfortable the sale happens.

Please do not pass this bill HF3410. Nothing good will come of it! * Do you want your name / address , your parents or your children's posted on a public site or social media? No.... I didn't think so... and neither do we!

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Marj Kruger
Licensed Commercial Breeder

Chair Becker-Finn and Members of the House Judiciary Finance and Civil Law Committee:

Hello, I feel compelled to voice my opinion on this bill. It makes me very uncomfortable as a FEMALE business owner for my personal information to be public knowledge. There's absolutely no reason for my address, phone number, business information or State Inspection reports to be in public view. Why is this even being considered when I am already overseen by the state and yearly inspected?

Several female breeders in the past have been attacked, from stalking to one poor lady mutilated and murdered!! Is this something our state legislators are comfortable risking our lives for? I oppose this bill and and pray it is seriously reconsidered.

Thank you for your time.

Lorie Syring
Licensed Commercial Breeder



AMERICAN
KENNEL CLUB®

Phil M. Guidry, J.D.
Director, Policy Analysis
Government Relations

Monday, March 18, 2024

The Honorable Jamie Becker-Finn, Chair
Minnesota House Judiciary Finance and Civil Law Committee
Room 559, State Office Building
100 Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55155

Re: AKC Deeply Concerned with House File 3410

Dear Chair Becker-Finn and Members of the House Judiciary Finance and Civil Law Committee,

The American Kennel Club (AKC) writes to express strong concerns with House File 3410 and to respectfully urge the members of the House Judiciary Finance and Civil Law Committee to not advance this legislation.

Since our founding in 1884, the American Kennel Club has worked to protect and promote purebred dogs and is dedicated to preserving the future of purebred dogs. We honor purebred dog breeders whose commitment, vision, and high standards have developed, sustain, and continue to advance purebred dogs as unequalled family and working companions. AKC strongly supports and actively promotes a wide range of programs to educate the public about responsible purebred breeding practices and the responsibilities of dog ownership; and supports reasonable and enforceable laws that protect the welfare and health of dogs and do not restrict the rights of breeders and owners who meet their responsibilities.

When enacted in 2014, the Minnesota Commercial Breeders Act (M.S.A. § 347.57, *et seq*) classified licensees' internal operating data as private or nonpublic under the state's Government Data Practices Act (M.S.A. § 13.01, *et seq.*) While we appreciate amendments already made to the bill, as currently worded, HF 3410 would remove that classification and require disclosure of operating data upon request of a member of the general public.

The American Kennel Club is deeply concerned that the publication of sensitive information would provide anti-breeder protestors or animal rights extremists with facility location information and lead to harassment of licensees or business interruptions at their facilities, including at private homes. AKC has long-been concerned with reports of breeders being harassed or retaliated against by individuals who oppose breeding and will use whatever means necessary to interrupt facility operations; or because breeders have defended responsible breeding practices with public officials, commented on troublesome anti-breeder legislation, or testified about it before state and local legislatures. This concern is not based in hypotheticals. Consider, for example, a story published on Sunday, March 10, 2024, by the Minneapolis Star Tribune of one Winona County breeder who had protesters gathering outside their family home on Christmas. (<https://www.msn.com/en-us/news/us/its-amish-vs-animal-lovers-as-winona-county-cracks-down-on-dog-breeding/ar-BB1jDQBy>) From neighboring Wisconsin, a Friday, March 8, 2024, article details how a case against three animal rights activists who broke into a dog breeding facility was dismissed when the facility moved to have the case dismissed due to, "concerns for


Founded in 1884; a not-for-profit corporation

their physical safety, as well as for their business.” According to the article, the facility owners received an increasing amount of death threats as the court was preparing for trial.

(<https://isthmus.com/news/news/Ridglan-Farms-beagle-rescue-case-dismissed/>)

The American Kennel Club believes that HF 3410 presents a risk to responsible, licensed, and law-abiding dog breeders, and respectfully requests that the committee not advance this bill. Thank you for your attention to these concerns and recommendations. Please do not hesitate to contact me or any member of the AKC Government Relations team at 919-816-3720 or doglaw@akc.org if we may be of assistance in any way.

Sincerely,



Phil M. Guidry, J.D.
Director, Policy Analysis - AKC Government Relations

CC: Representatives Mike Freiberg and Andrew Myers, HF 3410 sponsors
Committee Administrator Anna Borgerding

The American Kennel Club (AKC) is a non-partisan, not-for-profit purebred dog registry dedicated to promoting responsible dog ownership, advocating for dogs as family companions, advancing canine health and well-being, and working to protect the rights of all responsible dog owners. AKC represents more than 5,000 dog clubs nationally, including 102 clubs in Minnesota, representing thousands of responsible dog owners. In 2022, the AKC licensed and sanctioned 653 events in Minnesota in which more than 77,000 dogs participated.