

Chairman Dan Kerschen
Members of the Kansas State Senate Agricultural Committee

Honorable Senators:

I am Sam Mosshart, President of Kansas Federation of Animal Owners, kennel owner since the mid 1980's. I am here to discuss Senate Bill 47.

On page 5, lines 13, 14 & 15 pertaining to "adequate veterinary medical care" for USDA Licensed breeders or distributors needs to be left intact.

Page 11, lines 35 through 43 and page 12, lines 1 through 9 "The commissioner shall only adopt as rules and regulations *regarding facility operations and husbandry standards* for United States department of agriculture licensed animal distributors and animal breeders, and animal distributor and animal breeder premises the rules and regulations promulgated by the secretary of the United States department of Agriculture, cited at 9 C.F.R. 3.1 through 3.12 pursuant to the provisions of the United States public law, Commonly known at the Animal Welfare Act."

(c) Notwithstanding any provision in subsection (b), the commissioner may adopt a requirement that each licensee and permittee file with the commissioner evidence that animals entering or leaving the state are free from any visible symptoms of communicable disease. *The commissioner may additionally require that the United States department of agriculture licensed animal distributors and animal breeders comply with any provision of this act or rules and regulations of the commissioner regarding maintenance and inspection of records, identification of animals, adequate veterinary care and access to and inspection of premises.*"

If we lose the USDA exemptions it will be the beginning of the end of USDA licensed kennels in the state of Kansas because we cannot operate under two different sets of rules.

Do not take hobby breeders out. Leave Hobby breeder and research facility at a \$300 fee. I have never understood why you want to gift some but not all. They all should pay and be inspected.

In addition I would like to see all facilities (rescues, hobby, pet stores, commercial breeders, pet stores, shelters and research facilities) inspected, licensed and treated equally. It makes no sense to me why one classification is different than the other. Don't be a follower of Animal Rights, pet propaganda as many others are. Stand up for OUR rights.

Since 2007, Kansas USDA licensed kennels have declined by approximately 75%. I would like to know have the expenses for the program also declined as the number of licensed breeders and dealers have? Are there more facilities being added as shelters or under the category of "Rescue Network"? If so, what percentage of the Animal Facilities Inspection Program do they consume and what percentage of the fee scheduling do they pay?


What percent of the expense of the program goes to investigating unlicensed locations? How many unlicensed facilities were inspected last year; how much staff time and funding was spent on those; and how many animals were seized and how many were euthanized?

Is the answer simply to increase fees?

If the KDA wants to lower the cost of the program than they should eliminate dual inspections. The USDA licensed facilities would not be routinely inspected by the Animal Facilities Inspection Program inspectors.

I think the large part of the Animal Facilities Inspection Program expense should come from the General Fund as the general public wants the law enforced. Do not raise fees.

SB 47 is a bad bill! Vote no on SB 47.

Sincerely, 

Sam Mosshart
President – Kansas Federation of Animal Owners
Member of Kansas Pet Professionals
Member of the Cavalry Group
Phone #: 620-635-6512