

Submitter:	richard grimm
On Behalf Of:	myself
Committee:	Senate Committee On Natural Resources and Wildfire
Measure, Appointment or Topic:	SB1076

I anxiously listened to the testimony given in the hearing in the Senate Natural Resources committee today on HB 1076. I was genuinely interested in why anyone would think this bill was necessary when Oregon already has some of the most protective anti-cruelty, anti-abuse laws in the country. I was confused when Representative Gomberg said that this bill was a result of the current licensing program for rescue entities not being cost effective for the State. Representative Gomberg did not give a figure relating to the revenue shortage. Several people testified that since breeders are "for profit" they should be required to pay for the majority of the expense of this program. I would argue that most "breeders" if they are decent breeders make little profit. The cost of nutritious food and veterinary care is now such that there is little profit in raising many animals at all, especially "small mammals". I did some research and found that Oregon Humane Society sold between 11,000 and 12,000 pets last year. Dogs and puppies were sold between \$55 and \$600 each and cats and kittens were sold for between \$25 and \$200 each. Most animals are surrendered by members of the public and OHS receives food donations, so it's arguable that the profits from selling shelter animals could exceed the profits from privately sold pets. In 2023 Oregon Humane Society received 28.3 million dollars in donations, in addition to the revenue from selling pet animals to the public. I am having a hard time wrapping my mind around the explanation that a \$600 licensing fee (or potentially higher) would be a hardship on Oregon Humane Society. Perhaps they could add a \$1 or \$2 surcharge to the sale price of their adoption pets to pay for the difference in the cost of implementing this program? If the potential cost to breeders is based on the number of puppies/kittens, etc., sold, then it would seem quite unfair that the organization that is selling over 11,000 animals annually should be exempt from the same fees.

I was hoping to hear some statistics from Representative Gomberg about the number of rescue facilities that were cited or fined under the current program. How many of these entities were convicted of animal abuse, neglect, or cruelty? If there were few to none, I would have to question whether or not the current program is even needed.

I have great concern that if this bill passes that any breeder that dares to place an ad anywhere in a public domain will be the victim of an anti-captive animal zealot. It would be very easy for anyone to report any breeder that places an ad to the Department of Agriculture, placing undo stress and burdens on the breeder. This already happens regularly in the exotic animal/zoo industry with the USDA. They regularly get complaints from people who have never been to the facility. Sometimes

they are people that don't even live in this country. It puts an undo strain on the USDA inspectors as they are required to follow up on all complaints. You can be assured the same will happen with this program with the State Department of Agriculture.

The OHS website states that the price of an animal depends on the age and breed of the animal. That would suggest that young purebred animals would fetch a higher price than an older mutt or less desirable breed, such as a pitbull. Can the State guaranty breeders that they will not find themselves being targeted in order to fill the shelters with more valuable pets for them to sell? Can you understand why this is a concern for breeders who have invested many thousands of dollars in their breeding stock, and whose animals are family members?

I believe this is a flawed bill. If the purpose is truly to pay for the rescue entity licensing program, then I would ask that a committee of stakeholders be convened to discuss an equitable solution or create a surcharge on rescue animals adopted to help pay for this program.