January 13, 2007

Bureau of Dog Law Enforcement Attn: Ms Mary Bender Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture 2301 North Cameron Street Harrisburg, PA 17110-9408

Dear Ms Bender:

My name is Shelley Schweinsberg, I reside at 1019 Route 68, New Brighton, PA 15066. I am very active in the Beaver County Kennel Club, of which I hold a position as Club Treasurer and am a member of the Board Of Directors. I have been involved in dogs as long as I can remember. Currently one of my dogs is used as a "stub" dog and I plan to breed sometime in the future.

I am writing to comment on the proposed amendments to the Pennsylvania dog law regulations that were issued on December 16, 2006. I strongly believe that substandard and inhumane kennel conditions should not be tolerated. However, I do not agree with most of the proposed regulatory changes. I think they are not needed and will not produce a beneficial outcome. Many of these changes are impractical, excessively burdensome and costly. Not to mention, unenforceable and/or will not improve the quality of life for the dogs in these kennels.

The definition of "temporary housing" would require thousands of small residential hobby and show-breeding households (such as I would be) to become licensed which could not possibly comply with the regulations and which there is not reason to regulate.

Smaller breeders and dog owners who maintain their own residential premises but are not covered by the Pennsylvania dog law, who provide care and conditions far superior to those required by the proposed new standard, would be unable to comply with the rigid commercial kennel standard.

The above is far from a complete list of the deficiencies with the proposed regulations. I also associate myself with the more detailed comments on this proposal by the Pennsylvania Federation of Dog Clubs.

The Bureau has tacitly conceded that its current regulations have not been adequately enforced. If, after implementing its recently announced enhanced enforcement program, the Bureau finds it is still unable to prevent the inhumane treatment of dogs because of

specific deficiencies in the existing regulations, then it should cite these deficiencies and proposed changes based on them.

The current proposal appears to be a laundry list of ideas for improving the environment for dogs that has no connection to specific instances in which the welfare of dogs could not be secured. It has no basis in science or accepted canine husbandry practices.

I urge you to withdraw this proposal.

Shelley Edweinly

Sincerely,

Shelley Schweinsberg