

From: [Andy Mendelsohn](#)
To: [Simmons, Caroline](#)
Cc: [BOR AllReps](#)
Subject: The Mayor's Choice to Veto of Humane Pet Stores and Opportunity to Overturn
Date: Saturday, December 6, 2025 7:01:29 AM

Mayor Simmons,

Thank you for your response regarding Ordinance LR31.072. As a Stamford resident who cares deeply about humane policy and consumer protection, I would appreciate clarification on several points referenced in your email. I will be an active voice in helping to overturn your veto and this will help me better understand your perspective.

- 1. Are you aware of the hundreds of Stamford residents who wrote to the Board of Representatives to express their desire to pass this ordinance?*
- 2. Which specific Connecticut statutes or legal precedents does the City believe would expose Stamford to liability if LR31.072 were enacted?*
- 3. What state laws would Stamford be failing to abide by if the ordinance moved forward?*
- 4. I understand that Humane World for Animals offered pro-bono legal support to the City should a lawsuit arise. I am also aware that they have supported other municipalities in similar situations. Could you please clarify why this is not seen as an acceptable option by your administration to support the city of Stamford?*
- 5. Given that hundreds of municipalities across over 30 states and Washington, DC have successfully enacted humane pet-store laws, how does Connecticut differ in a way that prevents Stamford from doing the same?*
- 6. How does the humane pet-store ordinance differ from other municipal actions that deviate from state-level allowances? For example, the city of Stamford enacted a stricter plastic bag ordinance than state law without receiving preemption. In addition, other municipalities like Fairfield and Greenwich have taken similar approaches regarding sale of cannabis, which is permissible at the state level but not permitted at a municipal level. How is this situation uniquely different from those examples?*
- 7. You noted that the state level is the appropriate venue for this issue. Since a similar bill died on the floor last session, what steps do you intend to take to help move it forward this year, given the strong interest expressed by hundreds of Stamford residents?*

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to your response.

*Sincerely,
Andrew Mendelsohn*

226 Dogwood Lane, Stamford, CT 06903

Andy Mendelsohn
Full Stop Management

Caution: This email originated from outside our organization. Please be careful when clicking links or opening attachments.

From: [Courtney Chester](#)
To: [Simmons, Caroline](#)
Cc: [BOR AllReps](#)
Subject: The Mayor's Choice to Veto of Humane Pet Stores and Opportunity to Overturn
Date: Saturday, December 6, 2025 7:01:30 AM

Mayor Simmons,

Thank you for your response regarding Ordinance LR31.072. As a Stamford resident who cares deeply about humane policy and consumer protection, I would appreciate clarification on several points referenced in your email. I will be an active voice in helping to overturn your veto and this will help me better understand your perspective.

- 1. Are you aware of the hundreds of Stamford residents who wrote to the Board of Representatives to express their desire to pass this ordinance?*
- 2. Which specific Connecticut statutes or legal precedents does the City believe would expose Stamford to liability if LR31.072 were enacted?*
- 3. What state laws would Stamford be failing to abide by if the ordinance moved forward?*
- 4. I understand that Humane World for Animals offered pro-bono legal support to the City should a lawsuit arise. I am also aware that they have supported other municipalities in similar situations. Could you please clarify why this is not seen as an acceptable option by your administration to support the city of Stamford?*
- 5. Given that hundreds of municipalities across over 30 states and Washington, DC have successfully enacted humane pet-store laws, how does Connecticut differ in a way that prevents Stamford from doing the same?*
- 6. How does the humane pet-store ordinance differ from other municipal actions that deviate from state-level allowances? For example, the city of Stamford enacted a stricter plastic bag ordinance than state law without receiving preemption. In addition, other municipalities like Fairfield and Greenwich have taken similar approaches regarding sale of cannabis, which is permissible at the state level but not permitted at a municipal level. How is this situation uniquely different from those examples?*
- 7. You noted that the state level is the appropriate venue for this issue. Since a similar bill died on the floor last session, what steps do you intend to take to help move it forward this year, given the strong interest expressed by hundreds of Stamford residents?*

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,
Courtney Chester
1392 Summer St Stamford CT 06905

Caution: This email originated from outside our organization. Please be careful when clicking links or opening attachments.

From: [Barbara J. Bentley](#)
To: [Simmons, Caroline](#)
Cc: [Mayor's Office](#); [BOR AllReps](#)
Subject: The Mayor's Choice to Veto of Humane Pet Stores and Opportunity to Overturn
Date: Saturday, December 6, 2025 7:04:25 AM

Mayor Simmons,

Thank you for your response regarding Ordinance LR31.072. As a Stamford resident who cares deeply about humane policy and consumer protection, I would appreciate clarification on several points referenced in your email. I will be an active voice in helping to overturn your veto and this will help me better understand your perspective.

- 1. Are you aware of the hundreds of Stamford residents who wrote to the Board of Representatives to express their desire to pass this ordinance?*
- 2. Which specific Connecticut statutes or legal precedents does the City believe would expose Stamford to liability if LR31.072 were enacted?*
- 3. What state laws would Stamford be failing to abide by if the ordinance moved forward?*
- 4. I understand that Humane World for Animals offered pro-bono legal support to the City should a lawsuit arise. I am also aware that they have supported other municipalities in similar situations. Could you please clarify why this is not seen as an acceptable option by your administration to support the city of Stamford?*
- 5. Given that hundreds of municipalities across over 30 states and Washington, DC have successfully enacted humane pet-store laws, how does Connecticut differ in a way that prevents Stamford from doing the same?*
- 6. How does the humane pet-store ordinance differ from other municipal actions that deviate from state-level allowances? For example, the city of Stamford enacted a stricter plastic bag ordinance than state law without receiving preemption. In addition, other municipalities like Fairfield and Greenwich have taken similar approaches regarding sale of cannabis, which is permissible at the state level but not permitted at a municipal level. How is this situation uniquely different from those examples?*
- 7. You noted that the state level is the appropriate venue for this issue. Since a similar bill died on the floor last session, what steps do you intend to take to help move it forward this year, given the strong interest expressed by hundreds of Stamford residents?*

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

*Barbara J Bentley
237 Strawberry Hill Ave #28
Stamford CT. 06902*

On Friday, December 5, 2025 at 02:14:09 PM EST, Simmons, Caroline <csimmons@stamfordct.gov> wrote:

Dear Barbara,

Thank you very much for writing to us regarding LR31.072, "An Ordinance to Add Section 111-12.5 to Chapter 11 of the Stamford Code, Concerning the Sale of Dogs and Cats by Retail Pet Shops." I am completely supportive of this effort, and I advocated this year in support of the state legislation, HB 6832, "An Act Authorizing Municipalities to Prohibit the Sale of Dogs, Cats, and Rabbits in Pet Shops."

However, because pet shops are licensed by the state and state law allows the sale of cats and dogs by licensed pet shops, municipalities do not have the authority to regulate the sale of cats and dogs by pet shops. Municipalities are not allowed to preempt state law, and our Corporation Counsel has advised the Board of Representatives and our administration that the passage and any attempted enforcement of this proposed ordinance may expose the City to liability.

I would be more than happy to discuss ways we can partner during the 2026 legislative session to ensure this legislation is re-introduced, and we can work to advocate for its passage by the General Assembly.

While state law restricts municipalities from banning these pet shops entirely, my administration has taken steps to limit where and how they may operate. Previously, pet stores were permitted as-of-right in all commercial districts. Working with the Land Use Bureau, we revised the zoning regulations to require special permits for full-service pet stores and to create a separate "pet stores, supplies and accessories only" category, which prohibits the sale of cats and dogs. Full-service pet stores are now allowed only in a few districts and only with special permit approval from the Zoning Board.

Additionally, my administration has demonstrated a deep commitment to animal welfare, underscored by the recent groundbreaking of the long-overdue 8,000-square-foot Stamford Animal Care & Control Center. This new facility will provide compassionate, high-quality care for animals and a safe, modern environment for staff and volunteers, with features including 20 dog kennels with interior runs and quarantine areas, dedicated cat housing with an outdoor catio, modern office and adoption spaces, training rooms, new landscaping, a dog-walking park, and improved drainage.

I will continue to support and advocate for animal welfare measures that strengthen protections for animals and improve care standards across our state, and I remain committed to advancing this work in partnership with our community and state leaders.

Best,

Caroline

Mayor Caroline Simmons

203-977-4150

csimmons@stamfordct.gov

Click [here](#) for weekly city news updates or follow us on social media: [Facebook](#) [Twitter](#) [Instagram](#)

See an issue? Let us know and track the progress: www.stamfordct.gov/Fixit

From: Barbara J. Bentley <iluzhn@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, December 4, 2025 7:41 PM

To: Simmons, Caroline <CSimmons@StamfordCT.gov>; Mayor's Office <MayorsOffice@StamfordCT.gov>

Subject: Please Support Ordinance LR31.072 — Humane Pet Shop Bill

Dear Mayor Simmons,

As a Stamford resident, I am urging you to support Ordinance LR31.072, which would ban the sale of dogs and cats in pet shops and stop the puppy mill-to-pet store pipeline in our city. This ordinance protects animals from inhumane breeding operations, protects consumers from sick puppy sales and predatory financing, and supports the humane, responsible pet businesses that already thrive in Stamford.

The Board of Representatives voted overwhelmingly in favor of this measure because they listened to the community. I hope you will do the same. Stamford has the opportunity to lead Connecticut with compassion and protect both families and animals.

Please sign Ordinance LR31.072 into law.

Respectfully,

Barbara J Bentley

237 Strawberry Hill Ave #28

Stamford CT 06902

Caution: This email originated from outside our organization. Please be careful when clicking links or opening attachments.

Caution: This email originated from outside our organization. Please be careful when clicking links or opening attachments.

From: [Elizabeth Middleton](#)
To: [Simmons, Caroline](#); [BOR AllReps](#)
Subject: Mayor's veto of Ordinance LR31.072
Date: Saturday, December 6, 2025 7:18:17 AM

Dear Mayor Simmons and the Board of Representatives,

I am a Stamford resident who cares deeply about animal welfare. I adopted two dogs from Lucky Dog Refuge, fostered others, and volunteered there for several years. I have seen the negative effects of puppy mills and unwanted dogs and therefore supported Ordinance LR31.072 to ban the sale of dogs in Stamford. I was disappointed to hear that Mayor Simmons vetoed this ordinance that was passed overwhelmingly by the previous Board of Reps; I would encourage the mayor to publicly address several questions raised below and the Board of Reps to move to overturn the veto with a re-vote in the next 40 days.

Questions for Mayor Simmons

- Which specific Connecticut statutes or legal precedents does the City believe would expose Stamford to liability if LR31.072 were enacted?
- What state laws would Stamford be failing to abide by if the ordinance moved forward?
- I understand that Humane World for Animals offered pro-bono legal support to the City should a lawsuit arise. I am also aware that they have supported other municipalities in similar situations. Could you please clarify why this is not seen as an acceptable option by your administration to support the city of Stamford?
- Given that hundreds of municipalities across over 30 states and Washington, DC have successfully enacted humane pet-store laws, how does Connecticut differ in a way that prevents Stamford from doing the same?
- How does the humane pet-store ordinance differ from other municipal actions that deviate from state-level allowances? For example, the city of Stamford enacted a stricter plastic bag ordinance than state law without receiving preemption. In addition, other municipalities like Fairfield and Greenwich have taken similar approaches regarding sale of cannabis, which is permissible at the state level but not permitted at a municipal level. How is this situation uniquely different from those examples?
- You noted that the state level is the appropriate venue for this issue. Since a similar bill died on the floor last session, what steps do you intend to take to help move it forward this year, given the strong interest expressed by hundreds of Stamford residents?

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Middleton
4 Hornez St, Stamford CT 06905
District 15

Caution: This email originated from outside our organization. Please be careful when clicking links or opening attachments.

From: [Maria Chaudhry](#)
To: [Simmons, Caroline](#)
Cc: [BOR AllReps](#)
Subject: The Mayor's Choice to Veto of Humane Pet Stores and Opportunity to Overturn
Date: Saturday, December 6, 2025 7:25:03 AM

Mayor Simmons,

Thank you for your response regarding Ordinance LR31.072. As a Stamford resident who cares deeply about humane policy and consumer protection, I would appreciate clarification on several points referenced in your email. I will be an active voice in helping to overturn your veto and this will help me better understand your perspective.

- 1. Are you aware of the hundreds of Stamford residents who wrote to the Board of Representatives to express their desire to pass this ordinance?*
- 2. Which specific Connecticut statutes or legal precedents does the City believe would expose Stamford to liability if LR31.072 were enacted?*
- 3. What state laws would Stamford be failing to abide by if the ordinance moved forward?*
- 4. I understand that Humane World for Animals offered pro-bono legal support to the City should a lawsuit arise. I am also aware that they have supported other municipalities in similar situations. Could you please clarify why this is not seen as an acceptable option by your administration to support the city of Stamford?*
- 5. Given that hundreds of municipalities across over 30 states and Washington, DC have successfully enacted humane pet-store laws, how does Connecticut differ in a way that prevents Stamford from doing the same?*
- 6. How does the humane pet-store ordinance differ from other municipal actions that deviate from state-level allowances? For example, the city of Stamford enacted a stricter plastic bag ordinance than state law without receiving preemption. In addition, other municipalities like Fairfield and Greenwich have taken similar approaches regarding sale of cannabis, which is permissible at the state level but not permitted at a municipal level. How is this situation uniquely different from those examples?*
- 7. You noted that the state level is the appropriate venue for this issue. Since a similar bill died on the floor last session, what steps do you intend to take to help move it forward this year, given the strong interest expressed by hundreds of Stamford residents?*

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to your response.

*Sincerely,
Maria Chaudhry
4 Duncanson Street*

Caution: This email originated from outside our organization. Please be careful when clicking links or opening attachments.

From: [Melissa Mezo](#)
To: [Simmons, Caroline](#)
Cc: [BOR AllReps](#)
Subject: The Mayor's Choice to Veto of Humane Pet Stores and Opportunity to Overturn
Date: Saturday, December 6, 2025 7:34:43 AM

Mayor Simmons,

Thank you for your response regarding Ordinance LR31.072. As a Stamford resident who cares deeply about humane policy and consumer protection, I would appreciate clarification on several points referenced in your email. I will be an active voice in helping to overturn your veto and this will help me better understand your perspective.

- 1. Are you aware of the hundreds of Stamford residents who wrote to the Board of Representatives to express their desire to pass this ordinance?*
- 2. Which specific Connecticut statutes or legal precedents does the City believe would expose Stamford to liability if LR31.072 were enacted?*
- 3. What state laws would Stamford be failing to abide by if the ordinance moved forward?*
- 4. I understand that Humane World for Animals offered pro-bono legal support to the City should a lawsuit arise. I am also aware that they have supported other municipalities in similar situations. Could you please clarify why this is not seen as an acceptable option by your administration to support the city of Stamford?*
- 5. Given that hundreds of municipalities across over 30 states and Washington, DC have successfully enacted humane pet-store laws, how does Connecticut differ in a way that prevents Stamford from doing the same?*
- 6. How does the humane pet-store ordinance differ from other municipal actions that deviate from state-level allowances? For example, the city of Stamford enacted a stricter plastic bag ordinance than state law without receiving preemption. In addition, other municipalities like Fairfield and Greenwich have taken similar approaches regarding sale of cannabis, which is permissible at the state level but not permitted at a municipal level. How is this situation uniquely different from those examples?*
- 7. You noted that the state level is the appropriate venue for this issue. Since a similar bill died on the floor last session, what steps do you intend to take to help move it forward this year, given the strong interest expressed by hundreds of Stamford residents?*

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Melissa Mezo

18 Brundage street Stamford CT 06907

Caution: This email originated from outside our organization. Please be careful when clicking links or opening attachments.

From: [Deanna DeLucia](#)
To: [Mayor's Office](#)
Cc: [BOR AllReps](#)
Subject: Re: Please Sign the Humane Pet Shop Ordinance
Date: Saturday, December 6, 2025 7:56:43 AM

Mayor Simmons,

Thank you for your response regarding Ordinance LR31.072. As a Stamford resident who cares deeply about humane policy and consumer protection, I would appreciate clarification on several points referenced in your email. I will be an active voice in helping to overturn your veto and this will help me better understand your perspective.

- 1. Are you aware of the hundreds of Stamford residents who wrote to the Board of Representatives to express their desire to pass this ordinance?*
- 2. Which specific Connecticut statutes or legal precedents does the City believe would expose Stamford to liability if LR31.072 were enacted?*
- 3. What state laws would Stamford be failing to abide by if the ordinance moved forward?*
- 4. I understand that Humane World for Animals offered pro-bono legal support to the City should a lawsuit arise. I am also aware that they have supported other municipalities in similar situations. Could you please clarify why this is not seen as an acceptable option by your administration to support the city of Stamford?*
- 5. Given that hundreds of municipalities across over 30 states and Washington, DC have successfully enacted humane pet-store laws, how does Connecticut differ in a way that prevents Stamford from doing the same?*
- 6. How does the humane pet-store ordinance differ from other municipal actions that deviate from state-level allowances? For example, the city of Stamford enacted a stricter plastic bag ordinance than state law without receiving preemption. In addition, other municipalities like Fairfield and Greenwich have taken similar approaches regarding sale of cannabis, which is permissible at the state level but not permitted at a municipal level. How is this situation uniquely different from those examples?*
- 7. You noted that the state level is the appropriate venue for this issue. Since a similar bill died on the floor last session, what steps do you intend to take to help move it forward this year, given the strong interest expressed by hundreds of Stamford residents?*

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,
Deanna DeLucia
1455 Washington Blvd, 330

On Fri, Dec 5, 2025 at 2:05 PM Mayor's Office <MayorsOffice@stamfordct.gov> wrote:

Dear Deanna,

Thank you for writing the Office of Mayor Caroline Simmons regarding LR31.072, “An Ordinance to Add Section 111-12.5 to Chapter 11 of the Stamford Code, Concerning the Sale of Dogs and Cats by Retail Pet Shops.” The Mayor is completely supportive of this effort, and has advocated this year in support of the state legislation, HB 6832, “An Act Authorizing Municipalities to Prohibit the Sale of Dogs, Cats, and Rabbits in Pet Shops.”

However, because pet shops are licensed by the state and state law allows the sale of cats and dogs by licensed pet shops, municipalities do not have the authority to regulate the sale of cats and dogs by pet shops. Municipalities are not allowed to preempt state law, and our Corporation Counsel has advised the Board of Representatives and our administration that the passage and any attempted enforcement of this proposed ordinance may expose the City to liability.

The Mayor would be more than happy to discuss ways we can partner during the 2026 legislative session to ensure this legislation is re-introduced, and we can work to advocate for its passage by the General Assembly.

While state law restricts municipalities from banning these pet shops entirely, my administration has taken steps to limit where and how they may operate. Previously, pet stores were permitted as-of-right in all commercial districts. Working with the Land Use Bureau, we revised the zoning regulations to require special permits for full-service pet stores and to create a separate “pet stores, supplies and accessories only” category, which prohibits the sale of cats and dogs. Full-service pet stores are now allowed only in a few districts and only with special permit approval from the Zoning Board.

Additionally, the Simmons administration has demonstrated a deep commitment to animal welfare, underscored by the recent groundbreaking of the long-overdue 8,000-square-foot Stamford Animal Care & Control Center. This new facility will provide compassionate, high-quality care for animals and a safe, modern environment for staff and volunteers, with features including 20 dog kennels with interior runs and quarantine areas, dedicated cat

housing with an outdoor catio, modern office and adoption spaces, training rooms, new landscaping, a dog-walking park, and improved drainage.

The Mayor will continue to support and advocate for animal welfare measures that strengthen protections for animals and improve care standards across our state, and I remain committed to advancing this work in partnership with our community and state leaders.

Best,
The Office of Mayor Caroline Simmons

From: Deanna DeLucia <deannadelucia@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 9, 2025 9:26 PM
To: Mayor's Office <MayorsOffice@StamfordCT.gov>; Simmons, Caroline <CSimmons@StamfordCT.gov>
Subject: Please Sign the Humane Pet Shop Ordinance

Dear Mayor Simmons,

As a Stamford resident, I'm writing to urge you to sign the ordinance banning the sale of dogs, cats, and rabbits in pet stores. This legislation is a critical step in stopping the cruel puppy-mill-to-pet-store pipeline that harms both animals and consumers.

By signing this ordinance, you will make Stamford the first city in Connecticut to take a stand for compassion, responsible business practices, and progress. The Board of Representatives heard the voices of residents and voted overwhelmingly in favor. I hope you will do the same.

Thank you for your leadership and for standing on the right side of history.

*Sincerely,
Deanna DeLucia
1455 Washington Blvd, 330*

Caution: This email originated from outside our organization. Please be careful when clicking links or opening attachments.

Caution: This email originated from outside our organization. Please be careful when clicking links or opening attachments.

From: [Cristina Y Romero](#)
To: [Simmons, Caroline](#)
Cc: [BOR AllReps](#)
Subject: The Mayor's Choice to Veto of Humane Pet Stores and Opportunity to Overturn
Date: Saturday, December 6, 2025 8:08:45 AM

Mayor Simmons,

Thank you for your response regarding Ordinance LR31.072. As a Stamford resident who cares deeply about humane policy and consumer protection, I would appreciate clarification on several points referenced in your email. I will be an active voice in helping to overturn your veto and this will help me better understand your perspective.

Are you aware of the hundreds of Stamford residents who wrote to the Board of Representatives to express their desire to pass this ordinance?

Which specific Connecticut statutes or legal precedents does the City believe would expose Stamford to liability if LR31.072 were enacted?

What state laws would Stamford be failing to abide by if the ordinance moved forward?

I understand that Humane World for Animals offered pro-bono legal support to the City should a lawsuit arise. I am also aware that they have supported other municipalities in similar situations. Could you please clarify why this is not seen as an acceptable option by your administration to support the city of Stamford?

Given that hundreds of municipalities across over 30 states and Washington, DC have successfully enacted humane pet-store laws, how does Connecticut differ in a way that prevents Stamford from doing the same?

How does the humane pet-store ordinance differ from other municipal actions that deviate from state-level allowances? For example, the city of Stamford enacted a stricter plastic bag ordinance than state law without receiving preemption. In addition, other municipalities like Fairfield and Greenwich have taken similar approaches regarding sale of cannabis, which is permissible at the state level but not permitted at a municipal level. How is this situation uniquely different from those examples?

You noted that the state level is the appropriate venue for this issue. Since a similar bill died on the floor last session, what steps do you intend to take to help move it forward this year, given the strong interest expressed by hundreds of Stamford residents?

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Cristina Romero
54 W North Street
Stamford, CT 06902

Caution: This email originated from outside our organization. Please be careful when

clicking links or opening attachments.

From: [Cristina R](#)
To: [Simmons, Caroline](#)
Cc: [BOR AllReps](#)
Subject: The Mayor's Choice to Veto of Humane Pet Stores and Opportunity to Overturn
Date: Saturday, December 6, 2025 8:15:29 AM

Mayor Simmons,

Thank you for your response regarding Ordinance LR31.072. As a Stamford resident who cares deeply about humane policy and consumer protection, I would appreciate clarification on several points referenced in your email. I will be an active voice in helping to overturn your veto and this will help me better understand your perspective.

Are you aware of the hundreds of Stamford residents who wrote to the Board of Representatives to express their desire to pass this ordinance?

Which specific Connecticut statutes or legal precedents does the City believe would expose Stamford to liability if LR31.072 were enacted?

What state laws would Stamford be failing to abide by if the ordinance moved forward?

I understand that Humane World for Animals offered pro-bono legal support to the City should a lawsuit arise. I am also aware that they have supported other municipalities in similar situations. Could you please clarify why this is not seen as an acceptable option by your administration to support the city of Stamford?

Given that hundreds of municipalities across over 30 states and Washington, DC have successfully enacted humane pet-store laws, how does Connecticut differ in a way that prevents Stamford from doing the same?

How does the humane pet-store ordinance differ from other municipal actions that deviate from state-level allowances? For example, the city of Stamford enacted a stricter plastic bag ordinance than state law without receiving preemption. In addition, other municipalities like Fairfield and Greenwich have taken similar approaches regarding sale of cannabis, which is permissible at the state level but not permitted at a municipal level. How is this situation uniquely different from those examples?

You noted that the state level is the appropriate venue for this issue. Since a similar bill died on the floor last session, what steps do you intend to take to help move it forward this year, given the strong interest expressed by hundreds of Stamford residents?

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Cristina Romero
54 W North Street
Stamford, CT 06902

Caution: This email originated from outside our organization. Please be careful when clicking links or opening attachments.

From: [NEWS12CT](#)
To: [Board of Representatives](#)
Cc: [Rose Shannon](#)
Subject: News 12 Inquiry-Stamford Board of Representatives
Date: Saturday, December 6, 2025 11:08:57 AM
Attachments: [Outlook-hawfnckp.png](#)

Hello,

Reaching out to see if the board has comment and or statements on Mayor Simmons' vetoing legislation that would ban the sale of cats and dogs?

We're also wondering what are the board's next steps following this veto?

Thank you.

News 12 Connecticut | Assignment Desk

203-849-1321 | connecticut.news12.com

news12

The information transmitted in this email and any of its attachments is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information concerning Altice USA and/or its affiliates and subsidiaries that is proprietary, privileged, confidential and/or subject to copyright. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient(s) is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this in error, please contact the sender immediately and delete and destroy the communication and all of the attachments you have received and all copies thereof.

Caution: This email originated from outside our organization. Please be careful when clicking links or opening attachments.

From: [Cindy Sennewald](#)
To: [Simmons, Caroline](#)
Cc: [BOR AllReps](#)
Subject: The Mayor's Choice to Veto of Humane Pet Stores and Opportunity to Overturn
Date: Saturday, December 6, 2025 10:43:26 AM

Mayor Simmons,

Thank you for your response regarding Ordinance LR31.072. As a Stamford resident who cares deeply about humane policy and consumer protection, I would appreciate clarification on several points referenced in your email. I will be an active voice in helping to overturn your veto and this will help me better understand your perspective.

- 1. Are you aware of the hundreds of Stamford residents who wrote to the Board of Representatives to express their desire to pass this ordinance?*
- 2. Which specific Connecticut statutes or legal precedents does the City believe would expose Stamford to liability if LR31.072 were enacted?*
- 3. What state laws would Stamford be failing to abide by if the ordinance moved forward?*
- 4. I understand that Humane World for Animals offered pro-bono legal support to the City should a lawsuit arise. I am also aware that they have supported other municipalities in similar situations. Could you please clarify why this is not seen as an acceptable option by your administration to support the city of Stamford?*
- 5. Given that hundreds of municipalities across over 30 states and Washington, DC have successfully enacted humane pet-store laws, how does Connecticut differ in a way that prevents Stamford from doing the same?*
- 6. How does the humane pet-store ordinance differ from other municipal actions that deviate from state-level allowances? For example, the city of Stamford enacted a stricter plastic bag ordinance than state law without receiving preemption. In addition, other municipalities like Fairfield and Greenwich have taken similar approaches regarding sale of cannabis, which is permissible at the state level but not permitted at a municipal level. How is this situation uniquely different from those examples?*
- 7. You noted that the state level is the appropriate venue for this issue. Since a similar bill died on the floor last session, what steps do you intend to take to help move it forward this year, given the strong interest expressed by hundreds of Stamford residents?*

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to your response.

*Sincerely,
Cindy Sennewald*

84 Knox Rd Stamford CT

Lucky Dog Refuge volunteer and animal lover / advocate

Sent from my iPhone

Caution: This email originated from outside our organization. Please be careful when clicking links or opening attachments.

From: [Anna Darkhanonva](#)
To: [Simmons, Caroline](#)
Cc: [BOR AllReps](#)
Subject: The Mayor's Choice to Veto of Humane Pet Stores and Opportunity to Overturn
Date: Saturday, December 6, 2025 9:29:46 AM

Mayor Simmons,

Thank you for your response regarding Ordinance LR31.072. As a Stamford resident who cares deeply about humane policy and consumer protection, I would appreciate clarification on several points referenced in your email. I will be an active voice in helping to overturn your veto and this will help me better understand your perspective.

Are you aware of the hundreds of Stamford residents who wrote to the Board of Representatives to express their desire to pass this ordinance?

Which specific Connecticut statutes or legal precedents does the City believe would expose Stamford to liability if LR31.072 were enacted?

What state laws would Stamford be failing to abide by if the ordinance moved forward?

I understand that Humane World for Animals offered pro-bono legal support to the City should a lawsuit arise. I am also aware that they have supported other municipalities in similar situations. Could you please clarify why this is not seen as an acceptable option by your administration to support the city of Stamford?

Given that hundreds of municipalities across over 30 states and Washington, DC have successfully enacted humane pet-store laws, how does Connecticut differ in a way that prevents Stamford from doing the same?

How does the humane pet-store ordinance differ from other municipal actions that deviate from state-level allowances? For example, the city of Stamford enacted a stricter plastic bag ordinance than state law without receiving preemption. In addition, other municipalities like Fairfield and Greenwich have taken similar approaches regarding sale of cannabis, which is permissible at the state level but not permitted at a municipal level. How is this situation uniquely different from those examples?

You noted that the state level is the appropriate venue for this issue. Since a similar bill died on the floor last session, what steps do you intend to take to help move it forward this year, given the strong interest expressed by hundreds of Stamford residents?

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,
Anna Dark
111 Morgan St, Apt 635, Stamford, CT 06905

Caution: This email originated from outside our organization. Please be careful when clicking links or opening attachments.

From: [Heather Lindner](#)
To: [Simmons, Caroline](#)
Cc: [BOR AllReps](#)
Subject: Re: The Mayor's Choice to Veto Humane Pet Stores and Opportunity to Overturn
Date: Saturday, December 6, 2025 9:18:43 AM

Dear Mayor Simmons,

Thank you for your response regarding Ordinance LR31.072. As a Stamford resident who cares deeply about humane policy and consumer protection, I would appreciate clarification on several points referenced in your email. I will be an active voice in helping to overturn your veto and this will help me better understand your perspective.

1. Are you aware of the hundreds of Stamford residents who wrote to the Board of Representatives to express their desire to pass this ordinance?
2. Which specific Connecticut statutes or legal precedents does the City believe would expose Stamford to liability if LR31.072 were enacted?
3. What state laws would Stamford be failing to abide by if the ordinance moved forward?
4. I understand that Humane World for Animals offered pro-bono legal support to the City should a lawsuit arise. I am also aware that they have supported other municipalities in similar situations. Could you please clarify why this is not seen as an acceptable option by your administration to support the city of Stamford?
5. Given that hundreds of municipalities across over 30 states and Washington, DC have successfully enacted humane pet-store laws, how does Connecticut differ in a way that prevents Stamford from doing the same?
6. How does the humane pet-store ordinance differ from other municipal actions that deviate from state-level allowances? For example, the city of Stamford enacted a stricter plastic bag ordinance than state law without receiving preemption. In addition, other municipalities like Fairfield and Greenwich have taken similar approaches regarding sale of cannabis, which is permissible at the state level but not permitted at a municipal level. How is this situation uniquely different from those examples?
7. You noted that the state level is the appropriate venue for this issue. Since a similar bill died on the floor last session, what steps do you intend to take to help move it forward this year, given the strong interest expressed by hundreds of Stamford residents?

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,
Heather Lindner
190 Butternut Lane, Stamford

Caution: This email originated from outside our organization. Please be careful when clicking links or opening attachments.

From: [David @ Eyes Of Steel](#)
To: [BOR AllReps](#); [Board of Representatives](#); [Shaw, Ramya](#); [Morson, Eric](#)
Subject: Please Override the Veto of the Tree Ordinance
Date: Saturday, December 6, 2025 9:11:13 AM

Dear President Shaw, Majority Leader Morson, and Members of the Board of Representatives,

That it is an unusual way to start your four year term, having to consider overriding vetos is a serious task with big responsibility. Of course I d like to say that this really did not have to, nor should have happened, but the fact is you are being tested with huge public pressure.

I urge you to override the Mayor's veto of the Tree Ordinance — a carefully built, balanced, and widely supported measure that strengthens Stamford's long-term safety, infrastructure, and quality of life. This ordinance has strong support from many of the environmental advocates that work in Hartford, all the way to members of the GC3.

Trees are not symbolic. They are essential components of neighborhood livability. They cool streets, reduce energy costs, absorb stormwater, lessen flood risk, and protect public health. Once a mature tree is removed, its benefits cannot be replaced for decades.

Connecticut's GC3 resilience planning and DEEP's Urban Forest Equity and Resilience programs recognize tree canopy as a vital tool in protecting residents from rising heat and increasingly intense storms. The Stamford ordinance aligned directly with this state guidance.

The veto memo's concerns — bureaucracy, staffing, costs, and overlapping roles — do not reflect the content of the ordinance:

- Homeowners keep full discretion to remove trees, with only a \$15 registration.
- The Tree Commission consolidates existing leadership; it does not duplicate it.
- The ordinance establishes the Urban Forester and gives 18 months for implementation.
- Tree protections lower long-term costs by reducing heat exposure, stormwater failures, and infrastructure strain.

It is also important to acknowledge context. The ordinance was amended multiple times to accommodate feedback from developers and the administration. Yet it was vetoed anyway! This continues a pattern in which widely supported protections — environmental, public health, and even consumer protections — are blocked when they require modest accountability from large developers.

The public supports this ordinance because it is practical, balanced, and necessary. Stamford's canopy is declining. Stormwater risk is rising. Neighborhood temperatures are increasing. These trends do not resolve themselves.

Overriding the veto is not a partisan or "faction" decision. It is a responsible one.

I respectfully ask the Board to uphold the ordinance and protect Stamford's long-term livability, safety, and resilience. Again tgis calls on filling your legislative role of being a check on the executive branch.

Thank you for your consideration,

David Michel
914-843-7545
Rockledge Drive, Stamford
Former State Representative for Stamford's 146th House District

Caution: This email originated from outside our organization. Please be careful when clicking links or opening attachments.

From: [Sandra Brenha](#)
To: [Simmons, Caroline](#)
Cc: [BOR AllReps](#)
Subject: The Mayor's Choice to Veto of Humane Pet Stores and Opportunity to Overturn
Date: Saturday, December 6, 2025 8:25:30 AM

Mayor Simmons,

Thank you for your response regarding Ordinance LR31.072. As a Stamford resident who cares deeply about humane policy and consumer protection, I would appreciate clarification on several points referenced in your email. I will be an active voice in helping to overturn your veto and this will help me better understand your perspective.

- 1. Are you aware of the hundreds of Stamford residents who wrote to the Board of Representatives to express their desire to pass this ordinance?*
- 2. Which specific Connecticut statutes or legal precedents does the City believe would expose Stamford to liability if LR31.072 were enacted?*
- 3. What state laws would Stamford be failing to abide by if the ordinance moved forward?*
- 4. I understand that Humane World for Animals offered pro-bono legal support to the City should a lawsuit arise. I am also aware that they have supported other municipalities in similar situations. Could you please clarify why this is not seen as an acceptable option by your administration to support the city of Stamford?*
- 5. Given that hundreds of municipalities across over 30 states and Washington, DC have successfully enacted humane pet-store laws, how does Connecticut differ in a way that prevents Stamford from doing the same?*
- 6. How does the humane pet-store ordinance differ from other municipal actions that deviate from state-level allowances? For example, the city of Stamford enacted a stricter plastic bag ordinance than state law without receiving preemption. In addition, other municipalities like Fairfield and Greenwich have taken similar approaches regarding sale of cannabis, which is permissible at the state level but not permitted at a municipal level. How is this situation uniquely different from those examples?*
- 7. You noted that the state level is the appropriate venue for this issue. Since a similar bill died on the floor last session, what steps do you intend to take to help move it forward this year, given the strong interest expressed by hundreds of Stamford residents?*

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Sandra Brenha

1011 Washington Blvd

Caution: This email originated from outside our organization. Please be careful when clicking links or opening attachments.

From: [Isabel Kim](#)
To: [Simmons, Caroline](#)
Cc: [BOR AllReps](#)
Subject: The Mayor's Choice to Veto of Humane Pet Stores and Opportunity to Overturn
Date: Saturday, December 6, 2025 11:31:47 AM

Mayor Simmons,

Thank you for your response regarding Ordinance LR31.072. As a Stamford resident who cares deeply about humane policy and consumer protection, I would appreciate clarification on several points referenced in your email. I will be an active voice in helping to overturn your veto and this will help me better understand your perspective.

- 1. Are you aware of the hundreds of Stamford residents who wrote to the Board of Representatives to express their desire to pass this ordinance?*
- 2. Which specific Connecticut statutes or legal precedents does the City believe would expose Stamford to liability if LR31.072 were enacted?*
- 3. What state laws would Stamford be failing to abide by if the ordinance moved forward?*
- 4. I understand that Humane World for Animals offered pro-bono legal support to the City should a lawsuit arise. I am also aware that they have supported other municipalities in similar situations. Could you please clarify why this is not seen as an acceptable option by your administration to support the city of Stamford?*
- 5. Given that hundreds of municipalities across over 30 states and Washington, DC have successfully enacted humane pet-store laws, how does Connecticut differ in a way that prevents Stamford from doing the same?*
- 6. How does the humane pet-store ordinance differ from other municipal actions that deviate from state-level allowances? For example, the city of Stamford enacted a stricter plastic bag ordinance than state law without receiving preemption. In addition, other municipalities like Fairfield and Greenwich have taken similar approaches regarding sale of cannabis, which is permissible at the state level but not permitted at a municipal level. How is this situation uniquely different from those examples?*
- 7. You noted that the state level is the appropriate venue for this issue. Since a similar bill died on the floor last session, what steps do you intend to take to help move it forward this year, given the strong interest expressed by hundreds of Stamford residents?*

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to your response.

Best,
Isabel Kim

124 snow crsytal lane
Stamford ct 06905

Sent from my iPhone

Caution: This email originated from outside our organization. Please be careful when clicking links or opening attachments.

From: [Edit Karacsony](#)
To: [Simmons, Caroline](#)
Cc: [BOR AllReps](#)
Subject: The Mayor's Choice to Veto of Humane Pet Stores and Opportunity to Overturn
Date: Saturday, December 6, 2025 3:11:13 PM

Dear Mayor Simmons,

I hope this message finds you well. I am writing to share my deep disappointment regarding your recent veto of ordinance LR31.072 and to offer a personal experience that I hope you will consider as you continue to evaluate this important issue.

In 1999, I purchased a cocker spaniel puppy named Max from a pet shop at the Danbury Mall, not knowing at the time that he had likely come from a puppy mill. When I first saw him, he was huddled in the corner of the cage, looking frightened and defeated. I felt so bad for him that I wanted to give him a chance at a better life. He was still very cute. I had no intent to buy a dog that day, but they sure know how to lure you in.

On the drive home, Max began having severe breathing attacks, and I had to pull over the car. My friend who was with me said Edit, this puppy is not well. He was coughing and running a fever, so before we even reached home, I brought him straight to a veterinarian. It quickly became clear how sick and deeply traumatized he truly was. His health challenges continued, and he grew into an extremely anxious and erratic dog.

I was young then, still a student and working two jobs to support myself, and despite trying my best, I eventually could not provide the level of care and specialized training Max desperately needed. It was one of the most heartbreaking decisions of my life, but I ultimately had to rehome him. Thankfully, after a long search and interviews, I found a loving home for him upstate in New York, where he was able to get the training he needed, chase wild turkeys, and run free. The pet shop never stated that Max is sick. They never asked me or tried to tell me "hey you live in an efficient apartment downtown Stamford, we don't think a cocker spaniel is a good fit" All they cared about was the \$600 price being paid.

But now as a volunteer at a local animal refuge, I know firsthand that very few dogs coming out of the commercial breeding pipeline are this fortunate. I just recently saw a puppy being given up to our refuge. He is sick. This is a real issue even after 25 years since my incident.

These are the personal stories that illustrate why legislation like LR31.072 matters—not in the abstract, but in the lived experiences of residents like me and most importantly the animals who suffer silently.

With this in mind, I hope you might reconsider your position or at least share what steps the City of Stamford plans to take to prevent similar situations from happening again. How will the city work to ensure that no more families, and no more animals are put through experiences like mine?

Thank you for taking the time to hear my story. I genuinely hope it contributes to a deeper understanding of the real impact these policies have on our community.

Sincerely,
Edit Karacsony

43 Underhill Street, Stamford, CT. 06902

(203)321-3434

Caution: This email originated from outside our organization. Please be careful when clicking links or opening attachments.

From: [Robin Stieglitz](#)
To: [Simmons, Caroline](#)
Cc: [BOR AllReps](#)
Subject: The Mayor's Choice to Veto of Humane Pet Stores and Opportunity to Overturn
Date: Saturday, December 6, 2025 3:54:35 PM

Mayor Simmons,

Thank you for your response regarding Ordinance LR31.072. As a Stamford resident who cares deeply about humane policy and consumer protection, I would appreciate clarification on several points referenced in your email. I will be an active voice in helping to overturn your veto and this will help me better understand your perspective.

- 1. Are you aware of the hundreds of Stamford residents who wrote to the Board of Representatives to express their desire to pass this ordinance?*
- 2. Which specific Connecticut statutes or legal precedents does the City believe would expose Stamford to liability if LR31.072 were enacted?*
- 3. What state laws would Stamford be failing to abide by if the ordinance moved forward?*
- 4. I understand that Humane World for Animals offered pro-bono legal support to the City should a lawsuit arise. I am also aware that they have supported other municipalities in similar situations. Could you please clarify why this is not seen as an acceptable option by your administration to support the city of Stamford?*
- 5. Given that hundreds of municipalities across over 30 states and Washington, DC have successfully enacted humane pet-store laws, how does Connecticut differ in a way that prevents Stamford from doing the same?*
- 6. How does the humane pet-store ordinance differ from other municipal actions that deviate from state-level allowances? For example, the city of Stamford enacted a stricter plastic bag ordinance than state law without receiving preemption. In addition, other municipalities like Fairfield and Greenwich have taken similar approaches regarding sale of cannabis, which is permissible at the state level but not permitted at a municipal level. How is this situation uniquely different from those examples?*
- 7. You noted that the state level is the appropriate venue for this issue. Since a similar bill died on the floor last session, what steps do you intend to take to help move it forward this year, given the strong interest expressed by hundreds of Stamford residents?*

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Robin Stieglitz

184 Summer Street

Caution: This email originated from outside our organization. Please be careful when clicking links or opening attachments.