

**From:** [Emily Rakos](#)  
**To:** [Simmons, Caroline](#)  
**Cc:** [BOR AllReps](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Please Support Ordinance LR31.072 — Humane Pet Shop Bill  
**Date:** Monday, December 8, 2025 9:41:11 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,  
Emily Rakos

50 Forest St, Stamford, CT

On Fri, Dec 5, 2025 at 2:59 PM Simmons, Caroline <[CSimmons@stamfordct.gov](mailto:CSimmons@stamfordct.gov)> wrote:

Dear Emily,

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](mailto: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](http://www.stamfordct.gov/Fixit)

---

**From:** Emily Rakos <[emilyrakos97@gmail.com](mailto:emilyrakos97@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Thursday, December 4, 2025 9:46 AM

**To:** Simmons, Caroline <[CSimmons@StamfordCT.gov](mailto:CSimmons@StamfordCT.gov)>; Mayor's Office  
<[MayorsOffice@StamfordCT.gov](mailto: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.

Thank you,  
Emily Rakos  
50 Forest St, Stamford, CT

**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:** [Lauren Sirois](#)  
**To:** [Mayor's Office](#)  
**Cc:** [BOR AllReps](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Please Sign the Humane Pet Shop Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, December 8, 2025 9:57:26 AM

---

Mayor Simmons,

Thank you for your response regarding Ordinance LR31.072, though I am sad to learn of your position and that you vetoed this ordinance. 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,

Lauren Sirois  
850 Pacific Street

On Fri, Dec 5, 2025 at 1:59 PM Mayor's Office <[MayorsOffice@stamfordet.gov](mailto:MayorsOffice@stamfordet.gov)> wrote:

Dear Lauren,

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:** Lauren Sirois <[laurenmsirois@gmail.com](mailto:laurenmsirois@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 10, 2025 10:06 AM  
**To:** Simmons, Caroline <[CSimmons@StamfordCT.gov](mailto:CSimmons@StamfordCT.gov)>; Mayor's Office <[MayorsOffice@StamfordCT.gov](mailto:MayorsOffice@StamfordCT.gov)>  
**Subject:** Please Sign the Humane Pet Shop Ordinance

Dear Mayor Simmons,

As a Stamford resident and proud adopter of Daisy (photo below), a Golden Retriever who spent the first 5 years of her life in a puppy mill in Pennsylvania being forced to carry litters over and over again for profit, 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, which I witnessed in person last week as I attended that meeting. I hope you will do the same.

Connecticut would not be the first state to see a local ordinance pass before a state ban and I urge you to see the widespread impact this ordinance could have for our state as a whole if Stamford could start the wheels in motion.

If you are interested in learning more about this topic from an unaffiliated resource, I have attached the link to the podcast of my law school professor Penny Ellison from the University of Pennsylvania Carey Law School. I was fortunate to take her Animal Law class while at Penn Law. One of her recent podcasts focused on retail pet sale bans.

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

**Animal Advocacy Academy Podcast Link:**  
<https://animaladvocacyacademy.com/podcast/>

**Daisy:**



Sincerely,  
Lauren Sirois  
850 Pacific Street

--

**Lauren M. Sirois**

University of Pennsylvania Carey Law School (J.D., 2015)

Bar Admissions: New York (2016)

(603) 320-1910

[laurenmsirois@gmail.com](mailto:laurenmsirois@gmail.com)

**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:** [fawltytours@aol.com](mailto:fawltytours@aol.com)  
**To:** [Simmons, Caroline](#)  
**Cc:** [BOR AllReps](#)  
**Subject:** The Mayor's Choice to Veto of Humane Pet Stores and Opportunity to Overturn  
**Date:** Monday, December 8, 2025 11:53:42 AM

---

Dear Mayor Simmons,

*As a Stamford resident who cares deeply about humane policy and consumer protection, I would appreciate clarification on several points. Because, as it stands, I will be an active voice in helping to overturn your veto. Perhaps clear answers to the below can help me understand your thoughts on the subject.*

- 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.*

*PS I have an awesome dog, he is 7 years old and the best boy. He came from a shelter. His name is Starsky :*



*Sincerely,*

*Jack Carson  
73 Clay Hill Rd, Stamford 06905*

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

**From:** [Kristen Roeckle](#)  
**To:** [Beckham, Nicole](#); [Blank, David](#); [Bouchard, Tom](#); [Boudreau, Matthew](#); [Bradford, Phil](#); [Camporeale, Karen](#); [de la Cruz, Virgil](#); [Didelot, Matt](#); [Dorsey, Kierra](#); [Field, Michael](#); [Finkel, Lewis](#); [Gardner, Felix](#); [Gilbride, Cara](#); [Goldberg, Amiel](#); [Graham, Chanta \(Board of Reps\)](#); [Gross, Theo](#); [Hill, Winton](#); [Hughes, Ryan](#); [Hyatt, Lori](#); [Johnson, Parker](#); [Lapine, Noah](#); [McKeown, Michael](#); [Morson, Eric](#); [Pavia, Bobby](#); [Pelliccia, John](#); [Pollack, Maureen](#); [Price, Glenn](#); [Salas, Ricardo](#); [Sandford, Daniel](#); [Shaw, Ramya](#); [BOR AllReps](#); [Shore, Steven](#); [Stone, Scott \(Board of Representatives\)](#); [Sylvestre, Stephanie](#); [Walston, Kindrea](#); [Weathers, Candace](#); [Wirz, Jeff](#); [Yeager, Matthew](#); [Zachary, Andrew](#); [Weinberg, Carl](#)  
**Cc:** [Kirstin Mende](#); [Jessica Barnes](#); [Matt Witek](#); [John Louizos](#); [maclovello@gmail.com](#); [leonorhlopez@yahoo.com](#); [jenner1026](#); [montanari.gianmarco@gmail.com](#); [kristinarazza@gmail.com](#); [Volpettig19@gmail.com](#); [Nicholas DiNino](#); [lauren.y.marvin@gmail.com](#); [taylorleach1202@gmail.com](#); [Geena.chiacu@gmail.com](#); [Meaghan Conway](#); [Amanda.erb@gmail.com](#); [Diane Holcombe](#); [Animals- R-Family](#); [cooperman.rebecca@gmail.com](#); [Annie Hornish](#); [Joshua Levin](#)  
**Subject:** Introduction & Invitation for Discussion: Overturning Mayor Simmon's Veto of LR31.072  
**Date:** Monday, December 8, 2025 2:27:50 PM

---

Dear Members of the Stamford Board of Representatives,

My name is Kristen Roeckle, and I serve on the Board of Directors of **Lucky Dog Refuge, a 501(c)(3) animal rescue located at 36 Pulaski Street here in Stamford.**

I am writing on behalf of our Board of Directors and staff to congratulate you on joining (or continuing to serve on) this important legislative body and to introduce ourselves as partners in the work ahead. Lucky Dog Refuge operates daily within Stamford's animal welfare landscape, handling medical, cruelty, and neglect cases in our region, in partnership with other non-profit and municipal organizations such as the Stamford Animal Control and Care Center. **It was disappointing to hear that Mayor Simmons chose to veto the previous Board of Representative's 35-1-1 passing of the humane pet store ordinance this past Friday, even after an overwhelming amount of community support.**

**Our goal is to facilitate open, transparent, and constructive dialogue around the opportunity to overturn the mayor's veto of Ordinance LR31.072.** We want to understand your questions and priorities as you begin your due diligence on this ordinance and consider an override. The previous BoR vote reflected months of due diligence and the clear sentiment of Stamford residents, animal welfare leaders - many of whom are copied on this email and stand united in their support. This newly seated Board now has an extraordinary opportunity to consider an override in alignment with the will of constituents and the broad coalition of organizations committed to humane policy in Stamford. We hope you will give us the opportunity to share our perspective, our data, and the lived experiences of the animals and families we serve.

**We plan to host a community-focused conversation on the ordinance and the future of animal welfare in Stamford in the coming days. We will reach out with details and an invitation once the details are finalized, and we would be honored to have you join us for an open discussion.**

In the meantime, know that our doors are open. If any of you have questions — whether about the ordinance itself, the fallout our rescue experiences from these pet stores, our partnership with Stamford Animal Control and Care Centers, or the broader policy landscape — we would be more than happy to connect individually or as a group.

Thank you for your service to Stamford and for the time and thoughtful consideration you devote to this critical issue. We look forward to engaging with you and supporting a well-informed path forward as this Board evaluates whether to override the veto and realign with the wishes of Stamford residents.

For the Dogs,

Kristen Roeckle  
Board of Directors, Lucky Dog Refuge

Kirstin Mende  
Founder & CEO, Lucky Dog Refuge

Jessica Barnes  
Executive Director, Lucky Dog Refuge, Stamford Resident

Supporters in Cc:

1. John Louizos, Board of Directors, Lucky Dog Refuge (Stamford resident)
2. Amanda Erb, Founder, Hazels House Rescue (Stamford resident)
3. Diane Holcombe, Founder, Red Leash Rescue (Stamford resident)
4. Nicole Bruck, Founder, Animals R Family (Stamford resident)
5. Maria Lovello, Volunteer and Rescue Foster, Stamford Animal Control (Stamford resident)
6. Matthew Witek, Lucky Dog Refuge x Stamford Run Club Liaison
7. Leonor Lopez, Volunteer, Lucky Dog Refuge (Stamford resident)
8. Jen Volker Volunteer, Lucky Dog Refuge (Stamford resident)
9. Gian Marco Montanari, Volunteer, Lucky Dog Refuge (Stamford resident)
10. Kristina Razza, Volunteer, Lucky Dog Refuge (Stamford resident)
11. Gabbie Volpetti, Volunteer, Lucky Dog Refuge (Stamford resident)
12. Nicholas DiNino, Volunteer, Lucky Dog Refuge (Stamford resident)
13. Geena Chiacu, Lucky Dog Refuge Adopter (Stamford Resident)
14. Meaghan Conway, Lucky Dog Refuge Adopter (Stamford Resident)
15. Taylor Leach, Animal Advocate (Stamford Resident)
16. Lauren Marvin, Animal Advocate (Stamford Resident)
17. Rebecca Cooperman, Animal Advocate, Beagle Freedom, Lucky Dog Refuge, NYACC (Stamford resident)
18. Annie Hornish, CT State Director, Humane World for Animals
19. Joshua Levin, Legislative Advocate, CT Votes for Animals

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

**From:** [Robin Schultz](#)  
**To:** [BOR AllReps](#); [Simmons, Caroline](#)  
**Subject:** The Mayor's Choice to Veto of Humane Pet Stores and Opportunity to Overturn  
**Date:** Monday, December 8, 2025 4:32:13 PM

---

**Mayor Simmons and Board of Representatives:**

*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 schultz*  
129 Emery Drive E, Stamford  
203-667-9014  
[schultzrobin115@gmail.com](mailto:schultzrobin115@gmail.com)

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

**From:** [Reilly Miller](#)  
**To:** [BOR AllReps](#)  
**Subject:** Please Overturn the Veto on Ordinance LR31.072 — Humane Pet Shop Bill  
**Date:** Monday, December 8, 2025 8:26:03 PM

---

Dear Members of the Stamford Board of Representatives,

As a Stamford resident, I'm writing to urge you to **overturn the veto issued by Mayor Simmons on Ordinance LR31.072, which would ban the sale of dogs, cats, and rabbits in pet shops.** This important legislation will help end the puppy mill-to-pet shop pipeline to our city and protect consumers from predatory financing and deceptive marketing.

No pet shop needs to sell live animals to be profitable, and no resident needs a pet shop to find the pet of their choice. Please stand with Stamford residents who care about animal welfare and consumer protection by supporting Ordinance LR31.072.

Thank you for your time and leadership on this important issue.

Sincerely,

Reilly Miller

1315 Washington Blvd

Apt 503

Stamford CT 06902

845-649-6547

Reilly Miller

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