

## **Companion Animal Licensing Procedures Work Group Meeting Summary**

Meeting date and time: 10a-2p, 9/9/2016

Meeting place: Perimeter Center  
9960 Mayland Drive  
Henrico, Virginia 23233  
Board Room #3

Julia Murphy welcomed everyone and gave an overview of the meeting's agenda and goals. The meeting started with an introduction of attendees around the room.

### **Attendees:**

Julia Murphy, Virginia Department of Health (VDH)  
Terry Taylor, Virginia Veterinary Medical Association (VVMA)  
Heidi Meinzer, Virginia Federation of Humane Societies (VFHS)  
Debra Griggs, VFHS  
Robin Starr, Richmond SPCA  
Matthew Gray, Humane Society of the United States  
Jamie Hawley, Piedmont Health District, VDH  
Alice Harrington, Federation of Dog Clubs and Breeders  
Carolynn Bissett, Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (VDACS)  
Rob Leinberger, Virginia Animal Control Association (VACA), Richmond Animal Care & Control  
William Tydings, VACA  
Paulette Dean, Danville Area Humane Society (DAHS)  
Scott Miller, Hanover County Treasurer, Treasurers' Association of Virginia (TAV)  
Sharon Adams, Virginia Alliance for Animal Shelters (VAAS)  
Kathy Strouse, VAAS  
Benny David, VAAS  
Pat Duttry, Three Rivers Health District, VDH  
April Rogers, DMV  
Michelle Welch, Office of the Attorney General

Julia Murphy began the meeting by distributing the work group member sign in sheet as well as a hard copy of the letter from the VVMA that had been distributed electronically earlier in the week that contained the VVMA's thoughts about concepts associated with dog licensing the VVMA membership felt it could support and those concepts we had been discussing they thought it could not support. Dr. Murphy then asked all work group members to introduce themselves and then thanked the members of the general public in attendance.

The work group started by discussing the definition of a home based rescue as at the last meeting the topic of home based rescues had been discussed and Robin Starr had concerns about the characterization of a home based rescue offered by Carolynn Bissett at that time. Robin Starr was concerned that Carolynn Bissett had stated that home based rescue groups could not be owners of their animals and felt that this had implications for the work these groups do and the animals in their care. She then went on to state that it was her reading of the law that that home based rescue groups have

custody of animals and the law does not state whether home based rescue operators do or do not own the animals in their care. Carolyn Bissett stated that she was trying to make the point at the last meeting that a home based rescue's purpose is for adoption of animals but recognized that, after the holding period, home based rescue operators can be considered owners and did not mean to imply that they could not be owners. Sharon Adams commented that her remembrance of the conversation was a more specific one in regard to discussion around specific activities like licensing and rabies vaccination as it related to home based rescues and Debra Griggs commented that regardless of the context it is important to clarify the statement since the statement was made by a public official. Michelle Welch when as for legal clarification of the term home based rescue as it relates to ownership was that home based rescue operators can be considered owners of the animals in their care. Sharon Adams commented that an argument could be made that if a home based rescue operator does not follow statute an argument could be made that ownership is in question and Michele Welch commented that this would then be something that would need to be settled in court. Debra Griggs commented that it was her understanding from former discussions with VDACS that a home based rescue could act as a releasing agency. Pat Duttry inquired about the term custody vs ownership as it related to home base rescue group and Michele Welch commented that the term custody was incorporated into the definition of owner.

Terry Taylor wanted to comment on two things from a previous meeting. In a previous meeting he was asked if veterinarians talk to their clients about licensing and he polled the VVMA executive committee and clinical practice veterinarians who serve on the VVMA Board of Directors and was told by these clinicians that they do discuss licensing with their owners. VVMA also submitted a letter to the group this week which was also distributed in hard copy today since VVMA wanted to go on record in regard to ideas from this group that the VVMA membership could support and those it could not. Julia Murphy asked if the presentation of those thoughts could be, in addition to other written statements by both Larry Land and Scott Miller, held for the group's discussion of the conclusion of the report and then any other groups could offer thoughts about the options presented in the conclusion.

Julia Murphy then went on to review each section of the report with the group. She explained that some of the statistical calculations had been changed to reflect a correction of a mistake she had made in categorizing the VDH regions attributed to the veterinarians, consumers and treasurers who participated in the survey as well as reflecting an additional 16 consumer surveys she received after the deadline. In reviewing the report's introduction and background, Pat Duttry asked if the language associated with the TAV's desires related to not making any changes to the Freedom of Information Act was clear to everyone, this was discussed and comments were offered by Scott Miller and Michele Welch and it was thought by the group that the language in this regard was accurate. The methods section was then reviewed and no comments or changes were made. Debra Griggs asked if the calculations in the report needed any review for general accuracy and just to allow for human error. Julia Murphy explained that she did often check calculations more than once which is how she found the errors associated with VDH region calculations and that there probably will be some error especially in regard to categorizing the consumer survey comments since it could be argued that some comments could fit into more than one category. She also asked if anyone, on reviewing the results, any

calculation(s) that did not seem right to them and after discussion, no one requested any further assessment of the calculations. Alice Harrington mentioned that it is difficult to bring accuracy to the surveys since, given the time we had while we made a good efforts, the survey processed was flawed. Julia Murphy commented that she tried to address the limitations of the study in the conclusion and that at least for some groups, like the treasurers and animal control groups; we did at least know the total number reached and, therefore, the proportion of those groups that responded.

Sharon Adams asked Scott Miller for thoughts on why the treasurers who did not respond did not participate in the survey. Scott Miller responded that his impression is that many treasurers do not have the data to respond or perhaps keep the data in a way such that the answers to the questions could be readily calculated and they may not feel comfortable answering that opinion questions since treasurers are not the ones that may fiscal decisions for the locality since they collect the money, but do not make decisions on spending locality funds.

Julia Murphy commented that since only a proportion of the treasurers or any of the groups surveyed responded, that is why in using the convention that she has mentioned in previous meetings of addressing the treasurers in the conclusion of the study, she thought it would be good to encourage the treasurers to review this study and see if the statistics reported in the results of this study seemed to align with the experience of any locality that did not respond to the survey.

Scott Miller inquired about the number of rabies vaccinations veterinarians who responded to the survey reported giving annually and asked Terry Taylor what proportion of veterinarians in Virginia were members of the VVMA. Terry Taylor commented that the VVMA membership represented about 33% of all veterinarians licensed in Virginia. Scott Miller further commented that one general assessment of the number of dogs in Virginia could be made by looking at the number of dogs vaccinated annually. Further discussion in regard to the number of dogs vaccinated and the annual range reported by the veterinarians who responded and that accuracy of that and Dr. Taylor commented that some veterinarians may have responding with an annual count of the number of rabies vaccinations all of the veterinarians in a practice per year not that individual veterinarian.

Sharon Adams commented on the treasurers' survey results in regard to the follow up done by treasurers when they have evidence of a dog being vaccinated, but the owner does not present for a license as well as general dog licensing compliance rate according to the respondents to the treasurers' survey which would indicate that compliance rate, if you combine those who present both within and after 60 days have passed after the treasurer receives a rabies certificate is about 57%. Scott Miller commented that there was some overlap in those 2 numbers and that information from data he gathered would indicate compliance is about 50%.

Alice Harrington asked that a copy of the VDH regions could be included in the report for reference and Julia Murphy commented that she could put the VDH region map as an attachment to the report.

Julia Murphy commented that she would be writing an executive summary as the front matter of the report. The remaining sections of the results were reviewed and some typographical errors were corrected.

[The group broke for lunch]

Julia Murphy then started to review the results. She stated that the convention that was being used was addressing the treasurers in the study conclusion and presenting them with the options and thoughts we had for the treasurers' consideration. She further stated that as options for the treasurers' consideration are presented in the report, any group represented on the study group can offer their perspectives on a particular option such as whether the group they represent would support that option or not, recognizing that not all groups would agree or have the same perspectives on each option presented to the treasurers. A question was raised in regard to where the study would be posted and Carolynn Bissett commented that there is a section of the General Assembly site where studies instructed to be performed by the General Assembly were posted.

Julia Murphy also asked if the studies that she referred had inserted as references for response rates in the initial part of the results sections had been circulated to the wider group and when the group indicated that she had not, she promised to circulate them. Sharon Adams offered that she had not seen an online option for paying license fees included in the conclusion section and that this was an option that the group had discussed. Julia Murphy then inserted into the conclusion section. Scott Miller then asked about the lifetime licensing option that is included in the first paragraph in the conclusion addressing options stating that microchip implants may not be the only method of identification that could be considered with that option. Discussion then ensued including Heidi Meinzer, Sharon Adams and Benny David in regard to an idea that had been discussed whereby lifetime licensing might be incentivized by microchip implantation. Terry Taylor commented that lifetime licensing would be something the VVMA would support as an idea and that a lifetime license should be accompanied by some requirement for tamper proof identification. Robin Starr inquired about whether the suggestion of lifetime licensing was being made in the context of the local option of licensing or not and, if so, perhaps we are getting too specific in regard to the information we are including because in the context of the local option localities would go about licensing how they chose to go about it. Julia Murphy then commented that she thought that there were certain laws that allowed localities to be performed certain mandated tasks within certain parameters. Carolynn Bissett then commented that perhaps the best approach would be to remove the microchip implant language associated with that sentence and then document that there was not consensus among the work group members in regard to the details the particular identification that would be required as part of a lifetime license.

Matthew Gray then asked if we as a group were planning to come to a conclusion in regard to a specific recommendation this group is making or are we listing all the things we talked about whether we think they would make good policy or not. Julia Murphy offered that since this was a big group and she knew that there were some things we would not be able to reach consensus on in the time we had, that providing a short list of options that was distilled down from the information we received as part of our data gathering efforts and then, for each option, offering to the treasurers the group's perspective on that option and where there was consensus and where there was not and that some of the main ideas that the group discussed would not require legislation. Matthew Gray responded that he was concerned that approaching the conclusion in that way was not giving any helpful guidance to the legislature and if we did not make a specific recommendation to the legislature it would result in

multiple bills reflecting different perspectives being introduced if we as a group do not tell the legislature what we think needs to be done. Robin Starr asked if we were providing recommendation to the treasurers or to the General Assembly. Julia Murphy responded that the convention she had discussed was to address the treasurers association and perhaps even use the thoughts submitted by Scott Miller on behalf of the TVA as a part of the conclusion. Julia Murphy also stated that she did not see this group as a group moving forward with legislation or approaching a General Assembly representative about a bill, but saw this group as one that was to gather information and then try to distill that information down into a short list of ideas for the treasurers' consideration and further deliberation. Matthew Gray commented that he did not think that this is what we were doing for the last 6 months and offered that he actually agreed with the items the TVA submitted in anticipation of this meeting in regard to a local option. He then asked if the action item for his group was to be prepared to offer whether his group agreed or disagreed with options included in the conclusion and Julia Murphy stated yes that for any option presented in the conclusion, if his group felt strongly about that option he should comment for his group.

Sharon Adams stated that the language of the legislation assigned the group to review companion animal licensing and assess the feasibility of a statewide system and she thinks we have gone well beyond that. She also stated that she thinks we do have to state in the conclusion whether a statewide system is feasible or not. Julia Murphy commented that this was addressed in the conclusion and, in short, she put forward that it is technologically feasible, however, since one of the goals of the treasurers was to have a minimal fiscal impact that she did not know if it was feasible from that standpoint. Julia Murphy stated that because of that the suggestion in the conclusion was that the TVA should review the final report and use it to continue to discuss the concept of a statewide database and if that is something that they wanted to continue to pursue. Sharon Adams pointed out that the VDH was charged with assessing the feasibility of a statewide database and that the majority of treasurers, ACOs and members of the general public who responded to the surveys were in favor of a statewide database and there needs to be some integrity in regard to a specific response to the legislation as it is written. Heidi Meinzer then added that perhaps the respondents to the surveys did not necessarily have a perspective on the funding issues involved with a statewide database. Sharon Adams commented that there is a revenue stream attached to licensing and thinks that we do not have a specific cost associated with a statewide database. Terry Taylor indicated that the localities have indicated that they do not really want to remit payment to the state. Sharon Adams stated that we need to be responsive to the statewide database feasibility question in the legislation. Debra Griggs stated that she thought the answers to the survey questions Sharon Adams was referring to were not necessarily relevant to the feasibility of a system. Julia Murphy commented that there were different kinds of feasibility and she felt that she tried to reflect in the report that she thought a statewide database seemed to be a popular idea and that it seemed technologically feasible, however, when it came to trying to meet the TVA's goal of having a statewide database with minimal fiscal impact, that was where there seemed to be a feasibility problem a need to encourage the TVA to have further discussion. Sharon Adams commented that we should characterize statewide feasibility that given that a majority of those surveyed interested in a statewide database and given the presentations that offered that it was technologically feasible,

that the idea should be further developed in regard to specific costs and willingness of localities to participate.

Scott Miller offered that originally he thought that the cost sharing associated with funding a statewide database was going to be straightforward, but as we have studied it and particularly in light of Larry Land's comments in previous meetings and the statement he offered from the Virginia Association of Counties for consideration at this meeting, localities can be concerned about remitting payments to the state. Scott Miller then went on to comment that this is why he put forward the concept of the local option in regard to licensing and politically it could be difficult to put forward a statewide system. Jamie Hawley commented that some localities only charge \$2 for dog licenses and that would make it difficult for the state to collect money to offset the cost of a statewide system.

Julia Murphy then asked if, from the group's perspective, VDH had met the mandate that was given to it by the General Assembly to review companion animal licensing and assess the feasibility of a statewide database. Matthew Gray commented that perhaps if there is consensus present, not necessarily unanimity, and we agree on a proposal then we should include that in the conclusion and Benny David offered that if we can make some points in the conclusion that everyone agrees on, then we should do that. Julia Murphy asked if it would be helpful if the conclusion would then be stratified in sections whereby those ideas where there was consensus reached and those main ideas that were distilled from the information that the group deliberated on, but could not reach consensus. Robin Starr offered that we needed to be clear on what we meant by consensus and the difference between consensus and unanimity with consensus being the majority and unanimity being the entire group, since unanimity is harder to achieve. William Tydings offered that perhaps we should consider doing what VACA does in their decision making process and that VACA does agree with some form of licensing and was unanimous in that.

Sharon Adams asked if someone could elaborate on the term local option and what that entailed. Scott Miller described it in terms of the concept of a locality being able to offer a 1, 2 or 3 year license or perhaps adding a lifetime license option or using a rabies certificate as a license. Sharon Adams then asked if that meant a locality could have no licensing since while she could agree on localities having options in licensing, she could not agree in regard to localities not licensing. William Tydings then offered that he was not suggesting that there was no license, but that perhaps the rabies vaccination could serve as the license, which kind of means no license, however, his jurisdiction decided that they would keep license tags. Heidi Meinzer offered a thought about where there is very broad consensus, like everyone agreeing that dogs should be vaccinated for rabies and everyone agrees that dogs should be identified in some way. Julia Murphy offered that perhaps we could put forward ideas in the conclusion where there is unanimity and other ideas where there was not unanimity and then explain, in regard to where there was not unanimity why there was not and what different groups thought about that idea.

Prior to reviewing the ideas included in the first draft of the conclusion, Julia Murphy asked Sharon Adams if she had any further thoughts or language associated with the characterization of the statewide database. Sharon Adams offered that she thought it could be written more strongly in regard to our

obligation to continue to discuss the feasibility of a statewide system and Julia Murphy offered to review that section with that thought in mind.

Julia Murphy then asked if Terry Taylor and Scott Miller wanted offer a few words about the written statements they both submitted for the group's consideration prior to the meeting. Scott Miller presented the two ideas that he proposed which the group could consider and let decided if they liked neither, one or both. The first idea Scott Miller presented was the concept of automatically considering a dog licensed when a rabies certificate is sent to a treasurer's office and then requiring the owner of all dogs in that locality to have some sort of identification on the dog that identified the owner/a "get me home tag" and that a form of identification in this option could be a microchip. This option except for dangerous dogs and kennel licenses would get a locality out of the non-profitable business of licensing, although he offered as a potential disadvantage to this option that there may be some decision makers who would struggle with the idea of no license tag. The second option Scott Miller presented was that of a lifetime license which should be priced so that it was an attractive option to consumers. He presented that the advantage of a life-time tag idea is just getting it approved and that treasurers continuing to selling tags locally, would be something that decision makers will identify with and might be more likely to approve at the state level and then implement at the local level. Finally he mentioned that if fees are set at an attractive level, localities could probably cut their workloads significantly. Sharon Adams said she liked the idea of a lifetime license but wanted to know how that was associated with a current rabies vaccination; could it be that a person could have his dog vaccinated, get a lifetime license and not get another rabies vaccination. Scott Miller and Benny David commented that the concept would be that if a dog's rabies vaccination was not up to date, the license would not be considered valid. Terry Taylor commented that in regard to Scott Miller's first idea that the VVMA has very specific and strong policies at the national organization level as far as licensing is concerned. Terry Taylor then went on to suggest that he thought the VVMA could probably support the concept expressed in Scott Miller's first idea as long as a county ordinance clearly tied the rabies vaccination certificate was the license and that the license was only good as long as the rabies vaccine was current and that the dog had very specific owner identification and contact information. Terry Taylor also stated that the VVMA supported the concept of lifetime licensing as well.

Matthew Gray commented that he like both of the TVA's ideas but offered that perhaps we are being too specific and wondered if we should just put forward that localities should just decide for themselves since there are places in the *Code of Virginia* where localities are given discretion. Alice Harrington asked how kennels would be handled and Scott Miller stated that they would be handled the same way they are now. Debra Griggs asked Matthew Gray to clarify his statement about localities deciding for themselves and he responded that localities could be given the authority to, by local ordinance, develop their own licensing procedures including price, types of licenses and whether or not they would require licenses or have a vaccination certificate as a type of license. Scott Miller offered that it would probably be good to offer to localities some parameters in regard to licensing. Heidi Meinzer inquired about whether a rabies certificate had a space for a microchip number and Terry Taylor responded that there was not but one could be added.

Sharon Adams commented that if licensure is a local option, we have retreated from what she thought would have been a position of unanimity which was the importance of rabies vaccination compliance and that Virginia is second only to Pennsylvania in the number of rabies cases in cats it reports and third

in the nation in regard to the number of dogs it reports. She also stated that we talked about what the cost associated with stray animals relative to licensing. A question was asked about the statewide database local option and Julia Murphy offered that the question that was asked of localities in the surveys was specifically about opting in or out of the statewide database, not opting in or out of licensing itself. Alice Harrington asked what the purpose of statewide database would be if all localities did not participate and Scott Miller offered that localities could be mandated to participate.

Rob Leinberger added that he liked the idea of a local option, but thought it would be important to have information regarding what those options are. Heidi Meinzer offered that we perhaps should include in the report that rabies vaccination is a high priority and that is a locality decided to use the option of an animal identification requirement and then if a locality experienced a decline in compliance with rabies vaccination, that locality would need to assess that.

Julia Murphy offered that rabies vaccination is very important and licensing is related to rabies prevention and control in regard to how much licensing helps to support animal control since animal control is an important partner in rabies prevention and control. So while the health department is not in charge of licensing, in as much as licensing helps support animal control, this can help the health department with rabies prevention and control.

Matthew Gray commented that he does not understand the connection between having a rabies vaccination and having a license. He further commented that his veterinarian advises him about the requirement to have a license, but does not see how not having a license would affect public health.

Julia Murphy commented that rabies vaccination and licensing can be connected in that the support licensing gives to animal control assists with rabies prevention and control and the National Animal Control Association supports licensing as a form of animal identification, proof of ownership and source of financial support for animal services.

Sharon Adams commented that many national organizations such as the American Veterinary Medical Association, National Animal Control Association and National Association of Shelter Veterinarians support licensing. Scott Miller stated that we are still supporting a mechanism of tracing the dog.

Carolynn Bissett asked if the group could refocus the group to evaluate the thoughts in the first draft of the conclusion to see where the group could agree or not. Terry Taylor commented on the memo that the VVMA submitted and listed the ideas that the VVMA could support and listed multiyear licenses, localities developing online options for purchasing a license, developing a lifetime license and raising the maximum fee a locality could charge for a dog license. He then went on to say that the VVMA would have some very serious concerns about eliminating dog licenses altogether (although he thought the VVMA could support a vaccination certificate as a license) and would vehemently oppose a requirement that veterinarians sell licenses. Terry Taylor also stated that the VVMA felt that certain suggestions like eliminating license fees altogether and a requirement to microchip dogs may not be well received by the General Assembly.



Julia Murphy then asked for the group to review the written comments Larry Land submitted via email prior to the meeting about the local government officials thoughts about our deliberations. These were "The 2 basic principles that would guide VACo's position on work group recommendations is 1.) our opposition to un-funded mandates and 2.) localities would preserve the option of managing their own programs. At the last meeting we plainly heard from Loudoun County representatives about how much they believe their program is working for that county. Participation in a statewide database should be optional.

One other concern: Generally, with respect to any state program, VACo has opposed any procedure requiring localities to remit to a state agency any portion of revenues collected by a locality. In a past meeting, I recall some discussions of such a procedure that would be utilized to help pay for the development of a statewide data base."

Julia Murphy then started to review the first draft of the conclusion. The first paragraph associated with ideas that this group might be able to put forward to the treasurers was reviewed and Julia Murphy asked the group if as we go through the ideas in the report she would like to as the concepts are discussed whether there was unanimity on each concept discussed. Debra Griggs commented that, from a formatting perspective, she liked the list of the ideas expressed in the conclusion that was presented at the last meeting and perhaps this format for the conclusion should be considered in the final report. Julia Murphy then reviewed the first paragraph which encourages the TVA to encourage its members to pursue multiyear licensing in their localities and the concept of lifetime licensing with provisions like the next to maintain proof of current rabies vaccination on file with the locality. William Tydings expressed that he thought it was important that as part of a lifetime license people are told they must keep their rabies vaccinations up to date or the lifetime license is void because it would be an incentive for people to not allow their rabies vaccine to expire. Sharon Adams then mentioned that she had not seen an online option for licensing in the conclusion and Julia Murphy noted language to that effect. Scott Miller inquired and then conversation ensued in regard to the microchip implant aspect of the lifetime license. Heidi Meinzer commented that she thought there was unanimity in regard to lifetime licenses provided the rabies vaccine was up to date and the dog was readily identifiable. Conversation ensued in regard to the best language to use in regard to dog identification. Benny David mentioned that he thought it would be helpful if there was an incentive to microchip and Scott Miller suggested that perhaps we could include language that encouraged localities to offer license fee discounts for dogs with microchips. William Tydings mentioned difficulties in regard to enforcing the wearing of dog tags. There was a unanimous agreement that these were concepts that could be supported by the group.

The group went to the public comment period. Les Foldesi mentioned the proposal he submitted for consideration in regard to an Access database as a start to a statewide system would be an evolving database. He also mentioned that, if he was in charge of a database, he would want, and recommend the group consider, general funds directed for that effort since he thought trying to collect fees from the localities would be difficult. When a person paid for a dog license, that person would receive a note from the state thanking them for being in compliance and then the locality would receive a list of residents who purchased a license from the state. Nina Stively, Director of Loudoun County Animal Services, commented that Loudoun has good system for licensing and as long as they were allowed to continue with their system that is what they would be interested in.

Julia Murphy then renewed discussion about the paragraph associated with lifetime licensing, multiyear licensing and encouraging treasurers to consider an online method of dog owners paying for licensing. She checked again in regard to the group's support and it was unanimous in regard to these concepts.

Julia Murphy then initiated discussion about language associated with a microchip serving as a tag which was a concept that had been discussed at previous meetings. Conversation ensued about its inclusion in the report and what would the TVA need to consider in this regard. Julia Murphy then recommended to the group that since this concept may be associated with other recommendations to the treasurers that came later in the conclusion, perhaps we could continue to discuss other concepts in the conclusion and see if that was the case and how groups felt about that. She then went on to the paragraph that discussed no cost licensing, specifically a system whereby veterinarians would be supplied with county/city tags and then those would be given to dog owners when they had their dogs vaccinated. She reviewed the concept based on the responses of the treasurers whereby there was a request to look into how administrative burden could be alleviated while also considering the VVMA surveys responses which indicated that veterinarians may be willing to assist in the licensing process provided they did not have any increased administrative burden. She reviewed the cautions she included to the treasurers in regard to the need for an economic analysis if a locality was going to forgo licensing and also consider if this would have any effect on the activity we want to encourage which is rabies vaccination. Scott Miller suggested that this option be removed because it would create a situation where veterinarians would have to distribute tags. Debra Griggs commented that having a rabies certificate serve as a license was perhaps another form of no cost licensing. Terry Taylor mentioned that he thought the no cost licensing language was redundant to other options and Jamie Hawley and Benny David mentioned that it would be difficult for veterinarians who see clients from multiple localities to manage. That paragraph was then removed from the conclusion.

Julia Murphy then moved on to the paragraph that discussed the suggestion from the group that the TVA encourage its members to consider automated systems of data management to decrease administrative burden. This concept included encouraging localities that use automated systems to reach out to other localities or perhaps consider contacting with other localities to assist with rabies certificate data management. Julia Murphy asked if the group agreed with this and there was unanimity associated with this concept.

Julia Murphy then reviewed the paragraph detailing a concept that had been discussed in previous meetings and was reflected in some of the consumer surveys which was encouraging the TVA to make greater efforts associated with education of the general public about dog licenses and/or the options available for purchasing dog licenses. Suggestions within this concept included working with veterinarians to have point of vaccination education about licensing, encouraging treasurers to have an online option for licensing, contracting with agents such as animal control, grocery stores and pharmacies to sell dog licenses. In addition, at the request of VACA, Julia Murphy added that another option for the treasurers to consider was transferring the responsibility of dog licensing to animal control officers. Debra Griggs mentioned that she had not remembered discussion of licensing education that included educating consumers about how licensing money is used since we learned that the money in most cases is put in the general fund, but was ok with leaving that in. These concepts were supported by the entire group.

Julia Murphy then discussed the summary of the VFHS proposal which included a requirement for all dog owners to have a dog identification requirement in lieu of licensing and having all rabies certificates associated with vaccinated dogs being sent to the local animal control agency instead of the treasurers.

Terry Taylor commented that the VVMA could not support this option if it was being done in lieu of licensing and said that if it could be changed to state that a dog would be considered licensed if this was in place. Heidi Meinzer commented that she thought perhaps the language associated with this paragraph should start with identifying it as a VFHS proposal and Debra Griggs responded that she thought that may pigeonhole the suggestion. Julia Murphy suggested that this could be an option where if there was not unanimity, then groups could remark on their support or opposition or perhaps the VVMA could comment on their thoughts that this identification should be in lieu of licensing. Scott Miller commented that the license goes along with the rabies vaccination. Terry Taylor commented that he is not sure we need this. Robin Starr mentioned that the group had talked about the local option of having the rabies vaccination certificate serving as the license. Terry Taylor said the difficulty was the phrasing that referred to this option in lieu of licensing because the VVMA could not go against the American Veterinary Medical Association in this regard. Scott Miller commented that there needs to be something on a dog's collar so that an owner can be found. Heidi Meinzer and Debra Griggs stated that they could review the VFHS proposal in that regard. Benny David commented that having proof of ownership is important and paper trail/background information like a rabies certificate to trace a dog back to is important.

Carolynn Bissett suggested that given the time, it might be best if Julia Murphy reviewed the comments and discussion from today and sent the next version out and then groups could comment on where they could or could not support an option. Scott Miller suggested that we may not want to be too specific in regard to the identifying information we say needs to be on a dog since some people are sensitive about their telephone numbers being included in that.

Debra Griggs suggested that the VFHS could rework their proposal to offer that the rabies vaccination is the license. Julia Murphy then continued with the paragraph associated with the VFHS proposal where she wrote that, not unlike the no cost licensing language, localities would need to consider that this option would result in dog licensing no longer being a revenue stream, the *Code of Virginia* sections that would need to be modified and the Board of Veterinary Medicine regulations that would need to be reviewed. Mathew Gray offered that he thought including the phrasing associated with this option not having a revenue stream was not necessary and that localities are not going to forgo a revenue stream without doing an analysis. Julia Murphy asked if it would be clear to a treasurer, in regard to this proposal, that this option would result in no licensing revenue. Debra Griggs stated that if we are leaving the option to the locality, perhaps some would charge or develop a mechanism whereby the dog owner could be charged. Terry Taylor stated that the veterinarians would not want to collect fees and so the only other way to collect money in regard to this option would be if the locality sent a bill to the owner. Debra Griggs offered that we do not want to micromanage how localities would do this.

Julia Murphy then went on to describe the paragraph about the concepts in the VAAS proposal of greater penalties for noncompliance with licensing as an idea to present to the treasurers. Matthew Gray commented that he was in agreement with the first sentence, but not the second sentence in the paragraph. Robin Starr and Debra Griggs commented that they did not think this paragraph fit well into the conclusion. Julia Murphy responded that it was in the context of discussions we had before about motivating behaviors which could be done by either a carrot or stick approach. Benny David mentioned that since treasurers have stated that licensing is not profitable, that this penalty money would be funding coming back to the treasurer's office. Robin Starr commented that localities can already enforce penalties by all the means that the law permits and so they do not need this instruction. Julia Murphy commented that perhaps in trying to distill down this information, she mischaracterized the VAAS proposal and should ask VAAS about it.

Julia Murphy then asked the group if would be acceptable if she would review the deliberations of today and send out another draft of the report for everyone's review with the conclusion stratified into areas where, based on our discussions today, there seemed to be unanimity and areas where there was not or areas where there was a questions in that regard. With the next version of the report, groups would be asked to comment on where they agreed and when they could or could not support certain concepts. Jamie Hawley asked if we could include in the statewide system aspect of the conclusion the idea it was suggested that the statewide system could be funded by general funds and Terry Taylor commented that if a statewide system took money away from animal control, the VVMA could not support it. Terry Taylor also asked if we could include a paragraph that we suggest the concept of raising the maximum fee for licensing.

Matthew Gray offered that he wanted to encourage Julia Murphy in working on this draft to include that that there was broad consensus for first item in the TAV proposal and that everyone seems to be in agreement about that. Matthew Gray offered that VAAS's disagreement on one point is not contention. Julia Murphy responded that she wanted to be honest who was and who was not in agreement on any concept and she knew that throughout this process that there would be things we would not all agree on. Robin Starr agreed with Matthew Gray in stating that she thinks there was broad support for the first item on the TAV's proposal. Julia Murphy responded that she did not want to ignore the minority and wanted to be fair to all parties and include which groups supported certain concepts and which did not and would like to highlight particularly where we had unanimity.

Carolynn Bissett suggested that Julia Murphy review the deliberations from today and send out another version of the report and allow any group to comment on the concepts included in the conclusion.