

## Companion Animal Licensing Procedures Work Group Meeting Minutes

Meeting date and time: 5/24/2016, 10a-2p

Meeting place: Virginia Tech Richmond Center  
2810 Parham Road, Suite 300  
Richmond, VA 23294  
Room 333

Attendees: Jaime Hawley, Piedmont Health District, Virginia Department of Health  
Jodi Collins, Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services  
Sharon Adams, Virginia Alliance for Animal Shelters  
Paulette Dean, Danville Area Humane Association  
Robin Starr, Richmond SPCA  
Matthew Gray, The Humane Society of the United States  
Alice Harrington, Virginia Federation of Dog Clubs and Breeders  
Debra Griggs, Virginia Federation of Humane Societies  
Heidi Meinzer, Virginia Federation of Humane Societies  
Patricia Duttry, Three Rivers Health Department, Virginia Department of Health  
Susan Seward, Virginia Veterinary Medical Association  
Terry Taylor, Virginia Veterinary Medical Association  
Julia Murphy, Virginia Department of Health  
Leslie Knachel, Virginia Board of Veterinary Medicine  
William Tydings, Virginia Animal Control Association  
Rob Leinberger, Virginia Animal Control Association  
Larry Land, Virginia Association of Counties  
Richard Cordle, Virginia County Treasurer's Association  
April Rogers, Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles  
Kathy Strouse, Virginia Animal Control Association  
Larry Pritchett, Virginia County Treasurer's Association

Dr. Murphy began the meeting by welcoming everyone and thanking both the work group members for their participation and members of the general public for attending. All work group members introduced themselves. Dr. Murphy then brought to the group's attention the copies of the agenda and HJ160 that were available for anyone who needed them. At that point, hard copies of Ms. Kurz presentation were distributed to the work group members. Dr. Murphy updated the work group in regard to the progress associated with the dog licensing procedures survey development and distribution. She reported that all surveys had now been finalized and all had been made into electronic form. The County Treasurers' Association (CTA) was taking the lead on distribution of the survey designed for local treasurers, the Virginia Veterinary Medical Association (VVMA) was taking the lead on distributing the survey designed to capture thoughts of veterinarians and the Virginia Animal Control Association (VACA) was taking the lead on distributing the survey designed for animal control officers. Responses to these surveys will all be captured in electronic form, however Scott Miller, who is coordinating the distribution of the treasurers' survey and Rob Leinberger and William Tydings, who are coordinating the survey of animal control officers, that it would be prudent to share the survey in Word document form with local treasurers and animal control officers for their review prior to initiating the online version of the survey since the answers to some questions may require some research. In

addition, Dr. Murphy relayed to the group that an electronic form of the general public survey had been developed by the VVMA since some veterinarians requested that as an option. The VVMA, therefore, will be distributing the survey in an online and Word document form. VACA will also be assisting with distribution of the Word document version of the general public survey. All Word document based surveys will be sent to Dr. Murphy and then be entered into an electronic form that can be blended with the online general public survey.

Ms. Griggs expressed concern about the length of the treasurers' survey and if that may affect response.

Mr. Cordle responded that he shared those concerns as well and that some questions would require research and outreach to other local government partners to answer.

Dr. Murphy responded that, while all stakeholders who were being surveyed were important, she saw the treasurers and ACOs as a particularly important part of understanding the day to day administrative and financial responsibilities associated with licensing and so it was thought that having a more detailed and longer survey for these groups was important.

Ms. Starr offered a concern that the method of distribution of the general public survey would not be as likely to reach low income owners and that responses are likely, with the current method of distribution we are using, to skew toward the pet guardians who are able to afford full service veterinary hospital care. Hearing from this demographic would be invaluable since their views may be different than those who seek services at full service veterinary hospitals.

Ms. Adams agreed with Ms. Starr and volunteered that we could probably identify 5 or 6 facilities that serve low income pet owners and ask if those facilities could help us coordinate outreach to their client base.

Ms. Griggs inquired about an electronic copy of the general public survey and asked if she could coordinate sending out this survey through VFHS.

Ms. Adams volunteered that VAAS has discussed this study as part of their workshops and she could coordinate outreach in regard to the consumer survey as well as ACOs with VAAS members.

Ms. Harrington inquired about how we would maintain validity and reliability in regard to the distribution of the general public survey expressing concern that, based on the current method we were using, the possibility existed that one person could complete the survey multiple times and we would not be able to control for that.

Dr. Murphy replied that she would emphasize to those coordinators of general public survey distribution within each participating stakeholder group that every effort should be made to distribute general public surveys in a way that decreased the likelihood of duplicate entries. She also stated that she would make it clear in the final report that a limitation of the general public survey was that we did not uniquely identify each survey and so the possibility exists that some members of the general public completed the survey more than once, but that we felt it was the best way forward given the time we had and given our desire to bring feedback from the general public to our efforts. She also stated that she would ask about the method each group that distributed the general public survey was using in regard to trying to control for repeat completions of the survey.

Dr. Collins and Ms. Adams offered that the general public survey was not really meant to be used as formal research analysis tool, but rather a general opinion survey.

Ms. Hawley inquired about whether social services or health departments could be used as a mechanism to distribute the general public survey.

Ms. Harrington requested that the Virginia Federation of Dog Clubs and Breeders be a coordinating stakeholder group in regard to distributing the general public survey since most of the groups involved in that effort were shelter rescued groups.

Dr. Murphy responded that the Virginia Federation of Dog Clubs and Breeders could certainly participate in that effort as could any of the groups represented on the work group in regard to outreach to the general public and what she would ask is that any group assisting with outreach to the general public take measures to decrease the likelihood of repeat entries. She also reiterated that she would make it clear in the final report that the limitations of the general public survey.

Dr. Murphy then introduced Ms. Kurz with the Office of the Attorney General who had been invited to offer an overview of the Freedom of Information Act and discuss the sections of the *Code of Virginia* that spoke to dog licensing since these items may have some bearing on how we proceed in the group's discussions of the feasibility of a statewide system to capture rabies vaccination and licensing information.

Ms. Kurz explained that she is council to the state department of health specifically the local health districts and the Office of Epidemiology and the Office of Emergency Preparedness and Response within the Virginia Department of Health (VDH). Ms. Kurz offered that her understanding of one option we were considered was a registry of rabies vaccinations and license information and so wanted to review some of the public information aspects of a system like that. She noted that the Freedom of Information Act would a law that would apply in regard to public information and that it requires that all public records be open to all citizens of the Commonwealth and that a public record is a record in the possession of a public body. A record is something written that a public body has in its possession and that the Act states that records maintained in a public database are a public record. Definition of a public body is also broad and includes state agencies and localities and also applies if a public body delegates the management of a system to a contractor or the database management is largely supported by public funds. There are records that are exempt from FOIA like bank information, credit care expiration and social security numbers and driver's license numbers. There is not an exemption for a person's contact information unless it's tied into a medical record or a personnel record. She then reviewed what is currently considered open to public inspection when it comes to animal licensing such as the name and address of the owner, date of payment, and the year the license was issued and whether the animal was spayed or neutered. Mr. Tydings pointed out that veterinarians are required to send rabies certificate information to the treasurer. Ms. Seward also mentioned that veterinarians need to share information about animals if they are requested to by a local official like and ACO due to a bite issue. Ms. Kurz also mentioned that additional information beyond what is currently collected in the process of licensing and on rabies certificate could be collected, but to be mindful of the Government Data Collection and Disseminated Practice Act which instructs government agencies to collect only the information that authorized by law and is appropriate, needed and relevant. That act also then imposes controls on unauthorized disclosures and for correcting data. Could put language about a public registry in the *Code of Virginia* and that could be a mechanism for FOIA exemption. Other registries in the *Code*

include the human immunization and donor registries. Child support enforcement and sex offender registries have certain aspects of them open to the public. The registry that may be most relevant to explore for our purposes is the Dangerous Dog Registry which is available in full to ACOs, but then only certain elements are available to the public. Ms. Adams then inquired about discussions about the definition of public record and how that relates to an organization that is a contractor with a locality particularly in regard to legal language that refers to an organization that is principally funded by public funds. Ms. Kurz responded that there have been a number of legal opinions in this regard and any situation would need to be assessed on a case by case basis. Ms. Harrington asked how often are there are challenges to FOIA. Ms. Kurz mentioned the FOIA Advisory Council in regard to where members of the general public can view information on FOIA case opinions and, while it has happened in the past, it is unusual for a person or organization to sue a public body in regard to records they feel should have been released. Ms. Kurz then reviewed *Code of Virginia* sections in regard to licensing and may need to be amended depending on how this group decides to proceed. *Codes of Virginia* sections 3.2-6527, 3.2-6532, 3.2-6526, 3.2-6528, 3.2-6531 were then reviewed.

Dr. Murphy asked the group to consider what a statewide data system might look like especially in light of the information Ms. Kurz presented and see if we can come up with a list of problems were trying to solve in regard to licensing sine that might help inform the options we present in a final report and also assist with the information we can share with other agencies or groups we may invite to address this group.

Ms. Griggs mentioned that for any potential solution we put forward, we will need to talk about the potential for unintended consequences of that solution

Dr. Murphy responded that in the final report it would be important to list considerations, advantage and disadvantages of any option we put forward

Mr. Leinberger offered that he thought the use of the Dangerous Dog Registry might be a viable option to consider.

Ms. Meinzer inquired about how ACOs access the Dangerous Dog Registry and Mr. Leinberger responded that an ACO must log in to gain access and the public can see some parts of the registry.

Mr. Tydings stated that a limitation to the Dangerous Dog Registry is that ACOs can only see information in regard to dogs in their jurisdiction and if he needs another jurisdiction or state's help in getting that information.

Ms. Adams inquired about what she thought was an updating or further development in the Dangerous Dog Registry and if Dr. Collins knew anything about that. Dr. Collins replied that she could follow up with Dr. Bissett in that regard.

Ms. Harrington asked if the Dangerous Dog Registry was created that way for a specific purpose or did it just evolve that ACOs only has access to their jurisdiction's information and Mr. Leinberger said it was his understanding that it just evolved that way.

Mr. Leinberger also stated that ACOs, provided they are certified, can also get data via the DMV system.

Ms. Harrington inquired about how many dogs were in the Dangerous Dog Registry and the answer by

Dr. Collins was approximately 488. Ms. Harrington then inquired about using a system that had information about 488 dogs to thousands of records and if that registry had the capacity to handle that amount of data. She also mentioned that we would need cross jurisdictional functionality with a rabies vaccination and licensing system.

Dr. Murphy stated that an important consideration in regard to databases is trying to anticipate how much capacity a system has and if an existing system could handle or be developed to handle that amount of information that would need to be recorded in it.

Mr. Leinberger stated that the amount of data for each dog in the dangerous dog registry was much more than what we would be entering in regard to rabies vaccinations and licensing.

Dr. Murphy explained that her thought for the next meeting was to invite managers of statewide data systems in other state agencies and ask for each party to give an overview of that system including the financial and administrative considerations associated with maintaining that system and what recommendations each would have for the group in regard to best practices or pitfalls to avoid in regard to any system we may suggest.

Ms. Starr recommended that we should discuss the issues that the General Assembly was trying to solve in regard to this resolution what the purpose of the study was. For instance, was the goal increased revenue? assisting localities with lost dogs?

Ms. Griggs asked the treasurers if they could speak to the problem since, as a consumer on the face of it, she doesn't know that she necessarily sees the problem with the current system.

Mr. Cordle responded that may be a better question is to ask what is the purpose of licensing and thinks that at least in recent years this has been driven by rabies compliance and an accounted for if there is a bite issue. Issues that treasurers have is the noncompliance with licensing and offered that this may represent poor compliance with rabies vaccination compliance.

Dr. Murphy offered that it is important to remember that rabies vaccination and licensing are two different things and that, based on a small study that the treasurers have already done, there seems to be a greater tendency for dog owners to be in compliance with rabies vaccinations than licensing. She also offered that to have an appreciation of the rabies compliance rate, a locality would need to do a dog population survey. She also offered that it was her understanding that the treasurers association was interested primarily in making licensing more efficient and taking from a 2 step process to a 1 step process.

Ms. Starr pointed out that when Richmond SPCA staff send rabies certificate information to the city treasurer they are told that the treasurer does not want that. In addition, she agreed that it is important for dogs to be vaccinated for rabies, but is still unclear on the purpose of licensing.

Mr. Cordle offered that he thinks that a discussion about the purpose of licensing was one of the issues the treasurers association was trying to raise with this study.

Ms. Seward commented that she thinks one of the original reasons for licensing when the laws were created a long time ago was livestock predation, although that is not the main reason now, but that the human health component has now become a main factor and Ms. Adams also offered that the return to

owner component was a reason for licensing.

Ms. Adams mentioned that it is important to remember that licensing compliance used to be about 25% and now, based on the smaller survey of 8 localities that the County Treasurer's Association did it is now 57% and so the statistics should be taken into context in regard to previous compliance. She also asked what is being done in localities among veterinarians, treasurers and ACOs to help improve compliance since it varies widely among localities. She also mentioned that even if localities are not seeing much revenue from licensing, that is sometimes expected in government functions and if licensing helps with rabies compliance and return to owner rate and the license fee could be seen as a user fee where people could understand that their ownership of an animal may place some extra reliance on some public services, those were the way licensing could be helpful.

Ms. Hawley thought vaccination compliance in her area was not good based on a recent rabies exposure investigation she led whereby 3 of 4 dogs owned by the same person had never been vaccinated.

Ms. Griggs asked Mr. Cordle if there is any indication that the 2006 law requiring veterinarians to submit certificates to the treasurer has increase rabies vaccination compliance and asked Dr. Murphy if asked if there had been any noticeable change in the number of animals diagnosed with rabies since that law was enacted. Dr. Murphy responded that there was not any noticeable change in lab confirmed cases of rabies.

Ms. Seward highlighted the survey by the CTA which measured the licensing compliance from 2006-2008 and noted the increase in licenses sold based on that survey. Mr. Cordle responded that, in Chesterfield, it has since decreased.

Ms. Griggs asked about the purpose of licensing and Ms. Starr offered that she thinks discussing the purpose of licensing before we discuss or contemplate a statewide database would be important.

Dr. Collins mentioned that the purpose of licensing has likely evolved over time and is different for each locality now and that what we have been tasked to do as part of the joint resolution is one thing, no one has stated that we necessarily have to propose a statewide database and we should be receiving additional information in the responses to the surveys that can help guide our thoughts in that regard.

Ms. Harrington offered that perhaps the tag her veterinarian already gives her when she gets her dogs vaccinated for rabies could serve as the license and that maybe a county license tag was not needed.

Dr. Murphy mentioned that the tags (at least from a state law perspective) veterinarians often issue when they vaccinate dogs for rabies are not required and so if this group wanted to makes that recommendation, we would need to propose a change to the law.

Ms. Meinzer offered that the main goals she sees with licensing are would put forward would be to making sure that and rabies status can be confirmed quickly and return to owner, but that revenue does not seem to be a goal and so maybe that would remove the treasurers from the process. In addition, low cost option might be to have a rabies tag and some requirement to have other identification on your dog.

Dr. Murphy offered that perhaps treasurers could just issue tags to veterinarians and ask them to give them out when they vaccinate dogs.

Ms. Hawley stated she takes her dogs to a veterinarian in another county and so, in Dr. Murphy's scenario, she would not be issued a tag for her county.

Ms. Seward asked if the health department would still want to see a rabies certificate when a bite occurred or would a tag be sufficient. Dr. Murphy responded that the health department would want to confirm rabies status via a certificate. Ms. Seward also stated that perhaps it was an idea to send all rabies certificates to the health department if we would always want to confirm status via a certificate.

Ms. Hawley said she would not be in favor of sending rabies certificates to the health department.

Ms. Seward offered that in Sussex the majority of animal control funds come from the county's general fund, whereas in some localities, the revenue from licensing may be important to that locality.

Ms. Meinzer inquired as to whether health department personnel would accept a rabies certificate submitted to us by an owner and Dr. Murphy replied that we would.

Ms. Seward inquired about how long before a person needs to start the rabies vaccination (PEP) series after an exposure.

Dr. Murphy responded that would not recommend starting PEP provided we had dog or cat; if the dog or cat was not available for a 10 day confinement and if we could not find the dog or cat in 3-4 days, the health department would likely recommend initiating the series. The only time it's too late for the PEP is when person starts acting ill with rabies although we would never want anyone assessed as exposed to wait that long; rabies PEP is an urgency but not emergency.

Mr. Land expressed the importance of not losing sight of the local revenue issue since that can be important to localities and that consumer convenience and knowledge of what to do/how to go about licensing is important.

Ms. Seward mentioned that the Sussex treasurer mails a license notice with property tax.

Ms. Starr if the real purpose of licensing is rabies vaccination, then you may decrease compliance with rabies because now you have attached an additional cost to the consumer and they may be less likely to be in compliance with vaccinating.

Mr. Land asked could you offset a concern about rabies vaccination compliance by creating a system where dogs are licensed when they are vaccinated and decrease the number of steps from 2 to one and it would not cost responsible animal owners any more than they are already required to pay.

Ms. Adams referred to a 2.5 year study done in Virginia Beach where they explained why licensing was important and did not find a reduction in rabies vaccination compliance related to willingness to license.

Ms. Griggs spoke to trying to decrease inefficiency and supporting the thought of making the medical record the equivalent to the rabies tag to try to help reunite pets with owners. She would always want to not add another layer to what the consumer had to do.

Mr. Land stated that he thought there need to be an increase in compliance with licensing since the

revenue can help local governments comply with a lot of the state standards and animal control services and that owners should have some burden in helping to support the system associated with animal control services.

Dr. Murphy reminded the group of our primary assignments as articulated in the resolution and asked the group to focus on some problems that we are trying to solve in regard to the current system particularly informed by the CTA representatives' views on the problems they perceive since it was this group that brought this issue to the attention of the General Assembly. The first item she described was a desire she had heard reiterated in the first 2 meetings to make the process of licensing more efficient and Mr. Cordle agreed stating that the desire for efficiency was both from the treasurers' perspective and veterinarians' perspective and can we build on existing systems to do that. Mr. Cordle asked/offered that the treasurers would be interested in knowing if there was a way to accomplish what needs to be accomplished within the existing system and that the treasurers were looking for way to make the system more efficient.

Dr. Taylor stated that we should start with the assumption that the rabies certificate and whether or not there is going to be an additional cost, that's for someone else to decide, but we are going to have to have some type of unique ID on the certificate since we will need to prove ownership of the animal. Veterinarians already have to send the rabies certificates to the local treasurer and it should not be any more of a burden to send them to another entity like a state agency. He mentioned that Dr. Rucker, the VVMA president, stated at the first meeting that since pharmaceutical companies already can mine veterinary office databases, perhaps VDH or VDACS or whoever maintains this database could be given permission to mine databases at veterinary offices.

Ms. Griggs expressed concern that a veterinarian would allow a pharmaceutical company would have access to veterinary records and Ms. Starr agreed and asked if veterinarians would really be OK with the state having access to their records.

Dr. Taylor responded that this would only be one option of how veterinarians could transmit information.

Ms. Strouse asked if the rabies certificate number truly a unique number for the animal vaccinated or is it only unique to that practice or brand of vaccine.

Dr. Murphy responded that she knew of no number associated with a rabies certificate that was a unique number for that animal or any type of systematic way unique identifiers were assigned to rabies certificates. She further commented that if we wanted to move to a system of unique ID, we would need to issue something like a tag with a unique ID that veterinarians could use which may also help with returning an animal to his owner quickly.

Ms. Meinzer asked if we really need a unique ID if the main purposes of what we are trying to accomplish are confirmation of rabies and getting that dog back to his owner quickly.

Ms. Adams stated that there is a real interest, based on conversation with VAAS members, on the part of one microchip company to work with a state to demonstrate their technology/work with a state on a demonstration project and one microchip company that has developed the ability to rewrite the microchip so that it can be easily updated. So there is a desire for microchip companies and the technology to try and solve the metal tag issue.

Dr. Taylor mentioned his work with the USDA and USDA's efforts with radio frequency ID tags in livestock which was a challenge and that the microchip itself only has a number and so a registry would still be needed. He also stated that he thought while microchipping is a great idea, given the expense of microchipping, he thought the consumer would need other options.

Ms. Knachel suggested that if the issue is that licensing is not profitable for them and the veterinarian do not want to be collecting money that has to be given back to the locality, her suggestion was to have the state purchase tags with unique ID that the veterinarian can purchase from the state, then the veterinarians can recoup their cost for the tags when they vaccinate and send the rabies certificate in to the state via some method to the entity keeping the certificates which then would maintain the registry/database of information.

Dr. Collins asked how money would get back to the counties and Ms. Knachel stated that in the system she just described, counties would not receive any money.

Ms. Hawley stated that she thought her county would not want to relinquish money.

Ms. Griggs offered that if we are trying to do some projections, it would stand to reason that if you have a good database that reunite animals to owners more quickly, you could make some assumptions about the savings to localities.

Dr. Murphy stated that she hopes to get at some of the financial savings and/or burden as well as the administrative savings and/or burden through the surveys sent to treasurers and ACOs and that, since these two surveys were particularly long, a Word document copy of these surveys were sent to ACOs and treasurers so that they could review the questions before going online to answer the questions.

Ms. Adams stated that the Commonwealth of Virginia does have the capacity to issue checks to localities from the sale of the pet friendly license plates and so perhaps funding for localities could come from a central funding source like that.

Ms. Meinzer stated she didn't understand that if the state was going to assume this responsibility why money would come back to the localities.

Dr. Murphy mentioned that it may be that since animal control services and that type of support is a local function, it may be that money going back to the localities would be important to support that function.

Ms. Meinzer stated that she would be ok with giving money back to localities if she knew it was going to animal control.

Mr. Gray stated that he thought there should be an opt in or opt out approach and perhaps based on the conditions in a locality like level of compliance with licensing.

Dr. Collins offered that an opt in/out system would then have some limitations in that an ACO accessing the system could not necessarily guarantee that all dogs that are licensed were in the system.

Mr. Tydings commented that the amount his locality would save by streamlining the system would be

worth it for lost revenue due to not collecting license fees.

Ms. Adams asked if Mr. Tydings's locality would stop doing compliance enforcement if the licensing revenue was lost and he stated he would not and explained the various functions that his localities does for enforcement.

Mr. Leinberger stated that his locality would not be OK with losing the licensing revenue.

Ms. Griggs asked Mr. Leinberger if he had an idea of how many pet owners are licensing their animals in his locality and Mr. Leinberger stated he did not have those figures, but that all of the money is going to directly to animal control and also said that it is now the animal shelter that is following up on noncompliance, not the treasurer, so this is a new system for them.

Ms. Starr asked if Mr. Leinberger knew if since the licensing money was coming directly to animal control, if that meant animal control in his locality was receiving less in general funds. Mr. Leinberger said that they shouldn't be received less in the way of general funds, but perhaps this could be an unintended consequence.

Ms. Griggs stressed again that it will be important to figure out what is the stray intake and what is the return to owner rate and Dr. Murphy responded that's he hopes the answers to some of the questions on our ACO survey will get at that.

Ms. Hawley asked about whether other states who have statewide systems and whether they were going to be invited to address the group. Dr. Murphy responded that Maine and Pennsylvania, the 2 states that had been mentioned at the April meeting were going to be invited to the June meeting to address the group about their systems.

Dr. Taylor mentioned that he thought online licensing was a great idea and he would be in favor of people self-certifying that they have a current rabies vaccination.

Dr. Murphy offered that she would like to suggest to the group a list of problems we are trying to solve to see how the group reacted to her suggestions. They were making licensing more efficient, making the process of return to owner quicker, generating of revenue for the state and/or the locality, privacy issues associated with a database, trying to develop incentives for licensing and making data management associated with licensing, no matter who does it, more efficient.

Ms. Adams expressed that rabies vaccinations are already public record and Dr. Murphy agreed mentioning that what would change in a centralized database is the scope of the information in one place that was available.

Ms. Harrington asked how 3 year rabies vaccinations squared with annual licensing and Ms. Adams replied that some localities have multiyear licenses. Ms. Harrington also asked how someone new to the state becomes licensed and Mr. Tydings responded that a person moving to the Virginia have 30 days to go to the local treasurer to purchase a license.

Ms. Meinzer stated that she thought that making the confirmation of rabies more efficient was important and then for the data management aspect, there is the rabies compliance piece and the owner information piece.

Ms. Adams stated that Virginia Beach uses licensing as another step in responsible animal ownership and tries to help animal owners understand that their reliance of city services increases as a result of pet ownership and while there will always be money in the general fund for animal control services, licensing fees are a part of responsible animal ownership and they have found that to a useful approach to animal ownership. Ms. Adams further stated that she hears some thoughts of the work group that maybe we should move away from licensing, but feels licensing does matter. In incentivizing people, it is important to explain how the money is used and that the money can help defray public costs.

Dr. Murphy mentioned that any group that would like to help coordinate the distribution of the public survey in paper and/or electronic form should identify themselves to Dr. Collins. Virginia Federation of Humane Societies, Virginia Federation of Dog Clubs and Breeders and the Virginia Alliance for Animal Shelters all asked to have a hard copy of the general public survey and an electronic version to distribute.

Ms. Harrington inquired as to how the free text section of the general public survey would be handled as far as a summary of responses.

Dr. Murphy replied that all responses would be entered into an electronic database and reviewed and then any trends in written responses would be, as fairly as possible, characterized in the summary. Dr. Murphy also mentions that all surveys, minutes, presentations and summaries of meetings as well as any materials shared with her by work group members, would be included as attachments to the final report.

Dr. Taylor suggested at end of meeting that we research how the Coggins database is run and how much it costs since it would be akin to what we may want in a statewide database of rabies vaccinations and license information.

Dr. Murphy stated that the goals for the next meeting is to bring information technology experts to address the group and present information about statewide systems that are somewhat analogous to what we are contemplating as a statewide system to collect rabies certificate and licensing information.

Ms. Harrington asked if information about state systems to be discussed next time could be shared with the group in advance.