

AGENDA

COMPREHENSIVE ANIMAL CARE LAWS WORKING GROUP

July 24, 2013

- 1. Welcome and Introductions**
- 2. Re-cap of last meeting: proposed legislation**
- 3. Review of dangerous dog definition**
- 4. Discussion regarding other nuisance animal issues**
- 5. Next steps regarding feral and stray cat issues**
- 6. Adjournment**

§ 3.2-6500. Definitions.

~~"Animal shelter" means a facility, other than a private residential dwelling and its surrounding grounds, that is used to house or contain animals and that is owned, operated, or maintained by a nongovernmental entity including a humane society, animal welfare organization, society for the prevention of cruelty to animals, or any other organization operating for the purpose of finding permanent adoptive homes for animals.~~

~~"Foster care provider" means an individual a person who provides care or rehabilitation for companion animals through an affiliation with a pound, public or private animal shelter, home-based rescue, or other releasing agency, or other animal welfare organization.~~

~~"Foster home" means a private residential dwelling and its surrounding grounds, or any facility other than a public or private animal shelter, at which site through an affiliation with a pound, public or private animal shelter, home-based rescue, or other releasing agency, or other animal welfare organization care or rehabilitation is provided for companion animals.~~

~~"Home-based rescue" means any person that accepts: (i) more than 12 companion animals; or (ii) more than nine companion animals and more than three unweaned litters of companion animals in a calendar year an incorporated, nonprofit animal welfare organization that takes custody of companion animals for the purpose of finding permanent adoptive homes for the companion animals facilitating adoption and houses such companion animals in a private residential dwelling or uses foster home or a system of housing companion animals in private residential foster homes.~~

~~"Incorporated" means organized and maintained as a legal entity in the Commonwealth.~~

~~"Pound" means a facility operated by the Commonwealth, or any locality, for the purpose of impounding or harboring seized, stray, homeless, abandoned, or unwanted animals; or a facility operated for the same purpose under a contract with any locality or incorporated society for the prevention of cruelty to animals.~~

~~"Private animal shelter" means a facility that is used to house or contain animals and that is owned or operated by an incorporated, nonprofit, and nongovernmental entity including a humane society, animal welfare organization, society for the prevention of cruelty to animals, or any other organization operating for the purpose of finding permanent adoptive homes for animals.~~

~~"Public Animal Shelter" means a facility operated by the Commonwealth, or any locality, for the purpose of impounding or sheltering seized, stray, homeless, abandoned, or surrendered animals; or a facility operated for the same purpose under a contract with any locality.~~

~~"Releasing agency" means a pound (i) public animal shelter; or (ii) a private animal shelter, humane society, animal welfare organization, society for the prevention of cruelty to animals, or other similar entity or home-based rescue, that releases companion animals for adoption.~~

**Comprehensive Animal Care Laws Working Group
Wednesday, June 26, 2013**

MINUTES

ATTENDANCE:

WORKING GROUP MEMBERS:

Dr. Jeff Newman
Ms. Sharon Adams
Ms. Paulette Dean
Ms. Dawn Harman
Mr. Rob Leinberger
Ms. Heidi Meinzer
Ms. Robin Starr
Ms. Kathy Strouse
Mr. William Tydings

GUESTS:

Mr. Will Gomma (VFHS)
Ms. Susan Seward (VVMA)

VDACS STAFF:

Dr.Carolynn Bissett
Dr. Daniel Kovich
Mr. David McGreevy
Ms. Lindsey Watson

Time and Place:

This meeting of the Comprehensive Animal Care Laws Working Group was held on Wednesday, June 26, 2013 at 1:00 p.m. at the Richmond SPCA. The meeting was called to order by Dr. Daniel Kovich.

Welcome and Introductions:

Dr. Kovich welcomed all assembled, including members of the public, and briefly went over the agenda for today's meeting.

Public Comments

Jeffrey Kerr (PETA): Would like the opportunity to comment on proposals that were just handed out at a later point in the meeting. Any focus on the private animal shelter definition that includes "the primary purpose" is a red herring. Thinks any language on "the primary purpose" is unenforceable and the definition should include "a primary purpose" instead of "the primary purpose." It appears to improperly and potentially target certain facilities that have always been consistent in best practices of any open admission responsible shelter. In addition to what has been put forward, we have no opposition to the definition of animal shelter that is included in today's packet. It should include a requirement for spaying/neutering. An animal should not leave a shelter without being spayed or neutered and these numbers are included in the annual summary report. Animal shelters should not be permitted to turn away any animals and the intention is not to add to the burden of any government facilities. Also think that there needs to be a separate category called "private adoption agency" that would be subject to regulation for organizations that turn away animals and charge fees to take animals, provide few or no other services, but seek to place limited numbers of animals in adoptive homes. There is also nothing to address what happens to animals that just die in facilities and that requires more intense inspection and investigation. Dealing with rabid animals is also not addressed here. This exposes staff and the public to potentially fatal bites. Home based rescues should be as fully regulated as shelters are. The definition of releasing agency should not include primary purpose language as it is unduly restrictive. The location for transfers of animals from one facility to another needs to be identified in the summary reports kept at the State Veterinarian's

office. There is a deep concern that many animals are being warehoused in a manner that is detrimental to their psychological welfare. If there is an unregulated situation, it is contributing to the overpopulation issue.

Re-Cap of Last Meeting

Dr. Kovich: At the last meeting, we discussed definitions related to animal related facilities. We had a good discussion on the current limitations, gaps, etc. At the conclusion of the last meeting, several people asked for something concrete to look at for this meeting. I took the entire body of the Comprehensive Animal Care Laws and made changes that reflect what we have discussed, with the exception of the feral cat issue. Ms. Meinzer, Ms. Strouse, and I then had a conference call to discuss these changes and came up with what you have here. These do not reflect VDACS' position or my personal opinion, but it is something down on paper to guide decisions. The goal is also to clarify current policies and regulations. To that end, the definitions in the packet are intended to clarify the current definitions. Some expressed concern over the purpose of a private animal shelter. The other document that you have in front of you has some alternatives that Ms. Meinzer came up with to address that issue.

Ms. Strouse: I want to make sure my role in this is clarified. When we met last time, we discussed animal shelter, humane society, and pound so my expectation was a discussion of those definitions. I was surprised to see such a large document and this is a lot to take in and I need a lot of time to mull. I know that the committee will have a lot of questions and concerns.

Dr. Kovich: This is not intended to avalanche people. It is simply some possible solutions to issues we have discussed. All does not have to move forward. Some can move forward and this is a working document. This is the last meeting of the working group where we will have a chance to make decisions to present to the department to move forward for the 2014 General Assembly session.

Ms. Starr: What is the basis for moving something forward? What is consensus ... majority or unanimity?

Dr. Kovich: Broad consensus, meaning most people. If there are just one or two holding out, then we could move forward, but if it is closer to 50/50, then that probably will not move forward. Would like as close to a consensus as possible. The original request for the working group was to provide clarification for the current system. We need to look at this in two ways, consensus on clarity for current laws and then look at actual changes to policy.

Ms. Adams: VAAS requested the working group, both to the House Agriculture Committee and the Commissioner. That request came out of a number of concerns, several voiced by members of the General Assembly who felt like they were being pulled into the animal welfare community with a number of competing interests and points of view. Many pieces of legislation were brought forward that also had impact on other sections of the Code. In response to those conversations with members of the General Assembly and in wanting the animal welfare community to be heard by the General Assembly as a coherent, compassionate whole, VAAS asked that the Committee allow us to have the time to have this process percolate so that we can come back to them with a consensus, not a majority. When disparate parties come together, the process can seem contentious and tedious. With a group of people who have had different experiences, you are going to have long conversations that do not seem to move the ball down the field. I think that is what democracy is. You can come out of the experience with more knowledge and develop a body of law that affects everyone in the Commonwealth, not just the people sitting at this table. While there may be some anxiety or desire to move the process along, it does take a while. VAAS has had two meetings on the document and their view on this, as the originators of the body, is that there is a genuine hope and belief that we will be able to find common ground and consensus where everyone feels a stake in the outcome.

Review of Potential CACL Amendments

Dr. Kovich went through the packet of information handed out at this meeting and explained the many proposed substantive and wording changes to sections of the Comprehensive Animal Care Laws for the working group to discuss.

Ms. Starr: If you are not a releasing agency, you cannot engage in transferring animals?

Dr. Kovich: Correct. You can be an animal welfare organization that maintains an animal shelter, but your options for animal intake would be direct owner surrender only. You can transfer them out as long as the receiving entity matches the definition of a releasing agency.

Ms. Meinzer: The biggest issue was with "private animal shelters." What does the purpose have to be? There are at least a couple of people on this working group that believe, for several reasons, that there should be a primary purpose of adopting out animals for a private animal shelter. These reasons include public perception, what an animal shelter should be, and non-veterinary euthanasia. I tried to make a simple definition that would include those purposes. While we do not want to make it exceedingly difficult for organizations to help, we thought there should be some criteria. This is my attempt to put something out there for a brief definition of public animal shelter.

Discussion of Potential CACL Amendments

Ms. Strouse: The three of us had this conversation and what is the yardstick for "primary?" What happens if someone thinks that you are not being "primary" enough and what happens out of that? VDACS is a regulatory not an enforcement agency. When you start putting that type of language in there, you are opening the door for many problems.

Ms. Adams: I run a private animal shelter and have a huge stake in this and I am not naïve. I think the intention is not fully described by your thinking. I am very troubled by a statement that you made about euthanasia without a veterinarian.

Ms. Meinzer: I struggled with two different issues: an organization whose primary purpose is not to adopt and an organization that either warehouses or euthanizes. Those are both institutions that do not warrant the definition of an animal shelter. They can be something else and should be regulated, but not as an animal shelter. There are a lot of different metrics to look at as a way to find primary purpose.

Ms. Adams: How was that an answer to my question about euthanasia without a veterinarian? Do you have a personal problem with private shelters that choose to euthanize without a veterinarian?

Ms. Meinzer: Private shelters have the right to euthanize without a veterinarian so we need to figure out who should be an animal shelter.

Ms. Adams: So we are backing into that by using the primary purpose of adoption and eliminating those that do not meet your criteria and therefore would lose the right to euthanize?

Mr. Goma: An animal may only be transferred to a releasing agency and to be a releasing agency, your primary purpose should be to adopt animals. Under the current law, the ability to euthanize animals, veterinarians have that. Veterinarians have years and years of training. The other group that is authorized under Virginia law is animal shelters and pounds. There is a public interest in regulating those facilities because the decisions made there are not necessarily made by veterinarians.

Ms. Starr: Veterinarians have a clearer code of ethics that they adhere to when making these decisions and many of us feel that decision rests comfortably in the hands of a veterinarian.

Ms. Strouse: That is almost an implication that open admissions shelters are lacking a code of ethics. I continue to be disturbed by wanting to use one measuring tool when we do not even have a tool to establish primary. Everyone is disturbed by something. By turning away animals, they are abdicating their primary purpose of finding adoptive homes. We run the risk of being very arbitrary. Who is going to decide what shelter's purpose is primary enough? This can have dangerous consequences.

Ms. Dean: Veterinary clinics will accept pets from clients. One particular clinic calls often and asks how full are you with kittens? If they are full, then the veterinarian will euthanize them. Is her decision better than ours if she brought them to us?

Ms. Starr: This discussion feels totally different than previous meetings. Suddenly this seems much more combative. Does not remember these very exercised objections at the last meeting concerning adoptions as a primary purpose. There was a lot of discussion and she does not remember any strongly negative or highly emotional concerns at that time. What has happened in the interim?

Ms. Strouse: There was a discussion of primary purpose. She chose to not debate the point at the last meeting and see what happens when she put pen to paper and shared her opinions during the discussion of definitions with Dr. Kovich and Ms. Meinzer. Do not take her silence for agreement about primary purpose. There is an elephant in the room about the primary purpose language. She is concerned about who is going to be the judge of this.

Ms. Meinzer: She is not doing this because she personally wants to do anything. She is trying to think of what the public thinks a private and public animal shelter should be. Based on conversations she has had, the definition seems reasonable.

Ms. Harman: For private animal shelters, what other purposes are you taking animals in for if not to find them homes? Usually stray animals are taken to pounds or a public municipality.

Ms. Adams: We may be taking them in to provide humane euthanasia. Sometimes the veterinarians turn animals away because the client does not have money or they are not a client and they refer them to us. Citizens have an animal that is suffering and dying in their arms and we provide humane euthanasia. Her point is that where we are going is of deep concern to her is because we continue marginalizing private and public shelters. They did the same thing up until about 10 years ago. What she sees by the documents and discussions in the community, some groups think they have a more noble purpose than another group, etc. This has no benefit to animals.

Ms. Harman: If you are taking them in for euthanasia, then that might be a problem because you are not allowed to take owner requests for euthanasia.

Dr. Kovich: The definition of euthanasia is different in the Comprehensive Animal Care Laws than it is in the veterinary medicine practice definition and the dictionary definition. Someone cannot come into a pound or shelter and ask to have them euthanized. They can surrender the animal and the pound or shelter can make the decision and that does happen a lot. We can separate that definition from euthanasia for other reasons. The proportions of euthanasia at shelters vary for different reasons and that is an important point to remember.

Ms. Harman: Why is it that we cannot make it okay for a person to say they want to have their pet euthanized? They cannot report it that way on the paperwork although we all know that the pet will be euthanized once it has been surrendered.

Dr. Kovich: Resource permitting, for next year's ARS, there will be two different categories of euthanasia.

Mr. Tydings: The inspector has to allow for different categories in the inspection.

Dr. Kovich: There will have to be a discussion with the Board of Veterinary Medicine to see if they are okay with owner requested euthanasia. Is there a consensus on looking at euthanasia as two different types?

Ms. Strouse: If shelters have a fear of being targeted because they are not "primary enough," then they may no longer offer compassionate euthanasia and that would be a real tragedy.

Ms. Adams: We have had a 400% increase in Virginia Beach citizens referred to Virginia Beach SPCA by Virginia Beach animal control for the purpose of euthanasia.

Dr. Kovich: Currently, animal shelters can accept animals in many ways and they can dispose of them by transfer, adoption, and euthanasia. Can an animal shelter exist for the purpose of taking in animals for the purpose of euthanasia?

Ms. Harman: Are there pounds in Virginia that accept animals that they do not try to adopt?

Ms. Adams: There are pounds that only transfer and do not adopt.

Ms. Meinzer: I will be happy to add that they are transferring to another entity who's purpose is to adopt.

Ms. Starr: Primary purpose only applies to private shelters.

Mr. Goma: Every jurisdiction would still have a shelter where a person could bring an animal for any reason.

Ms. Harman: There are no pounds that have obligation to adopt out, but she does not know of any that do not try to adopt or transfer. Is there a suggestion that there are private animal shelters that only accept animals for the purpose of euthanasia?

Dr. Kovich: Yes.

Ms. Adams: The Federation has a petition to remove PETA as an animal shelter. There are three members on the working group that have supported the petition to remove PETA as an animal shelter.

Dr. Kovich: That is not exactly true. They have expressed support for someone else's petition.

Ms. Harman: If PETA has a shelter with a high euthanasia rate, then maybe she is misinterpreting the mission of PETA.

Ms. Adams: Wants to lift all boats in Virginia and does not want to separate animal shelters out in different ways. She wants everyone in Virginia who is interested in animals to be involved. She wants all types of shelters to share obligations. If we want to separate them out with primary purposes, it suggests that the other ones do not have the same purposes. That is not the direction she wants to go or that VAAS want to go.

Ms. Meinzer: I try to stay in the middle of the road. I still believe that the primary purpose language is legitimate with many different issues including the perception of what a shelter is.

Ms. Starr: I fundamentally disagree with what you just said. Public and private animal shelters are quite different. We have fundamental things in common and share a deep dedication to animal welfare, but also recognize that roles and funding and obligations are different. Public animal shelters have an obligation to tax dollars and public safety. Private animal shelters are very different. We have donors and obligations to contributed income and roles that provide services that are not within the capacity or pervuew of a public agency. To suggest that we are the same is not reality. As time passes, thankfully, we progress and we provide new services to our community. There is nothing wrong with that as time goes forward and that does not change the respect that we have for public shelters. It has nothing to do with raising all boats. We need to acknowledge differences.

Ms. Adams: Some private shelters have made the choice to be different. Others have made the choice to be the same as public shelters. We made the choice in Virginia Beach to be more like a public shelter and Richmond has decided to be more private. If you and I do not share a common view on what an animal shelter is, then how would the pubic share a common perception on what a shelter is?

Dr. Kovich: It is obvious that today we are not going to come to a consensus on what the primary purpose of a private animal shelter is. If we are going to move forward with proposing legislation, are we going to agree on the new definition of private animal shelter or retain the current definition of animal shelter and re-title it private animal shelter? If we want to move forward, we need to decide if we are going to adopt the new definition.

Dr. Kovich: The question that we need to decide if we are going to leave the definition of private animal shelter the way it is or are we going to adopt something like what is in the packet?

Ms. Strouse: Thinks private animal shelter definition is perfect. For private animal shelters, the donors and staff should make decisions about their primary purpose and not the government.

Ms. Starr: There is no question that a private shelter can make decisions about its own policies, but the question here is who meets the definition of what a shelter is.

Ms. Strouse: Does not think that government should dictate private policies. Does not tell private entities what their purpose must be.

Ms. Meinzer: It incorporates an animal welfare part that is contentious.

Ms. Starr: There are a number of veterinary clinics that take in homeless animals and find them homes. Where do you see these places falling? Do they become a releasing agency?

Dr. Kovich: Currently, they affiliate more with a home based rescue and the clinic serves as a foster home. This is one of the current loopholes.

Ms. Adams: Another situation that we have is boarding kennels where individuals go to look at animals for adoption. Change to the definition of foster home would say that its purpose is as a foster home.

Dr. Kovich: The primary application of this is your PetSmarts, Petcos, and veterinary clinics.

Ms. Starr: It is of some concern to us is that there are some local veterinary clinics that take in animals and place them in homes with no reporting.

Dr. Kovich: That largely has to do with the context in which the veterinary clinics receives the animal.

Dr. Newman: if I have a person that calls and says they have found a dog and we have always allowed them to come in and scan them. A lot of times these people do not know where the shelter is and we let them stay there and call the shelter and let the shelter come and pick them up. That would not be allowed?

Dr. Kovich: That is a different situation where you are doing it for the convenience of animal control. Those situations would vary depending on how you got the animals, what your intent is with it, etc.

Ms. Adams: Would like to move "animal welfare organization" substituting the purposes for the same purpose under private animal shelter. Also move "private animal shelter" and "public animal shelter" as they are revised in today's most recent definition. She is asking for consensus on those. Adopt "private" and adopt "public" and "animal welfare organization" after changing Section 4.

Ms. Meinzer: Thinks it is a huge jump from what is known as a humane society to animal welfare organization and it is leading back to primary purpose.

Ms. Starr: Instead of the new definition being conjunctive, it is disjunctive.

Dr. Kovich: The new definition of animal welfare organization is meant to be broader than the definition of humane society.

Ms. Meinzer: Thinks judges would disagree on the current definition of shelter. The only clear consensus right now is to make pound a public animal shelter.

Ms. Strouse: Am I hearing that everyone is okay with the definition of humane society besides the title? Instead of humane society, keep the definition and use the title animal welfare organization.

Mr. Gomaa: What is the need to have them defined as animal welfare organizations?

Dr. Kovich: This is designed to provide larger framework for organizations that act beyond just taking in animals and disposing of them.

Ms. Strouse: It can still be an animal welfare organization, but not do anything other than assist displaced animals.

Dr. Kovich: It is getting late. Is there a consensus on foster care provider and foster home?

Consensus on:

Pound to public shelter: yes

Definition of public shelter: yes

Merging current sections into one?

Ms. Adams: The animal control people in her area thought rolling it all together was more complicated, especially when presenting cases in court.

Mr. Gomaa: If there are no substantive changes, then why merge?

Consensus to leave them and change the title: yes

Ms. Dean: Why was "unwanted" left out of public animal shelter definition?

Ms. Starr: By who are they unwanted? Who is doing the wanting and unwanted?

Ms. Dean: Example: Another shelter turned them away because the only reason he wanted to turn them in because they were unwanted.

Dr. Kovich: It was taken out because it is unclear.

Mr. Gomaa: We are changing language and have not done a survey of court cases to see how judges saw the language already in the Code. Just in general, the Attorney General's office likes to keep definitions as they are unless there is a need to change them. Does not think this definition is being changed for a substantive reason. The Federation is not in consensus on changing the definition of public animal shelter, just on changing the word from pound to public animal shelter.

Mr. McGreevy: The Attorney General's office reviews all proposed legislation before it goes to the General Assembly.

Dr. Kovich: If the only thing we are on consensus on is changing the word from pound to public animal shelter, then are we going through a lot of effort for no real practical value

Mr. Tydings: Think there is a purpose. Just like years ago when dog catcher got changed. It changes public perception. He thinks this is a good definition and we are beating it to death.

Dr. Kovich: Is there a consensus to move forward with this definition of public animal shelter with the understanding if the Attorney General's office approves the language and reasoning? yes

Ms. Meinzer: Feels that the proposed definition for animal welfare organization can have other implications on TNR and private animal shelter. She needs more time to mull it over. Until then, she's uncomfortable with it.

Ms. Starr: Shares this sentiment, so does Mr. Goma.

Dr. Kovich: Let's back up a step and talk about animal shelter.

Ms. Adams: Gave Wikipedia definition of animal shelter.

Dr. Kovich: Current definition of animal shelter does not serve the Commonwealth well. It does not give any preference to any disposition besides to return to owner, although under strict interpretation, it could be argued that the Code currently gives preference to euthanasia. Proposed definition in the packet casts wide net over what would be considered an animal shelter. It would bring more facilities under inspection that is already in operation.

Ms. Starr: We are referring to the definition of private animal shelter because the definition of animal shelter has already been stricken.

Ms. Meinzer: There are too many interlocking things.

Dr. Kovich: Could we replace animal welfare organization with non-profit incorporated instead?

Ms. Starr: The current proposed definition that does provide that sort of language for primary purpose and we are now talking about going to a definition that does not say that. We are back stepping.

Dr. Kovich: Looking at the current definition of animal shelter, what if we said a private animal shelter means a facility that is owned or operated by a non-profit incorporated organization including a humane society, etc. We are at an impasse and it starts in the current definition with the list of examples and we need to maintain that.

Ms. Strouse: By starting a laundry list, it becomes muddy.

Ms. Adams: if we are going to change this definition, then we are not keeping it. We are changing it.

Dr. Kovich: It looks like there is not going to be consensus on changing that final part of the definition then depending on what other changes we make here, we will probably not want to strike the humane society definition or need the animal welfare organization definition. Let me take a test consensus on the definition of private animal shelter as it is written in this packet. No consensus. Should we just put the word "private" in front of the current animal shelter definition? If we are not combining the Code sections, then we need it there for clarity.

Lack of consensus due to taking out the list of organizations and the last clause. Proposes to merge definition to private animal shelter definition facility that confines and disposes of animals in accordance with this chapter that is owned or operated by non-profit incorporated entity, including a humane society, etc.

Mr. Goma and Ms. Starr think it will impact the rest of the definitions.

Dr. Kovich: There is a split vote so it does not look like there will be consensus on this to move forward for this year. Do not strike through the definition of humane society. We are going to forgo the definition of animal welfare organization. Now we need to discuss a few more things. Foster home and foster care provider.

Proposes that foster care provider mean that it is any person who provides care through affiliation with public animal shelter, private animal shelter, home based rescue, other releasing agency, or animal welfare organization.

Ms. Strouse: Dr. Kovich is bringing us his experience on people who are falling outside of what we already have. They do need to be captured. Animal welfare organization should be kept in this definition.

Mr. Goma: Change individual to person and leave out animal welfare organization.

Ms. Meinzer: Person gets to veterinarians and Petsmarts.

No consensus on foster home statute.

Ms. Adams: There is a conflict between state statute and local ordinances.

Mr. Tydings: Number set by the Board of Supervisors at 50 and he does not like it. Save the number for another day.

Dr. Kovich: Proposal for new definition for home based rescue: incorporated, nonprofit animal welfare organization that takes custody of animals.

Ms. Meinzer: If a person does it on their own, then they slip through the cracks.

Dr. Kovich: Not going to strike humane society. Proposed definition for releasing agency is a public animal shelter, private animal shelter, or home based rescue.

Ms. Strouse: This is turning into a mess. Propose that a simple definition of a releasing agency should be a private animal shelter, public animal shelter, or home based rescue. Then go back to those three definitions to clarify what they are.

Ms. Starr: That backs up from what is the current law. It should include an organization that releases companion animals for adoption.

Dr. Kovich: We will change the wording in the Code sections to just reflect the change of word "pound" to "public animal shelter." The only thing we have consensus on is the name change. Changes to record keeping are off the table.

Next Steps; Future Meetings

Dr. Kovich: VDACS will go back and review the areas where there was consensus and review it with the administration. Even though it may not seem like it, the points of consensus today were significant with the changes to home based rescue, foster care provider, and foster home. He proposes moving on to nuisance animal and dangerous dog issues. We will return to the feral cats issue after discussing dangerous dogs and nuisance animals.

Next meeting: Wednesday, July 24, 2013 at Richmond SPCA at 10:00.

