## COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## HOUSE AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE HEARING

STATE CAPITOL
RYAN OFFICE BUILDING
ROOM 205
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2017

IN RE: HOUSE BILL 1463
DOG LICENSE FEES

## **BEFORE:**

HONORABLE MARTIN CAUSER, MAJORITY CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE EDDIE DAY PASHINSKI, MINORITY CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE STEPHEN BLOOM

HONORABLE KAREN BOBACK

HONORABLE RUSS DIAMOND

HONORABLE MINDY FEE

HONORABLE MARK GILLEN

HONORABLE MARCIA HAHN

HONORABLE RICH IRVIN

HONORABLE MARK KELLER

HONORABLE JOHN LAWRENCE

HONORABLE DAVE MILLARD

HONORABLE DAN MOUL

HONORABLE MIKE TOBASH

HONORABLE RYAN WARNER

HONORABLE DAVID ZIMMERMAN

HONORABLE PAMELA DILISSIO

HONORABLE SID KAVULICH

HONORABLE MAUREEN MADDEN

HONORABLE CHRISTOPHER RABB

HONORABLE EMILIO VAZQUEZ

JEAN DAVIS REPORTING

POST OFFICE BOX 125 • HERSHEY, PA 17033

Phone (717)503-6568

| 1  | COMMITTEE STAFF PRESENT:  |
|----|---|
| 2  | KERRY GOLDEN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, REPUBLICAN CAUCUS                       |
| 3  | MICHELE MUSGRAVE, LEGISLATIVE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT, REPUBLICAN CAUCUS |
| 4  | DESTINY ZEIDERS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS                    |
| 5  |   |
| 6  |   |
| 7  |   |
| 8  |   |
| 9  |   |
| 10 | JEAN M. DAVIS, REPORTER<br>NOTARY PUBLIC                                  |
| 11 | NOTAKI TOBLIC   |
| 12 |   |
| 13 |   |
| 14 |   |
| 15 |   |
| 16 |   |
| 17 |   |
| 18 |   |
| 19 |   |
| 20 |   |
| 21 |   |
| 22 |   |
| 23 |   |
| 24 |   |
| 25 |   |
|    |   |

| 1  | INDEX  |      |
|----|--|------|
| 2  | TESTIFIERS   |      |
| 3  | NAME   | PAGE |
| 4  | RUSSELL C. REDDING, SECRETARY,   | 5    |
| 5  | PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE   | 3    |
| 6  | KRISTEN DUNMOYER, DIRECTOR PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  | 22   |
| 7  |  | E 4  |
| 8  | JANIS CREASON, DAUPHIN COUNTY TREASURER, MEMBER, DOG LAW ADVISORY BOARD  | 54   |
| 9  | JULIAN PRAGER, SECOND VICE PRESIDENT AND<br>LEGISLATIVE CHAIR, PA FEDERATION OF DOG CLUBS<br>FORMER MEMBER, DOG LAW ADVISORY BOARD | 71   |
| 10 |  |      |
| 11 | JOHN GIBBLE, POLITICAL ACTION CHAIR, NORTHEAST BEAGLE FEDERATION, FORMER MEMBER, DOG LAW ADVISORY BOARD                            | 77   |
| 12 |  |      |
| 13 | MARY KENNEDY WITHROW,<br>MEMBER, DOG ADVISORY BOARD  | 82   |
| 14 |  |      |
| 15 |  |      |
| 16 |  |      |
| 17 |  |      |
| 18 |  |      |
| 19 |  |      |
| 20 |  |      |
| 21 |  |      |
| 22 |  |      |
| 23 |  |      |
| 24 |  |      |
| 25 |  |      |
|    |  |      |

| 1  | PROCEEDINGS   |
|----|---|
| 2  | * * *   |
| 3  | MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Good morning,                     |
| 4  | everyone.   |
| 5  | I'd like to call this meeting of the House                  |
| 6  | Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee to order and first  |
| 7  | of all ask you to join me in the Pledge of Allegiance.      |
| 8  | (Pledge of Allegiance)                                      |
| 9  | MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Today's meeting is a              |
| 10 | formal public hearing on House Bill 1463 sponsored by my    |
| 11 | good friend Chairman Pashinski. I'm looking forward to the  |
| 12 | testimony that will be provided.                            |
| 13 | As I said, this is a formal hearing so there will           |
| 14 | be a transcript and the meeting is also being recorded for  |
| 15 | those who can't be here. I know there are several meetings  |
| 16 | going on this morning. I know some members will be in and   |
| 17 | out but we will proceed.                                    |
| 18 | I'm going to ask Michele to call the roll.                  |
| 19 | (Roll call)   |
| 20 | MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Thank you, Michele.               |
| 21 | We agreed to have this hearing because our                  |
| 22 | Minority Chairman sponsored House Bill 1463 and I know that |
| 23 | it's a priority for the Department of Agriculture. And in   |
| 24 | the Senate, Senator Schwank also sponsored companion        |
| 25 | legislation. This legislation would provide for an increase |

-4

1 in dog license fees and provide for an online licensing 2 platform for issuing dog licenses. 3 We issued our hearing notice rather early so that interested parties could provide feedback. We have a number 4 5 of testifiers today to provide feedback on this legislation. 6 And in addition, we've received comments for the record from 7 a number of organizations. The members will find those 8 comments in your packets as additional correspondence. 9 Without further delay, I'd like to move forward 10 with the testimony. I'd like to welcome the Secretary of 11 Agriculture, Russell Redding. He's our first testifier. 12 Secretary Redding, welcome. You may proceed and introduce 13 anyone from the Department that's here with you. 14 SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Mr. Chairman, it's 15 good to see you. It's good to see you up close. 16 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Thank you. 17 We'll give you signals, if necessary. 18 SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: You can give me the 19 signal to move on or stop, whatever. 20 Chairman Pashinski, thank you as well. Good to 21 be here. And to the members of the Committee, it's always 22 good to be with you. Thank you for scheduling the hearing

I'm pleased today to have with me Kristin

Dunmoyer, who is the Director of the Bureau of Dog Law, and

and taking time to talk about the dog law in 1463.

23

24

25

Jonathan Hendrickson, who is our Legislative Director as well and today is our IT specialist. He will be on the PowerPoint.

I think you have a copy of the PowerPoint. You have the testimony. I'm not going to read that. I'm going to use the PowerPoint to try to walk through the issues and to guide this conversation a little bit.

As the Chairman noted, I mean, there's really two important components to this legislation. One is the fee increase. We'll talk about that. But importantly and for the first time, some modernization with it. So it allows both for access to online sales for the dog owners, but it also allows us to do a much better job, we feel, just in how we manage that data file and access to it and particularly in response to first responders and local law enforcement and our wardens. We'll talk about that today.

So just to cut to the chase on this. You can see the issue that's confronting us. We lay out in some detail here, you know, the fiscal year declining fund balance. You'll notice we will not leave the fiscal year we're presently in without going negative and without some action. All of next fiscal year will be negative. So we'll talk a little bit more about that.

Also important to note, for the last couple of years, the General Government Operating Fund for the

Department has supported the Bureau of Dog Law, but we simply can't continue. This \$1.2 million this year -- and we've all been in those conversations, protracted conversations, about how you fund the work of this government. We just don't feel that we can continue to put the \$1.2 million into the Bureau of Dog Law, again, underscoring the need for some action.

There's a couple of reasons for this. One, back in 2009, there was a transfer out of the Dog Law Fund of \$4 million. And ever since that time, it's been difficult to maintain financial stability in the Bureau.

Two, continue to see an escalation of operating costs of the Bureau. And three, one of those hidden points is that we continue to see the increase in the shift to lifetime licenses and away from the annual licenses and the long-term implications of that. If you buy a lifetime license, it's equivalent to about five years of an annual license. Obviously, the life expectancy of dogs are much longer. So a smart decision for the dog owner but it comes at a financial expense here for the Department.

The urgent part is that these now converge in 2017-'18. As the slide notes in the PowerPoint, you'll note that it could be as soon as November of this year. If the Fund goes negative, we have a little control over that just to say that that's part of the billing system within the

Department of Ag. But regardless of what month you take it, you can't end the year without going negative. So that is a key consideration.

The next slide, just to note, as I said earlier, all of next year is negative without some change in the fee structure. We've avoided seeking the increase for several years. I don't think there's anything hidden that this Fund was challenged over the last couple of years. We really wanted to do a couple of things.

One, to bring our Dog Law Advisory Board back together. We relaunched that with a new set of Dog Law Advisory Board members. We wanted to gain that experience of the Board as the Legislature envisioned the Advisory Board being used. We wanted to make sure that we were cutting the costs where they could be cut. And we also wanted to make sure that we were generating the revenue by way of sales that we could. But we can't wait any longer. We're really at a moment where we have to have some action on a fee increase in 1463.

Even with the increased revenues and the cost-cutting, you'll note just a couple of things that we have done since 2012. The Department worked to increase their revenue through sales of dog licenses. There's been a 14 percent increase from 2012 to 2016. That's 120,000 more licenses sold, 12 percent more revenue generated through

those sales, about \$650,000. Interesting, of the increase,

54 percent came from lifetime licenses, to demonstrate the

point earlier that that's where the dog owners are going.

We've reduced expenses on this slide, as you'll note, 486,000. We were looking hard at our expenses, where could you save money. We went to an on-demand printing versus a front printing and distribution. We've eliminated reimbursements to about 50 shelters in Pennsylvania.

I've heard from some of the members of the Committee about that. That's a direct result of just not having money to continue to do the direct support for shelters.

We've leased vehicles versus purchasing. We've reduced the complement in the Bureau from 92 positions to 62 positions. Over that time, that saved us \$650,000 as well.

And as the next slide notes -- a little hard to see here, but we put this in just to demonstrate that a third of the wardens in Pennsylvania are covering two counties or more. So in the original model it was designed to have a warden for every county. We simply can't afford that.

Our financial projections in the actual budget point to some very difficult decisions. We risk, I think, undermining the good work that was done in 2008 to protect dogs and commercial kennels as one concern. And that will

be part of the difficult decision because potentially we end up losing ground there.

We risk having fewer wardens in the state. The dangerous dogs is one of those issues. 520 dangerous dogs in Pennsylvania last year. We risk protecting the stray dogs. Last year we had 5,000 -- over 5,000 stray dogs. The Department was responsible for our wardens and returning those dogs, of course, to the rightful owner.

Responding to dog bites would be at risk here as well. 955 dog bites last year. These are investigations that have been closed or are still continuing. And just a note of interest, that the Insurance Information Institute and the State Farm Insurance actually ranked Pennsylvania fourth in the nation for dog bite cases. So there is a correlation here with amount of work and concern, of course, for the need for licensing and, noted earlier, just the potential for fewer kennel inspections as well.

All of these bad things can be averted with House Bill 1463 and the fee increase that we are seeking. To return the restricted Fund to solvency will require an increase in the price of a dog license. And as noted on this slide and in your packet, this will be the first increase in a fee, license fee, in 21 years for the Dog Law Fund.

The proposal, to note here in the current column,

just look at the top line. The neutered male/female is at \$6.50. That will go to \$10 under the proposal. I'll also draw your attention to the Treasurer component of this.

Under the current program, the Treasurers receive \$1.50 of each of those licenses sold. Under the proposal, that could go to \$2.

Far right column, just for orientation, the inflation-adjusted increase there -- you can see each of these categories -- for some, it's slightly over and others it's under. But to demonstrate the point that you're really talking about, a fee that is commensurate with the last 21 years of inflation. We try to take that into account here and be reasonable about it as well.

The next slide, these fees are comparable in the work of the Dog Law Advisory Board. They did look around the State of Pennsylvania at other dog licensing fees for those jurisdictions that are independent of the State. As an example, you'll see Pennsylvania at \$6.50. Here in Harrisburg at \$12. Scranton is \$35 for an annual license. Altoona, while shown here for the annual fee of \$9, their lifetime license is \$54, as an example.

House Bill 1463 reflects the work, as I mentioned, of the Dog Law Advisory Board, which really included a lot of good thinkers to include Janis Creason, the Dauphin County Treasurer, who you'll hear from soon, as

well as Mary Withrow, who will be testifying. Both of those had great, very constructive insight to dog law generally and certainly how we approach this dilemma of the Fund.

We'll also add convenience and efficiencies. We looked at this hard because it wasn't simply about satisfying a Department need but looking at the stakeholders. And the stakeholders, of course, being the public, No. 1. Secondly, the Department because of the responsibilities, but also our Treasurers in each of the counties, who are the partners for sales of and management of this program.

The wardens and local law enforcement personnel will be able to place a licensed dog, we feel, back to their rightful owner quicker because of the access to the database that would be developed. We spend a lot of time, as they do, once you pick up a stray. Then you've got to do something with it. You've got to manage that piece.

So we get the calls continuously from local law enforcement who picked up dogs. What do you do with them? That also is tied to the shelter point that I made earlier. But just know that there's a lot of time spent.

Important here in this modernization is the opportunity to purchase online. We have counties that operate an online system but we have never had online capability at the Commonwealth level. And that's one of the

changes we're seeking here as well. We can talk more about that and sort of how it would function.

You will be able to, from the convenience of home, go online, purchase it, tag your county. The county is notified. The license will be received. That whole transaction will be seamless from the purchaser's perspective. It will be like shopping on Amazon, right? All that transaction stuff will be worked out. But we've never had that capability. And there's implications.

Presently, as noted, we've got a very fragmented system. So 1463 allows the Commonwealth to create this single online platform, as the Chairman noted in opening statements. It does generate a single statewide database with that, just not the platform and access. Just being able to manage the data will certainly aid enforcement.

And as I often say on the renewal side -- I mean,
I don't know about you, but I need a prompt sometimes,
renewal to get my car inspected, right, to go to the
dentist, to take the kids to, you know, the after-school
program, whatever. We have no capability today to actually
notify you as a license holder that your renewal is
expiring. And that will be one of the real important
functions here, that we can actually send you that note. We
think that's going to be beneficial both from a service
standpoint but help us on the sales side as well.

This proposal will raise an additional 2.8 million. So on this slide -- sorry, Jon. Back up one. So you'll see the highlighted area here. If you look at the '17-'18 year, fiscal year, that would be an additional \$2.8 million raised with this fee increase.

Again, the fee structure is laid out. But the moving from \$6.50 to \$10 on those and the other non-kennel related fees would generate \$2.8 million. This would keep the Fund solvent through 2021.

As you'll note in 1463 and my testimony, this bill also allows the Department of Agriculture to establish by regulation a fee increase. Based on the need, of course, that would all be done in consultation with you and the Dog Law Advisory Board. So just to say that that is an important provision for us -- and we have fought many times about the current dilemma we're in -- we have no ability to adjust those licensing fees absent the legislative change. So going forward we're going to seek that in the legislation with your assistance. So again, that will be done by regulation as well.

On the modernization side, just to note sort of what's at risk here, you'll see that the shelter reimbursements for holding stray dogs, we eliminated the direct grants. But any further sort of reimbursement for that service we do provide on a per-dog basis. Kristen can

talk more about that, if you'd like. That is also at risk now without a fee increase.

1.3

The dangerous dog registry, you know, would be at risk. You know, there's no -- potentially no registration enforcement there. We can talk more about it. But a lot of time is spent with those dangerous dogs and tracking them within the Commonwealth and across state and county lines. Personnel to do the kennel inspections.

One of the original intents of the legislation back in 1893 when the Dog Law was created was this final point about livestock damage. We don't spend a lot of time talking about that but just to say that we still have today losses due to dogs and coyotes. The Fund allows for reimbursement of those costs. That would also be at risk here as well.

And just to wrap up, this proposal provides long-term solvency to the Fund. The initial fee increase, as I noted, would take effect and would carry the Fund through 2021. It would relieve our general government operating by about 1.25 million. And you'll see in some years that has been a direct contribution to the Bureau. Other times it has been a forgiveness, if you will, of the administrative cost to operate that Bureau within the administrative structure when we could afford it, right?

And again, the GGO, given where we are today, and

the difficulty of filling positions, but this would be a benefit to that. It restores the grants that we make to shelters. I say 50. I know that has been as high as 70 shelters across the state that we could reestablish those grants. It provides for a uniform platform both for management of the statewide database as well as the sales portal as well.

I look forward to the conversation this morning.

I just want to say thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to be here. We appreciate Representative Pashinski's sponsorship and Senator Schwank. Important conversation and one of those functions that has been with the Department for over 100 years that we're concerned about. We think it's incredibly important. There is an accountability provision to this for those who own the dogs who just believe that the special Fund should cover the special services provided to those who own the dogs versus our general government operating as it does today in part.

With that, thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Thank you for the information.

You know, the first thing that comes to mind is certainly cost increases over time. It has been a while since there's been an increase. But looking at your testimony, you're advocating for an increase but at the same

time wanting to provide more revenue for the County

Treasurers and also more revenue to be able to give out

grants to other agencies.

And one line in your testimony under the County
Treasurer section says, we hope to help counties turn the
dog licensing function of County Treasurers from a cost
center to a profit center. I'm not sure that we're looking
to turn the Treasurer's operation into a profit center. I
mean, they're providing a service. They should be
compensated for the work that they provide with that
service.

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Yeah.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: But I look at it from a perspective of covering costs rather than creating a surplus to be able to increase costs. I certainly would welcome any comment that you have on that.

And associated with that, it seems as though when looking at all the information here that a lot of dog officers' time is consumed with inspecting kennels. So it looks like when you look at the cost of a kennel license -- I know the lowest category is \$25 -- it seems like dog license fees are supplementing going out and inspecting kennels.

So is there a similar proposal to increase kennel fees to try to cover some of that cost?

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Right. So thank you for the question. Good question on the first part about the Treasurers. You know, we stated that in the testimony to sort of point out that at this time we have County Treasurers who their cost of on-line systems can be as much as \$10,000. That's a cost to the Treasurer and local government that we feel with the on-line system would help alleviate.

Two is we do count on the Treasurers to help market. And at this point, that's been one of the challenges of getting the word out and having a really proactive stance. It's not just for the Bureau and what we do, but having our County Treasurers lead agents within those jurisdictions helps us, you know, advertise and sell licenses.

So that's the profit center component of that.

Right now there's a loss in some counties. That shouldn't be a loss of the service. So we're trying to accommodate that with a slight increase from \$1.50 to \$2 on what they would receive out of the license, annual license, but also make the on-line system available to them at no cost.

On the second point, again, we contemplated what to do with the total fee structure within the program and whether, you know, to seek an increase on the kennels.

Kristen can share sort of the allocation of time that the

wardens spend. But we feel like 87 percent of the fees that

it takes to operate the Bureau come from the annual sales.

That would be most important to really secure some stability on the annual license fee. That's not to say that the other individual kennel fees, license fees, couldn't be considered. That's certainly a possibility.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Thank you.

Chairman Pashinski.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN PASHINSKI: Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary. Good to see you again.

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Good to see you.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN PASHINSKI: There's a couple points I want to make. Number 1, you've been subsidizing this operation at a tune of about \$1.2 million a year. Is that correct?

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: That's correct.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN PASHINSKI: Okay. I just want to share with everyone that I was just approached by my local SPCA to support a municipal agreement. The SPCAs don't have enough money to be able to take care of all the stray dogs that they are collecting. So they are going out to all of the communities from my local area and requesting a fee. It's going to be \$100 per dog that they collect.

If this were to be instituted, you could then restore that \$600,000 and therefore, most likely, eliminate

any potential for the locals having to reach out to the communities. So it seems as though it's sort of top down. If we fund this thing appropriately, you have enough money to operate. You have enough money to help the counties operate at a level where it is not a loss. You're able to then subsidize some of the local SPCAs, which then eliminates a need from the local folks of paying a fee.

Am I on the right track?

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Yeah, you're on the right track. It would certainly be -- assuming several things. One, that those local SPCAs are also designated shelters, right. So in your relationship, it's the designated shelter versus the actual organization. But it would certainly, you know, limit that request to the local to make a local appeal.

It's important to note in this system -- I mentioned the 5,000 dogs that are strays. So when we take possession of that dog, the 5,000, we have to find either the owner or you find a participating shelter. They can't stay in the back of the truck. You've got to do something with them.

And that's important because it's predicated then on our agreements with the local shelters to actually take a dog, that they can hold it until the rightful owner is found. So that's the relationship when we talk about, you

know, why those local grants are so important. We feel that there's an infrastructure there.

Right now we only provide sort of a minimal, you know, reimbursement to them to help. The grants sort of help us build the capacity within the system to make that larger system work by supporting local shelters.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN PASHINSKI: And then could you just, you know, take this a little further relative to the number of dog bites? We're fourth in the nation. The cost involved in that. You've gone from 92 to 62 employees. Has that had any relationship relative to the cost of the dog bites and the insurance obligations and so on?

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: There's not a direct line correlation between them. I think that what we have seen with the limited staff and reducing the complement is that you've got a geography problem. How do you cover -- we all live in areas and how difficult it is to navigate some areas of the State. So we have wardens that have got to cover a larger territory.

I think if there is a challenge, it is on the use of the warden's time for responses to, you know, the strays, certainly responding to the dangerous dogs, but it also shows up in the ability to do the canvassing and sales of licenses. But that's certainly part of the list of the things that wardens have to do.

1 Kristen, do you want to add something?

DIRECTOR KRISTEN DUNMOYER: I was just going to say that we looked based on 2016 numbers. And three-quarters of our time is actually spent handling complaints from the public, via dog bites, damages caused by dogs to livestock, the dog that is running down the street, picking up a stray dog and finding a shelter to transport it.

There are several counties in the State that do not have a local shelter willing to accept strays. At that point, we then have to start calling neighboring counties to find out if that shelter would be willing to accept a stray and then make arrangements to get that dog there.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN PASHINSKI: And staying with that once again, the whole purpose of a dog law was protection of the citizens, you know, and livestock and so on. So, you know, the need is obviously there. Too often we forget about it because maybe you're not approached by, you know, a stray dog that might be vicious.

And one last concern that I have -- Mr. Church, if that's okay?

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Yes.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN PASHINSKI: We have the Dog Law Advisory Board. There's been some concern about providing you with the sole authority to increase fees. Would there

be any process that you'd be amenable to where the Dog Law

Advisory Board might play a role in that discussion?

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Yeah. They should be intimately involved in that conversation. I mean, they helped us design what you see in 1463 in terms of the cost through comparative analysis to look at the forecasting of the next 20 years. I mean, the expectation would be they would be. If we need to formalize that through the legislation, we should do that.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN PASHINSKI: Okay. I appreciate that. Thank you very much.

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Sure.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN PASHINSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: A question came to mind that I wanted to ask. You know, we've talked a lot about dangerous dogs and that that's important to this discussion. And your testimony says that you'll be better able to monitor the registry. What exactly does that mean? And, you know, what exactly do you do in dog bite cases other than monitor where these dangerous dogs are? What is the role? How will this enable you to do a better job with what you do?

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Kristen, do you want to walk through? It's probably important to outline some of

what we do presently and then with the change what's enhanced by the on-line system.

DIRECTOR KRISTEN DUNMOYER: Sure.

So once a dog is --

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Can you pull the microphone closer?

DIRECTOR KRISTEN DUNMOYER: Sorry.

Once a dog is deemed dangerous by a Magisterial

District Judge, that Judge then sends our agency a

notification of the dog being determined dangerous. That

prompts our wardens to go out and serve the dog owner with a

registration packet.

From there we track 30 days. They have 30 days to register the dog. So having the dog microchipped, ensuring it's been neutered. There's a \$500 annual registration fee, a \$50,000 insurance policy that needs to be obtained. They have big yellow warning signs that they have to post.

Then our wardens go out, do an inspection. We ensure that the dog -- if it's not kept in the house, there's requirements for the type of enclosure that that dog has to be kept in outside. The cage has to have a solid top. It has to have a connected bottom embedded in the ground two feet deep. So the wardens go out and inspect twice a year to ensure compliance with that. If the dog is

out, if the dog owner is taking the dog to the vet, it has
to be muzzled at all times, anytime it's outside of its
enclosure.

And for us, we receive a lot of complaints from the neighbors or maybe the victim saying the dog owner has the dog out and it's not muzzled or the dog is running loose. So we continuously monitor that.

Every year we're making sure that their policies didn't lapse or that they're paying their \$500 annual registration fee. When that doesn't happen, that prompts our office to have to take next-level steps, meaning filing misdemeanor-level charges to try to gain our compliance.

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: And the second part of that question, Kristen, what can we do to do a better job of monitoring those dangerous dogs? What's enhanced by the new system?

DIRECTOR KRISTEN DUNMOYER: The enhancement really is just continuing to allow us to have the resources to go out and continue to provide those services.

Oftentimes the victims in these cases don't understand why we cannot just take the dog right away. It just allows us to continue responding to the public.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: How many dangerous dogs are there registered?

DIRECTOR KRISTEN DUNMOYER: Registered currently

1 there's about 192. That number changes quite often. 2 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: 192 in the 3 Commonwealth? DIRECTOR KRISTEN DUNMOYER: 4 Yeah. 5 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Just in the areas that 6 you serve because in the cities -- are you going into the 7 cities that have their own dog licensing to monitor 8 dangerous dogs? 9 DIRECTOR KRISTEN DUNMOYER: There are six cities 10 in the State that we do not have any authority in. And 11 that's Altoona, Erie, Pittsburgh, Harrisburg, Scranton, and 12 Philadelphia. In those counties, while we don't actually go 1.3 into these areas and monitor the dangerous dogs, we do make 14 sure that those dogs are listed on our registry. And we 15 work with the city officials to ensure we get that 16 information. 17 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: So you don't do 18 anything with those dangerous dogs so you would say there's no cost associated with that? 19 20 DIRECTOR KRISTEN DUNMOYER: 21 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: But you are saying 22 there's significant cost in the rest of the Commonwealth to 23 be able to monitor those dogs. Would you say that's a 24 significant amount of time for your officers?

DIRECTOR KRISTEN DUNMOYER: Yes.

25

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: You point to a problem, right, where we have this dangerous dog registry. If you have local jurisdiction of the Dog Law, we try to include those. But to be very honest about it, the reporting back to the Department -- and we have no primary jurisdiction -- is that there are issues there in terms of what list and, you know, how current that list is.

Two is when you get folks moving, right. So you move these jurisdictions. It becomes difficult to track those dangerous dogs without having the statewide system and you have those gaps in jurisdiction.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: And obviously the police have the jurisdiction also. I know they're overtasked in many areas.

DIRECTOR KRISTEN DUNMOYER: They have the jurisdiction to file the charges but not actually the registration. That would be solely on the Department.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Okay.

DIRECTOR KRISTEN DUNMOYER: And just to clarify, too, sometimes it takes a lot of our time if a dog is deemed dangerous and we can't get the registration packet served right away. An individual may say, I transferred the dog to my neighbor. It can be time-consuming for us to try to track down where this dog actually is located.

And we do take it seriously because it's a public

1 safety concern for us.

1.3

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Okay. Thank you.

Representative Diamond.

REPRESENTATIVE DIAMOND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary, for your testimony.

I certainly understand your costs-versus-duties argument. Let me just comment that it's not hard to understand that the reason there hasn't been an increase is because it requires legislative oversight and that becomes a political decision.

On the other hand, I know with a number of other departments it's been considered giving those departments autonomy in setting fees.

And the feedback I get back home is, if the

Executive Branch then has autonomy in setting fees, for lack

of a better way to put it, they want somebody to fire when

they think the fees are too high. So I think we have to

balance out. I mean, we're easier to fire than bureaucrats

in the Executive Branch and that sort of thing.

My real question, though, is, with the on-line system that you envision here and that's envisioned by HB 1463, how do I get my tag? I don't have a metal printer on my computer. You know, is this something that -- are the County Treasurers still going to handle that? Do I have to take a form to them?

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Yeah. 1 So you'll be 2 able to purchase online. You choose your county. You fill 3 out the registration form. The County issues tag. 4 REPRESENTATIVE DIAMOND: Okay. SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: It will still come 5 6 from the County. 7 REPRESENTATIVE DIAMOND: Okay. 8 REPRESENTATIVE MINDY FEE: Can I -- sorry, Martin 9 -- Chairman. I just want to follow up on that quickly. 10 I need to explain -- why are they County? I 11 mean, if it's State run, why can't you, as the Bureau, just 12 issue those different tags? Wouldn't that save a lot of 13 money? 14 Sorry, Treasurer. 15 SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Do you have time for 16 another hearing? 17 Well, it's interesting. There's always been this 18 formal partnership with the issuance of licenses by local 19 entity. And I think that is a product of, you know, the 20 need. And prior to any technology, right, you're walking 21 into the courthouse. You walk into the local Treasurer's 22 office to, you know, put your dollar down or whatever it was 23 at the time and get a hard tag. Technology has now changed 24 this.

That said, we still think there's value of the

25

local presence of the Treasurer in knowing locally where 1 2 that dog is and that relationship because we still depend on 3 the local law enforcement, the local veterinarians, the local community. So that's the piece. 4 5 If you were to simply redesign this and this was 6 the first discussion about licensing dogs, you would be able 7 to just have it be a State registry, State system, State 8 issued, right. But you wouldn't have any of that local 9 infrastructure then to protect, we think, on the back side, 10 really add to the value quite honestly, and the protection 11 of the public. 12 REPRESENTATIVE FEE: Well, I guess that would be 13 the whole point of modernization because then they could 14 also tap into the service to see where the dogs are, I would 15 think. 16 Thank you. 17 SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Thank you. 18 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Probably the same 19 reason County Treasurers are still issuing antlerless deer 20 license tags. Little bit of politics involved. 21 Representative DeLissio. REPRESENTATIVE DeLISSIO: Thank you, Mr. 22 23 Chairman. 24 Good morning, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Good morning.

25

REPRESENTATIVE DeLISSIO: At risk for elimination was the protection of livestock or, you know, reimbursement for livestock under dogs and coyotes. As a business concept, you have assets. Your assets are usually insured.

So is livestock not an insured asset? How does that work? If this is an insured asset, is the insurance like the first payer and the Department of Ag is subsequent? Does this incentivize some agricultural organizations not to carry insurance because they know Ag is a default? How does that work?

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Kristen.

DIRECTOR KRISTEN DUNMOYER: Yes. If the animals are insured, then we would deny the claim. That's grounds for us to deny a claim. It's the uninsured animals that we would then reimburse for up to 90 percent of market value.

REPRESENTATIVE DeLISSIO: And do we see a lot of non-insured because folks are using this as a default? Is there any type of deduction? Even under an insurance policy, there's at least a deductible so the owner of the policy, if you will, has some responsibility toward, you know, making themselves whole. Is there a like situation with Ag?

DIRECTOR KRISTEN DUNMOYER: We see specifically a lot of sheep, chicken, damage claims.

REPRESENTATIVE DeLISSIO: Okay.

1 DIRECTOR KRISTEN DUNMOYER: Average about \$30,000 2 in reimbursement for damage claims annually, per claim, 3 total for all claims. Average for all claims is about \$30,000. 4 REPRESENTATIVE DeLISSIO: Total for all claims. 5 6 Okay. 7 DIRECTOR KRISTEN DUNMOYER: And we also do 8 damages caused by coyotes as well. We make it our first 9 priority to seek out the dog owner if it's dog-caused 10 damages because then you get into filing dangerous dog 11 The owner would then be responsible for charges. 12 reimbursing the farmer for any damages to the livestock. 13 REPRESENTATIVE DeLISSIO: So if 30,000 is the 14 statewide total, what does an average claim look like in 15 terms of dollars? Do you know off the top of your head? 16 DIRECTOR KRISTEN DUNMOYER: It depends. It could 17 be anywhere from a couple hundred for chickens. We had a 18 deer damage claim several years ago that ended up being 19 negotiated down to \$32,000. When those claims happen, we 20 have to actually get certified livestock appraisers

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE DeLISSIO: Is it worth the infrastructure to maintain this process, to continue this if indeed it's a total of, you know, 30,000 because the process

involved. It becomes quite a process. We get into

litigation issues over it.

that -- the bureaucracy that has to be in place in order to respond to that may cost more than \$30,000. We're trying to be efficient.

And in this day and age, if there is -- I would imagine if there wasn't insurance and there weren't other resorts, but you really have to question whether or not this is even a necessary function of government. As the Representative from Lancaster County said, things move forward, modernization. And is this that opportunity to take a hard look at whether we should be doing this at all at this point?

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: It's a fair question.

I mean, it goes back to why in 1893 the Dog Law was
established to begin with. Right. It has its roots in
history.

Having been on the receiving end of the calls and concerns about, you know, dogs that have gotten in someone's poultry or sheep, I mean, they're difficult because they are assets. But sometimes, you know, the coverage and levels and stuff. It was one of the original premises of a dog law and why we have it and why we license dogs today, not that we've seen a huge increase, you know, in the losses and/or payouts but we can certainly consider whether that's still relevant or not.

REPRESENTATIVE DeLISSIO: Thank you.

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: 1 Sure. 2 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Thank you. 3 Representative Madden. REPRESENTATIVE MADDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 4 5 Thank you, Secretary Redding, for your testimony. SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Good morning. 6 7 REPRESENTATIVE MADDEN: Last week I toured AWSOM, which stands for Animal Welfare Shelter of Monroe County. 8 9 And they stepped in many years ago when our local SPCA 10 picked up and left. 11 I was amazed at how much work their no-kill 12 shelter -- if a dog takes five, six years, or never gets 13 adopted, they live there quite happily. And I'm amazed at 14 the amount of work and cost that it takes to run one of 15 those shelters. 16 I brought a 40-pound bag of dog food with me and 17 asked how long this would last. They said about a half a 18 So I'm certainly thrilled that you'll be restoring 19 annual grants to shelters. 20 My question is, with the recent passing of 21 Libre's Law, one of the consequences of being found guilty 22 of animal cruelty is the surrender of the dog. Do you have 23 any numbers? Do you anticipate how many dogs will be 24 surrendered and will be put into shelters? What possible

expense will that add to it? Does this raise enough to

25

compensate for what could be a growing number of dogs being surrendered?

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: That's a great question. I don't know if we've looked at when those dogs are relinquished, how many, and the terms of relinquishment.

Kristen, I don't know if you've looked at that at all.

DIRECTOR KRISTEN DUNMOYER: We haven't.

Actually, in those situations, it would not be the Department doing any reimbursement for those dogs.

There's, I believe, a section that the agency who is getting those dogs, that seize those dogs, and that they are now being forfeited them, that they can recover those funds from the dog owner.

But for us, the impact that we've seen to date with Libre's Law is just fielding questions from the public. We've been working hand in hand with the Humane Society of the United States, with the Pennsylvania SPCA, and with our State Police just ensuring that we're all on the same page and referring people to the right places.

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: I guess a point of clarification would be, certainly on the per-dog basis, there wouldn't be additional dollars for that dog specifically under Libre. But the actual shelter, AWSOM, as a shelter, could be one of the designated shelters receiving

| 1  | grants. But that's a base grant. That's not on a per-dog    |
|----|---|
| 2  | basis.  |
| 3  | I think your point is, what happens with those              |
| 4  | dogs when they find themselves in there and how is that     |
| 5  | managed financially? That's a great question.               |
| 6  | REPRESENTATIVE MADDEN: Okay. Thank you.                     |
| 7  | SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Sure.                            |
| 8  | MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Representative                    |
| 9  | Zimmerman.  |
| 10 | REPRESENTATIVE ZIMMERMAN: Thank you, Mr.                    |
| 11 | Chairman.   |
| 12 | Thank you, Mr. Secretary, for your testimony.               |
| 13 | SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: It's good to see you.            |
| 14 | REPRESENTATIVE ZIMMERMAN: Question. Do we                   |
| 15 | and I'm late. I apologize. Maybe my question has been       |
| 16 | answered. Do we know how many dogs are in Pennsylvania?     |
| 17 | SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: We have an estimate              |
| 18 | of about 2.3 million.                                       |
| 19 | REPRESENTATIVE ZIMMERMAN: And what percent of               |
| 20 | those are actually licensed?                                |
| 21 | SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: 55 percent.                      |
| 22 | REPRESENTATIVE ZIMMERMAN: 55. And what's                    |
| 23 | actually being done to license what's not licensed?         |
| 24 | SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: That is an everyday              |
| 25 | hustle. And that goes back to this local point of trying to |

reach out, do the canvassing. We do the notices. 1 We send 2 -- you know, you try to engage. But this is where this gap 3 exists of either being able to notify those renewals but how do you bring folks that haven't historically been in the 4 system into the system? 5 6 REPRESENTATIVE ZIMMERMAN: Right. 7 SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: It really is about 8 direct contact. We rely on offices. Your office is to help sort of spread that word. We work with the veterinarians to 9 10 help do that. We try to get the local law enforcement. But 11 at the end of the day, it's a personal responsibility and 12 accountability that comes into play here. 13 But we struggle with that. That's the bottom 14 line. 15 REPRESENTATIVE ZIMMERMAN: Because it seems like 16 that would be considerable dollars if the remaining dogs 17 would actually be licensed. 18 SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Yeah. If you could 19 get all 2.3 million dogs licensed, we wouldn't need a fee 20 increase. Right. Historically we've been in that 50, you 21 know, 60 percent of total dogs. 22 REPRESENTATIVE ZIMMERMAN: Okay. Thank you. 23 SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr.

REPRESENTATIVE ZIMMERMAN:

24

25

Chairman.

| i  |  |
|----|--|
| 1  | MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Representative Moul.               |
| 2  | REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.                |
| 3  | Good to see you again, Mr. Secretary.                        |
| 4  | SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Thank you, neighbor.              |
| 5  | REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: Just one thought and then               |
| 6  | two quick questions.   |
| 7  | SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Sure.                             |
| 8  | REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: I'm looking at the bill and             |
| 9  | it says the license fee increase goes from 7 to 11 dollars.  |
| 10 | To you and I, that's 4 bucks, who cares. But in the media,   |
| 11 | that's going to play out as a 40 percent increase. What do   |
| 12 | you think the backlash to that will be?                      |
| 13 | SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Well, I think the                 |
| 14 | again, some context here. I mean, over 21 years. Right. I    |
| 15 | think you have to say, listen, it's been 21 years since      |
| 16 | we've actually increased it. You know, you can't             |
| 17 | REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: I get it. You get it.                   |
| 18 | It's going to be an educational issue to make sure people    |
| 19 | understand it's the first time.                              |
| 20 | SECRETARY RUSSEL REDDING: I understand.                      |
| 21 | REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: I mean, when it came up to              |
| 22 | the fuel tax, the biggest part of that was to educate people |
| 23 | as to how long it was since we had done anything.            |
| 24 | SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Yes.                              |
| 25 | REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: Maybe in the future we                  |

address this more often so we don't have to have such big jumps.

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: If I could add. I think the other piece for us is going to be the convenience. It's the one thing we hear over and over and over is that -- I've got to go. You have online systems locally. But that's such a patchwork across the State. I think that convenience piece will be worth something. How do you sort of justify it? I get it.

REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: Right. I'm just trying to get the fires out before they get roaring.

You mentioned that your lifetime dog licenses actually wind up being losers for you because dogs are living longer now. So why continue to offer them? Not saying cancel the ones that are out there but why continue to offer them going forward if they're actually winding up losing you money in the long rung?

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Yeah. So there's two approaches. The one we've taken is increase the fee. I mean, so have it be a little more commensurate with -- right now it's five annual licenses to equal one lifetime. So you see the number. I don't know if it's going to be, you know, the life of the dog, you know, times the annual fee.

So our approach has been to sort of -- if the dog owners like it, don't take it away but have it be more

| 1  | commensurate with the cost and convenience.            |
|----|--|
| 2  | REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: Okay. And one last really         |
| 3  | quick question because I must run to a voting meeting. |
| 4  | SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Sure.                       |
| 5  | REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: You mentioned in your             |
| 6  | opening that, if I heard this correctly, there was \$4 |
| 7  | million transferred out of the Dog Law Fund years ago? |
| 8  | SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Yeah, in 2009.              |
| 9  | REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: In 2009. Where did it go?         |
| 10 | SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Went to the General         |
| 11 | Fund.  |
| 12 | REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: Oh, that's bad on our part,       |
| 13 | I guess. Okay. Thank you.                              |
| 14 | (Laughter)   |
| 15 | MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: We'll stop that              |
| 16 | questioning right there.                               |
| 17 | SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Thanks for asking.          |
| 18 | MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Governor Rendell             |
| 19 | didn't think it was bad.                               |
| 20 | Representative Kavulich.                               |
| 21 | REPRESENTATIVE KAVULICH: Thank you, Mr.                |
| 22 | Chairman.  |
| 23 | Ironically, Mr. Secretary, that's where my             |
| 24 | statement or line of questioning goes.                 |
| 25 | SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Yes.                        |

REPRESENTATIVE KAVULICH: I know this has been an issue, not only with yourself but with the previous

Secretary with the Dog Law Fund and slowly reducing funds and the amount of money you have in there. Then the Chairman talked a little bit about surplus earlier before.

How do we avoid being back in the same situation in four to six years because of what Representative Moul just said where the Legislature is hitting that Dog Fund again to transfer it into the General Fund, which we have a habit of doing here in this building.

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Well, I would say again the significant change here is that we can increase fees by regulation. I think that's important. Right.

Certainly having to come back every 21 years and ask for the Legislature's consideration of that even with, you know, the costs that we've seen escalate.

It's not a fail-safe measure. But I think knowing that you're venturing into this thing, listen, if we do that, there's going to be a need to go out and raise the fee. We'll have to do that by a regulation versus coming back.

But I don't know how you stop that. But it is something that happened. And not that this fund would have been self-sustaining for, you know, eternity. Eventually we would have run into this negative. It just would have been

1 a couple years from now. 2 REPRESENTATIVE KAVULICH: But it seems to me you 3 have to be careful that you don't get that surplus again 4 because then you're in danger of having to do this all over 5 again and come back here again looking for some way to 6 replenish that fund. 7 SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Yes. Absolutely. 8 REPRESENTATIVE KAVULICH: Thank you. SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: 9 10 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Representative Rabb. 11 REPRESENTATIVE RABB: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 12 Hello, Mr. Secretary. Good to see you again. 13 SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Good to see you. 14 REPRESENTATIVE RABB: We met the first time I 15 touched a cow. That was a pretty momentous occasion for me. 16 SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: I remember that. 17 REPRESENTATIVE RABB: Yes. I'm still processing 18 that experience. 19 SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Okay. 20 REPRESENTATIVE RABB: I'm in one of those six 21 bubbles that handle their own dog licenses. And I was 22 shocked to hear that the registry has only 192, in this 23 moment anyway, of dangerous canines. Is that the right 24 number presently for the Commonwealth? 25 DIRECTOR KRISTEN DUNMOYER: For registered.

That's not all the ones that are on the list. Of the 520, there's 192 that are actually registered.

living in that area.

REPRESENTATIVE RABB: I see. Okay.

ones, that's the 192. Is that inclusive of the six bubbles?

DIRECTOR KRISTEN DUNMOYER: It does. We actually

-- I'm sorry. It does include that. There are some in

Philadelphia. Several years ago we drove down there and met with officials to find a way to work with them to get to the point where we were being notified and at the very minimal have those dogs listed on the registry for the individuals

So within the subsets of registered dogs, the bad

REPRESENTATIVE RABB: Okay. I was just shocked at how low that number is in light of how many dogs are in Philadelphia alone and how many dogs I've seen personally in my district alone that are ravenous.

I'm curious. Is there a process of greater accountability by the entities in these six bubbles to the Department of Agriculture? It seems like there's generally a collaborative spirit that occurs as a win-win on some level. But is there anything that could provide a greater sense of accountability to what you're doing on the state level so that these numbers can be more reflective of the reality and also provide resources without increasing bureaucracy? Does that make sense?

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: 1 It does. We're 2 comfortable with the number that we have on the list. 3 we don't believe that that is 100 percent. That's part of your challenge. There are dangerous dogs there. 4 really worked hard to get that collaborative effort. 5 6 currently, you know, it really is -- it's more by 7 cooperation than it is by mandate that those bubbles, as you term, have a responsibility to notify the Department of a 8 9 dangerous dog. 10 So there's a gap here both in terms of the total 11 but also the process to get those on to the State list. 12 Importantly then that State list becomes available for local 13 law enforcement and local communities. 14 So to answer your question, I think in here we 15 can certainly tighten up the reporting requirements and be 16 more specific in terms of expectations. Once the dangerous 17 dog is identified, the reporting requirement to the State 18

for purposes of a statewide database can be tightened up.

REPRESENTATIVE RABB: And if I may?

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING:

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE RABB: Just a quick followup.

Will these six municipalities' residents be able to register on the State or do they have to continue to do it through their representative municipalities?

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: They will have to

work through the local municipalities.

REPRESENTATIVE RABB: They will?

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE RABB: And is there any benefit of figuring out a way to let them use your system prospectively to decrease costs based on infrastructure, technological infrastructure, and have that compliance built in where you say, okay, you have an ease of use of the State system, you still have your own municipal regs, what have you, but as a consequence of making it more convenient for Philly residents, for instance, you know, we need a little more transparency or whatever the things would be to allow you to have the information you need to make decisions across the Commonwealth?

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Yeah.

Kristen, if you could jump in. I would just say that there's certainly a benefit. I don't think there's anything that would preclude a system built, you know, to recognize that there are local jurisdictions. I think the greater challenge is on the back side of accounting.

REPRESENTATIVE RABB: Sure.

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: So you would do the online transaction. Then we have to take responsibility for how to account for that and get the dollars back to the local. But in a redesign of a system, it would certainly be

1 a benefit to having those bubbles in the system, right, both 2 for total dogs but also on the strays and particularly the 3 dangerous dogs. REPRESENTATIVE RABB: 4 Thank you. SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: 5 6 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Representative 7 Lawrence. 8 REPRESENTATIVE LAWRENCE: Thank you, Mr. 9 Chairman. 10 Mr. Secretary, always good to see you. 11 SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Good to see you. 12 REPRESENTATIVE LAWRENCE: Is there any incentive 13 right now, just following up on Representative Zimmerman's 14 question, with regard to, you know, the number of dogs that 15 are eligible but not licensed? Anytime you're talking about 16 a dog law, there's obviously controversy. 17 But I guess my question is, is there any 18 incentive for veterinarians who see, I'm sure, a large 19 quantity of unlicensed dogs to encourage folks to register 20 them? 21 I mean, I would think that, for example, if an 22 unlicensed dog or unregistered dog comes in and maybe the 23 vet is cut in for whatever the county would get, it's 24 probably not a whole lot, but, you know, that might

encourage folks to sign up if, you know, they were coming

25

1 through anyway. Just a question. 2 SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Yeah. And it's a 3 good question, one that we have looked at over time. certainly a point of access, right, and a good place to have 4 that conversation about licensure. 5 6 It is not something that the veterinarians have 7 wanted mandated. We do have some that are agents or 8 subagents within counties. And they would prefer to have 9 that be an option for their business versus a mandate to do 10 it. 11 REPRESENTATIVE LAWRENCE: Thank you. 12 SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Sure. 13 REPRESENTATIVE LAWRENCE: Thank you, Mr. 14 Chairman. 15 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Our Executive 16 Director, Kerry Golden. 17 MS. KERRY GOLDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 18 Mr. Secretary, actually I think this is probably 19 a question for Kristen. Back in 2013-'14 is when the grants 20 to the shelters that are commonly known as the Keep the 21 Lights On Program Grants were discontinued. But at the same 22 time the holding and disposing fees were increased from 25 23 to 40 dollars. 24 What is the current reimbursement for the holding

25

and disposing fees?

| 1  | DIRECTOR KRISTEN DUNMOYER: It is still \$40.                  |
|----|---|
| 2  | MS. KERRY GOLDEN: So shelters are still getting               |
| 3  | funding to keep dogs that dog wardens bring to them?          |
| 4  | DIRECTOR KRISTEN DUNMOYER: Shelters do still get              |
| 5  | paid \$40 per stray dog that they are holding for the minimum |
| 6  | 48 hours as long as they are submitting that quarterly.       |
| 7  | MS. KERRY GOLDEN: Thank you.                                  |
| 8  | MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Chairman Pashinski.                 |
| 9  | MINORITY CHAIRMAN PASHINSKI: Just one thing for               |
| 10 | everyone to think about.                                      |
| 11 | At the present time, you can't sell a puppy prior             |
| 12 | to being two months old. And you can't license a dog prior    |
| 13 | to three months old. Is there a decent consideration for      |
| 14 | the idea of point of sale at the appropriate time? In other   |
| 15 | words, massaging these numbers so that whenever that          |
| 16 | particular puppy is sold, that's when you would initiate the  |
| 17 | licensing process.  |
| 18 | SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: That's another one of              |
| 19 | the gaps. Right. And that would be a way to help close        |
| 20 | that a little bit.  |
| 21 | MINORITY CHAIRMAN PASHINSKI: So you're amenable               |
| 22 | to that?  |
| 23 | SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Yes.                               |
| 24 | MINORITY CHAIRMAN PASHINSKI: All right. So that               |
| 25 | might be another option that we can all discuss.              |

| 1  |  |
|----|--|
| 2  |  |
| 3  |  |
| 4  |  |
| 5  |  |
| 6  |  |
| 7  |  |
| 8  |  |
| 9  |  |
| 10 |  |
| 11 |  |
| 12 |  |
| 13 |  |
| 14 |  |
| 15 |  |
| 16 |  |
| 17 |  |
| 18 |  |
| 19 |  |

20

21

22

23

24

25

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Yes.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN PASHINSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Thank you.

One last thought. We talked a lot about the system that you want to set up, the on-line system. Do you know what the cost would be to create a system of that nature?

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: We don't know for sure what it is. What we have -- we've looked at a couple of systems. We've looked at the State of Ohio, who does have an online system. We looked at a couple of online systems even within the Commonwealth. The short answer is, I can't give you a number, Mr. Chairman. I don't know for sure.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Okay.

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: The conversation when it started probably a year ago has evolved a little bit to include some conversation about existing technology infrastructure the Commonwealth has already bought and paid for that can be borrowed for purposes of building the system. And there's some belief that there's a significant investment that's already been made.

I'll give you two examples both within the

Department of Agriculture. Our PA plants and one of our

animal health systems have the functionality that we're
looking for here. It doesn't have the county component.

But we think that we can, you know, work at using what we've already invested in as a good base to build out the system.

There will be an RFP process that will go out and get us a quote. We'll have some hard numbers to come back with. In fact, we're drafting that right now just to sort of keep this process moving.

As you see here on the calendar, I mean, we're going to have to do something by the end of the year, end of the fiscal year. We're going to get those numbers and we'll be glad to share that with you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: So you would envision this as a system where anyone in the Commonwealth could log on, buy a dog license, and pay for it online. The Department of Agriculture would then send the information back to the respective county to issue the dog license. And the payment to the County Treasurer would be issued back to the County Treasurer at that point?

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Correct.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: And it would work the same way if someone walked into the Treasurer's Office or went to a local agent still to be able to get a license?

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Yeah. So it's

envisioned -- the first part of that, yes. If somebody buys

online, that transaction would be purchase date, a transfer to the county to offer their 1.50 for that sale.

If there's a local transaction, one of the issues that we have to resolve is there's a couple of commercial systems available. And County Treasurers like those commercial systems. If that's the case -- now, they still have their own cost there. We would certainly prefer that they use ours.

But there's going to be the requirement that they provide certain data for inclusion in our data system under a certain format, on a certain frequency. That would be required.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: All right.

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: So you'll have the same functionality at the State level. So it'll live true to both the consumer access but also importantly the State database access that we're really in search of here and not the 47, 50 county variety.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: And who would have access to the information in this database?

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: So it would be the Department of Agriculture. It would be local law enforcement. It would be the wardens. And that would be the extent of that.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: No public access?

| 1   | SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: No public access.                 |
|-----|--|
| 2   | Correct.   |
| 3   | MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Okay.                              |
| 4   | Any other questions from the members?                        |
| 5   | Representative Boback.                                       |
| 6   | REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Now I need to clarify                 |
| 7   | this.  |
| 8   | SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Yes.                              |
| 9   | REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: So I buy a license                    |
| LO  | online.  |
| L1  | SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Yes.                              |
| L2  | REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: And you send the                      |
| L3  | information to my county. And I go to my Treasurer or        |
| L 4 | she'll send it to me at their expense?                       |
| L5  | SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Yeah. So the design               |
| L 6 | of the fee increase, right now they get 1.50 for that        |
| L7  | license. They could get \$2 under the proposed fee increase. |
| L8  | Part of that was anticipating them having to mail you the    |
| L9  | license from the county. That's accounted for in the \$2     |
| 20  | that they receive.   |
| 21  | REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: And I do apologize. I                 |
| 22  | was late. I had another meeting myself. So why this extra    |
| 23  | step? I mean, it just seems like it's more bureaucracy that  |
| 24  | I have to go through. Why can't my Treasurer just alert the  |
| 25  | State? I think they're doing that now. They sold so many     |

licenses to date. This is who they send it to and make it mandatory on their part. So why do we have this system that's being developed? Again, it seems like it's more bureaucratic. Why go through that?

1.3

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Yeah. There's two reasons for it. One -- and it's a good question because we've looked at that hard. In a perfect world, all of this would be local. Right. The reality is that we have this mismatch of systems.

We have 11 counties that are still on paper that they're using a tablet and a No. 2 pencil to keep track of. You've got different systems, none of which we have access to at the Department of Agriculture. There's no requirement for the local Treasurer to share that database with the Department of Agriculture. So we have no way to send notices to track.

And then you think of that in terms of law enforcement. Where's the law enforcement? So the whole system piece there that we think you can reserve and preserve the local autonomy for systems at the same time you create a statewide database that allows us to really market, communicate, to track, to inform.

So if a county wants to maintain their system and do that locally, they do it well, under this proposal, they can still do that. But they have an obligation then with

| 1  | the license file to share that with the Department of Ag.    |
|----|--|
| 2  | REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: And you can't make that               |
| 3  | mandatory of them now?                                       |
| 4  | SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Correct.                          |
| 5  | REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Thank you.                            |
| 6  | MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: The flip side is the               |
| 7  | Department of Agriculture could just issue the licenses and  |
| 8  | not have the extra expense expended by the County Treasurer. |
| 9  | SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: That's correct.                   |
| 10 | MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Thank you very much                |
| 11 | for the information. We have a number of other testifiers.   |
| 12 | But the information that you presented was very helpful for  |
| 13 | us as we continue to review this bill.                       |
| 14 | I appreciate your testimony and you joining us               |
| 15 | today.   |
| 16 | SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: It's a privilege.                 |
| 17 | Thank you.   |
| 18 | MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Thank you very much.               |
| 19 | SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Yes.                              |
| 20 | MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Our next testifier is              |
| 21 | Janis Creason, Dauphin County Treasurer, and a member of the |
| 22 | Dog Law Advisory Board.                                      |
| 23 | Welcome.   |
| 24 | TREASURER JANIS CREASON: Thank you.                          |
| 25 | MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Thank you for joining              |

1 us today.

TREASURER JANIS CREASON: Thank you for inviting me. It's an honor and a privilege to be here.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: You may proceed.

TREASURER JANIS CREASON: Thank you.

I won't have all the facts and figures that the Secretary had but I am Janis Creason, elected Dauphin County Treasurer, also a member of the Dog Law Advisory Board.

It's an honor to be here, as I said, and come willingly with information that pertains to how dog licensing works in my office, how I feel about dog licensing, and my remarks on the proposed amendment.

When I was elected as Dauphin County Treasurer, one of the first meetings that I had was with, at that time, Director Jessie Smith, who is the Director of Dog Law. And she sat down with me at lunch and she began to go over my responsibilities of selling dog licenses.

My background was in finance, so I was not thrilled to hear that I was now in the position to sell county dog licenses. Couple that with fish and game, this was not my venue. So I listened to everything she said.

And I thought, well, if I have a responsibility, I will rise to it, but I probably will not put my whole heart and soul into it. I'm being very candid when I tell you that.

Shortly thereafter, my municipality had a tax

increase. And I was surprised by the amount of the tax increase and that there was one, because I thought we had been doing very well fiscally.

Being good friends with the supervisors, I questioned them as to why we had this increase. They explained to me that the cost of maintaining stray dogs throughout our municipality was the reason for the increase in the taxes.

The cost by the Humane Society, the fee for housing a stray dog or taking possession of a stray dog had risen to \$247 per dog. And that had significantly increased their expenses and therefore they were passing that on as a form of a tax increase to the residents of Lower Paxton Township where I reside.

I am by nature, by my father's upbringing, a fiscal conservative. He said if you see \$20 on the ground, would you kick it or pick it up? I said, I'd pick it up every time. And he said, then you better pick up every \$20 you see in whatever manner you see it. And that's been my motto for most of my career.

So given that information, I was determined to license, or help to license, as many dogs in Dauphin County as I could, because I understood that if they were able to reunite a dog with its owner without calling in law enforcement or the Humane Society, effectively I was being

the best Treasurer I could be for my community because I was saving them tax dollars, which has always been my goal.

So we did increase each year. I have increased the sale of dog licenses in Dauphin County. It has been difficult because there are limited funds and a lot of the marketing has to be done very creatively on our own using some of the funds that are available for dog law.

We've experimented with billboards. I've had a magnet on my car, much to the disdain of my children. I have sent out notices with all the letters that go to our new homeowners, which has significantly increased the sales. By reaching out to homeowners, most homeowners will have dogs, I found.

When I go door to door -- I've been elected three times. I go door to door now during the campaign season or for any other elected official. The first thing the person says to me when they see my face at the door, since I've been on some of the billboards is, I have my license. And I'm like, I'm not here to see if you have one. But I am looking at your dog at the door and I do not see one. So usually shortly therefore they complete that application.

Recently on the human side of it, I had a phone call in the afternoon. We get several. Sometimes we have five phone calls a day to reunite lost dogs, dogs that have been found or someone calling to say their dog has been lost

and if we get a call please let them know.

Recently I received a call from someone in, I believe, it was Fredericksburg or somewhere going east on 81. And they had a dog in their possession that had a Dauphin County tag on it.

And she said, we have this dog but it's from
Dauphin County. And I put my name, also to the chagrin of
my children, on the back of the tag. So when someone finds
a dog, they will seek me out because my name and phone
number are on that tag. And they may find me through the
white pages or through Facebook or some other means. But
they will track me down all hours of the day and night.

So this woman called and said, I have this dog.

And so I immediately checked the database and I found the person, the owner of the dog, her name and address. She was local. And so I attempted to call her, but her phone went right to voicemail. So I looked her up on Facebook and I sent her a private message and said, if you get this message, please contact me because I have information regarding your dog.

And I even found her employer online. She was listed in a professional directory and I called her office and said, if you -- if she calls in or checks in by e-mail or otherwise, would you please have her call me? So interestingly enough, she was in LA. And when her plane

landed, she turned her phone back on and saw these messages.

Everyone was trying to get her. And as it turned out, she had left her dog with her mother while she went on a week-long business trip.

And her mother was at work and did not realize that this dog was an escape artist and had managed to open the door of the garage -- two doors, in fact, the kitchen and the garage -- and had left the home. And she was hysterical. She was beside herself that her dog had gotten out and more so she said, where is the other dog? Because her mother's dog was also in the home. And we didn't have that dog.

So she was able to immediately call her mom. Her aunt, who was at home during the day, ran and met these other people and were able to retrieve the dog and go back to the home and find out the other dog did not care to be an escape artist or was too lazy to be one and was still in the home.

But it's those types of situations that really make the Treasurers passionate about dog licensing. It's not just about putting the tag on a dog's collar. It's really about public service. And some folks here have asked, why is it with the Treasurers? I don't know some days because it's a lot of work and it's a lot of phone calls and it's a lot of responsibility. When you know that

someone has someone else's dog and it's a family member, you take it very seriously to hang up and say, I can't get them on the phone or I can't find them right now. You know, they're like, well, I don't know. I may have to leave the dog on the side of the road. I can't keep it any longer.

And it's very, very difficult.

We try not to call law enforcement. Sometimes we do because I will make the call to the owner and say, someone has your dog. How do you want me to reunite you? Because I don't want someone with nefarious purposes trying to, you know, get to a dog owner, maybe it's a guy/girl thing or something.

So we will ask her if she knows the person, if it's a neighbor. If they feel uncertain, we will call law enforcement -- we have done that -- and say, could you please accompany the finder of the dog and help the owner retrieve it? So we have done that.

Some dog collars are attached to dogs that are no longer living. And that's a very hard call, to call someone at 11 o'clock at night and say, we have your dog but your dog is not alive. But that tag does help to identify a dog.

So I hope that gives you a behind-the-scenes look at not just the academics of licensing but the human side of licensing and why it is so important and why I believe that Treasurers are the appropriate people.

The same is true -- and it's a different case and I won't elaborate. But I will say the same is true for the constituent services we provide for those hunters who are seeking antlerless deer licenses because those licenses are near and dear to their hearts. And we provide those same constituent services.

In regard to the fee, I believe the fee will be very palatable to the public. Most of the time when we tell someone what the fee is or I will remind someone if I see a dog or I'm talking to a dog owner, have you gotten your license? there are steep penalties if you do not have one and your dog roams and is caught or you have any problems with your dog, you can be cited, they're like, what is the cost? And they're anticipating a higher cost than what I say. And I say 6.50. And they're like, oh, is that all? Oh, okay. I'll get one right away. What do I do? Well, you can go online. You can go to one of our 12 agents. You can mail it to my office, whatever the case may be.

So I don't feel -- over across the board in ten years that I've been serving as Treasurer, I have not seen any outrage or, you know, anyone finding the fee to be unreasonable. A lot of people moving into the area tell me that it's as much as -- I know my daughter is in New York -- \$50. They just pay it. So I don't find that to be something that I could not endure so I could not promote.

Keep in mind that 80 percent of our County

Treasurers are already offering on-line sales to supplement
what they do by mail and what they do at the agents. So
they are already paying an additional \$2 to do that online
to the vendor. The Treasurer does not get that.

But if they want the convenience of online, we must pass that on. We cannot take that out of our own County revenue. So they are already paying \$2 more than what you might be talking about today. Probably 50 or 60 percent of my sales now are online. The rest are with agents.

And the one thing that I do see in the law that I would want to see changed, because it's not practical, is that the agents appear to be locked together with the Treasurers. Right now I have 12 agents. I have Agways, Ace Hardware. I can't get veterinarians. I beg them. I write to them actually on a monthly basis. They are not interested in selling these licenses. I don't know why. I think it would be great. But they do not want to get into it.

They will, however, many of them, especially those who know me well, pass my forms out, mostly just so I don't chastise them when I see them and they can say they're doing it. So they will pass the forms out but they are not really anxious to sell them at the counter.

Maybe they don't want the responsibility of the tags because they're almost like cash, you know, because we are audited for them.

So this bill that's being introduced does not account for the fact that we have agents, that our agents receive the dollar and we only receive the 50 cents when they sell a tag. So we are still maintaining the records. We debit them at the end of every month. We don't require them to do any reporting. We've made it as simple as possible for them. They simply need to be responsible for the tags and sell them.

They get a dollar and we get the 50 cents. And if you give everybody \$2 and take the agents away from us, No. 1, we will lose the responsibility over them. They would then require auditing. I just went through an audit and it was a week-long process for Dog Law and Game. So they would come out from under the auditing aspect, so I would have difficulty. I think the Treasurers would understand how that would work.

And we are the ones monitoring those agents, making sure that they're responsibile, that they understand how important it is that these tags have value. You can't go sell them on the open street. We watch them very carefully. We can see online everything they've sold.

We require that the agents sell it through the

software system that we use that our vendor provides. So we do not allow them to sell a tag, like just to hand write a tag out. They must do it online so we can see everything. We can run the report at the end of the month and charge them accordingly. So I'm not sure about that.

There is something in the current law that does require us to submit electronic records on a monthly basis to Dog Law. But most of the Treasurers do not do that and it is not necessarily enforced.

I do want to point out that what we do, the cost, the fee that we receive, includes postage. We have to cover our own postage, our own paper for printing, our own envelopes, and our own manpower. I have one part-time person. I probably pay her about \$27,000 a year. She solely does licensing along with tax certs. And pretty much that is her responsibility, issuing duplicate tags when people lose them, doing the reporting, issuing the tags, and so on.

So it is time-intensive, labor-intensive. The \$2 does not cover -- the \$1 does not come close to covering it.

We all know that. We do it regardless as our public service and because we're mandated by law. But the \$1 does not cover it. The \$2 would not cover it.

I don't think the Treasurers are here. And I'm not representing the Association. I'm just sharing what we

do as Treasurers. But we are not coming here demanding that
we be compensated according to what we spend. But it will
never be a revenue producer.

It was nice for the Secretary to indicate he'd like it to be. But it never will be. It never will be. I'm a numbers person. I could in my head -- I've owned a business 35 years. I can tell you very quick what income and expense is all about and how it all is calculated. And let me just tell you, there is no revenue to be received from this process.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Thank you very much for the information that you've presented today.

Can you speak directly to whether you would support this statewide system? I know you said that you have your own system that you contract.

TREASURER JANIS CREASON: We do.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: If we created this statewide system, what would you in turn do?

TREASURER JANIS CREASON: If the statewide system was designed in a practical manner that allowed us to do everything we need to do -- and that would be, you know, tracking the sales, being able to -- one component, as I described, is we need to be able to find the owner. We need to be able to edit information when they move.

If all those components are there, in other

words, it's not a bare bones where we cannot, you know, get information out of it easily, extract information, and track all our sales, which I'm sure it would be, I personally would be very accepting of that. I would definitely be an advocate for that.

I believe that the systems we have now are good but the Secretary is correct. There is no consistency.

When I took office in Dauphin County, we had no consistency among tax collectors. Some were paper. Someone around my office took the lead on developing a countywide tax collection system. They are using that. We mandated that they use it. If they did not use it, they would not get their fee.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Okav.

TREASURER JANIS CREASON: So I would be disingenuous to say that I wasn't going to be for a statewide system when I've imposed a countywide system on our 39 tax collectors.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Sure.

TREASURER JANIS CREASON: I think there could be some resistance because there is a strong relationship built between vendors and current Treasurers. But also you have to keep in mind that vendors come and go. The State is here consistently, just the way my office is there for the tax collectors. I would rather maintain that software long term

knowing that my successor will also maintain that software. 1 2 You're not going to go out of business. You're 3 not going to pick up the phone one day and find out that the person has had a heart attack and your vendor is the only 4 5 person that has a source code. 6 So I do believe that moving to a statewide system 7 would be, even though it may not be popular -- change is 8 never popular -- but it probably is going to be valuable to 9 us. 10 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Thank you. 11 We'll move to other questions from members. 12 TREASURER JANIS CREASON: 1.3 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: I would appreciate it 14 if you could be brief. We're up against a time limit here 15 with session starting at 11. 16 First member is Representative Keller. 17 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 18 Janis, thanks for being here. We really 19 appreciate it. 20 TREASURER JANIS CREASON: 21 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Couple questions. 22 question very quickly. You've indicated that you are a 23 member of the Dog Law Advisory Board. When was the last 24 time you had a meeting? 25 TREASURER JANIS CREASON: I think our meeting was

1 in April -- March. 2 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: March. Okay. Very good. 3 Second of all, as you can see, some of the documentation that was provided to us -- and I know you 4 5 stated you are not here representing the Treasurers Association. But it was indicated to me the Treasurers 6 7 Association of the State does not support this bill or the 8 companion bill in the Senate. 9 TREASURER JANIS CREASON: The only thing that was 10 mentioned -- if I could interject. The only thing that was 11 mentioned at our recent conference in June when we spoke to 12 this bill was one person came up and made a statement that 13 they felt we should not take a position for or against 14 because they did not want to be in a position of advocating 15 for a fee increase. REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: This indicates there was 16 17 a vote. 18 TREASURER JANIS CREASON: There was no vote that 19 I was present for and I don't think I missed any sessions. 20 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Okay. 21 TREASURER JANIS CREASON: Our president is here. 22 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: I guess maybe we should 23 reach out and ask them. 24 TREASURER JANIS CREASON: There's no position of

the Treasurers Association.

25

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: It's kind of confusing whenever this information is provided to us. And then if it really didn't take place, we need to -- you know, because it's important to members that their representative Treasurers are onboard with these bills. And if they're not, there's a reason why they're not.

1.3

Of course, we provide the documentation that I received from my County Treasurer that states that, you know, the County Treasurers Association voted not to support 1463 and Senate Bill 73 at the annual convention in June of 2017.

TREASURER JANIS CREASON: I'm good friends with your County Treasurer. And I don't want to say anything to the contrary, but I do not recall us taking a vote other than to remain neutral at the time. There was no vote not to support.

Prior to coming here, I did communicate to all of the County Treasurers through our e-mail distribution system that I would be here and asked them for feedback. I received it from two, one being your County Treasurer and one other who is our legislative rep. And, of course, Sally and I have talked. But to my knowledge, there was no formal action taken at the conference.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Let me get that cleared up for the committee. Just clear it up. That's all.

| 1  | TREASURER JANIS CREASON: There was definitely              |
|----|--|
| 2  | let me put it this way: There was definitely no discussion |
| 3  | other than one remark. I remember it clearly. And my ears  |
| 4  | would perk up because I am a member of Dog Law Advisory.   |
| 5  | REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: I thought it should.                |
| 6  | TREASURER JANIS CREASON: That would have been              |
| 7  | important. And I would have been a little disturbed that I |
| 8  | wasn't asked for any input. But I let him say what he      |
| 9  | wanted to say and moved on because there was no action. I  |
| 10 | thought it was premature to bring it up.                   |
| 11 | REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Okay. Very good.                    |
| 12 | Thank you very much.                                       |
| 13 | TREASURER JANIS CREASON: I'm glad I could                  |
| 14 | clarify that for you, if that was your impression.         |
| 15 | REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you.                          |
| 16 | MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Representative                   |
| 17 | Diamond.   |
| 18 | REPRESENTATIVE DIAMOND: No.                                |
| 19 | MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Any other questions?             |
| 20 | Thank you very much for your testimony.                    |
| 21 | TREASURER JANIS CREASON: Thank you.                        |
| 22 | MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: And the information              |
| 23 | that you presented is very helpful. Thank you.             |
| 24 | TREASURER JANIS CREASON: Thank you.                        |
| 25 | I would be happy at any time and I think a                 |
|    |  |

group of Treasurers would -- to fine-tune the amendments so 1 2 that they could be not only implemented but executed by the 3 Treasurers. I'm sure it will go through that process. MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: 4 Thank you. TREASURER JANIS CREASON: Sure. 5 6 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Our next testifier is 7 Julian Prager, Second Vice President and Legislative Chair 8 with the PA Federation of Dog Clubs and a former member of 9 the Dog Law Advisory Board. 10 Welcome, sir. 11 SECOND VICE PRESIDENT JULIAN PRAGER: Thank you, 12 Mr. Chairman. MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Thank you for being 13 14 here with us. If you could proceed with your testimony. 15 SECOND VICE PRESIDENT JULIAN PRAGER: You have my 16 written testimony so I'm not going to speak directly to 17 that. 18 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Yes, sir. 19 SECOND VICE PRESIDENT JULIAN PRAGER: But I do 20 have a few things I would like to expand on. 21 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Okav. 22 SECOND VICE PRESIDENT JULIAN PRAGER: One is my 23 background. You should know, just for the sake of openness, 24 that we were Plaintiffs in the lawsuit against the 25 Commonwealth to restore the funds to the Dog Law restricted

account.

We also in 2008 were very involved in the changes to the Dog Law, both with members of this Committee and members of the Senate Committee and members of both Legislatures. In fact, we awarded a member of this Committee at that time our Legislator of the Year Award. And I'm pleased to see that she's still a member of this Committee.

There are a couple of things that I would like to bring to your attention. One is we certainly support the increases in fees. And, yes, there's an educational effort that has to be undertaken in order to do that, but we don't think that's an overreach.

The fees that the Commonwealth charges are significantly lower than the fees in any comparable jurisdiction. And I don't see people being unwilling to safeguard their dogs. And it depends on how you sell it. But to safeguard their dogs for a slightly higher cost, that is something that I think people will support.

I have one concern with the Secretary's comments, although I agree with his conclusions. And that is he talked about where the revenue for Dog Law come s from but not where the expenses are.

And we were concerned about why the bill does not address kennel license fees. Because if you're talking

about having a system where you have essentially cost centers, you ought to look at whether the activities of that call center are funded by the fees associated with it. And we would hope that the Committee would take a look at that.

I understand that there are time constraints and that the Department faces significant risks if action is not taken quickly. So it may not wind up as being part of this bill, but it is something that we would like the Legislature to consider in the future because in 2008 -- and this is now nine years later -- we proposed increasing kennel license fees. We proposed increasing dog license fees because it had been so long. It hadn't kept up with inflation. And the Department needed the funds to conduct its operations. We still believe that that's true.

The members of the purebred dog breeding community all supported increases in kennel license fees. I should also say that I have a kennel license. So I'm not speaking as somebody who would be unaffected by this.

The shelters in the Commonwealth, you know, face a unique problem. Being able to take care of the Commonwealth's dogs is, I think, the paramount issue that should be facing them. Unfortunately -- and, again, it's not stricter than the scope of this law, but we're talking about reimbursements to local shelters for taking dogs in.

Local shelters have crowding issues. And one of

the reasons they have crowding issues is because dogs are coming into the Commonwealth from outside the Commonwealth.

And I'm not talking about an emergency like we've recently seen in Texas and in Florida and along the Coast. But I'm talking about just generally.

1.3

Dogs are moving around the country. And that affects the ability of the local Humane Societies and the local shelters to take care of the dogs in the Commonwealth. We would hope that that would be something the Legislature might want to take a look at.

The one aspect of the current law, which is not changing the proposal that we are concerned about, is the differential in the fees for intact and spayed and neutered dogs because that's not really a licensing issue. That's a policy issue that has to do with the impact of those dogs on the community.

And certainly from our perspective, most of the shelter dogs are not purebred dogs. And we don't see ourselves as contributing to that problem. And we're not interested in paying additional money to support activities which we're not responsible for. There's no enforcement difference, no licensing difference, in finding an intact dog that's not licensed and finding a spayed and neutered dog that's not licensed.

We would hope that that distinction -- again,

perhaps not in this bill, but as things move forward --1 2 would be eliminated from the law. 3 I would also like to mention there are -- at 4 least there were until recently -- two vacant positions on 5 the Dog Law Advisory Board, two statutory positions, which 6 affect both me and the speaker, who is going to follow me, 7 because those two positions -- they may have been filled; 8 I'm not sure -- were for a representative of a purebred dog 9 registry and a representative of dog clubs. 10 And it seems to me that the Dog Law Advisory 11 Board is missing some significant input by having those two 12 positions vacant. And I would hope that the Department would move forward to fill those vacancies. 1.3 14 Thank you for inviting me to speak to you. 15 course, would be glad to discuss anything with you in the 16 future should you want our input. 17 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Thank you very much 18 for your testimony. 19 Mr. Secretary, are those two positions still 20 vacant, do you know? 21 SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: I believe they are. 22 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Okay. Thank you. 23 Any questions from the members? 24 Representative Millard.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: Not a question.

But I

25

think that you mentioned about the licensing kennels with this. There's no question that, you know, they're all germane to what is being proposed here.

1.3

However, I think the issue before this Committee today is to focus on the individual dog owners and if they license their pet, their domesticated pet. And, you know, I think the kennels and everything else is, again, although it's germane -- I'm not going to speak for the Secretary -- but I think even though it's germane that that isn't the issue today.

The focal point today is to ensure that each individual dog owner pays their way to support the good work that the Department of Ag does.

And I do want to take one minute to compliment your Department and the dog wardens. You know, less than two months ago, my wife was viciously attacked by a dog.

Your Department was very responsive. And when I tell you that it was a vicious attack, I'm not understating it. You were Johnny-on-the-spot.

Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Any other questions?

Thank you, sir, for the information that you've presented today.

SECOND VICE PRESIDENT JULIAN PRAGER: You're

1 welcome.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Our next presenter is
Mr. John Gibble, the Political Action Chair for the
Northeast Beagle Federation and also a former member of the
Dog Law Advisory Board.

Welcome, sir.

ACTION CHAIR JOHN GIBBLE: Good morning.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: You may proceed.

ACTION CHAIR JOHN GIBBLE: I thought I could come here and give you perhaps a user's experience with the dog licensing, the folks that I speak for, Beagle Clubs, folks that hunt and field trial.

Gary and Linda Slick said good morning.

Probably every one of your districts I could throw a rock off your district office and probably hit one of the Beaglers. Your district, sir, Susquehanna Beagle Club over by Berwick. There's quite a few of us around. Dogs, coyotes, hounds, coon hunters. It's a good constituency.

Most of us have several dogs. We might breed a dog on occasion, but it's not a commercial affair by any means. Many of us had kennel licenses back until 2008. And at that point, we were, frankly, harassed out of that and forced to -- some of us downsized to make sure that we stayed under the 26 threshold, 26-dog threshold, and just

went to buying individual dog licenses. I'll admit that probably a lot of them have bypassed buying dog licenses since.

In my experience, several years ago I would go to my veterinarian and purchase a dog license I needed. It was an annual trip there. The dogs that needed rabies vaccinations went along. We purchased the dog licenses at the time. For some reason, the veterinarians don't seem to do that anymore.

Nowadays I head over to the Veterans Center there in New Bloomfield and pester the Treasurer and get my eight or ten dog licenses there.

As Julian alluded to, sometimes we had a little trouble with the 4.50, the 6.50, or the 8.50 based on whether they're spayed or neutered, yeah, okay, do that one it's 6.50. This one is 8.50. So if we could kind of focus on going towards a universal fee for a dog license, it would make some of our lives a little easier.

I buy a hunting license. And I know the Game

Commission is doing a good job bringing -- managing game,

gamelands, places for me to engage in hunting. I buy a fish

license. I go up and fish beautiful lakes that the Fish

Commission maintains. They stock trout in streams for us to

fish.

I come to buy a dog license and I have to scratch

my head as to why I buy it. Okay. The Department says it's your dog's ticket home. Their website says they pick up 50 to 100 dogs per month. Their annual report from 2016 says they handled 5,009 stray dogs. I sincerely doubt that those were all stray dogs.

With 46 wardens, that would be over 100 dogs per warden, per year. A lot of these have to do with the kennel operations or hoarding operations that are being depopulated and those dogs shuttled to shelters.

If we go with the 50 to 100 dogs per month, that's 900, 1,200 a year. 919,000 licenses -- I'm sorry -- 964,000 licenses that were sold last year, that's a one-in-a-thousand chance that my dog is going to go there.

Now what happens when my dog is picked up?

Oftentimes the dog is delivered to a shelter because there's only 83 shelters that are currently accepting stray dogs in the Commonwealth. It may be another county or two counties over. Now that dog that was lost from my backyard is now 60, 70 miles from my home. Oftentimes these dogs lose their collars. The collar could be taken off.

Representative Tobash, one of your constituents related a story where his dog was in a shelter for three days properly tagged and with a collar. He called the shelter directly and was told repeatedly that the dog was not there. Luckily for him his mother was a volunteer at

the very same shelter and found the dog.

Why this happens, I have no idea. Are these dogs being marketed? You know, is that \$300 adoption fee after 48 hours that important? I have no idea. But that system is not working. Our local Facebook page seems to work very well. I know if I would post on there that I lost a dog, there would be an army of busybodies launched in the neighborhood, headed out, picking up my dog and bringing it right to my house.

I often wonder how many times the dog is picked up running down the street in front of the house. If we had this electronic system that's being proposed, you know, the warden or police officer could reference right there, say this dog belongs at 119 North Market Street, and go directly to the home before we go to the shelter.

But instead we drive two counties over to drop
the dog off where it's not found or we have difficulties
finding it. So I have trouble saying that you need to pay
more money for this kind of service.

In June this year, Representatives from Lancaster County might remember the news report of the dangerous -registered dangerous dog that broke through a fence and attacked two children being strapped in their minivan. \$500 a year to keep a case of dynamite in your neighborhood seems like a rather small fee considering the danger to the

public.

We've heard the Secretary talk about the expenses of that program and perhaps if you choose to maintain that type of dog, then you should be required to pay for that service. I don't see where it's my responsibility or the responsibility of responsible dog owners.

Likewise with the kennel licenses. I was on the Advisory Board back in 2008 when we went through all of this stuff. And we cautioned at that time, two annual inspections -- last year it was 5,200 and some of the 2,340 facilities -- that's a big expense, more than the \$414,000 that was brought in on the sale of county licenses.

Non-profits. They get a \$25 kennel license to bring in as many dogs as they want to the Commonwealth, train, maintain, keep. But only 83 of those 405 non-profit kennels are actually providing a service by accepting stray dogs. I really don't think our folks are interested in supporting that end of things either.

So that's kind of the user's perspective. And I'll cut it short from there. You have my testimony. I appreciate greatly that you heard me.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Are there any questions?

Thank you very much for your testimony. It's very helpful as we move forward with the consideration of

this bill.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: And our last testifier is Mary Kennedy Withrow, current member of the Dog Law Advisory Board.

ACTION CHAIR JOHN GIBBLE: Thank you.

Thank you for joining us.

MARY KENNEDY WITHROW: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: You may proceed.

MARY KENNEDY WITHROW: Thank you.

You all have my testimony so I'll keep this brief. A lot of what I was going to say people have already said. I would like to -- like Janis, I am also a Republican, a fiscal conservative. My grandfather served in this same House.

I want to remind people that even though it's a license, it's essentially a user fee. If you don't own a dog, you don't pay. What makes it different is that what is paid to the Department of Agriculture for dog licensing protects all Pennsylvanians. So everybody benefits from the user fee paid by dog owners.

It would make more sense fiscally to increase the user fee rather than have the cost -- we have to borrow the money and then every Pennsylvanian is then contributing to the cost of owning a dog.

One other thing -- I'll just keep this brief,

too. I would like to actually write something as a person who has been a shelter director at two of the largest shelters in Pennsylvania. I would kind of like to write some rebuttal to some of the things, information about shelters, your question about how the law will change with Libre's Law.

In Pittsburgh we've had a tethering ban for four years so I can speak to stats about that. I could maybe submit to Kerry something that would answer some of the questions.

The other thing that I would like to mention,
too, is one thing dog wardens are responsible for are rabies
tags. Rabies is 99.9 percent fatal to humans. So it does
need to be monitored.

And as far as there only being 83 shelters who are holding dogs -- and wardens are not just the only people that bring dogs into an open-door shelter. They come in all day. And the cost of our shelter was \$33 a day. So we get reimbursed for \$40 for a dog that we're going to spend thousands on literally.

I think everything else has been said that needs to be said. I don't want to hold you guys up any longer. Really appreciate the chance to testify.

Kerry, thank you.

I hope that you will all support House Bill 1463.

| 1  | It's desperately needed. We can't keep cutting human         |
|----|--|
| 2  | capital.   |
| 3  | MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Thank you very much.               |
| 4  | Are there any questions?                                     |
| 5  | Representative Millard.                                      |
| 6  | REPRESENTATIVE MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, I would                |
| 7  | hope that we could provide the Secretary a chance to clarify |
| 8  | the differentiation in the fees for spayed and neutered and  |
| 9  | non-spayed and neutered. I think that it's to control        |
| 10 | population, an incentive to do that. But I'd like to hear    |
| 11 | that directly.   |
| 12 | Thank you.   |
| 13 | MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: We can offer the                   |
| 14 | Secretary that opportunity, if he would like.                |
| 15 | Are there any questions for our testifier?                   |
| 16 | If not, thank you very much.                                 |
| 17 | MARY KENNEDY WITHROW: Thank you.                             |
| 18 | MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: The information that               |
| 19 | you presented is very helpful.                               |
| 20 | MARY KENNEDY WITHROW: Okay.                                  |
| 21 | MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Thank you for joining              |
| 22 | us today.  |
| 23 | MARY KENNEDY WITHROW: Thank you.                             |
| 24 | MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Mr. Secretary, you're              |
| 25 | back.  |

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: It's good to see you again.

I think it's a population-control issue. I don't know the whole history here. Maybe Kristen can share some of that or we can follow up in writing with the Committee of just the history of whether, you know, over the course of years this is a relatively new development or if that really has been sort of part and parcel to a dog law in Pennsylvania. I honestly don't know that.

But I know just in the conversations around the Dog Law Advisory Board and the Bureau it's been sort of the population-control piece and some incentive to get the spayed and neutered done if it's not.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Thank you.

Any other questions?

Representative Madden.

REPRESENTATIVE MADDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE MADDEN: I have a quick question.

I'm certainly in favor of the two different prices for a dog that's spayed or neutered because I know when I brought my dog -- my husband brought my dog yesterday to the AWSOM

Clinic for a check-up, that's the first thing they ask. If they pick up a stray dog, there's more cost to spay and neuter a dog.

I guess my other question is, is there a different price or should there possibly be a different price for a pet owner who has taken the time to put a chip in a dog so that, as Mr. Gibble was saying, you know, two counties away the dog had to be taken because they didn't know who the dog was. But if there was a chip, then they have -- it would have been quicker to get that dog to its

And I know we had that problem. My husband found a stray dog. We brought it to our local shelter. And it had a chip and the dog was reunited within an hour of being found.

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Yes.

DIRECTOR KRISTEN DUNMOYER: That would be the lifetime license. As part of a requirement to have that license, the dog has to be microchipped or tattooed.

REPRESENTATIVE MADDEN: Excellent. Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Chairman Pashinski.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN PASHINSKI: I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank the Secretary and everyone that came here today and testified. Your testimony was extremely valuable.

And, Mary, I really would look forward to your assessment. Your experience is invaluable. And, you know,

your observations today will definitely help us as we continue on with this.

But a sincere thank you to everyone for your testimony.

Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for the opportunity to bring this bill forward.

Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Mr. Secretary, I didn't expect you to do double duty and come back up. But since you did stay with us and heard the additional testimony, in the last couple of minutes that we have, do you have any closing thoughts regarding anything that you heard in the testimony or any additional brief points that you'd like to make before we adjourn?

SECRETARY RUSSELL REDDING: Yes

Mr. Chairman, thank you. I'll just say that the conversation has actually been very helpful. I mean, there's sort of a confirmation of, you know, you need the fee. We need to do something. We can't stay on the path we're on.

Two is, I think the functionality of the on-line system and how do we respect the County Treasurers and, as Janis has pointed out, it really has been key to that sort of community and the local point of contact and the sensitivity to that, I think, are really going to be

important.

Three, this discussion about the fees for kennels
-- and as I said in the testimony at the offset, we didn't
focus on that, just given the, you know, 85, 87 percent of
the income to the Bureau. We really put the emphasis on the
fee and being sensitive to some fees were increased. Kennel
fees increased in 2008. That would be -- that was our
focus.

I think this continued conversation of how you address sort of the unlicensed, currently unlicensed dogs, I think that's part of the perpetual challenge. You have a lot of these dogs that are in the Commonwealth that are here now and are a public concern, health and safetywise, that we're not presently getting into the system.

I think that collective challenge of, how do you do that? Do you do it prior to first purchase? Do you do it, you know, through the veterinarians? I mean, I think that is a conversation worth continuing of, how do we do that?

We know we have natural points of access for animal care. How do we do it? Is there a conversation? and even larger around sort of the pet food companies and the retail and the services provided that are beyond, you know, healthcare for dogs. It could be part of this conversation about how to bring them into this.

But overall, Mr. Chairman, just very helpful. 1 2 think that you've got the really good foundation within 3 1463. And we appreciate Representative Pashinski having 4 this hearing. 5 We'll go back. I mean, I really want to follow 6 up on a couple of points. You were asking about the Dog Law 7 Advisory Board and the appointments there. I want to have 8 that conversation with staff just to figure out where we 9 are. 10 And we have a Dog Law Advisory Board meeting 11 coming in a couple weeks. 12 We really appreciate your interest and help to 13 focus this conversation and legislation. 14 Thank you. 15 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN CAUSER: Well, thank you very 16 much to you and your team for being here today and the 17 information that's been presented. 18 As I said, it's a formal public hearing so there 19 will be a transcript for anybody that would like the 20 transcript. And the video will also be available. 21 Thank you to everyone. This meeting is 22 adjourned. 23 (Whereupon, the hearing adjourned.) 24

25

| 1  | I hereby certify that the proceedings and                |
|----|--|
| 2  | evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes |
| 3  | taken by me on the within proceedings and that this is a |
| 4  | correct transcript of the same.                          |
| 5  |  |
| 6  |  |
| 7  |  |
| 8  | Jean M. Davis  |
| 9  | Notary Public  |
| 10 |  |
| 11 |  |
| 12 |  |
| 13 |  |
| 14 |  |
| 15 |  |
| 16 |  |
| 17 |  |
| 18 |  |
| 19 |  |
| 20 |  |
| 21 |  |
| 22 |  |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |
|    |  |

**-**90 -