

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STAFF ANALYSIS

BILL #: HB 255

Rabies Vaccination

SPONSOR(S): Russell

TIED BILLS:

IDEN./SIM. BILLS: SB 898

REFERENCE	ACTION	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR
1) Agriculture Committee	11 Y, 0 N	Kaiser	Reese
2) Health Care General Committee	7 Y, 0 N	Schiefelbein	Brown-Barrios
3) State Resources Council		Kaiser	Hamby
4) _____	_____	_____	_____
5) _____	_____	_____	_____

SUMMARY ANALYSIS

Current law requires all dogs, cats, and ferrets 4 months of age or older to be vaccinated against rabies by a licensed veterinarian using a United States Government approved vaccine. HB 255 requires the initial vaccination of all dogs, cats, and ferrets, with the animal being revaccinated 12 months after the initial vaccination. Thereafter, the vaccinations shall conform to the vaccine manufacturer's directions.

The effective date of this legislation is January 1, 2006, to accommodate rabies vaccination programs, which are administered on a calendar year basis.

The bill appears to have no fiscal impact on state government. However, by recognizing the duration of immunity for a 3-year vaccine, counties may realize some savings related to costs associated with tags, fees and processing.

FULL ANALYSIS

I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

A. HOUSE PRINCIPLES ANALYSIS:

Safeguard individual liberty: The bill provides pet owners the option of having pets vaccinated annually or every three years.

B. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

Current law requires all dogs, cats, and ferrets 4 months of age or older to be vaccinated against rabies by a licensed veterinarian using a United States Government approved vaccine. However, the statutes do not provide for revaccination.

HB 255 requires the initial vaccination of all dogs, cats, and ferrets, with the animal being revaccinated 12 months after the initial vaccination. Thereafter, the vaccinations shall conform to the vaccine manufacturer's directions, whether it requires revaccination annually or every 3 years. The bill clarifies that the vaccine be licensed by the United States Department of Agriculture.

Additionally, the bill codifies language currently in the state's Rabies Prevention and Control Manual precluding the use of rabies titers in lieu of revaccination.

For reporting purposes, the bill authorizes the adoption of the National Association of State Public Health Veterinarians' NASPHV Form 51, "Rabies Vaccination Certificate," or an equivalent form approved by the local government containing all the information required by the NASPHV Form 51.

The bill prohibits local governments from mandating revaccination of currently vaccinated animals except in instances involving post-exposure treatment for rabies.

The effective date of the legislation is January 1, 2006 to accommodate rabies vaccination programs, which are administered on a calendar year basis.

C. SECTION DIRECTORY:

Section 1: Amends s. 828.30, F.S., revising requirements for frequency of rabies vaccinations.

Section 2: Provides legislative intent.

Section 3: Provides an effective date of January 1, 2006.

II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

1. Revenues:

Provisions of the bill appear to have no impact on state government revenues.

2. Expenditures:

Provisions of the bill appear to have no impact on state government expenditures.

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues:

Please see Fiscal Comment section below.

2. Expenditures:

Please see Fiscal Comment section below.

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

Pet owners may realize some savings by choosing to have their animal(s) vaccinated every 3 years, rather than annually.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

Although the bill requires using new vaccination certificates, the cost of implementing the use of new forms will be negligible as most vaccine producers provide the forms free-of-charge. By recognizing the duration of immunity for a 3-year vaccine, counties may realize savings of approximately \$6.00 per animal vaccinated with the 3-year vaccine. The potential savings are related to costs associated with tags, fees and processing costs.

III. COMMENTS

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

1. Applicability of Municipality/County Mandates Provision:

HB 255 prohibits local governments from mandating revaccination of currently vaccinated animals except in instances of post-exposure treatment.

2. Other: None

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

This legislation contains no grant of rule-making authority.

C. DRAFTING ISSUES OR OTHER COMMENTS:

None

IV. AMENDMENTS/COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE & COMBINED BILL CHANGES