

1. Call to Order

Mr. Neuman called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm

- Attendance

Present:

Tamara Barrick, Pima Paws for Life
Nancy Emptage, Vice-Chair, Animal Welfare Coalition
Pat Hubbard, Humane Society of Southern Arizona
Yvette Hurley, City of Tucson
Pat Jacobs, Tucson Kennel Club
Jack Neuman, Chair, PACC Volunteers
Erin O'Donnell, DVM, Southern AZ Veterinary Medical Association
Jane Schwerin, People for Animals in the Prevention of Cruelty and Neglect
Kim Janes, Pima Animal Care Center (PACC), Ex-Officio

Absent:

Sophia Kaluzniacki, DVM, SPCA of AZ, Inc
Derek Marshall, Public Education
Helen Mendelsohn, Disabled Community
Gail Smith, MD, Board of Health

- Pledge of Allegiance

2. Adoption of the Minutes

- Adoption of the June 18, 2015 Meeting Minutes

The motion was made and seconded (Emptage/Hubbard) that the June 18, 2015 meeting minutes be adopted as written. The motion carried (8-0).

3. Animal Welfare and Dangerous Animal Cases for the Month of June and Recent Holds Snapshot

Ms. Schwerin referred to welfare case one which involved a dog on a tangled chain. In the report one of the Officer's suggested options was to crate train the dog. Ms. Schwerin said she is against crate training because she believes the dogs end up staying in the crate all the time. Ms. Schwerin asked if the owner in welfare case ten posted the bond. The case involved a homeless man and puppies which died in the heat. Mr. Janes answered that the bond was not posted and the remaining animals were forfeited to PACC on July 8. Ms. Emptage requested the owner in this case not be allowed to own animals until he has a stable home situation. Mr. Janes said he would pass on her request though enforcement staff to the County Attorney's Office. Ms. Hurley pointed out the owner in this case had placed a collar with a license from a deceased dog on the mother dog, and asked if that was illegal and if there was a citation issued. Mr. Janes said his recollection is that it is illegal in all the local jurisdictions, and said it does not appear (from the report) that such a citation was issued. Ms. Emptage requested such a citation be issued.

Ms. Schwerin asked if the dog Sativa, which has been on a hold for a number of months, is still being held at PACC and what is going on with the case. Mr. Janes reported the dog is still on a hold at PACC; that the owner appealed the decision to forfeit the dog to PACC; and that the hearing date (in Superior Court) has not been set yet. He added he has spoken with the County Attorney's Office trying to expedite the legal process. Discussion brought out that Sativa is not being walked because she is considered dangerous. Ms. Barrick asked if all dogs on legal holds do not get walked, and Mr. Janes said the decision is made between staff, the jurisdiction and the attorneys. He added that in some cases animals on holds could be placed with a foster.

Ms. Schwerin referred to an injured animal on the hold list in a felony case and said that it's not always good to go with a felony charge over a misdemeanor because the animal gets held longer. Mr. Janes pointed out the dog was confiscated on July 5 and is being held pending the forensic medical report be completed, then the animal could be released from the hold. Ms. Schwerin contended that PACC officers have a good track record in court and their testimony coupled with pictures make for good cases; therefore, the animal doesn't need to be held.

Ms. Schwerin referred to an animal on a hold with a notation to hold the animal in quarantine for 45 to 180 days, and asked about why the quarantine is so long. Mr. Janes said the animal in question on the report was removed from its hold on July 14, and went on to say a vaccinated animal exposed or possibly exposed to rabies (wildlife exposure) must be quarantined 45 days, but an unvaccinated animal exposed or possibly exposed to rabies must be quarantined under veterinary care for 180 days. Mr. Janes was unsure of the quarantine rules for pet on pet bites. Ms. Hubbard asked Dr. O'Donnell about dog on dog bites. Dr. O'Donnell's practice tries to verify the biter's vaccination status and informs the bitten dog's owner.

Ms. Schwerin asked about the last animal on the report, a cat brought in to be euthanized. Per Mr. Janes, the cat had a bad leg and the owner was given a \$1,500 quote to amputate the leg. Staff's assessment was that the surgery should not cost that much. The animal was returned to the owner who took it to a vet who performed the surgery and the cat is now home with its owner.

4. Call to the Audience

There were two speakers at this call to the audience: Marcie Velen and Lee Bucyk.

Ms. Velen, with No Kill Pima County, said she is not in favor of a spay-abort policy. Some consider the practice prevention, but she cannot consider it in the same category as spay and neuter efforts. She said it's not like a morning after pill; many of the puppies and kittens are viable. She said a shelter is not a good place for puppies and kittens to be born; shelters are high risk environments for newborn pets, but contended that if a place is available why not let rescues take the pregnant animals out. Ms. Velen suggested a policy giving rescues the opportunity to take pregnant animals from PACC. She said currently rescues are allowed to take an animal except a pregnant one; and that doesn't make sense to her.

Ms. Bucyk identified herself as the Executive Director of Hermitage No-Kill Cat Shelter. She also said she is not in favor of a spay-abort policy. Hermitage will take kittens and has offered to do so from PACC. They have taken pregnant cats, kittens and special needs cats from PACC. She contended there is no reason for such a policy when rescues are willing to take the animals. She added that if Pima County truly wants to be no-kill, then this policy needs to be addressed. Recently

when Hermitage took numerous kittens they asked PACC to spay and neuter the kittens once they reached two pounds and PACC refused their request. She contended that the reason PACC has an 80 percent live release rate is due to the rescues and rescues don't receive enough recognition.

5. Management Report

Mr. Janes reported the current year-to-date live release rate is 85 percent, with June's rate at 88 percent. He also pointed out the monthly operational report now has an additional line for enforcement calls for service 'requested' in addition to the line which shows total responses. The requested line represents all calls for service, not all of which are addressed. The additional line was requested at the last Committee meeting.

Mr. Janes referred to an additional handout provided at the meeting, with one side being a financial report for the City of Tucson through May 2015 and the other side showing statistics for cost allocation through May 2015. On the Tucson financial side he wanted the Committee to see where the donations are applied to the various cost categories pursuant to the intentions of the donors. He added that PACC's budget is built with the anticipation of receiving hundreds of thousands of dollars in donations. He continued that there are also donations of items and hundreds of hours from volunteers that do not show on this report. Mr. Jacobs asked if the general services statistical distribution between jurisdictions is similar to past years and Mr. Janes replied that they are very similar year to year.

Ms. Schwerin referred to Mr. Janes' Manager's Report memorandum item A15-170618 which indicated when a recheck was done the officer observe no dog on the patio and there was no answer at the door. She said the recheck was insufficient; wanted to know what happened with the dog; and requested another recheck. Mr. Janes said he would relay her request to staff. Mr. Neuman referred to the first case (A15-172564) and asked if no answer and no waste was a typical follow up outcome. Mr. Janes referred to the challenges of going back over and over and said officers are looking for indications of improvement on previously noted negative behavior, for example, no accumulated pet waste or a dog once left in the sun without shelter is not found in that state again. In response to a question, Mr. Janes indicated rechecks are generally unannounced.

6. Old Business

- City of Tucson Animal Care Funding / Jurisdiction IGA Discussion

Mr. Janes reported that thanks to many hours of effort from Tucson and County staff a new one-year intergovernmental agreement (IGA) for animal care services is in place. He added that the IGA is a model for going forward and should eliminate some of the challenges encountered this past year.

Ms. Hurley provided the following statements regarding the new IGA:

On June 23, 2015 the City of Tucson Mayor and Council voted 6-1 to approve the IGA, which is the intergovernmental agreement with Pima County, to fund the City's portion of costs for Pima Animal Care. Before that discussion the City agreed to pay about \$230,000 for the tent in an amendment to the prior year contract. That was a good decision in my opinion because the animals are truly helped by the additional space. Now concerning the vote on the IGA that just began on seven, one, fifteen, there was one dissenting voice,

Council member Steve Kozachik, who made a valiant attempt to inform the other council members of the inclusion of administrative overhead charges for the Pima County Administrator's Office in the amount of \$294,000, although the amount was left out of the contract. Now, Council member Kozachik was also concerned that the contract did not include legal language barring Pima County from again entering into debt agreements and contracting for major purchases at PACC, without first consulting the other jurisdictions, and then including these costs in the monthly charges. This was the case in fiscal year 2014/15 when Pima County added the tent structure and pushed through the costs to the jurisdictions without prior approval. Administrator Huckelberry earns a base salary of \$320,000; he is well worth every penny. This IGA, the City portion, will nearly cover the entire cost of his base salary. The other jurisdictions will kick in another roughly \$150,000 to fund his office. Pima County salaries are already covered by the property tax that we all pay to Pima County; the inclusion of these costs again in the IGA represents a tax upon a tax; this point was made by Steve Kozachik. City of Tucson residents through their governmental budget will now pay again for the same costs to fund Pima County; this will free up the money of course so that Pima County can spend the money in other ways. Never before in the 55 years of this agreement have these types of non-shelter related charges ever been part of this contract. This contract has been around since 1961. Furthermore, this institutionalizes these non-shelter overhead charges and from here on out the City and the other jurisdictions will struggle to pay these escalating costs; and these costs have no connection to the community of animals and people served by this contract.

So these charges will negatively impact the animals in the City of Tucson jurisdiction; let me explain. The City budget just passed by the Mayor and Council at \$1.36 billion has very limited funds. This IGA increases City costs approximately another one million dollars; \$300,000 of this, approximately, is to fund Administrator Huckelberry's office. The prior year City costs for the PACC IGA were \$3.9 million on a budget of just under \$7.8 million. So this is about a 23 percent increase in PACC costs to the City over the prior year; that's huge, just huge. This contract crafted by Administrator Huckelberry indicates that the City can scale back enforcement if it is unable to pay the amount under this contract. So what does scaling back enforcement look like? It means that when a concerned person calls 911 to report a dog in the street the staff at PACC can be instructed to say that they are unable to respond because the City has not paid the payment through this contract, so a dog is killed in traffic. It means that less abuse reports will be investigated; less community education regarding existing pet laws, and less unlicensed animals forced into licensing. It is, of course, the City's fault for not properly negotiating this contract. Many of the City Council Members, if you watch the meeting, which I did, appeared not to have read the IGA before voting. The City manager was only interim and she was quick to hand the baton to the next City Manager who just started July 1. His name is Michael Flores [Ortega]. So she was anxious to get all the contracts signed and get everything in a pretty little package for the new manager. By the way I've been with the City of Tucson ten years and I think that's our seventh City Manager. To contrast that with Pima County, Administrator Huckelberry has been there I think over 20 years, so they've had very consistent management; we have had very inconsistent management. So all of these factors, and a very clever Pima County Administrator, with impeccable timing, with a full staff of public relations personnel, has managed to paint the City as a bad faith partner in its fee for service contract for animal services through PACC, but the City has continued to bear the lion share of all PACC costs, approximately 56 percent this coming year. This

new IGA attributes an even larger share of PACC costs to the City; and the total budget for PACC, in case you were unaware is \$8.8 million.

No representative from the City has ever advocated killing animals to reduce costs, or training more people to euthanize animals, never, but the County has. The County Administrator made that claim and it was very publicly stated in the local newspaper; a cruel threat that worked. Now due to the pressure put on the City to sign this contract and poor representation on the City Council, we are paying for the County Administrator's total salary with this PACC contract. Now at the last meeting Ms. Emptage stated shame on the City, and I say tonight shame on Pima County for loading down this contract with bloat and using its incredible media machine to push this forward.

So what's the big deal, right, the City of Tucson should pay its fair share, right; I've heard that about 50 times. Well let me tell you about the City's financial situation. The City's bond rating was recently downgraded; what this means is that when they go to borrow, the interest rate is higher so they have to put out more money for interest. And there is actually in the current budget that was just passed, zero dollars for street repair, so they're going to have to float bonds, and when they float bonds the interest rate is going to be higher because of that decrease in the bond rating. Now, City of Tucson employees, including police and fire, have not received a pay increase in ten years. There was a one percent pay increase in 2013, but there was a seven, I think it was eight percent increase in health insurance cost, so we actually had a negative paycheck, a negative increase, it was actually a decrease. The Fire Department's fleet of vehicles are way past their useful lives; the ladder trucks that you see on the street; I just work for the Fire Department, so I know; have been repaired and re-repaired so many times that it is getting difficult to get any more work out of them. If you watch the fire trucks on the street they look really shiny; that's because there's a bunch of really young, very physically fit fire fighters who shine them up and they really keep them in good shape, but they're falling apart and the City can't keep any good mechanics because their salaries are too low. So, and the City continues to raid its rainy day fund to balance its budget, and this year they didn't have to. And these are just things that I want to talk about because I want to talk about the City's financial situation.

The County is in a much better financial situation than the City and I was very disappointed in this vote because it does include these administrative overhead charges that have nothing to do with the core service that this shelter is providing. The City already pays for the overhead charges for the Health Department; it already pays for the total overhead and all the salaries, well 55 percent of the salaries of the shelter. So the City's financial outlook is not good.

The reason I want to talk about this today is because I did talk to the City's budget manger; I've had regular meetings with her about PACC; and when you have a City that has a limited budget; the costs keep going up; it looks like when the \$22 million shelter comes on board the costs are probably going to double, that's my estimate. How is the City going to pay for these; because there is no kind of funding in the bond to fund the operating costs of that new shelter? I don't know if you're aware of that. So it's going to be funded the same way it's funded right now, which is going to be by IGA. So that means the City, Oro Valley, Marana will have to pay the costs to operate that shelter. Very little cost remains

with Pima County; now Pima County has to outlay the cost, but they bill all the jurisdictions for the costs. So will the costs double; will they triple; and how will they find the money to pay it? So, you might expect that if you have half the animals you have half the funding; what are they looking at; they are looking at alternatives to PACC, so they have been searching out other ways to shelter their animals. Oro Valley is going to do the same thing; I'm sure Marana will eventually. And when we get a City Manager that's around for any length of time, and we have somebody who can actually manage the City's budget, he will look at these options. I just want to let you know that. I'm not trying to be depressing, but it is something, truly something they are looking at right now as an option to PACC. So making this contract bloated, overfilled with these additional things does not help any of the partners; it's very short term thinking. Yes, it helps Pima County cover their budget, but in the long term it doesn't help the shelter and it doesn't help the animals in Pima County and the City of Tucson, so I just wanted to say that, thanks.

Ms. Hubbard asked if Ms. Hurley's statement was generated by Mr. Kozachik or by Ms. Hurley. Ms. Hurley replied that she wrote the statement, but that she has spoken with Mr. Kozachik frequently, as well as with the budget director. Ms. Hubbard pointed out that all but one on the City Council voted for the IGA, so they thought it was the thing to do. Ms. Hurley added that if you watch the video of the meeting, most of the Council was so enthused about the one dollar increase in licensing fees that they used that as an excuse to go ahead and ignore the fact that the City is being charged an outrageous amount for administrative overhead for the County Administrator's Office. She estimated the increase in licensing revenue to be approximately \$30,000 for the City and suggested it would be less if there is less enforcement. Mr. Neuman echoed Ms. Hubbard's comment, saying six of the seven City representatives voted, for whatever reasons, in favor of the IGA. There was some discussion on whether Ms. Hurley would or should provide the written document she read from. She expressed that the pages had additional notes, and that what was said and written do not completely match. Mr. Janes said the minutes will reflect what was said.

- Volunteer Policy and Partnership Agreement

Mr. Neuman said to remove this item from Old Business unless staff wants to put it back on.

- Animal Care Staffing

Mr. Janes said PACC just hired one new Enforcement Officer and recruitment is underway for one Shelter Supervisor, two Animal Care Techs and a Program Coordinator. PACC also recently received a grant for two part time positions, with one being an Animal Care Specialist to assist with tracking animals to ensure every animal is receiving proper daily care. In response to questions, Mr. Janes said the grant is from a local donor and the positions are temporary unless continued funding can be secured. Dr. O'Donnell asked about the process of donating a grant and Mr. Janes briefly discussed connecting with PACC's Fund Development Director, Karen Hollish.

- Licensing Awareness

Ms. Emptage provided an updated draft letter (dated July 16, 2015) to the Southern Arizona Veterinary Medical Association (SAVMA). She said many dog owners don't realize they need a license and that veterinary office paperwork does not say anything about the requirement. The letter requests veterinary offices should promote licensing awareness through signage and/or by adding

licensing requirement notification wording to their vaccination receipts. She also feels veterinarians should promote microchipping and do microchip checks on every pet to help ensure that everything is in order to help reunite lost pets with their owners. Mr. Neuman asked if enforcement officers in the field are they supposed to check for dog licenses. Mr. Janes said the standard is to confirm licensing status either through the owner's paperwork or PACC's electronic records and to cite if there is no license when required. Ms. Emptage relayed a story about an owner of an unlicensed dog. The dog needed veterinary care and the owner stopped at the DMV, with the dog in the car, after going to the vet. The owner said he checked on the dog in the car every 15 minutes; however, PACC was called and now he must get a license and the animal is unaltered, so he has to get it fixed or pay a much higher licensing fee.

- Licensing Fee Structure

Mr. Neuman said the speaker who was going to talk on this topic was not able to make the meeting. Mr. Janes referred the Committee to the proposed ordinance to amend licensing fees in Pima County Code 6.04.070, which was in the packet. He pointed out the proposed changes including the elimination of the senior/disabled unaltered dog license discount; the provision that only unaltered guide dogs be licensed without a fee; and the addition of a provision to license active or retired law enforcement dogs without a fee. He added that he just found out that all retired law enforcement dogs must be altered, so he requested that the word "altered" be added in front of the word "retired" in the ordinance for consideration. Mr. Janes also pointed out that previous ordinance recently approved by the Board of Supervisors just raised the licensing fees one dollar on July 1, so the proposed ordinance will need to reflect those changes as well. Mr. Janes said the proposed ordinance was the result of a joint effort by Ms. Emptage, Ms. Schwerin and him, and is presented as a recommendation for the Committee's consideration. Discussion ensued regarding the reduced license fee for dogs ten years or older. Some suggested male dogs are still reproductively viable at that age; and Ms. Schwerin suggested changing the discount cut-off to 12 years. Dr. O'Donnell said if owners haven't had their dogs fixed for ten years, then why give them a discount.

Due to varied discussion Mr. Neuman decided to consider the proposal (section B) one item at a time and take a vote on how the Committee stands on each item. The votes included the aforementioned updates from Mr. Janes. The votes also include the understanding that these fees will go up one dollar per year as detailed in the recently passed ordinance also pertaining to this code.

The results of the votes were:

1. Regular, unaltered dog, \$61: 7-1 in favor, Mr. Jacobs opposed.
2. Regular, altered dog, \$16: 7-0 in favor, Mr. Jacobs abstained.
3. Dogs declared dangerous or vicious, \$101: 7-1 in favor, Mr. Jacobs opposed and said the reason he opposed this is because he feels the fee should be much higher, like \$1,000.
4. Strike out senior/disabled... unaltered... (discounted license): 7-1 in favor, Mr. Jacobs opposed.
5. (To become the new 4.) Senior/disabled... altered... (discounted license), \$11: 8-0 in favor.
6. (To become the new 5.) Dogs ten years of age or older, \$16: 0-8, unanimously opposed.
7. (To become the new 6.) A dog owner with a household income below the federal poverty level... altered, \$11: 7-1, Ms. Hubbard opposed.
8. (To become the new 7.) An altered guide dog... service animal... without payment of a fee: 7-0 in favor, Mr. Jacobs abstained.

There was discussion on the next item prior to the vote. Mr. Jacobs felt the language was confusing particularly the use of the word resident in the proposed new paragraph 8. Mr. Janes said in the legal sense dogs are not residents, only people, and dogs legally are considered property. Ms. Schwerin asked why law enforcement dogs are unaltered. Ms. Hubbard said, in her experience, the agencies do not want to take the risk associated with putting the dog under anesthesia because of the tremendous investment made in the animal, but if a law enforcement dog does need to go under for some necessary procedure, then they typically go ahead and have it altered at that time. Dr. O'Donnell asked if proposed ordinances have to go through legal review first; and Mr. Janes replied that they do and a County Attorney has to actually sign the document.

8. (The new paragraph 8.) An active or altered retired law enforcement working dog... without payment of a fee: 6-1 in favor, Mr. Jacobs was opposed and Mr. Neuman abstained.
9. Processing/Postage fee per license, \$1: 8-0 in favor.

- Process Used By PACC To Track Every Animal's Care Every Day That Does Not Include Volunteers

Mr. Neuman said this issue will be addressed by the new person being hired as reported by Mr. Janes under the Animal Care Staffing agenda item.

- Correspondence Regarding Alleged Horse Abuse

Mr. Neuman reported that he sent the letter, video and pictures to the Director of the Arizona Department of Agriculture as discussed at the last Committee meeting. A copy of the letter was included in the packet. Ms. Schwerin wanted to enter into discussion on this item. However, Mr. Neuman said the item was a to-do item; he did what he said he would do; and the item is done. He added that he did not want to enter into any further discussion while other business still needed to be addressed. Later in the meeting Ms. Schwerin brought up a letter from the Director of the Arizona Department of Agriculture, (which was part of the packet of a previous meeting) she read the portion of the letter which stated all of the horses at Castaway Treasures are under the care of a licensed veterinarian who is making decisions regarding the care and treatment of the animals.... She referred to what she read as a terrible situation. Mr. Neuman said the agenda item was to finalize the situation, which he did by sending an additional letter, the video and pictures.

- Ajo Center Emergency Veterinary Services

Mr. Neuman said that recently Mr. Gallick said dogs will not stay at Ajo more than two weeks; however, Mr. Neuman report one dog has been there since June 15 and two since June 19 and asked why. Mr. Janes said he would ask Mr. Gallick.

- Tie-Out Prevention Campaign

There was no discussion on this item.

7. New Business

- Spay-Abort Policy

Ms. Hurley said she wanted to discuss this item primarily due to a letter sent to the City of Tucson from Lee Bucyk from Hermitage No-Kill Cat Shelter (see item 4. Call to the Audience), and being asked to address the issue by the Tucson City Manager. She spoke mostly reading from a prepared statement.

After the fourth of July, PACC waived all boarding fees for pet owners of stray dogs who let PACC spay or neuter their pets. Kristin Barney (PACC Chief of Operations) was quoted in the paper saying, "This is a progressive and life-saving strategy for a county shelter to take." I read that and thought to myself, Life-saving what about the spay-abort policy, that's not life-saving. Every creature has an innate will to live, whether born or unborn. The dogs and cats that come to Pima Animal Care are largely traumatized; they're always frightened; and as every creature is when pregnant, wracked with hormones and physical difficulties as a result of the pregnancy. Now at PACC, this animal is further subjected to the trauma and strain of the spay-abort procedure. Sometimes the procedure is fatal to the mother. And that's just the mother. The puppies or kittens have their little lives ended abruptly. If near term the puppies are killed one by one with injections; if not, the babies die in-utero of suffocation from the procedure. I have a sister in Montana,; I'm from Montana; who is a vet tech and she kind of explained the procedure to me because I'm an accountant; I'm not a vet. She said it's not performed very often by vets, but it seems to be performed here at PACC more often than ordinarily by vets, I guess. I know that spay-abort is one tool that is used to increase the live release rate; well congratulations you've increased the live release rate. All of this is done quietly, out of the sight of groups that are truly PACC's partners.

Personally, I find the procedure shameful and disgusting, but I'm not going to suggested that the procedure should never be done at the shelter. I realize that the shelter has limited space and resources; every shelter has limited space and resources; every person has limited space and resources. Instead I am proposing that qualified rescue groups be given notice to redeem the pregnant animal; to take this terrified animal to a quiet place; give it proper nutrition; a peaceful environment; and let the puppies or kittens be born. Then the groups can properly screen adopters for the mother and babies; give the puppies or kittens the proper immunizations; and spay/neuter them when appropriate. This takes this role away from backyard breeders and puts it in hands of concerned and dedicated volunteers, many of whom are in the audience today. It avoids the cruelty and gives qualified adopters an opportunity to save the life of an animal that otherwise would be treated as refuse. These groups know how to handle pregnant dogs and cats; it's what they do it's what they've been doing before this policy was instituted. Now folks, the rescue groups and the volunteers are largely the reason that you have an 80 percent live release rate, now 84 percent, I guess. These are your partners. Give them a chance to change the outcome for these small creatures. I am proposing a three-day notification to rescues on the appropriate sites, which there's websites already set up to network dogs which are near euthanization; I see the e-mails go back and forth. People really work hard to get these animals out of

PACC and they will work their very best; I know they will, if given the opportunity. And then, if after three full days no qualified rescue has made arrangements to pick up the animal for foster care, then perform the procedure; go ahead and perform the procedure, but give them a chance at least. Now this is truly progressive and life-saving.

Now I want to read an extract from a letter dated May 20, 2015, received by the City of Tucson from Lee Bucyk, who's in the audience, Executive Director, once again, of Hermitage. Hermitage gets 70 to 80 percent of its feline residents from PACC. This letter was sent to the City Manager, who at that time was Martha Durkin, it was sent to the Mayor and Council and was forwarded to me by Martha Durkin with the request that I address some of the issues as part of this Committee.

Ms. Hurley reading from and/or commenting on the letter:

Quite frankly and in my opinion, the only reason PACC can claim a live release rate of 80 percent is due to the other rescue organizations who routinely step in to take some of their most at risk felines. And while PACC claims to be working toward a no kill status with their communications to the media, they are currently, by their own admissions, spay-aborting pregnant animals, even when those animals have a rescue partner willing to take them out of the care and responsibilities of the County. As I have told their management directly, this is in direct contrast to this no kill philosophy and not what I or other taxpayers of Pima County signed up for when we passed proposition 15 [415]. It is the desire of the City of Tucson that the rescues be given a three-day advance notification of the spay-abort procedure, so that the pregnant animal and its offspring can be rescued. Most of the shelter animals, probably about, I believe it's 55 percent, it's gone up this year, it's like 55.5 percent for the City of Tucson, come from the city limits. And the majority of funding for this shelter is provided by the City and its residents. Please honor PACC's rescue partners and the citizens of Tucson by allowing for this change in the spay-abort policy.

So I'm moving that forward. So a three-day, three business day hold, before the spay-abort policy is implemented.

Mr. Jacobs seconded Ms. Hurley's motion and discussion began. Ms. Barrick said PACC is open seven days a week so the term business days is not necessary. Dr. O'Donnell rhetorically asked what happens when the puppies or kittens are born at PACC within the three days, then answered they get squished, or die slowly of distemper, or die as one did, found in a drain with its skull crushed. She said PACC is no place for puppies or kittens and added she would love for puppies and kittens to not be aborted; and in her practice won't do it if they are late term, but continued that she, as a partner with Pima Paws for Life, also has to deal with the sick and dying puppies that rescue groups wouldn't take. She said she would like to support a no spay-abort policy, but it would require a viable contingency for when birth occurs within the 72-hour period of time. Ms. Hurley restated her motion to be a three-day hold on animals determined by PACC to be pregnant to network the animal with the rescue organizations; however, if the animal is close to birth or gives birth, that there would be a 72-hour emergency call to the rescues to pick up the animal and its offspring to get them out of the dangerous shelter environment. Mr. Neuman expressed that the motion was confusing. Dr. O'Donnell said she is hoping the rescues can come up with a solution. Ms. Hubbard asked about who

determines an animal is pregnant and Mr. Janes said initially anyone can point out an animal believed to be pregnant then the veterinary staff make the final determination. Mr. Jacobs moved the matter be tabled until the next meeting at which time written policy and written proposals can be presented for consideration. Ms. Hubbard seconded the motion. Ms. Hurley then contended that in the interim animals will be killed and willing rescues will not have the opportunity to rescue those animals. Ms. Emptage asked if Ms. Hurley was amending her motion to request a temporary situation of holding pregnant animals for 72 hour so that rescues can be allowed to pick them up pending the next meeting; to which Ms. Hurley responded, "Yes." Mr. Jacobs asked what the Committee's action is trying to accomplish; is it trying to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors; is it trying to establish a policy? Mr. Neuman said the Committee's capacity is to give advice to PACC and the Board of Supervisors. A recommendation from the Committee can be made directly to PACC, which may or may not act on that recommendation, and the Committee can also make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Jacobs wanted clarification as to whether the policy in discussion is an Agency (PACC) policy or a Board of Supervisors' policy; and Mr. Janes clarified it as a PACC policy. Ms. Hubbard asked about the law requiring PACC to spay or neuter animals before release. Mr. Janes said there is such a law, but there is a County policy that allows PACC to place animals with rescues, the law doesn't apply in this case.

Ms. Hurley redefined her motion as a two-day hold on pregnant animals before the spay-abort policy is carried out, until the next meeting when clearer language will be presented, which will deal with various situations in question concerning the policy. Mr. Jacobs seconded the motion. Ms. Hubbard pointed out that the recommendation, if the motion carries, is presented to staff, but it is up to staff whether or not they follow the recommendation. Mr. Neuman concurred with her statement. A vote was taken and the motion did not pass: (2-4) Ms. Hurley and Mr. Jacobs for; Ms. Barrick, Ms. Emptage, Ms. Hubbard and Ms. Schwerin against; and Mr. Neuman and Dr. O'Donnell abstaining.

- Spay and Neuter Statistics

Mr. Janes directed the Committee to the table on the last page of his July Manager's Report memorandum. The table shows contract year 14-15 community spay neuter costs broken down by agency. The total outlay was in excess of \$516 thousand to accomplish 8,455 surgeries. Mr. Jacobs requested this type of information on a quarterly basis

- Committee Officers Elections

Ms. Schwerin nominated Ms. Emptage for the Chair position. Ms. Hubbard said she wishes to withdraw her name as a nominee for the Chair. Discussion brought out that since there was only one name for each position, (Emptage, Chair and Neuman, Vice-Chair), there was no need for paper ballots. Mr. Janes, hearing no objection and having been given the floor for the vote, asked if there were any other nominees; hearing none, he took the votes openly. For Chair the vote in the meeting was 7-0 for Ms. Emptage, with Ms. Emptage abstaining from the vote. Additionally, there were three absentee votes for Ms. Hubbard already cast with staff prior to the meeting, making the total vote 7-3 for Ms. Emptage as Chair. For Vice-Chair the vote in the meeting was 7-0 for Mr. Neuman, with Mr. Neuman abstaining from the vote, plus three absentee votes for Ms. Neuman already cast with staff prior to the meeting, making the total vote 10-0 for Mr. Neuman as Vice-Chair.

Mr. Neuman took a moment to say his service as the Chair has been very gratifying; said much has been accomplished during the past two years; and thanked everyone for their participation, including the volunteers and rescues.

8. Donations: A total of 1,498 individuals gave \$41,928.22 in donations during the month of June.

There was no discussion on this item.

9. Complaints and Commendations: There were three complaints and two commendations received by staff during June.

Ms. Schwerin referred to the provided letter from County Administrator Huckelberry to a complainant, which had the name redacted, and wanted to know who the letter was to. She stated, "We are entitled to know to whom this letter was written." She also protested about the redaction of signatures in the complaint letter provided in the packet, asking why they are marked out and saying the letters are not confidential. Mr. Janes agreed that the letters are not confidential and said he would provide the requested information. Ms. Schwerin went on to complain about the redacting of names in the welfare complaints as well. Mr. Neuman agreed and Mr. Janes said the names should not be redacted.

10. Call to the Audience

There were three speakers at this call to the audience: Kim Silver, Tiffany Rosler and Ryan Inama.

Ms. Silver wanted to clarify that proposition 415 was not voted to make the shelter no-kill; it was for a new building, new facility. As much as we would like to go in that direction, the bond doesn't guarantee no-kill, it's programs and policies in place that make a shelter no-kill. She thanked Ms. Hurley for bringing up the spay-abort issue; said Ms. Hurley will encounter opposition if she pushes the issue, but encouraged her to continue. Lastly, she suggested spay-abort procedures be tracked and that the data for the animals killed be considered in calculating the live release rate.

Ms. Rosler thanked Ms. Hurley for bringing up the spay-abort issue, saying it was brought up earlier this year and there was support from the rescue community for a 72-hour notice prior to spay-abort and PACC didn't want to work with the rescues on the issue. She said that animals without microchips have to be held 72 hours before PACC can do the spay abort procedure and those with microchips have to be held seven days. She said 72 hours is plenty of time if there is early networking. She continued that rescues aren't even being notified about mom's and puppies or mom's and kittens until they have been at PACC for three or four weeks and have contracted or been exposed to diseases. "Proactive is not spay-aborting; proactive is networking when they hit the shelter." If animals are networked, they get out faster. She said her organization used to take 90 percent of their animals from PACC, but now it is less than five percent. She added that they take huge owner surrenders and when they do they require the owner let them pay to alter the parents. She said that action is proactive, not spay-abort. She added that rescue group relations have been damaged by PACC. She closed by saying one phone call from a PACC employee got two moms with eleven puppies and a pregnant dog out of PACC in two hours, as an example of what simple networking can do.

Mr. Inama asked if the live release numbers include kittens being spay-aborted. He said his organization has been a partner with PACC for many years and has taken over 1,200 animals out of PACC in the last two and a half years. He claimed a 77 percent adoption rate and said those not adopted are still with them, not killed. He said he attended a meeting roughly four months ago and in the meeting stated his organization has an empty maternity ward, a list of fosters ready and staff ready; stop spay-aborting; all you have to do is call me, but he doesn't get called or e-mailed.

11. Announcements, Schedules and Proposed Agenda Items

Ms. Emptage, after the IGA discussion, said she wanted possible sources of revenue for animal care, for all jurisdictions, as an agenda item.

Mr. Jacobs brought up the SAVMA letter discussed under Old Business Licensing Awareness. Ms. Emptage requested feedback and Ms. Emptage said the item will be on the next meeting agenda. Mr. Jacobs asked if the spay-abort policy will be on the next meeting agenda and Mr. Neuman said it would. Mr. Jacobs also requested that the recommendations of the Committee regarding the licensing fees (PCC 6.04.070) be written up and represented at the next meeting.

Ms. Emptage announced that on July 23, from 6:00 to 7:30 pm, at the Abrams building there will be a forum for the public and volunteers to meet with leadership regarding the new shelter.

Mr. Janes announced that the Director has replaced him as the Committee's Executive Secretary with Health Department Deputy Director Marcy Flanagan, to begin at the next meeting. The Committee thanked Mr. Janes for his service.

12. Next Meeting – August 20, 2015

Ms. Emptage said the next meeting will be at PACC.

13. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:02 pm



**NOTICE
PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
PIMA COUNTY ANIMAL CARE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

July 16, 2015 – 5:30 p.m.
Pima Animal Care Center
Admin Building
4000 N Silverbell Road
Tucson, Arizona
 (520) 724-7729

Functions of the Committee

1. Serve in an advisory capacity to the Board, and to the Manager of the Pima Animal Care Center; and
2. Review and evaluate the operations of the Center to make recommendations in writing to the Board for the formulation of guidelines to assure that:
 - A. The Center's operations are conducted in the best interest of the public health and safety; and
 - B. The Center keeps pace with the most modern practices and procedures of animal care and welfare; and
3. Review complaints from the public concerning policies of the Center and make recommendations for resolution to the proper authority.

AGENDA

1.	Call to Order <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roll Call • Establishment of Quorum and Pledge of Allegiance 			
2.	Review and Adoption of Minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adoption of June 18, 2015 meeting minutes 			
3.	Animal Welfare and Dangerous Animal Cases for the Month of June and Recent Holds Snapshot			
	Welfare		Dangerous Dogs	
	A15-173848	A15-173403	A15-172063	
	A15-173571	A15-173015	A15-173171	
	A15-168329	A14-172632	A15-167398	
	A15-173437	A15-172800		
	A15-173405	A15-174102		
4.	Call to the Audience			
5.	Management Report			
6.	Old Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of Tucson Animal Care Funding / Jurisdiction IGA Discussion (Neuman/Janes) • Volunteer Policy and Partnership Agreement (PACC Management Team) • Animal Care Staffing (Neuman/PACC Management Team) • Licensing Awareness (Emptage) • Licensing Fee Structure (Neuman) • Process Used By PACC To Track Every Animal's Care Every Day That Does Not Include Volunteers (Neuman) • Correspondence Regarding Alleged Horse Abuse (Neuman/Janes) • Ajo Center Emergency Veterinary Services (Neuman) • Tie-Out Prevention Campaign (Marshall) 			
7.	New Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spay-Abort Policy • Spay and Neuter Statistics • Committee Officers Elections (Janes) 			
8.	Donations: A total of 1,498 individuals gave \$41,928.22 in donations during the month of June.			
9.	Complaints and Commendations: There were three complaints and two commendations received by staff during June.			
10.	Call to the Audience			
11.	Announcements, Schedules and Proposed Agenda Items			
12.	Next Meeting – August 20, 2015			
13.	Adjournment			

Copies of this agenda are available upon request at the Pima County Health Department, 3950 S. Country Club Road, by calling 724-7729 or at www.pima.gov/animalcare. The Committee may discuss and take action on any item on the agenda. At the conclusion of an open call to the public Committee members may only respond to criticism made; ask staff to review the matter raised; or ask to include the matter on a future agenda.

Should you require ADA accommodations, please contact the Pima County Health Department at 724-7729 five (5) days prior to the meeting.

Pima County Animal Care Advisory Committee
Minutes
June 18, 2015
3950 S. Country Club Road
Tucson, Arizona 85714

Draft

1. Call to Order

Mr. Neuman called the meeting to order at 5:32 pm

- Attendance

Present:

Nancy Emptage, Vice-Chair, Animal Welfare Coalition
Pat Hubbard, Humane Society of Southern Arizona
Yvette Hurley, City of Tucson
Pat Jacobs, Tucson Kennel Club
Sophia Kaluzniacki, DVM, SPCA of AZ, Inc
Derek Marshall, Public Education
Helen Mendelsohn, Disabled Community
Jack Neuman, Chair, PACC Volunteers
Jane Schwerin, People for Animals in the Prevention of Cruelty and Neglect
Gail Smith, MD, Board of Health
Kim Janes, Pima Animal Care Center (PACC), Ex-Officio

Absent:

Tamara Barrick, Pima Paws for Life
Erin O'Donnell, DVM, Southern AZ Veterinary Medical Association

- Pledge of Allegiance

2. Adoption of the Minutes

- Adoption of the May 21, 2015 Meeting Minutes

The motion was made and seconded (Hubbard/Hurley) that the May 21, 2015 meeting minutes be adopted as written. Ms. Schwerin then requested that the typo referred to in the draft minutes be expressed as to what the actual change was. A second motion was made (Mendelsohn/Hubbard) to adopt the minutes as written with the inclusion of the typo detail as requested by Ms. Schwerin. The motion carried (10-0).

3. Animal Welfare and Dangerous Animal Cases for the Month of May and Recent Holds Snapshot

Ms. Schwerin referred to welfare case five wherein there was a limping dog which had not received proper treatment and other dogs present. The owner screamed at the officer and used profanity. Originally there was a decision to impound all the dogs, but that was later changed to only impounding the one injured dog. Ms. Schwerin asserted that such an owner cannot be a good owner, and asked what happened to the impounded dog. Mr. Janes replied that the dog was adopted. Ms. Emptage asked if the insect larvae found in case five tested positive for West Nile Virus (WNV). Mr. Janes replied that if it had he would have been notified as the manager over the program that deals with WNV surveillance, but has received no such notification. Mr. Neuman asked why the other dogs were not impounded which the officer initially started to do. Enforcement Manager Jose Chavez

discussed the judgment call. The other dogs were not in distress and at a recheck the owner had complied with PACC's direction. Committee members requested a copy of the recheck documentation on this case and others as applicable going forward.

Ms. Schwerin referred to case seven which involved a dog in a cage in direct sunlight without water. She said just keeping the dog in the cage is cruel and she would never trust such a cruel owner. Mr. Neuman asked what makes PACC believe that the dog will not be put back in the cage after the officer leaves. Mr. Chavez replied that it is judgment call based on the circumstances. Requests were made, shade and shelter were provided and the owner was cited, which is another form of education. Ms. Schwerin requested a recheck. Mr. Janes said he would consult with staff on the request. Ms. Emptage asked if when officers check for licensing, do they also check for vaccination, to which Mr. Chavez replied they do.

Dr. Smith referred to case one and three and asked about rechecks when the welfare case cover memo states the case is closed. Mr. Janes will try to have the memo clearer going forward. Dr. Smith requested addendum information on these cases, as applicable when there are rechecks.

Regarding the holds snapshot, Ms. Schwerin asked about what happened with the case regarding the dog Sativa, which has been held for months. Mr. Chavez replied that the judge has not made a decision yet. Mr. Janes said the hearing has been held. Mr. Neuman interjected that judges sometimes forget. Discussion brought out that this case is building a large expense tab and the court may rule on the required payment if the dog goes back to the owner.

Ms. Schwerin referred to three holds with notes to issue citations if the owner tries to redeem. She asked if PACC would allow the owners to redeem the animals and if they did. Mr. Janes said the hold report only offers a snippet of information and a decision to allow redeeming would be based on all information available. He did not know if the animals were redeemed and said he would have to follow up.

Dr. Kaluzniacki referred to welfare case eight which involved a dog with a muzzle. She asked how often PACC encounters muzzles and what is PACC's policy regarding muzzles. Mr. Janes said there is no policy that he knows of, but he will check, and said this case was the only one he has encountered other than dangerous dogs which require a muzzle. Dr. Kaluzniacki pointed out that typically a muzzle interferes with a dog's ability to pant to cool itself, so use of a muzzle could be considered cruelty. Ms. Emptage pointed out that a muzzle was reportedly used to prevent the dog from damaging the gate, but the dog was reported to be in a crate with a muzzle. Being in the crate prevents access to the gate, so the muzzle would be unnecessary.

4. Call to the Audience

There were no speakers at the call to the audience.

5. Management Report

Mr. Janes referred to items presented in his June Manager's Report memorandum included in the Committee's packet. He reported an overall fiscal year live release rate of 84 percent, broken down to 91 percent for cats and 81 percent for dogs (New Business, fourth bullet) through the end of May. He added that the higher cat numbers are due largely to the current community cat trap-neuter-release

(TNR) program. Also, the County Board of Supervisors has approved an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) (next agenda item bullet) to provide animal care services to the City of Tucson. The IGA is to be considered by the City at their June 23 meeting.

Mr. Neuman said the reason he asked about the separation of dog and cat live release percentages was because the TNR cat numbers are changing the overall percentage, but the dog numbers could get lost in the overall increase. He went on to note that the May Operational Report shows a ten percent reduction in rescues comparing this year to last year-to-date and asked why. Mr. Janes said the Center is taking on more treatment of pets, mitigating the need for rescues. Mr. Neuman asked for clarification on the reports enforcement calls (26,042) and welfare responses (3,635). Mr. Janes explained the welfare responses are a subset of the larger number and the enforcement calls are only those responded to in some manner. Some requests go unaddressed, and he estimated the total number of requests year-to-date is approximately 30,000. Mr. Neuman requested the total calls figure be included in the report going forward to demonstrate the need for more staff.

Ms. Hurley said she has called before about a loose dog. She said she was asked if the dog was in the street and was told that a dog not in the street is not a priority call. She asked how she could know whether or not the dog was picked up or addressed. Mr. Janes replied that she could ask for a case number and call back about that specific case. Mr. Janes went on to say an animal not in distress or danger is a lower priority and often is not addressed the day of the call. Typically the animal is nowhere to be found when staff finally address the call and that is the dynamic create by the current staffing levels.

Ms. Emptage asked about knowing what areas TNR efforts are going on in. Mr. Janes said Best Friends (Animal Society) should be able to say what areas they are working in. Ms. Emptage also asked if PACC could track referrals to People for Animals, for help with pet euthanasia. Mr. Janes said he would refer the request to staff.

6. Old Business

Mr. Neuman said at the last meeting there was a question on who provides emergency veterinary services for the Ajo facility animals. Mr. Janes said he will have to get with staff to ascertain the answer.

Mr. Neuman also mentioned the tie-out prevention campaign should remain on old business. Mr. Marshall had no new information on the topic.

- City of Tucson Animal Care Funding / Jurisdiction IGA Discussion

Mr. Janes touched on this topic under item five, Management Report. It was pointed out that County Administrator Huckelberry's May 28, 2015 memorandum for the June 2 meeting was cut off. Staff will find and provide the Committee with the full document.

- Volunteer Policy and Partnership Agreement

There was no discussion on this item.

- Pima Animal Care Overhead Charges

Mr. Neuman requested this item be tabled since the IGA is in progress.

- Animal Care Staffing

Mr. Neuman thanked Mr. Janes for the PACC organizational chart and noted there were six vacancies on the chart. Mr. Neuman said PACC's overhead charges include \$46,000 for Human Resources (HR) yet there are these vacancies; and asked when it is anticipated those vacancies will be filled. Mr. Janes replied that there was a hiring freeze and he will check up on when the vacancies will be filled. In response to a question from Mr. Neuman, Mr. Janes said the HR overhead costs were not reduced during the hiring freeze.

- Licensing Awareness

Ms. Emptage said she would like the Committee to send a letter to the Southern Arizona Veterinary Medicine Association requesting their assistance with increasing awareness on licensing requirements and pet recovery measures, and provided a rough draft letter. She said she would be upset if she was dog owner who was unaware of the licensing requirement and was not told about it by her veterinarian when she had her dog vaccinated. She added that she has seen numerous forms of documentation for various vaccinations, none of which make any mention of the need for a license. The letter requests that pets be scanned for microchips every time they are brought to a clinic to ensure they have detectable chips. Ms. Emptage said she does so with her animals and recently a chip could not be detected and the end result was that the scanner needed to be recalibrated. Mr. Neuman requested Committee members review the draft letter and send comments to Mr. Janes.

Ms. Hurley said the City of Tucson is trying to increase licensing and wants to start accepting license fees at Tucson Water and City Counsel offices, and suggested that maybe licensing and vaccination information signage could be placed at those locations. Mr. Neuman requested this topic be on next month's agenda, adding that there will be a speaker who has been doing research related to the topic.

7. New Business

- The Case of Gorda the Dog

Mr. Neuman referred to the material provided by staff regarding this dog and said the rendition of what happened provided is not correct; however, Gorda is now doing well thanks to volunteers and Bridge Rescue. He added that if anyone wants to get the correct version of what happened with Gorda they can contact him.

- Donations to PACC being applied to amount jurisdictions owe

Mr. Neuman said the reason he put this on the agenda is because donations, currently around a half million dollars a year, are being cut off the top of what jurisdictions owe and that is not why people give. Also he pointed out that County Administrator Huckelberry, in his June 9, 2015 Board of Supervisors memorandum for the June 16 Board of Supervisors meeting, states he wants to use donations to pay for spay and neuter. There was discussion that the donations currently are going for spay and neuter, and are not going for spay and neuter, and are partially (60 percent) going for spay

and neuter. Mr. Neuman contended that the municipalities already have their obligations and money donated should not go to reduce these obligations. Ms. Hurley added that the current IGA with the City of Tucson states how these funds are handled this year and the new IGA will establish how things are handled next year. Mr. Neuman read the portion of the memorandum he was referring to.

The County had previously credited donations proportionately to reduce each jurisdiction's contribution. In the future, the full cost of the Spay and Neuter program will be paid by donations, which has been the desire of most donors. This will eliminate the need for a jurisdiction to earmark the previous licensing fee increase for our spay and neuter program.

- Process used by PACC to track every animal's care every day that does not include volunteers

Mr. Neuman asked how PACC monitors animals independent from efforts by volunteers. He said the only way PACC staff knows a dog has a need is when a volunteer tells them, and added that dogs "get missed." Mr. Janes said he will pass the question on to management staff.

- Save rates for dogs and cats separately

This was discussed during the Management Report (item five).

- 24PetWatch Microchip Service

Mr. Neuman said the 24PetWatch microchip, which currently is the free microchip with an adopted PACC pet, will cost \$59 if you want to change the registry, which he found out when he made a change. Mr. Janes said his understanding is that the licensing staff has the responsibility to tell the new owner to contact the microchip vender to do change the registry; otherwise the chip is registered to PACC. If the pet is found PACC shows as the owner and has to look up who adopted the animal. Therefore, if someone with a microchipped pet from PACC changes their contact information or transfers ownership and the microchip registry is not update and PACC is not updated, then there is no way to contact the owner. Mr. Janes said PACC's microchip vender has changed in the past and could change again in the future. In response to a question Mr. Janes said the microchip number is recorded in the system (Chameleon) in connection to the animal when it is microchipped, not when it is adopted out. At adoption the animal record is then linked to the person record.

- Licensing and fees for seniors and the indigent

Mr. Neuman said this item will be carried over to next month to include the presentation mentioned under the Old Business Licensing Awareness bullet.

- Letter from State Department of Agriculture responding to County Administrator Huckleberry's request to review alleged horse abuse

Ms. Schwerin referred to the March 23 e-mail (part of packet) Mr. Janes sent to the Sheriff's Department regarding a request from the Committee (March 19 motion), and asked Mr. Janes if he ever received an answer. Mr. Janes said there was no response. Ms. Schwerin added that she heard

both the horse that couldn't put its leg down and the horse with the large growth died. She cited another March 19 motion that the Committee write and send a letter and the (horse) video to the State Department of Agriculture and the Governor. She said the video was not originally sent and asked Mr. Neuman if the video was ever sent. Mr. Neuman said he was going to resend the letter with the video, but then received the May 29 reply letter (part of the record) from Mark Killian, Director of the Arizona Department of Agriculture, and felt it was no longer necessary since the Department already sent an experienced investigator to Castaway Treasures and responded back to Mr. Huckelberry. Ms. Schwerin referred to Mr. Killian's letter as a "whitewash." She added that in the past the unnamed Castaway Treasures veterinarian and Castaway Treasures have boasted about never euthanizing animals. Mr. Neuman referred to the letters statement about veterinary care and asserted that he is not qualified to challenge a veterinarian and has no intention to do so. Schwerin protested that the video should still be sent. Dr. Kaluzniacki suggested focusing on the present Castaway Treasures conditions, not the past. Dr. Smith suggested that Ms. Schwerin could call Mr. Killian since his letter closed with a, "feel free to contact me," comment and his number. Ms. Schwerin said she would call him. Ms. Schwerin continued that the Committee voted to send the letter to the Governor and the State Department of Agriculture. Mr. Neuman said he sent the letter to the Governor. Dr. Smith contended that it is apparent that Mr. Killian, who works for the Governor and has responded to the situation, has seen the letter. Mr. Jacobs suggested that the letter and video could be sent with wording to the effect that it is being provided for their file. Mr. Neuman asked if Mr. Janes had a copy of the video and agreed to send the letter with the video to the State Department of Agriculture to ensure they have a complete record.

- Committee By-Laws

Ms. Emptage said she appreciated the time put in by Committee members and staff to attend the Committee meetings, but added that many have busy schedules and long drives home. She continued that the by-laws state the Committee meetings are from 5:30 pm to 7:00 pm and suggested the Committee should either stick to those parameters or amend the by-laws. Ms. Mendelsohn suggested the meetings could be two hours. Dr. Kaluzniacki suggested the Committee could leave the by-laws as is, with the understanding that the meetings could go over a little. There were comments about meetings going until roughly 9:00 pm. Mr. Jacobs said he has no problem indicating to the Chair when 7:00 pm comes around that the Committee is in danger of violating their by-laws.

- July Committee Elections

Mr. Janes briefed the Committee that individuals have indicated interest in the positions of Chair and Vice-Chair and asked that if anyone wants to nominate themselves or others, please do so through him or Mr. Schlueter. He indicated the vote will be at the end of next month's meeting so that the current Chair may chair the meeting with the agenda he participated in developing. Mr. Janes pointed out the by-laws state the Chair and Vice-Chair cannot succeed themselves in their respective offices. Discussion brought out that members are allowed, per the by-laws, to vote by absentee ballot. Ms. Emptage added that there have been occasions where neither the Chair nor Vice-Chair were available for a meeting, and requested if members are willing to chair a meeting if such an occasion should arise, then please let the Officers know. Discussion also brought out that the vote will use paper ballots. Mr. Janes said the management report will include who has expressed interest in being Chair and Vice-Chair and once received those who will not be present please send their vote back to him.

8. Donations: A total of 1,878 individuals gave \$60,077.87 in donations during the month of May.

There was no discussion on this item beyond Mr. Neuman saying the total was an amazing amount.

9. Complaints and Commendations: There were four complaints and no commendations received by staff during May.

There was no discussion on this item.

10. Call to the Audience

There were no speakers at the call to the audience.

11. Announcements, Schedules and Proposed Agenda Items

Ms. Hurley stated Tucson Major Rothschild received an impassioned letter from Hermitage No Kill Cat Shelter requesting Ms. Hurley speak about PACC's spay-abort policy, so she requested the topic be on the next agenda.

Mr. Jacobs said in light of Mr. Huckelberry's intentions for donations to go to spay and neuter efforts, he is requesting a statistical report on spay and neuter each month. Mr. Neuman said it could be placed on the agenda.

Ms. Hurley said the City will be discussing the County's proposed IGA on June 23 and she wants the IGA on next month's agenda.

12. Next Meeting – July 16, 2015

Mr. Neuman said the next meeting will be at PACC.

13. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:37 pm



**PIMA COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT
PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER
4000 N. SILVERBELL RD • TUCSON, AZ 85745
(520) 724-5900 FAX (520) 724-5960
www.pima.govanimal/care**

MEMORANDUM

TO: Kim Janes, Chief of External Operations
FROM: Jose Chavez, Enforcement Operations Manager
DATE: 7-2-15
SUBJECT: Welfare report for June 2015

1. A15-173848 One animal was impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at PACC. The animal was redeemed by the owner. This complaint is closed.
2. A15-173571 Two animals were impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at PACC. The animals were redeemed. This complaint is closed.
3. A15-168329 No animals were impounded. Staff reviewed the animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. This complaint is closed.
4. A15-173437 No animals were impounded. Staff reviewed welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited the owner at the scene. This complaint is closed.
5. A15-173405 Seven animals were relinquished to PACC. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. The animals are receiving care and their outcome is pending.
6. A15-173403 One animal was impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. The owner redeemed the animal. This complaint is closed.
7. A15-173015 One animal was impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at PACC. The animal was relinquished to PACC and was adopted. This complaint is closed.
8. A15-172632 One animal was impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at PACC. The animal was redeemed. This complaint is closed.
9. A15-172800 Two animals were impounded and bonded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. No bond was posted the animals were automatically forfeited to PACC. One animal was adopted the second animal is pending an outcome. This complaint is closed.
10. A15-174102 Three animals were impounded and bonded. Five dead animals were also impounded. Staff and the Sheriff's Deputies reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and citations were issued by the Deputy. The deadline to post bond is 7-7-15.

N/C 1

INVESTIGATION REPORT		SUSPECT				ACC NAME / BADGE #		ACTIVITY/BITE NUMBER			
Pima County Health Department Pima Animal Care Center 4000 N. Silverbell Rd. Tucson, Arizona 85745 Phone: (520) 243-5900 Fax: (520) 243-5960 www.pimaanimalcare.org		SUSPECT'S ADDRESS Alvernon Way				T. Foster 2042		A15-173848			
CITY		STATE	ZIP	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER		BITE <input type="checkbox"/>		WELFARE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/>		
Tucson		Az	85712	520-4		OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>					
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS		CITY		STATE	ZIP	DRIVERS LICENSE		CI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CO <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>			
UNK		N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A					
SEX	WEIGHT	HEIGHT	EYES	HAIR	ORIGIN	DOB	SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER				
M	305	6'4"	BRO	BLK			not given				
DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		LOCATION OF INCIDENT Alvernon Way				DATE AND TIME OF INCIDENT		DATE AND TIME REPORTED			
		FOOD	WATER	SHELTER	VENTILATION	ABANDONED	TIED OUT	BEATEN	WASTE	INJ / ILL	OTHER (EXPLAIN)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/> I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case	VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME				DATE OF BIRTH	RESIDENCE PHONE	BUSINESS PHONE				
	Officer J. Henderson #1904				N/A	N/A	520-724-5900 ext3				
<input type="checkbox"/> I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.	VICTIM'S ADDRESS				CITY	STATE	ZIP				
	N/A				N/A	N/A	N/A				
<input type="checkbox"/> REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B) and § 8-286 (B)	VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS				CITY	STATE	ZIP				
	4000 N Silverbell Rd				Tucson	AZ	85745				
NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)	DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED	RESTITUTION REQUESTED	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE #			FOLLOW UP REQUEST				
	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A	N/A			<input type="checkbox"/> SD <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER: N/A				
<input type="checkbox"/> ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM	<input type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY:		TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED	PACC				
	<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	VET				
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM	PART OF BODY BITTEN:		OWNER KNOWS OF BITE		RELEASE DATE:		HOME				
PHONE NUMBER	N/A		YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		N/A		FTQ				
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS	CLINIC'S ADDRESS			QUARANTINE (DAYS)		FRA HEAD#					
	N/A			10 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>		N/A					
	3 rd PARTY CITATIONS		CITING ACO	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS					
	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		M. Hendrickson #2066	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A	N/A					
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE	CODE/DRO VIOLATED						REVIEWED BY				
	4-3(2)(E)(2); 4-3(2)(C); 4-3 (2)(B)						Konst 2002 6/26				
	CITATIONS/NUMBERS						BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
	#74370 (A, B, C)										
BREED/DESCRIPTION	ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	LICENSE #	CONDITION	ANIMAL ID#				
Golden Retriever mix	Aqua	Tan/Black	F	7m	L15-251914	Normal	A524552				
VICTIM OWNER											
VICTIM OWNER											
VICTIM OWNER											
VICTIM OWNER											
VICTIM OWNER											
VICTIM OWNER											
VICTIM OWNER											
VICTIM OWNER											
WITNESS 1	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS			RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #				
M. Hendrickson #2066		N/A	4000 N Silverbell Rd			N/A	520-724-5900 Ext 3				
WITNESS 2	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS			RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #				
WITNESS 3	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS			RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #				
WITNESS 4	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS			RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #				

W/C 1



INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-173848

ACO Name & Badge: T. Foster #2042

06/20/15 20:10 hours Pima Animal Care Dispatch Operators received a call from a female citizen who reported that she observed a dog tied to a tree at Alvernon Way without water. She stated that she located the property manager and despite a language barrier was able to convince him to provide the dog with water. The caller stated that she did not know if the man was the owner of the dog or not.

06/21/15 15:42 Hours Officer J. Henderson #1904 arrived at Alvernon Way. He knocked on the front door but did not receive an answer. He stated that it appeared as though someone was either moving in or out of the unit. Officer Henderson observed that the gate to the back yard was wide open. When he looked through the open gate he was able to see a tan and black dog that he believed to be a Golden Retriever type mixed breed dog tied to a tree in plain view. He observed that due to the tangled chain that the dog was unable to access shade/shelter and the water that was provided for her. Officer Henderson removed the dog from the tangled chain and impounded her for her safety. He then posted a notice of impound on the front door of the unit. Officer Henderson also placed an enforcement hold on the dog's paperwork and requested that the owner be issued citations for Neglect-Tie Out; Neglect-No Water; and Neglect-No Shelter should they come to Pima Animal Care Center to redeem the dog.

06/22/15 17:30 I, Officer Foster #2042 met with [redacted] and [redacted] who claimed to be joint owner's of the dog known as Aqua (A524552). Mr. [redacted] stated that he was aware that it is against the law to tie-out a dog in the City of Tucson and Pima County. He stated that although he knew it was wrong he felt that the dog was better off tied up than possibly escaping from the yard where she was located and impounded from. He stated that at his previous address Aqua would escape the yard through the dilapidated fencing. He stated that because the property owner's refused to repair the fence that he moved to the Alvernon and believed that the fence there would keep her contained. He stated that he did not want to leave her loose in the yard until he was certain that she could not escape it and that he decided to use a chain tie-out until such a time as he was certain that she would remain contained in the yard. He asked me if I thought the dog would have been better off loose in the yard and possibly escaping to be struck by a car on Alvernon Way. I responded by listing other options such as boarding her at a pet kennel for the day and explained that many have daily board rates. I also suggested that the dog be crate trained and kept indoors, or possibly watched by a friend or relative at their home. I provided Mr. [redacted] and Mr. [redacted] with a copy of the dog laws pamphlet and a the "tie-out solutions" pamphlet. I then issued the citations requested by Officer Henderson #1904. Mr. [redacted] did not have an ID with him and I issued the requested citations to Mr. [redacted]. Mr. [redacted] stated that he wanted to accept the legal responsibility for Aqua being on a tie-out and told me that he could not have Mr. [redacted] receiving the citations. I told Mr. [redacted] that if he returned to Pima Animal Care Center on 06/23/15 with a government issued ID, that I would issue him the citations instead and void the citations I issued to Mr. [redacted]. Mr. [redacted] agreed and stated that he would be back on 06/23/15 before the close of business hours to receive the citations.

06/23/15 15:00 Officer Hendrickson #2066 was met by [redacted] at Pima Animal Care Center. Mr. [redacted] stated that he was the person most responsible for the dog being tied out and would prefer to be issued the citations instead of Mr. [redacted]. Officer Hendrickson then re-issued the citations for Neglect-No Water; Neglect-Tie-out; and Neglect-No Shelter to Mr. [redacted]. Mr. [redacted] acknowledged, signed, and accepted his copy of the citations. Officer Hendrickson provided him with his court date, time, and location.

Officer's Signature: J. Foster # 2042

Date: 6/26/2015

W/C 2

INVESTIGATION REPORT
 Pima County Health Department
 Pima Animal Care Center
 4000 N Silverbell Rd
 Tucson, Arizona 85745
 Phone: (520) 243-5900
 Fax: (520) 243-5960
 www.pimaanimalcare.org

SUSPECT				ACO NAME / BADGE # Martinez 2067	COMPLAINT NUMBER A15-173571
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS S Aleppo Dr				BITE <input type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>	
ZIP 85706	CITY Tucson	STATE Az	RESIDENTIAL PHONE NUMBER 520-	CODE IF OTHER :	
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS Unknown				CI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CO <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>	
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER	DRIVERS LICENSE	
SEX F	WEIGHT 149	HEIGHT 5'6	EYES Br	HAIR COLOR Br	ORIGIN
			DOB	SSN Unknown	

DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES NO

LOCATION OF INCIDENT Broadway Blvd	DATE AND TIME REPORTED 6-15-15 / 1938	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 6-15-15 / 1959
FOOD <input type="checkbox"/> WATER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SHELTER <input type="checkbox"/> INJURED/ILL VENTILATION <input type="checkbox"/> ABANDONED <input type="checkbox"/> TIEOUT <input type="checkbox"/> BEATEN <input type="checkbox"/> WASTE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (EXPLAIN) <input type="checkbox"/>		

<input type="checkbox"/> I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case	VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME C. Martinez Badge 2067	D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	BUSINESS PHONE NO. 520-724-5900
<input type="checkbox"/> I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.	VICTIM'S ADDRESS	ZIP	CITY	STATE
<input type="checkbox"/> REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B) and § 8-286 (B)	VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS 4000 N Silverbell Rd	ZIP 85745	CITY Tucson	STATE Az

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)	DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # 150615456 <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> TFD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:	FOLLOW UP REQUEST <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:
---	---	--	-----------------------	---	--

<input type="checkbox"/> ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM	<input type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY:	TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED	PACC <input type="checkbox"/>
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM	<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION	PART OF BODY BITTEN:			RELEASE DATE:	VET <input type="checkbox"/>
PHONE NUMBER	VET CLINIC	PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>			HOME <input type="checkbox"/>
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS	CLINIC'S ADDRESS	QUARANTINE 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>	FRA HEAD# <input type="checkbox"/>			FTQ <input type="checkbox"/>

3 RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CITING ACO Klein 1926	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE	CODE/ORD VIOLATED 4-3(2)(B), 4-3 (2) (F)	CITATIONS/NUMBERS 74280 A,B,C,D		REVIEWED BY 2002 Korist 6/16
				BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL	ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
Shihtzu VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Miko	Wht/Brn	M	5y		169745	Current	ok	A284285
Shihtzu VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pepe	Blk	M	5Y		131680	Current	ok	A298191
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									

WITNESS 1 Dave Harper	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS 6420 E Broadway Ste B105	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE # 520-319-1911
WITNESS 2 TPD Officer Hernandez #35796	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS 270 S Stone Ave	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE # 520-791-4925
WITNESS 3	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 4	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #

W/C 2



INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-173571

ACO name & Badge: Klein 1926

On June 15, 2015 at 1938 hours the Tucson Police Department (TPD) called the Pima County Animal Care Center (PACC) dispatch department and requested assistance at the Park Place Mall regarding two dogs inside of a vehicle parked on the second story parking lot in front of Dillard's department store.

On June 15, 2015 PACC Officer Martinez Badge 2067 arrived at 1959 hours and met with Mall Security Officer Dave Harper and TPD Officer Hernandez badge 35796. Officer Hernandez responded under TPD case 150615456. Officer Hernandez stated TPD received a call at approximately 1904 hours reporting 2 dogs left in a white Dodge pick-up truck on the upper level parking lot of Dillard's. He stated Dillard's called on their intercom system for the owner to return to their vehicle.

Officer Hernandez and Officer Martinez found the vehicle to be unlocked. Officer Martinez noted that the driver's side window was rolled down approximately 1-2 inches. She found no water available for the dogs and took photographs. Officer Martinez was informed by PACC dispatch that the current temperature was 98 degrees.

The 2 dogs were removed from the vehicle. Officer Martinez described the dogs as a black Shih Tzu named Pepe wearing license 131680 and a white and brown Shih Tzu named Miko wearing license 169745. Officer Martinez returned to PACC with the dogs.

On June 16, 2015 I met with Ms _____ when she came to the Pima County Animal Care Center (PACC) to redeem her two dogs, Miko and Pepe. Ms _____ provided her Arizona driver's license as identification and stated she made a mistake and wanted her dogs back. She stated she has owned Miko and Pepe for 5 years. They are both 6 years old and both are currently vaccinated and licensed.

W/C 2

I explained the dangers of leaving an animal in a vehicle. I issued citation 74290 A,B,C and D for the violations of neglect no water and neglect ventilation as requested by PACC Officer Martinez badge 2067. I explained the violations to Ms [redacted]. I provided her signed copy and explained the court appearance. She understood and stated it will never happen again. I then escorted Ms [redacted] back to the licensing department where she was allowed to redeem Miko and Pepe. E.Klein Badge 1926

Officer's Signature:



Date:

6.16.15

E. Klein #1926

N/C 3

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Pima County Health Department
 Pima Animal Care Center
 4000 N. Silverbell Rd
 Tucson, Arizona 85745
 Phone: (520) 243-5900
 Fax: (520) 243-5960
 www.pimaanimalcare.org

SUSPECT				ACO NAME / BADGE # C. Martinez #2067	COMPLAINT NUMBER A15-168329
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS J. Bruce				BITE <input type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>	
ZIP 85735	CITY Tucson	STATE AZ	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER 520-		
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS N/A				CODE IF OTHER:	
ZIP N/A	CITY N/A	STATE N/A	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER N/A		
SEX F	WEIGHT 130	HEIGHT 5-00	EYES BRO	HAIR COLOR BR	ORIGIN
				DOB	SSN N/A

DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES NO

LOCATION OF INCIDENT J. Bruce	DATE AND TIME REPORTED 3/21/15 1833	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 6/14/15 1000
FOOD <input type="checkbox"/> WATER <input type="checkbox"/> SHELTER <input type="checkbox"/> INJURED/ILL <input type="checkbox"/> VENTILATION <input type="checkbox"/> ABANDONED <input type="checkbox"/> TIEOUT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BEATEN <input type="checkbox"/> WASTE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (EXPLAIN) <input type="checkbox"/>		

I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case.

VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME C. Martinez #2067	D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	BUSINESS PHONE NO. 724-5900
---	-------	---------------------	---------------------------------------

I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.

VICTIM'S ADDRESS 4000 N. Silverbell	ZIP 85745	CITY Tucson	STATE AZ
---	---------------------	-----------------------	--------------------

REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-05 (B) and § 8-286 (B)

VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS	ZIP	CITY	STATE
---------------------------	-----	------	-------

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)

DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER N/A	OTHER AGENCY CASE # <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> TFD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:	FOLLOW UP REQUEST <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:
---	--	-------------------------------------	---	--

ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

<input type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY:	TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED	PACC: <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------	----------------	------------	--------------	------------------	--------------------------------

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION	PART OF BODY BITTEN:	RELEASE DATE:	VET <input type="checkbox"/>	HOME <input type="checkbox"/>
--	----------------------	---------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------

PHONE NUMBER

VET CLINIC N/A	PHONE NUMBER N/A	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	FTQ <input type="checkbox"/>	UTQ <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	----------------------------	---	------------------------------	------------------------------

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

CLINIC'S ADDRESS N/A	QUARANTINE 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>	FRA HEAD# <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------------

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

3 RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CITING ACO C. Martinez #2067	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER A12-110825	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS 14-155928,
--	--	--	---	---

CODE/DRO VIOLATED 6.040.110 (B) (5)	CITATIONS/NUMBERS 74549	BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
---	-----------------------------------	--

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL	ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
German Shepherd VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lobo	Sable	M	8y	Current		OK	A411740
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								

PERSON 1	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
PERSON 2	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
PERSON 3	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
PERSON 4	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #

W/C 3



INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-168329

ACO name & Badge: C. Martinez #2067

On June 13, 2015 at approximately 1000 hours I, Officer Martinez #2067 arrived at S. Neal and spoke with a juvenile and asked to speak with an adult and he informed me his mother was home but feeling well. I then asked him to let his mother know I was there responding to the call made about loose dogs. He then informed me that he was the one the dogs chased on numerous occasions. He gave me a description of the house and I informed him I would try to make contact with the owner. He did inform me that the owners are rarely home.

I then went to Bruce and saw 2 dogs on the property. It didn't appear to me that anyone was home. A German Shepherd by the name of, "Lobo" started barking and still no response. I went back to the truck to write up a notice to leave when "Lobo" stood up and I noticed he was on a tie out. He was on a plastic cable that was approximately 15 feet in length. I also noticed that the dog had wrapped around the pole approximately two times. He had shelter, shade and water. I could see a Bull dog mix in the back but it was unclear from my stand point if the dog on the property was on a tie out as she was not reactive to my presence. It was sitting under a tree with a bucket next to it. I drove around to see if there was an alley way I could walk or drive thru but my attempts were unsuccessful. The dog had shade and later I was able to verify the bucket I could see had water.

Since I was unable to gain access into the yard I asked dispatch to call the owner and inform her I was at her house and that she needed to meet me or I would need to take her dogs. Contact was made and gave a 20 minute ETA. I waited for the owner to arrive.

arrived and I explained to her the reason for my being there and then addressed the dogs being on the tie outs. escorted me into her yard and I took photographs of "Lobo" and his area. I then asked about the other dog. She informed me her name was "Chloe" and belonged to her son. "Chloe" had a leash attached to her harness but as I walked over to her she got excited and ran over to me, she was not in fact tied up. I educated the owner on other alternatives to tie-outs. She stated she was going to try something because he is a good family/guard dog and wants to keep him.

I cited for "Lobo" being on a tie-out. showed me proof of rabies and license. Ms. signed and received her copy of citation and is aware of date, time and location.

Officer's Signature

C. Martinez #2067

Date: 6/14/15

W/C 4

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Pima County Health Department
 Pima Animal Care Center
 4000 N. Silverbell Rd
 Tucson, Arizona 85745
 Phone: (520) 243-5900
 Fax: (520) 243-5960
 www.pimaanimalcare.org

SUSPECT				ACO NAME / BADGE # Robert Tovar 2021		COMPLAINT NUMBER A15-173437	
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS E Wrigley Way				BITE <input type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>			
ZIP 85756	CITY Tucson	STATE AZ	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER 520-				
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS				CODE IF OTHER :			
ZIP				CITY		STATE	
BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER				DRIVERS LICENSE			
SEX M	WEIGHT 175	HEIGHT 5'7"	EYES Bro	HAIR COLOR Br	ORIGIN	DOB	SSN

DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES NO

LOCATION OF INCIDENT E Wrigley Way				DATE AND TIME REPORTED 06/13/15 / 11:51		DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 06/13/15 / 13:42	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FOOD				WATER		SHELTER	
INJURED/ILL				VENTILATION		ABANDONED	
TIEOUT				BEATEN		WASTE	
OTHER (EXPLAIN) Exercise Space							

I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case

VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME Robert Tovar			D.O.B		RESIDENCE PHONE NO.		BUSINESS PHONE NO. 520-724-5900	
--	--	--	-------	--	---------------------	--	---	--

I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.

VICTIM'S ADDRESS				ZIP		CITY		STATE	
------------------	--	--	--	-----	--	------	--	-------	--

REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-1405 (B) and § 8-286 (B)

VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS 4000 N Silverbell Rd				ZIP 85745		CITY Tucson		STATE AZ	
--	--	--	--	---------------------	--	-----------------------	--	--------------------	--

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE IF APPLICABLE)

DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER		OTHER AGENCY CASE # <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> TFD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:		FOLLOW UP REQUEST <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:	
--	--	---	--	-----------------------	--	---	--	--	--

ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

<input type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION		BITE SEVERITY:		TREATED BY		PHONE NUMBER		DATE QUARANTINED		PACC <input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION		PART OF BODY BITTEN:								VET <input type="checkbox"/>	
								RELEASE DATE:		HOME <input type="checkbox"/>	

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

VET CLINIC				PHONE NUMBER		OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		FTQ <input type="checkbox"/>		UTQ <input type="checkbox"/>	
------------	--	--	--	--------------	--	---	--	------------------------------	--	------------------------------	--

PHONE NUMBER

CLINIC'S ADDRESS				QUARANTINE 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>		FRA HEAD# <input type="checkbox"/>					
------------------	--	--	--	--	--	------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		CITING ACO Robert Tovar #2021		PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER		OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS			
--	--	---	--	--	--	----------------------	--	--------------------------	--	--	--

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

CODE/ORD VIOLATED 4-3(1); 4-3(2)(B); 4-3(2)(E); 4-81; 4-76				REVIEWED BY 6-15-15 DTK 1911			
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

CITATIONS/NUMBERS 73641				BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>			
-----------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
oodle	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tommy	Wh	M	2Y		Cited	Cited	N	A523617
	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									

WITNESS 1 Cyle Klug	M <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS 6632 E Wrigley Way 85756	RESIDENCE PHONE # 520-663-3486	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 2	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 3	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 4	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #

W/4



INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-173437

ACO name & Badge: Robert Tovar #2021

On June 13, 2015 at 11:51 hours the complainant called the Pima County Animal Care Center to report that there was a dog at E Wrigley Way who was locked in a crate with no water.

06/13/15 13:42 hours I, Officer Tovar #2021, arrived at E Wrigley Way. I observed a blue Ford Pickup Truck in the driveway and a silver Ford sedan in front of the house at this address. I also saw that the garage door was open. I rang the doorbell and knocked on the front door but did not receive an answer. I rang the doorbell two more times and knocked loudly on the door, however, I still did not receive an answer at the door. I walked around to the west side of the house where there is a brown wooden gate. I looked over the gate and saw that it was not locked. I entered the backyard where I saw a white poodle sitting in an uncovered metal crate exposed to the direct sunlight. I observed that there was not a water bowl in the crate with the dog and that the dog was panting heavily. The appeared to be dehydrated. I photographed the dog in the crate and then removed the dog and placed him in my truck. I gave the dog a bowl of water which it drank quickly.

A man who identified himself as _____, approached me and told me that he was the person who called the Pima Animal Care Center to report that the dog was in the crate and that he did not see any water for the dog inside the crate. He stated that he got home today at approximately 1130 hours and heard the dog crying in the neighbor's backyard so he looked over the wall to see why the dog was crying and it was at this time that he saw the dog inside the crate. He also said that the neighbors left the house around 0500 this morning and did not know if anyone was currently home. He gave me the dog owner's names, _____ and _____. He provided two phone numbers, 520-405-3279 and 520-741-2913. Mr. _____ also told me that the dog owner's really do not take care of their dog as he has often seen the dog with his hair matted and other times covered in feces. He stated that he was willing to testify in court about seeing the dog in the crate without water today.

W/C 4

I called dispatch to call the Tucson Police Department to do a welfare check due to the residence appearing unsecured and not receiving an answer at the door. I asked dispatch for the current temperature and was told that it was 97.3 F.

Tucson Police Officer Davis #47230, Event #151640429, arrived and I explained the situation to him. Officer Davis went to check the front door and found that it was unlocked. He announced himself and it was at this time that a young man later identified as, [redacted] came down the stairway. He came out of the house and I explained why TPD and I were present. Mr. [redacted] stated that last night his parents and sister went out of town and he had some friends over the house. He said that they were jumping on the trampoline and he put his dog, Tommy, in the metal crate to keep it from trying to jump on the trampoline and on his friends.

Mr. [redacted] stated that his friends left about 1:00 in the morning and he went to bed as he had to be at work at 5:00 a.m. Mr. [redacted] said that he "forgot" that he had placed the dog in the crate and apologized for his actions. I cited Mr. [redacted] for Cruelty, Neglect-No Water, Neglect-Exercise Space, No License and No Rabies Vaccination. He signed and received his copy of said citation.

It should be noted that I did see a black bucket with water in it on the back porch, however, the bucket was not clean. I asked Mr. [redacted] to clean the water bucket which he did. I had staffed the call with Supervisor Konst #2002 who advised me that it was ok to return the dog to the owner. I returned the dog to Mr. [redacted] and gave him a copy of the Tucson and Pima County Animal Laws. It should be noted that there was a dog house and shade for the dog on the covered back porch. The dog appeared to be in good health when I returned it to Mr. [redacted] as it was very active when it returned to the backyard.

Officer's Signature: *Robert Lowe #2021* Date: *6-14-15*

W/C 5

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Pima County Health Department
 Pima Animal Care Center
 4000 N. Silverbell Rd.
 Tucson, Arizona 85745
 Phone: (520) 243-5900
 Fax: (520) 243-5960
 www.pimaanimalcare.org

SUSPECT				ACO NAME / BADGE # X. Delgadillo #2047	COMPLAINT NUMBER A15-173405
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS W. Virginia St				BITE <input type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>	
ZIP 85706	CITY Tucson	STATE AZ	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER None provided		
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS				CODE IF OTHER :	
ZIP				CITY	
STATE				BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER	
SEX F				WEIGHT 150	
HEIGHT 5'2"				EYES Bro	
HAIR COLOR Gray				ORIGIN	
DOB				SSN	

DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES NO

LOCATION OF INCIDENT W. Virginia St			DATE AND TIME REPORTED 06/12/15 / 14:33		DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 06/12/15 / 15:02	
FOOD <input type="checkbox"/>	WATER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SHELTER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	INJURED/ILL <input type="checkbox"/>	VENTILATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ABANDONED <input type="checkbox"/>	TIEOUT <input type="checkbox"/>
BEATEN <input type="checkbox"/>			WASTE <input type="checkbox"/>		OTHER (EXPLAIN)	

I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case

VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME X. Delgadillo #2047		D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	BUSINESS PHONE NO. 520-724-5900*3
---	--	-------	---------------------	---

I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.

VICTIM'S ADDRESS			ZIP	CITY	STATE
------------------	--	--	-----	------	-------

REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B) and § 8-286 (B)

VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS 4000 N. Silverbell Rd			ZIP 85745	CITY Tucson	STATE AZ
---	--	--	---------------------	-----------------------	--------------------

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)

DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> TFD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:	FOLLOW UP REQUEST <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:
---	---	-----------------------	---	--

ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

<input type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY:	TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED	PACC <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION	PART OF BODY BITTEN:			RELEASE DATE:	VET <input type="checkbox"/>
					HOME <input type="checkbox"/>

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

VET CLINIC	PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	FTQ <input type="checkbox"/>	UTQ <input type="checkbox"/>
------------	--------------	---	------------------------------	------------------------------

PHONE NUMBER

CLINIC'S ADDRESS		QUARANTINE 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> FRA HEAD#		
------------------	--	--	------------------------------------	--	--

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	CITING ACO	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS	
---	------------	--	----------------------	--------------------------	--

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

CODE/ORD VIOLATED 4-3-1	REVIEWED BY		
-----------------------------------	-------------	--	--

CITATIONS/NUMBERS 74095 and 74096				BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	
---	--	--	--	--	--

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL	ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
Pit bull mix VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Chi Chi	Tan/White	F	A					523494
Pit Bull mix VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Puppy #1	White/Black	M	P					523495
Pit Bull mix VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>	Puppy #2	Black/White	M	P					523497
Pit Bull mix VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>	Puppy #3	Brown/Black	F	P					523498
Pit Bull mix VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>	Puppy #4	Brown/Black	F	P					523500
Pit Bull mix VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>	Puppy #5	Brown/Black	F	P					523501
Pit Bull mix VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>	Puppy #6	Brown/Black	M	P					523503
Pit Bull mix VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>	Puppy #7	White/Black	M	p					523504

WITNESS 1	M <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 2	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #

W/C 5

INVESTIGATION REPORT



Activity Number: A15-173405

ACO name & Badge: X. Delgadillo #2047

On June 12, 2015 at approximately 15:02 I, Officer Delgadillo #2047, arrived to W. Virginia St in reference to a complaint of neglect.

I walked up the drive way and heard a dog howling and puppies crying near the west side of the yard. I knocked on the door and met with Ms. Mary Flores. I advised her I there to conduct a welfare check on her dog as we received a complaint that the dogs are in distress; in direct sunlight, one deceased.

Ms. [redacted] allowed access to her back yard and I observed a female Pit Bull mix and approximately 8 puppies in a plastic barrel container. The mother dog was panting profusely and kept going in and out of the barrel howling and stepping on her puppies. I advised Ms. [redacted] that the dogs are very hot and I asked how long the dogs had been in this barrel. Ms. [redacted] said the dog had the puppies on Tuesday June 9, 2015 and has been ever since; it's now three days later. I explained that the dogs could not be in this condition as I bent down to touch the inside of the barrel I had to immediately remove my hand as it was very hot to the touch. Ms. [redacted] started yelling saying that she has no help and she doesn't have time to care for the dog. At this point her daughter came out and I attempted to explain the condition of the dog and puppies and she stated "take the damn dog already". I asked Ms. [redacted] if she wanted to relinquish ownership and she stated that she wasn't sure. I explained to her that she cannot keep the dogs in this condition and have to have appropriate shelter; the water was not potable.


Ms. [redacted] then agreed to surrender the dogs. As I bent down to take the puppies out of the barrel, I discovered one puppy had died.

Ms. [redacted] was cited into Tucson City Court for Neglect-Cruelty for Chi-Chi a female Tan and White Pit Bull mix and seven puppies. Ms. [redacted] signed her citations and Release of Ownership forms. Ms. [redacted] received a copy; provided her court date and time.

W/C 5

I transferred care to Dr. Wilcox upon arrival to Pima Animal Care and Animal Care Technician #2070 recorded the temperature of the mother Dog, Chi Chi at 103.2 and of puppy#1 at 102.4. The mother dog and her puppies were left in the care of Dr. Wilcox's staff for further examination.

Officer's Signature:

A handwritten signature consisting of several overlapping loops and a vertical line through the center.

Date:

6/13/15

W/C 6

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Pima County Health Department
 Pima Animal Care Center
 4000 N. Silverbell Rd.
 Tucson, Arizona 85745
 Phone: (520) 243-5900
 Fax: (520) 243-5960
 www.pimaanimalcare.org

SUSPECT				ACO NAME / BADGE # J RADEMAKER 2019		COMPLAINT NUMBER A15-173403	
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS E LA MIRADA ST				BITE <input type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>			
ZIP 85719	CITY TUCSON	STATE AZ	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER				
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS				CODE IF OTHER :			
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS				CI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CO <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>			
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER		DRIVERS LICENSE		
SEX M	WEIGHT 170	HEIGHT 5'8"	EYES BR	HAIR COLOR BR	ORIGIN	DOB	SSN

DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES NO

LOCATION OF INCIDENT E LA MIRADA ST			DATE AND TIME REPORTED 06/12/15 / 1337, 1347		DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 06/12/15 / 1453				
FOOD	WATER	SHELTER	INJURED/ILL	VENTILATION	ABANDONED	TIEOUT	BEATEN	WASTE	OTHER (EXPLAIN)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case

VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME OFFICER J RADEMAKER 2019		D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.		BUSINESS PHONE NO. 724-5900	
--	--	-------	---------------------	--	---------------------------------------	--

I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.

VICTIM'S ADDRESS PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER			ZIP	CITY	STATE
--	--	--	-----	------	-------

REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B) and § 8-286 (B)

VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS 4000 N SILVERBELL RD			ZIP 85745	CITY TUCSON	STATE AZ
--	--	--	---------------------	-----------------------	--------------------

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)

DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> TFD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:		FOLLOW UP REQUEST <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:	
--	---	-----------------------	---	--	--	--

ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

<input type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY:	TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED	PACC <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION	PART OF BODY BITTEN:			RELEASE DATE:	VET <input type="checkbox"/>
VET CLINIC		PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		HOME <input type="checkbox"/>
					FTQ <input type="checkbox"/>
					UTQ <input type="checkbox"/>

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

PHONE NUMBER

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

CLINIC'S ADDRESS		QUARANTINE 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/> FRA HEAD#	
3 rd PARTY CITATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CITING ACO	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS	

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

CODE/ORD VIOLATED 4-3(2)(C); 4-3(2)(E)(2); 11-1008(E)ARS			REVIEWED BY 2002 KONST 6/13		
CITATIONS/NUMBERS 7442B4A-C			BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL	ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
SIBERIAN HUSKY VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	BALTO	R/W	M	2Y		CITED	CURRENT	N	A523483
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									

WITNESS 1	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 2	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 3	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 4	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #

W/C b

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-173403

ACO name & Badge: J RADEMAKER 2019

On June 6, 2015 at 1:37PM and again at 1:47PM Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) dispatch received calls about a dog in distress at E. La Mirada St. The second complainant stated she works nearby and has been hearing the dog howling, yelping and whimpering all morning so she went and looked into the backyard. She stated that the dog is on a short tie-out due to it being wrapped around some lawn chairs. She stated the dog can't get to the shade or water in the yard.

On June 12, 2015 at 2:53PM I, Officer Rademaker 2019, responded to E La Mirada on the complaint of a dog on a tangled tieout. I received no response to my knocks at the front door. I heard a high pitched whine/bark coming from the back yard. I entered the side yard through an unlocked gate and when I came to the back yard found a young male red and white Siberian husky on a cable tie-out that had become tangled around its body and some stacked plastic chairs. There was water and shelter at the other end of the yard by the house. The dog was able to access the water, but not the shelter because of the tangled tie-out.

I impounded the dog without incident and placed a notice of impound on the front window. On intake I discovered a vanity tag on the dog with name Balto, the addresses La Mirada and N Quicksilver, and phone #.

On June 6, 2015 at 4:45PM I met with owner at PACC when he came to redeem Balto. He explained the tie-out by saying that Balto was an escape artist and impossible to confine. I explained that tie-outs are illegal and he said he will probably relocate the dog to his mother's home in Oro Valley.

I issued him citations for neglect tie-out and neglect no shelter. I also issued a citation for failure to obtain a license because Officer Downing 1923 had met with him on 1/22/15 and informed him that he had to get a license for Balto and he had not complied. I explained court and he said he understood.

Officer's Signature:


2019

Date:

6/12/15

W/C 7

INVESTIGATION REPORT		SUSPECT				ACO NAME / BADGE #		ACTIVITY/BITE NUMBER	
Pima County Health Department		SUSPECT'S ADDRESS				T. Foster #2042		A15-173015	
Pima Animal Care Center		W Miracle Mile !				BITE <input type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/>			
4000 N. Silverbell Rd.		CITY	STATE	ZIP	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER	OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>			
Tucson, Arizona 85745		Tucson	AZ	85705	520-				
Phone: (520) 243-5900		SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS				CI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CO <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>			
Fax: (520) 243-5960		UNK				DRIVERS LICENSE			
www.pimaanimalcare.org		CITY	STATE	ZIP	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER				
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
		SEX	WEIGHT	HEIGHT	EYES	HAIR	ORIGIN	DOB	SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER
		F	95	5'	BRO	BR			Not Asked
DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS?		LOCATION OF INCIDENT				DATE AND TIME OF INCIDENT		DATE AND TIME REPORTED	
YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		W Miracle Mile				06/06/15 06:25		06/06/15 06:25	
		FOOD	WATER	SHELTER	VENTILATION	ABANDONED	TIED/OUT	BEATEN	WASTE
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case		VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME				DATE OF BIRTH		RESIDENCE PHONE	
<input type="checkbox"/> I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.		David Denomme				N/A		520-247-1138	
		VICTIM'S ADDRESS				CITY		STATE	
		1468 W Miracle Mile Space #1				Tucson		AZ	
		VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS				CITY		STATE	
		N/A				N/A		N/A	
REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B) and § 8-286 (B)		DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED				DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER		OTHER AGENCY CASE #	
		YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		N/A		N/A	
NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)		RESTITUTION REQUESTED		OTHER AGENCY CASE #		SHERIFF DEPT		TUCSON POLICE	
		YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		N/A		N/A		N/A	
		FOLLOW UP REQUEST		SHERIFF DEPT		TUCSON POLICE		OTHER: N/A	
		YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		N/A		N/A		N/A	
<input type="checkbox"/> ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM		VIOLATION		BITE SEVERITY:		TREATED BY		PHONE NUMBER	
		<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION		N/A		N/A		N/A	
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM		PART OF BODY BITTEN:		N/A		DATE QUARANTINED		PACC <input type="checkbox"/>	
		N/A		N/A		N/A		VET <input type="checkbox"/>	
PHONE NUMBER		VET CLINIC		PHONE NUMBER		OWNER KNOWS OF BITE		HOME <input type="checkbox"/>	
		N/A		N/A		YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		FTB <input type="checkbox"/>	
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS		CLINIC'S ADDRESS		QUARANTINE (DAYS)		FRA HEAD#		N/A	
		N/A		10 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>		N/A		N/A	
		3 RD PARTY CITATIONS		CITING ACO		PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS		PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	
		YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		N/A		YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		N/A	
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE		CODE/ORD VIOLATED				OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS			
		4-3(2)(E)(2)				N/A			
		CITATIONS/NUMBERS				REVIEWED BY 2012			
		#74392 (A)				KORST 6/9			
						BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
BREED/DESCRIPTION		ANIMAL'S NAME		COLOR	SEX	AGE	LICENSE #	CONDITION	ANIMAL ID#
Siberian Husky Mix		Ezekia		White/Sable	F	2yrs	None	Normal	A522669
VICTIM OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
WITNESS 1		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS			RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #	
WITNESS 2		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS			RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #	
WITNESS 3		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS			RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #	
WITNESS 4		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS			RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #	



W/C 7

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-173015

ACD Name & Badge: T. Foster #2042

06/06/15 06:28 Pima Animal Care Dispatch operator received a call from the complainant who stated that there is a dog behind his house at the [redacted] Trailer Park that is tied up to something and has been like that for two days. He stated that the dog looks miserable and that he does not know how long the chain is exactly, but it looks like it is tangled around it's self. He stated that an Officer can go to his house and he will show them where the dog is.

06/06/15 06:36 I, Officer Foster #2042 arrived at [redacted] W Miracle Mile and met with the caller who allowed me to look over his fence so I could see the dog in question. I was able to observe a white and sable colored Siberian Husky type mixed dog on a chain tie-out as described. I asked Mr. [redacted] if he knew the address and he stated that he did not know the physical address but that he believed that the trailer was in space [redacted] or [redacted] in the [redacted] mobile home park located just west of his mobile home. I thanked the man and then relocated to the [redacted] Mobile Home Park. A records search of the GIS database revealed that the park is located at [redacted] W Miracle Mile. I arrived at [redacted] W Miracle Mile and confirmed that I was at the correct trailer by locating the dog. I knocked on the door but did not receive an answer after several tries. I impounded the dog for her own safety without issues. I posted a notice of impound on the back door because it appears to be the one most frequently used.

06/08/15 18:30 I, Officer Foster #2042 met with the dog owner and her mother at Pima Animal Care Center regarding the dog I impounded at [redacted] W Miracle Mile Space [redacted]. The dog owner [redacted] is a monolingual Spanish speaker and Kennel Supervisor D. Miranda translated from English to Spanish for me. Ms. [redacted] advised me that she was out of town and brought her dog to Tucson so her daughter [redacted] could pet sit the dog known as Ezekia. Ms. [redacted] stated that the dog was too active to be indoors and because she did not have a fenced area where the dog could be contained she chained the dog up behind her trailer while her mother was out of town. Ms. [redacted] also stated that she had a second dog inside the residence that does not get along with her mother's dog and cited that as an additional reason for utilizing a tie-out to contain Ezekia. I issued Ms. [redacted] a citation for Ezekia being on a tie-out after explaining that it is against the law in Tucson and Pima County to tie up a dog. Ms. [redacted] acknowledged, signed, and accepted her copy of the citation. I thanked her for her time and walked her and her mother out to the licensing department. I was later told by a licensing staff member that Ms. [redacted] declined to redeem her dog and cited the cost as the reason for signing over ownership to Pima Animal Care Center.

Officer's Signature: J. Foster #2042

Date: 6/9/2015

W/C 8

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Pima County Health Department
 Pima Animal Care Center
 4000 N. Silverbell Rd
 Tucson, Arizona 85745
 Phone: (520) 724-5900
 Fax: (520) 724-5960
 www.pimaanimalcare.org

SUSPECT				ACO NAME / BADGE # Delgadillo #2047	COMPLAINT NUMBER A15-172632
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS East Sylvane Street				BITE <input type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>	
ZIP 85711	CITY Tucson	STATE AZ	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER 520-	CODE IF OTHER :	
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS Self-employed				CI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CO <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>	
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER	DRIVERS LICENSE	
SEX M	WEIGHT 180	HEIGHT 5'8"	EYES Brb	HAIR COLOR Blk	ORIGIN
DOB		SSN			

DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES NO

LOCATION OF INCIDENT West Missouri Street	DATE AND TIME REPORTED 5/30/15 18:17	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 5/30/15 19:30
FOOD <input type="checkbox"/> WATER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SHELTER <input type="checkbox"/> INJURED/ILL <input type="checkbox"/> VENTILATION <input type="checkbox"/> ABANDONED <input type="checkbox"/> TIEOUT <input type="checkbox"/> BEATEN <input type="checkbox"/> WASTE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (EXPLAIN) <input type="checkbox"/>		

I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case
 I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.

VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME Delgadillo #2047	D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	BUSINESS PHONE NO. 724-5900
VICTIM'S ADDRESS	ZIP	CITY	STATE
VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS 4000 North Silverbell Road	ZIP 85745	CITY Tucson	STATE AZ

REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B) and § 8-286 (B)
 NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)

DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> TFD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:	FOLLOW UP REQUEST <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:
---	--	-----------------------	---	--

ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

<input type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY:	TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED	PACC <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION	PART OF BODY BITTEN:			RELEASE DATE:	VET <input type="checkbox"/>

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

VET CLINIC	PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	FTQ <input type="checkbox"/>	UTQ <input type="checkbox"/>
------------	--------------	---	------------------------------	------------------------------

PHONE NUMBER

CLINIC'S ADDRESS	QUARANTINE 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>	FRA HEAD# <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------	--	------------------------------------

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	CITING ACO Windauer #1984	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS
--	-------------------------------------	--	----------------------	--------------------------

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

CODE/ORD VIOLATED 4-3(2)(B)	REVIEWED BY KONST 6
CITATIONS/NUMBERS 73498 A	BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL	ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
Cocker Spaniel VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Many	Buff	M	7y				N	A521878
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									

WITNESS 1	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 2	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 3	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 4	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #

W/C 8



INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-172632

ACO Name & Badge: Windauer #1984

On May 30, 2015 at approximately 1810 hours Officer Delgadillo #2047 arrived at West Missouri Street reference an abandonment complaint called in at 1355 hours, the same day. The Officer arrived at the address and found the dog inside the fenced yard but was not able to verify if the dog had water available due to the gates being chained and padlocked. The Officer was advised by a neighbor that the owners had moved out four days ago. Officer Delgadillo then called for assistance, someone with bolt cutters, to check if the dog had water available.

I, Officer Windauer #1984 arrived and cut the lock of the walk through gate and we entered the property. The dog, a buff cocker spaniel appeared to be in good condition but was standoffish. Officer Delgadillo took several pictures of the conditions, noting a bowl of non-potable water near the residence. The Officer posted a door knocker and impounded the dog for its well-being. The Officer requested the owner be cited for Neglect-No Water if dog redeemed

On June 3, 2015 at approximately 1400 hours, I met with the dog's owner- at the Pima County Animal Care Center trying to redeem his dog. With Dispatcher Lugo translating, it was explained to him what Officer Delgadillo had seen while on his property and why the dog was impounded. He was told that it was necessary to issue him one citation for Neglect-No Water before releasing dog back to him. Mr. requested a fee quote before he signed anything (to be sure he had enough money) and then accepted the citation. I provided him with his copy and indicated his appearance date and location of the court.

Officer's Signature:

D. Windauer
#1984

Date:

6-4-2015

W/C 9

INVESTIGATION REPORT Pima County Health Department Pima Animal Care Center 4000 N. Silverbell Rd Tucson, Arizona 85745 Phone: (520) 243-5900 Fax: (520) 243-5960 www.pimaanimalcare.org	SUSPECT				ACO NAME / BADGE # X. Delgadillo #2047		COMPLAINT NUMBER A15-172800		
	SUSPECT'S ADDRESS W. Lester				BITE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>				
	ZIP 85705	CITY Tucson	STATE AZ	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER 520-		CODE IF OTHER :			
	SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS				CI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CO <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>				
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER		DRIVERS LICENSE				
SEX F	WEIGHT 180	HEIGHT 5'3"	EYES Bro	HAIR COLOR Bro	ORIGIN	DOB	SSN		
DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>				LOCATION OF INCIDENT W. Lester		DATE AND TIME REPORTED 06/02/2015 / 16:39		DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 06/02/2015 / 17:22	
<input type="checkbox"/> I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case <input type="checkbox"/> I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.				<input type="checkbox"/> HOOD <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WATER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SHELTER <input type="checkbox"/> INJURED/ILL <input type="checkbox"/> VENTILATION <input type="checkbox"/> ABANDONED <input type="checkbox"/> TIEOUT <input type="checkbox"/> BEATEN <input type="checkbox"/> WASTE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (EXPLAIN)					
VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME Tucson Police Department				D.O.B		RESIDENCE PHONE NO. 520-791-5059		BUSINESS PHONE NO.	
VICTIM'S ADDRESS				ZIP		CITY		STATE	
VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS				ZIP		CITY		STATE	
NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)		DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER		OTHER AGENCY CASE # 1506020495 <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> TFD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:	
								FOLLOW UP REQUEST <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:	
ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM		<input type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION		BITE SEVERITY:		TREATED BY		PHONE NUMBER	
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM		<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION		PART OF BODY BITTEN		DATE QUARANTINED		PACC <input type="checkbox"/> VET <input type="checkbox"/> HOME <input type="checkbox"/>	
PHONE NUMBER		VET CLINIC		PHONE NUMBER		OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		FTQ <input type="checkbox"/> UTQ <input type="checkbox"/>	
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS		CLINIC'S ADDRESS		QUARANTINE 10 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>		FRA HEAD#			
		3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		CITING ACO X. Delgadillo #2047		PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER A15-172789	
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE		CODE/DRO VIOLATED 4-3-(1), 4-3-2 (B)		CITATIONS/NUMBERS 74094		OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS		REVIEWED BY KEAST 2002 6/3	
								BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME		COLOR		SEX		AGE	
Pit Bull		Smokey		Chocolate/White		M		A	
Pit Bull		Karlil		White		F		A	
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
WITNESS 3		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>		DOB		ADDRESS		RESIDENCE PHONE #	
WITNESS 4		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>		DOB		ADDRESS		RESIDENCE PHONE #	

W/C 9



INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-172800

ACO name & Badge: X. Delgadillo #2047

On June 2, 2015 at approximately 17:22 I, Officer Delgadillo #2047, arrived at [redacted] W. Lester St. in reference to two dogs in a small shelter in full sun with no water.

I met with Tucson Police Officer Landeau badge # 52789 and Jones badge #52900, TPD Case#1506020495 and observed two large pit bulls in a wire carrier which was too small to house dogs of this breed and size. The carrier was in partial sun at this time. Officer Jones explained that when they arrived the dogs were in the sun and had no water. Officer Jones and Officer Landeau provided the dogs with a gallon of water and they were desperately searching for more water; a second gallon was given. The owner then came outside and met with the Officers and provided the dogs a metal bowl with water which they again began to drink. The dog owner, Sabrina Romero, was cleaning the apartment because the dogs had "made a mess" last night and decided to place the dogs outside. After the cleaning was completed she took a nap while the dogs were still outside.

This call was the second call as the first call was reported at 13:37 hours but the caller had given the wrong address; Tucson Police verified that the call was indeed the same address as they match the telephone from the person who wished to remain anonymous.


Officer Jones had conducted interviews with neighbors and they reported that this is a continuous occurrence from the dog owner and another neighbor alleged that their previous dog had died from being left in the carrier in full sun. I reviewed the weather from the National Weather Service for June 2, 2015(attached) and at approximately 13:37 when the first call was reported the temperature was approximately 94 degrees and at 17:22 when I arrived the temperature was approximately 100 degrees.

I then met with the dog owner, [redacted], who stated the same as she had to Officer Jones. I advised Ms. [redacted] that the original call came in at approximately 1130 and again at 1330 hours but the wrong address was given and the dogs have been outside in the sun with no water for approximately 6 hours in a kennel that is extremely too small for two large breed dogs. Due to the severity of the neglect the dogs were confiscated and bonded for their wellbeing. Ms. [redacted] signed the bond form and was advised the amount of \$2650.00, 1325.00 per dog, is the bond amount to secure a court date.

w/c 9

Ms. | was cited into Tucson City Court for Cruelty and Neglect-no water for Karlii a white female pit bull and Smokey a chocolate and white male pit bull. Ms. signed her citations; received a copy and was provided her court date and time.

Officer's Signature:



Date:

6/3/15

W/C 10

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Pima County Health Department
 Pima Animal Care Center
 4000 N Silverbell Rd
 Tucson, Arizona 85745
 Phone: (520) 243-5900
 Fax: (520) 243-5960
 www.pimaanimalcare.org

SUSPECT		ACO NAME / BADGE # Klein 1926		COMPLAINT NUMBER A15-174102	
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS W Sahara St		BITE <input type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>			
ZIP 85705	CITY Tucson	STATE Az	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER		
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS None		CODE IF OTHER: CI <input type="checkbox"/> CO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>			
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER		
SEX M	WEIGHT 140	HEIGHT 5'5	EYES	HAIR COLOR brn	ORIGIN
DOB		SSN unknown		DRIVERS LICENSE	
LOCATION OF INCIDENT W Sahara St		DATE AND TIME REPORTED 6-25-15 / 1747		DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 6-25-15 / 1821	
FOOD <input type="checkbox"/> WATER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SHELTER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> INJURED/ILL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> VENTILATION <input type="checkbox"/> ABANDONED <input type="checkbox"/> TIEOUT <input type="checkbox"/> BEATEN <input type="checkbox"/> WASTE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (EXPLAIN) <input type="checkbox"/>					
I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case <input type="checkbox"/>		VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME E.Klein Badge 1926		D.O.B	
I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case <input type="checkbox"/>		RESIDENCE PHONE NO.		BUSINESS PHONE NO. 520-724-5900	
REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-405 (B) and § 8-286 (B) <input type="checkbox"/>		VICTIM'S ADDRESS		ZIP	
NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE IF APPLICABLE		VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS 4000 N Silverbell Rd		CITY Tucson	
DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	
OTHER AGENCY CASE # 150625244		FOLLOW UP REQUEST <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> TFD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:		STATE Az	
ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/>		VIOLATION <input type="checkbox"/>		BITE SEVERITY:	
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM		NON-VIOLATION <input type="checkbox"/>		PART OF BODY BITTEN:	
PHONE NUMBER		VET CLINIC		PHONE NUMBER	
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS		CLINIC'S ADDRESS		OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE		3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		CITING ACO	
CODE/BIRD VIOLATED		QUARANTINE 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>		PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
CITATIONS/NUMBERS		PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER		OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS	
BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME		COLOR	
SEX		AGE		TAG COLOR	
LICENSE #		VX CERTIFICATE #		COND	
ANIMAL ID#		ANIMAL ID#		ANIMAL ID#	
WITNESS 1 Jena Childs		DOB		ADDRESS 2858 W Sahara St	
WITNESS 2 Chris Binder		DOB		ADDRESS 2866 W Sahara St	
WITNESS 3 Deputy Higns badge 7329		DOB		ADDRESS 1750 E Benson Hwy	

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
'it mix	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	McKenzie	Wht/tan	F	5y		none	none	poor	A525174
'it mix	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pup #1	Blk	M	1w				poor	A525175
'it mix	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pup #2	Blk	M	1w				poor	A525176
'it Mix	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pup #3	Blk/wht	M	1w				DOA	A525178
'it Mix	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pup #4	Blk	M	1w				DOA	A525179
'it mix	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pup #5	Blk	F	1w				DOA	A525180
'it mix	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pup #6	Blk/Wht	F	1w				DOA	A525181
'it mix	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pup #7	Blk	F	1w				DOA	A525182

REVIEWED BY **Zoo 2**
KONST #29
 BOND YES NO

W/C 10



INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-174102

ACO name & Badge: Klein Badge 1926

On June 25, 2015 at 1747 hours the Pima County Animal Care Center (PACC) dispatch department received a call from the Pima County Sheriff's Department (PCSO) stating they were sending a Deputy to meet with a complainant regarding possible animal cruelty. It was reported that 7 puppies died at their neighbor's house after being exposed to the heat.

On June 25, 2015 at 1821 hours I, Investigator Klein badge 1926 arrived at W Sahara St where I was met in the street by [redacted]. Ms [redacted] speaks very little English but was able to tell me that her daughter called 911 about their neighbor.

Mrs [redacted] pointed to [redacted] W Sahara St. and told me that at 2:00 pm all of the dogs were alive. They were in direct sun with no shade. Mrs [redacted] said the puppies were all dead by 3:00 pm. I asked if she saw any water or shelter available for the dogs. She said they had water but no shelter or shade of any kind. She kept telling me to hurry and go look because the owner was taking the puppies and hiding them on the north side of the property before I arrived. Mrs [redacted] said her husband and her daughter told the man the puppies were dying and they were going to call the police. She said that is when the man started hiding the puppies and then he left. She said there was a second man there right now but he is not the owner. Mrs [redacted] said the mother dog was still alive but was not doing well.

I then went to [redacted] W Sahara St. I was met at the entry gate on the west side of the property by Chris Binder (DOB 12-2-69). Mr [redacted] stated he lives in the trailer on this property and just arrived home. He stated he had allowed a homeless man to bring his female dog with puppies here last night. Mr [redacted] said when he came home today the man told him that some of the puppies died and that the cops were coming. Mr [redacted] said the man then took off.

PCSO Deputy Higen badge 7359 arrived under PCSO case 150625244 as I was speaking with Mr [redacted]. Mr [redacted] was explaining that he does not know the man's name or where he went. He said he met the man at Mike's Bike Shop and felt sorry for the mother dog and her puppies and invited the man to stay at the north end of the property with his dogs.

W/C 10

Mr [redacted] said the man asked if he could bury the puppies in the yard. He showed us the area where the ground had been dug up recently. The area was still wet and a shovel was lying on the ground.

Mr [redacted] then showed us the north east area of the property where he allowed the man to stay. I observed a ladder lying on its side to make a barrier. There was a lawn chair, a back pack, a laundry basket, a box with a bag of wet dog food inside of it. There was a blanket on the ground where the mother dog and two black puppies were lying.

The two puppies were not moving. The mother dog kept pulling them into her body. The mother dog appeared to be a brown and white pit bull mix. Her face and legs have white fur. Her skin was very red and had the appearance of a sun burn. She was trembling and softly growling while pulling the puppies into her body. I noticed that she was wet as was the blanket she was lying on. There was a bowl of water next to her. I asked why the dog was wet. Mr Binder said the owner did that to try to cool her down.

The mother dog was wearing a collar with a pima county dog license and a microchip identification tag on it. As I reached to read the numbers off of the tags she lifted her head and growled. I was then able to see the two puppies move and realized they were alive. I called pacc dispatch and asked for the owner information linked to the license number. I was told the license information belonged to a deceased Poodle that lived on Glenn st.

A man rode up to the property on a motorized bicycle with a trailer attached to it. There was a plastic dog house tied to the trailer. Mr [redacted] identified the man as being the dog owner.

[redacted] (DOB [redacted]) stated he has been staying on this property for a few days and just brought the dogs over last night. He provided his father's address of [redacted] N Nova Place as being his mailing address.

He said he has owned McKenzie for 5 years and this is her second litter. I asked where he got the license and collar she was wearing and he said from a dumpster. We asked Mr Welch how many puppies McKenzie had. He said she had 8. He told us one puppy was given to his friend Dahlena to bottle feed and that 5 puppies died today because they got too hot. He said he buried them and then went to get a dog house for McKenzie and the remaining two puppies. He does not know how to get in touch with Dahlena and does not know who the father dog is.

I told Mr [redacted] that I needed to see the other 5 puppies. As he was digging them up he told me he was trying to give them water by bottle feeding them after the neighbors yelled at him. He knew it was too hot and that they were dying so he tried to put them in shade under a trailer bed but it was already too late. He said that he decided to hose down McKenzie and the two remaining puppies to help them.

I asked Mr [redacted] why he didn't take them to a vet. He said he didn't have any money or a car. I asked him why he didn't call pacc or bring them to the Animal Care Center.

N/C 10

He again said he doesn't have a car. I asked him why he didn't put them in the trailer on the back of his bike and bring them in. He said he couldn't. I asked him why he left after the neighbors said they called the police instead of staying and asking the police for help. He then started yelling. He said it was over 100 degrees today and they died. He asked me what I wanted him to do and said he loves his dogs.

I told Mr [redacted] that I wanted him to provide shelter, shade, water, food and medical care when they need it. He told me they have food. I let him know that I already found the bag of dog food. He said it had rained and the food got wet so he put it into another bag. He began yelling again and said it just got too hot today and they died. I asked him why he didn't build shelter to provide shade using the materials on the property. He pointed to the open area where his chair was and said there was shade sometimes.

I impounded the 5 deceased puppies, the mother dog McKenzie with her two surviving puppies. I served Mr Welch with a notice of impound and bond for McKenzie and the two surviving puppies. I explained to Mr Welch that he would be required to pay the bond to pacc at 4000 N Silverbell no later than July 5, 2015 to request a hearing. I told him that if he did not the dogs would be forfeited to pacc. He was very argumentative and said he did not understand why. I explained that the dogs were in distress when I arrived and their life was in danger if I left them.

Deputy Higen issued citations for cruelty, neglect of vet care and neglect shelter for all 8 dogs.

I immediately returned to the Animal Care Center and informed the medical staff of the incident. The 5 deceased puppies were placed in the cooler to be examined by the veterinarian. McKenzie and her two puppies were processed, put into a private kennel with bedding, food and water and placed on the veterinarian medical list to be examined.

Officer's Signature:



Date:

6.26.15



PIMA COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT
PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER
4000 N. SILVERBELL RD • TUCSON, AZ 85745
(520) 724-5900 FAX (520) 724-5960
www.pimaanimalcare.org

MEMORANDUM

TO: Kim Janes, Chief of External Operations
FROM: Neil Konst, Animal Care Field Supervisor
DATE: 7/4/15
RE: Dangerous dog cases for June 2015

Pima:

1. A15-172063 Beyer; As part of a diversion agreement reached with Pima County Justice Court The dog owner was required to have a dangerous dog evaluation performed on Daisy. Daisy was declared not dangerous by Investigator Klein.
2. A15-173171 Mixer; dogs named Sarge and Sammy. Sammy was declared not dangerous and Sarge was declared dangerous by Investigator Eckelbarger. Mr. Mixer has requested a dangerous dog hearing, the hearing is being scheduled.
3. A15-167398 Crawford; On 05/21/15 Pima County Justice Court ordered a dangerous dog evaluation be performed on Kota. Kota was declared not dangerous by Investigator Klein.

#1

INVESTIGATION REPORT
 Pima County Health Department
 Pima Animal Care Center
 4000 N. Silverbell Rd.
 Tucson, Arizona 85745
 Phone: (520) 243-5900
 Fax: (520) 243-5960
 www.pimaanimalcare.org

SUSPECT				ACO NAME / BADGE # Klein 1926		COMPLAINT NUMBER A15-172063	
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS							
ZIP		CITY		STATE		RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER	
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS							
ZIP		CITY		STATE		BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER	
SEX		WEIGHT		HEIGHT		EYES	
HAIR COLOR		ORIGIN		DOB		SSN	

DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES NO

LOCATION OF INCIDENT				DATE AND TIME REPORTED 9-25-14 / 1630		DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 9-25-14 / 1655	
FOOD <input type="checkbox"/> WATER <input type="checkbox"/> SHELTER <input type="checkbox"/> INJURED/ILL <input type="checkbox"/> VENTILATION <input type="checkbox"/> ABANDONED <input type="checkbox"/> TIEOUT <input type="checkbox"/> BEATEN <input type="checkbox"/> WASTE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (EXPLAIN) <input type="checkbox"/>							

I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case

VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME			D.O.B		RESIDENCE PHONE NO.		BUSINESS PHONE NO.	
-------------------------	--	--	-------	--	---------------------	--	--------------------	--

I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.

VICTIM'S ADDRESS				ZIP		CITY		STATE	
------------------	--	--	--	-----	--	------	--	-------	--

REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B) and § 8-286 (B)

VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS				ZIP		CITY		STATE	
---------------------------	--	--	--	-----	--	------	--	-------	--

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)

DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER		OTHER AGENCY CASE # <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> TFD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:		FOLLOW UP REQUEST <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:	
---	--	--	--	-----------------------	--	---	--	--	--

ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

<input type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION		BITE SEVERITY:		TREATED BY		PHONE NUMBER		DATE QUARANTINED		PACC <input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION		PART OF BODY BITTEN:						RELEASE DATE:		VET <input type="checkbox"/>	
										HOME <input type="checkbox"/>	

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

VET CLINIC				PHONE NUMBER		OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		FTQ <input type="checkbox"/>		UTQ <input type="checkbox"/>	
------------	--	--	--	--------------	--	---	--	------------------------------	--	------------------------------	--

PHONE NUMBER

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

CLINIC'S ADDRESS				QUARANTINE 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>		FRA HEAD# <input type="checkbox"/>	
------------------	--	--	--	--	--	------------------------------------	--

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

3 RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		CITING ACO		PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER		OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS	
--	--	------------	--	--	--	----------------------	--	--------------------------	--

CODE/ORD VIOLATED

CITATIONS/NUMBERS								REVIEWED BY	
-------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-------------	--

BOND YES NO

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
Lab/Pit	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Daisy	white	F	2Y		231771		ok	A496858
	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									

WITNESS 1	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 2	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 3	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 4	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #

#1



INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-172063

ACO name & Badge: Klein 1926

On September 25, 2014 it was reported to the Pima County Animal Care Center (PACC) that the Labrador, Pit bull mix known as Daisy bit a neighbor on the leg while at large. The victim did not want citations at the time of the incident and stated they just want the dog to be kept in its own yard.

PACC Officer Delgado met with Daisy's owner and explained the incident. Daisy's owner stated they got Daisy from a friend and were unable to provide any paperwork. The owner was cited for no proof of rabies vaccination and no proof of license. Daisy was quarantined as required.

On May 20, 2015 I, Investigator Klein was assigned to a dangerous dog assessment on Daisy that was requested by the Pima County Attorney's Office.

I met with Daisy and found her to be friendly. I completed a premise inspection and observed a pen that has been provided near the main house on the 2.5 acre lot owned by Daisy's owner. Daisy's owner stated they no longer allow Daisy to be left outside unattended and she is primarily an indoor dog.

I completed neighbor interviews and learned that Daisy has not been observed behaving aggressively. Some of the neighbors mentioned riding their horses while accompanied by their own dogs and stated Daisy never left her own property when they passed by.

I found no history of complaints regarding Daisy or her owner in the PACC data base.

After completing the assessment Daisy scored +1 point on the evaluation criteria score sheet and was not deemed dangerous. I notified Daisy's owner that Daisy was not declared dangerous at this time.

Officer's Signature:

E. Klein
E. Klein #1926

Date: 7.1.15

COPY



Pima County Attorney's Office

32 North Stone Avenue
Suite 1400

Tucson, Arizona 85701-1412

Phone (520) 740-5600
Fax (520) 740-5585
www.pcao.pima.gov

Barbara LaWall
Pima County Attorney

May 5, 2015

DD
A15-172063
5/20/15

Patrick Moran, Esq.
530 S. Main, Ste. B
Tucson, AZ 85701
Attorney for Defendant

RE: State v. Jeffrey Beyer CR14-419372 A14-156661

Dear Mr. Moran,

After review of the case, and speaking with the victim, the State is extending an offer of Informal Diversion to Mr. Beyer. The following terms must be completed as part of the Informal Diversion:

1. \$200.00 fine (distributed to PACC pursuant to Pima County Ordinance 6.04.050(B)) OR 20 Hours of Community Service
2. Proof of completion of dangerous dog evaluation by PACC, and to follow any conditions implemented by PACC as a result of the evaluation.
3. Keep dog confined to Defendant's property, and when off Defendant's property, on a leash.
4. Do not have any further contact with the victims in this case.
5. Write an apology letter to the victim (to be sent to the State for forwarding to the victim.)

Proof of Completion of the requirements in this letter must be submitted to the State on or before **August 6, 2015**. Upon submission of proof, the State will motion the Court for dismissal of the case. If the State does not receive proof of completion of the above terms before the close of business **August 6, 2015**, the State will continue with prosecution of the case. No other offer of Informal Diversion will be made. Additionally, should Mr. Beyer be arrested or have further contact with law enforcement between now and **August 6, 2015**, this offer will be rescinded and become void.



COPY

PIMA COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT #1
PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER
4000 N. SILVERBELL RD. TUCSON, AZ 85745
(520) 724-5900 FAX (520) 724-5960
www.pima.gov/animalcare

CASE NO: A15-172063
OWNER: JEFFREY BEYER
ANIMAL NAME: DAISY A496858

ADDRESS: 13450 W. STATE RD
SEX: F BREED: LAB/PIT
COLOR: WHITE DATE: 5.23.15

EVALUATION CRITERIA

REPORTED BITES:

NON-VIOLATION BITE + 3 _____
VIOLATION-BITE + 6 +1e

SEVERITY OF INJURY TO HUMANS:

(Check One Factor Only Per Victim)

NO BREAK IN SKIN + 1 +1
BREAK IN SKIN OR BRUISING + 2 _____
MEDICAL CARE (RELEASED) + 3 _____
MULTIPLE BITES-SINGLE INCIDENT + 4 _____
BIT DOWN AND SHOOK VICTIM + 4 _____
MEDICAL CARE (HOSPITALIZATION) + 5 _____

Animal Complaints or Violations:

LEASH LAW CITATIONS + 2 _____
LEASH LAW COMPLAINTS + 1 _____
ATTEMPTED BITE CITATIONS + 2 _____
ANIMAL ATTACK CITATIONS + 3 _____
OTHER CITATIONS / OR COMPLAINTS + 1 +2

SEVERITY OF INJURY TO ANIMALS:

ATTACK WITH NO INJURY + 1 _____
INJURIES TREATED BY OWNER + 2 _____
VET CARE (1 To 2 Visits) + 3 _____
EXTENSIVE VET CARE (>2 VISITS) + 4 _____
INJURIES RESULTED IN DEATH + 5 _____

CONFINEMENT MEASURES: (Check one factor only)

(Primary Method of Confinement at the time of the incident)

SECURE FENCE/WALL AND GATES - 5 _____
INADEQUATE FENCING OR GATES + 5 +5

OWNER ACCOUNTABILITY / RESPONSIBILITY:

REPAIRED DEFICIENT CONFINEMENT - 3 -3
ANIMAL IS NEUTERED / SPAYED - 1 -1
OWNER AWARE OF ANY AGGRESSION + 1 _____
OWNER FAILED TO REPAIR CONFINEMENT + 5 _____
CURRENTLY LICENSED LIC # 231771 - 1 -1
NO CURRENT LICENSE + 1 _____
NO CURRENT RABIES VACCINATION + 1 _____

NEIGHBOR COMMENTS (Scored by Majority Opinion):

(Two or More Neighbors Interviewed)

ANIMAL NEVER OBSERVED AT LARGE - 3 -3
ANIMAL NOT OBSERVED AGGRESSIVE - 3 -3
ANIMAL OBSERVED AT LARGE <5X/YR + 1 _____
ANIMAL OBSERVED AT LARGE >5X/YR + 2 _____
ANIMAL OBSERVED BEING AGGRESSIVE + 2 _____

DOGS BEHAVIOR: (If Observed by Officer)

ANIMAL BEHAVES AGGRESSIVELY + 2 _____
ANIMAL NOT AGGRESSIVE - 2 -2
ANIMAL SHOWS UNSAFE BEHAVIOR + 1 _____

Confinement / Fencing:

THE 0.5 ACRE LOT IS CONFINED BY BARBED WIRE AND WOODEN SLATE FENCING. THERE IS A SECURE PEN ON THE PROPERTY THAT IS NOW BEING USED AS CONFINEMENT FOR DAISY.

General Comments:

I FOUND NO HISTORY OR COMPLAINTS REGARDING DAISY.

DAISY IS NOT DEEMED DANGEROUS AT THIS TIME.

E. Klein OFFICER # 19210

TOTAL SCORE: +1

A SCORE OF TEN POINTS OR HIGHER SHALL BE DEEMED A DANGEROUS ANIMAL

____ DANGEROUS
 NOT DANGEROUS

We have determined that your dog displays or has a tendency, disposition, or propensity to injure, bite attack, chase or charge, OR attempt to injure ,bite, attack, chase or charge a person or domestic animal in a threatening manner OR bare its teeth or approach a person or domestic animal in a threatening manner City Code 4-13 / County Code 6.04.150. The owner has ten (10) days in the City, five (5) days (County & other jurisdictions) as to appeal the declaration of dangerous by filing a request for a dangerous dog hearing, providing the dog has not been declared vicious by a court. The owner may obtain this form at PACC IN PERSON.

2

INVESTIGATION REPORT Pima County Health Department Pima Animal Care Center 4000 N. Silverbell Rd. Tucson, Arizona 85745 Phone: (520) 243-5900 Fax: (520) 243-5960 www.pimaanimalcare.org		SUSPECT Joshua Daniel Mixer				ACO NAME / BADGE # Downing#1923		COMPLAINT NUMBER A15-173171			
		SUSPECT'S ADDRESS				BITE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>					
		ZIP		CITY	STATE	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER			CODE IF OTHER :		
		SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS				CI <input type="checkbox"/> CO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>					
		ZIP		CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER			DRIVERS LICENSE		
		SEX	WEIGHT	HEIGHT	EYES	HAIR COLOR	ORIGIN	DOB	SSN		
		5		NA		
DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		LOCATION OF INCIDENT				DATE AND TIME REPORTED 6-9-2015 / 0638		DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 6-9-2015 / 515Am			
		FOOD	WATER	SHELTER	INJURED/ILL	VENTILATION	ABANDONED	TIEOUT	BEATEN	WASTE	OTHER (EXPLAIN)
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case		VICTIM/IMPAIRED NAME				DOB Adult		RESIDENCE PHONE NO.		BUSINESS PHONE NO. Unk.	
<input type="checkbox"/> I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.		VICTIM'S ADDRESS				ZIP		CITY	STATE		
<input type="checkbox"/> REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B) and § 8-286 (B)		VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS				ZIP		CITY	STATE		
NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)		DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER		OTHER AGENCY CASE # <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> TFD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:		FOLLOW UP REQUEST <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:	
<input type="checkbox"/> ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION		BITE SEVERITY: 1		TREATED BY		PHONE NUMBER		DATE QUARANTINED 6-9-2015	PACC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION		PART OF BODY BITTEN: Rt. Hand						RELEASE DATE: 6-18-15	VET <input type="checkbox"/>
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM		VET CLINIC				PHONE NUMBER		OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		FTQ <input type="checkbox"/>	HOME <input type="checkbox"/>
PHONE NUMBER										UTQ <input type="checkbox"/>	
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS		CLINIC'S ADDRESS				QUARANTINE 10 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>		FRA HEAD#			
		3 RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		CITING ACO Downing#1923		PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER		OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS	
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE		CODE/ORD VIOLATED 6.04.030, 11-1010 (A) ARS, 6.04.120 (B) (2) 6.04.070								REVIEWED BY 6-11-15 OTK 1911	
		CITATIONS/NUMBERS 74586 A,B,C,D,E 74587 A,B,C,D								BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME		COLOR	SEX	AGE	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#	
Pit Bull Mix		VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/>	OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sarge	Brn.	M	A	Cited	Cited	OK	
Lab/Retreiver Mix		VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/>	OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sammy	White	F	A	Cited	Cited	Ok	
		VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/>	OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								
		VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/>	OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								
		VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/>	OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								
		VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/>	OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								
		VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/>	OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								
WITNESS 1		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DOB A	ADDRESS			RESIDENCE PHONE #		BUSINESS PHONE #		
WITNESS 2		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS			RESIDENCE PHONE #		BUSINESS PHONE #		
WITNESS 3		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS			RESIDENCE PHONE #		BUSINESS PHONE #		
WITNESS 4		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS			RESIDENCE PHONE #		BUSINESS PHONE #		

2



INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-173171

ACO name & Badge: Downing #1923

On June 9, 2015 at 0707. I, Officer Downing #1923, Met with [redacted] at his residence at [redacted]. He stated that at about 0515am this morning he was out walking his two dogs on leash. When he got to the location of [redacted], two dogs charged out of the driveway there. One was described as a Pit Bull mix, brown in color, the other as a Lab mix all white with a dark patch on the left eye. The Pit Bull mix grabbed one of [redacted] dogs named Gertie, by the neck and began shaking it. He began kicking at the dog to have it let go. The white dog did not have contact, but [redacted] had to keep it away while trying to get the Pit Bull mix off. [redacted] was finally able to have the dog let go of Gertie long enough for him to get away. Eventually the dogs ran away. A passerby named [redacted] saw the aftermath of the attack and saw [redacted] covered in blood and helped him. After getting home [redacted] took Gertie to Pima Pet Clinic for medical treatment. [redacted] was treated for his injuries at [redacted]. I took photos of [redacted] injuries. He had injuries to his right hand where he was bitten. Also injuries to his right knee and left hand as he had fallen during this incident. [redacted] is not sure if he was bitten by the Pit Bull mix or the Lab mix or possibly his dog. I checked [redacted] dog for a current rabies vaccination and license and confirmed that it was current. [redacted] believed the two dogs live at [redacted], as he has seen these dogs loose before.

I went to the address of [redacted] where the two attacking dogs possibly live and spoke with a [redacted]. I explained the complaint. He showed me his two dogs in his house. I had the victim come over and [redacted] positively identified them as the two dogs. I issued citations to [redacted] on behalf of [redacted] and impounded both dogs for quarantine at Pima Animal Care Center for the 10-days. I also took photos of the two dogs for the file. Also photos of the location of the attack and his clothing with the blood on them. I also noted that the white dog has what appeared to be a red stain on its front chest area.

Officer's Signature: *[Handwritten Signature]* #1923

Date: 6-11-15



PIMA COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT
PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER
4000 N. SILVERBELL RD. TUCSON, AZ 85745
(520) 724-5900 FAX (520) 724-5960
www.pima.gov/animalcare

CASE NO: A15-173298
OWNER: Joshua Mixer
ANIMAL NAME: Sarge

ADDRESS:
SEX: M BREED: Pitbull mix
COLOR: Brown DATE: 6-21-15

EVALUATION CRITERIA

REPORTED BITES:

NON-VIOLATION BITE +3
VIOLATION-BITE +6 +6

SEVERITY OF INJURY TO HUMANS:

(Check One Factor Only Per Victim)
NO BREAK IN SKIN +1
BREAK IN SKIN OR BRUISING +2 +2
MEDICAL CARE (RELEASED) +3
MULTIPLE BITES-SINGLE INCIDENT +4
BIT DOWN AND SHOOK VICTIM +4
MEDICAL CARE (HOSPITALIZATION) +5

Animal Complaints or Violations:

LEASH LAW CITATIONS +2 +2
LEASH LAW COMPLAINTS +1
ATTEMPTED BITE CITATIONS +2
ANIMAL ATTACK CITATIONS +3 +3
OTHER CITATIONS / OR COMPLAINTS +1

SEVERITY OF INJURY TO ANIMALS:

ATTACK WITH NO INJURY +1
INJURIES TREATED BY OWNER +2
VET CARE (1 To 2 Visits) +3
EXTENSIVE VET CARE (>2 VISITS) +4 +4
INJURIES RESULTED IN DEATH +5

Confinement / Fencing:

The owner has fencing appx 5.5 feet tall with three gates leading into the backyard.

General Comments:

The dog Sarge scored a +16 and is therefore declared dangerous at this time.

CONFINEMENT MEASURES: (Check one factor only)

(Primary Method of Confinement at the time of the incident)
SECURE FENCE/WALL AND GATES -5
INADEQUATE FENCING OR GATES +5 +5

OWNER ACCOUNTABILITY / RESPONSIBILITY:

REPAIRED DEFICIENT CONFINEMENT -3 -3
ANIMAL IS NEUTERED / SPAYED -1 -1
OWNER AWARE OF ANY AGGRESSION +1
OWNER FAILED TO REPAIR CONFINEMENT +5
CURRENTLY LICENSED LIC # -1
NO CURRENT LICENSE +1 +1
NO CURRENT RABIES VACCINATION +1 +1

NEIGHBOR COMMENTS (Scored by Majority Opinion):

(Two or More Neighbors Interviewed)
ANIMAL NEVER OBSERVED AT LARGE -3
ANIMAL NOT OBSERVED AGGRESSIVE -3 -3
ANIMAL OBSERVED AT LARGE <5X/YR +1 +1
ANIMAL OBSERVED AT LARGE >5X/YR +2
ANIMAL OBSERVED BEING AGGRESSIVE +2

DOGS BEHAVIOR: (If Observed by Officer)

ANIMAL BEHAVES AGGRESSIVELY +2
ANIMAL NOT AGGRESSIVE -2 -2
ANIMAL SHOWS UNSAFE BEHAVIOR +1

OFFICER # 1942 Edelberger

TOTAL SCORE: +16

A SCORE OF TEN POINTS OR HIGHER SHALL BE DEEMED A DANGEROUS ANIMAL

D DANGEROUS
NOT DANGEROUS

We have determined that your dog displays or has a tendency, disposition, or propensity to injure, bite attack, chase or charge, OR attempt to injure, bite, attack, chase or charge a person or domestic animal in a threatening manner OR bare its teeth or approach a person or domestic animal in a threatening manner City Code 4-13 / County Code 6.04.150. The owner has ten (10) days in the City, five (5) days (County & other jurisdictions) as to appeal the declaration of dangerous by filing a request for a dangerous dog hearing, providing the dog has not been declared vicious by a court. The owner may obtain this form at PACC IN PERSON.



PIMA COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT #2
 PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER
 4000 N. SILVERBELL RD. TUCSON, AZ 85745
 (520) 724-5900 FAX (520) 724-5960
 www.pima.gov/animalcare

CASE NO: A15-173298.
 OWNER: Joshua Mixes
 ANIMAL NAME: Sammy

ADDRESS: _____
 SEX: F BREED: Lab mix
 COLOR: white DATE: 6-21-15.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

REPORTED BITES:

NON-VIOLATION BITE + 3 _____
 VIOLATION-BITE + 6 +6

SEVERITY OF INJURY TO HUMANS:

(Check One Factor Only Per Victim)
 NO BREAK IN SKIN + 1 _____
 BREAK IN SKIN OR BRUISING + 2 +2
 MEDICAL CARE (RELEASED) + 3 _____
 MULTIPLE BITES-SINGLE INCIDENT + 4 _____
 BIT DOWN AND SHOOK VICTIM + 4 _____
 MEDICAL CARE (HOSPITALIZATION) + 5 _____

Animal Complaints or Violations:

LEASH LAW CITATIONS + 2 +2
 LEASH LAW COMPLAINTS + 1 _____
 ATTEMPTED BITE CITATIONS + 2 _____
 ANIMAL ATTACK CITATIONS + 3 _____
 OTHER CITATIONS / OR COMPLAINTS + 1 _____

SEVERITY OF INJURY TO ANIMALS:

ATTACK WITH NO INJURY + 1 _____
 INJURIES TREATED BY OWNER + 2 _____
 VET CARE (1 To 2 Visits) + 3 _____
 EXTENSIVE VET CARE (>2 VISITS) + 4 _____
 INJURIES RESULTED IN DEATH + 5 _____

Confinement / Fencing:

The owner has fencing appx 5-5 feet tall with three gates leading into the backyard

General Comments:

The dog "Sammy" scored a +9 and is therefore declared not dangerous at this time.

CONFINEMENT MEASURES: (Check one factor only)

(Primary Method of Confinement at the time of the incident)
 SECURE FENCE/WALL AND GATES - 5 _____
 INADEQUATE FENCING OR GATES + 5 +5

OWNER ACCOUNTABILITY / RESPONSIBILITY:

REPAIRED DEFICIENT CONFINEMENT - 3 -3
 ANIMAL IS NEUTERED / SPAYED - 1 -1
 OWNER AWARE OF ANY AGGRESSION + 1 _____
 OWNER FAILED TO REPAIR CONFINEMENT + 5 _____
 CURRENTLY LICENSED LIC # _____ - 1 _____
 NO CURRENT LICENSE + 1 +1
 NO CURRENT RABIES VACCINATION + 1 +1

NEIGHBOR COMMENTS (Scored by Majority Opinion):

(Two or More Neighbors Interviewed)
 ANIMAL NEVER OBSERVED AT LARGE - 3 _____
 ANIMAL NOT OBSERVED AGGRESSIVE - 3 -3
 ANIMAL OBSERVED AT LARGE <5X/YR + 1 +1
 ANIMAL OBSERVED AT LARGE >5X/YR + 2 _____
 ANIMAL OBSERVED BEING AGGRESSIVE + 2 _____

DOGS BEHAVIOR: (If Observed by Officer)

ANIMAL BEHAVES AGGRESSIVELY + 2 _____
 ANIMAL NOT AGGRESSIVE - 2 -2
 ANIMAL SHOWS UNSAFE BEHAVIOR + 1 _____

TOTAL SCORE: +9.

OFFICER # 1942 Eckelbarger

____ DANGEROUS
 NOT DANGEROUS

A SCORE OF TEN POINTS OR HIGHER SHALL BE DEEMED A DANGEROUS ANIMAL

We have determined that your dog displays or has a tendency, disposition, or propensity to injure, bite attack, chase or charge, OR attempt to injure, bite, attack, chase or charge a person or domestic animal in a threatening manner OR bare its teeth or approach a person or domestic animal in a threatening manner City Code 4-13 / County Code 6.04.150. The owner has ten (10) days in the City, five (5) days (County & other jurisdictions) as to appeal the declaration of dangerous by filing a request for a dangerous dog hearing, providing the dog has not been declared vicious by a court. The owner may obtain this form at PACC **IN PERSON**.

#3

INVESTIGATION REPORT		SUSPECT Ryan Crawford				ACO NAME / BADGE # Hendrickson#2066		ACTIVITY/BITE NUMBER A15-167398	
Pima County Health Department Pima Animal Care Center 4000 N. Silverbell Rd. Tucson, Arizona 85745 Phone: (520) 243-5900 Fax: (520) 243-5960 www.pimaanimalcare.org		SUSPECT'S ADDRESS				BITE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/>		OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>	
		CITY		ZIP		RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER		CI <input type="checkbox"/> CO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>	
		SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS				DRIVERS LICENSE			
		CITY		STATE		ZIP		BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER	
		SEX		WEIGHT		HEIGHT		EYES	
		HAIR		ORIGIN		DOB		SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER	
DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		LOCATION OF INCIDENT				DATE AND TIME OF INCIDENT 03/08/15 16:55		DATE AND TIME REPORTED 03/08/15 16:40	
		FOOD <input type="checkbox"/>		WATER <input type="checkbox"/>		SHELTER <input type="checkbox"/>		VENTILATION <input type="checkbox"/>	
		ABANDONED <input type="checkbox"/>		TIEDOUT <input type="checkbox"/>		BEATEN <input type="checkbox"/>		WASTE <input type="checkbox"/>	
		INJ / ILL <input type="checkbox"/>		OTHER (EXPLAIN)					
<input type="checkbox"/> I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case		VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME				DATE OF BIRTH		RESIDENCE PHONE	
<input type="checkbox"/> I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.		VICTIM'S ADDRESS				CITY		STATE ZIP	
<input type="checkbox"/> REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B) and § 8-286 (B)		VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS				CITY		STATE ZIP	
NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)		DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER		OTHER AGENCY CASE # 150308180 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SHERIFF DEPT <input type="checkbox"/> TUCSON POLICE <input type="checkbox"/> FIRE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:	
		FOLLOW UP REQUEST <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:							
<input type="checkbox"/> ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION		BITE SEVERITY: 3		TREATED BY		PHONE NUMBER	
		<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION		PART OF BODY BITTEN:		DATE QUARANTINED 03/08/15		PACC <input type="checkbox"/> VET <input type="checkbox"/> HOME <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM		VET CLINIC				PHONE NUMBER		OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	
PHONE NUMBER		FTQ <input type="checkbox"/> UTQ <input type="checkbox"/>							
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS		CLINIC'S ADDRESS				QUARANTINE (DAYS) 10 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/> FRA HEAD#	
		3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		CITING ACO Hendrickson #2066		PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE		CODE/ORD VIOLATED 6.04.070, 6.04.120(B)(2), 6.04.070				OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS		REVIEWED BY <i>3/17</i> <i>Konst 2002</i>	
		CITATIONS/NUMBERS 74157						BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
BREED/DESCRIPTION		ANIMAL'S NAME		COLOR		SEX		AGE	
German Shep/Pit X		Kota		Sable		F		5YR	
VICTIM OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>								LICENSE #	
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								CONDITION	
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								ANIMAL ID#	
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
WITNESS 1		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		DOB		ADDRESS		RESIDENCE PHONE #	
WITNESS 2		M <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>		DOB		ADDRESS		RESIDENCE PHONE #	
WITNESS 3		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>		DOB		ADDRESS		RESIDENCE PHONE #	
WITNESS 4		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>		DOB		ADDRESS		RESIDENCE PHONE #	



3

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-167398

ACO Name & Badge: M. Hendrickson #2066

On March 8th 2015 at 17:36 I Officer Hendrickson #2066 arrived at _____ in response to a call to assist Pima County Sheriff Deputy in regards to a dog bite . When I arrived I was met by Pima County Sheriff Deputy J. Taylor Badge #4417 case# 150308180 who showed me pictures of the bite wounds on the child victim _____. There were multiple puncture wounds mainly in the chest area on the victim. I was informed the victim was being transported to the hospital with the mother before my arrival. I spoke with the victim's father _____ who stated that his wife witnessed the dog attack his daughter. _____ stated that his wife and daughter were at _____ located at _____ at the playground. He said that the dog owner was playing ball with his dog off leash and then attacked his daughter while she was playing. He stated the attack was unprovoked and would like citations issued to the dog owner for leash law and biting animal.

I met with the dog owner _____ who didn't want to give me a statement without his lawyer present. His dog Kota a female sable German Shepherd/pit bull mix was current on her rabies vaccination but didn't have a current Pima County dog license. I issued a home quarantine for the dog Kota and issued citations on behalf of the victim's Father _____ for biting animal and Leash law (#74157 A-C). _____ signed accepted and received a copy of his citation along with home quarantine agreement. He was informed of his court date time and location.

On March 10th, 2015 at 12:45 Pima County Animal Care Officer Hinte Badge #2068, met with the victim's mother, _____ to collect her bite statement. _____ stated that on 3/08/15 at approximately 4:30 PM she took her five year old daughter _____ to the _____. While walking from the car to the playground, she saw a man with his dog off leash playing fetch on the soccer field approximately 100-200 yards away from the playground. She instructed her daughter to stay away from the dog. Her daughter was walking about ten feet in front of her towards the playground when the owner threw the ball for his dog to fetch. The dog ran in the opposite direction of _____ and her daughter. The dog grabbed the ball and began running back towards the owner, but for an unknown reason, noticed _____ walking, dropped the ball, and charged at her. _____ tried to get to her daughter but the dog was too quick. She stated that dog owner yelled "don't pet the dog." _____ covered her face with her arms and the dog bit her once in the stomach. The dog then circled _____, growling, and bit her once more on the arm and breast. The dog owner approached and grabbed the dog by the collar while saying "she's fine, she's fine." _____ informed the dog owner that her daughter was not fine and she would need to call 911. The dog owner stated that he could not stay. _____ asked him for his information. He stated that his name was _____ and provided her a contact phone number. _____ stated that she did not feel comfortable so she called her husband, who was down the street at her parent's house. _____ arrived and stopped the dog owner from leaving until the police arrived. _____ then transported _____ North West Hospital for medical treatment.

Officer's Signature: *M. Hendrickson #2066*

Date: 3/13/15

3



PIMA COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT
PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER
4000 N. SILVERBELL RD. TUCSON, AZ 85745
(520) 724-5900 FAX (520) 724-5960
www.pima.gov/animalcare

CASE NO: A15-172727
OWNER: RYAN CRAWFORD
ANIMAL NAME: KATA A280213

ADDRESS: _____
SEX: F BREED: SHEP/PIT
COLOR: BRN + TAN DATE: 6.20.15

EVALUATION CRITERIA

REPORTED BITES:	
NON-VIOLATION BITE	+ 3
VIOLATION-BITE	+ 6 <u>+6</u>

SEVERITY OF INJURY TO HUMANS:	
(Check One Factor Only Per Victim)	
NO BREAK IN SKIN	+ 1
BREAK IN SKIN OR BRUISING	+ 2
MEDICAL CARE (RELEASED)	+ 3 <u>+3</u>
MULTIPLE BITES-SINGLE INCIDENT	+ 4
BIT DOWN AND SHOOK VICTIM	+ 4
MEDICAL CARE (HOSPITALIZATION)	+ 5

Animal Complaints or Violations:	
LEASH LAW CITATIONS	+ 2 <u>+2</u>
LEASH LAW COMPLAINTS	+ 1
ATTEMPTED BITE CITATIONS	+ 2
ANIMAL ATTACK CITATIONS	+ 3
OTHER CITATIONS / OR COMPLAINTS	+ 1 <u>+1</u>

SEVERITY OF INJURY TO ANIMALS:	
ATTACK WITH NO INJURY	+ 1
INJURIES TREATED BY OWNER	+ 2
VET CARE (1 To 2 Visits)	+ 3
EXTENSIVE VET CARE (>2 VISITS)	+ 4
INJURIES RESULTED IN DEATH	+ 5

CONFINEMENT MEASURES: (Check one factor only)	
(Primary Method of Confinement at the time of the incident)	
SECURE FENCE/WALL AND GATES	- 5
INADEQUATE FENCING OR GATES	+ 5 <u>+5</u>
<u>OFF LEASH</u>	
OWNER ACCOUNTABILITY / RESPONSIBILITY:	
REPAIRED DEFICIENT CONFINEMENT	- 3 <u>-3</u>
ANIMAL IS NEUTERED / SPAYED	- 1 <u>-1</u>
OWNER AWARE OF ANY AGGRESSION	+ 1
OWNER FAILED TO REPAIR CONFINEMENT	+ 5
CURRENTLY LICENSED LIC # <u>245615</u>	- 1 <u>-1</u>
NO CURRENT LICENSE	+ 1
NO CURRENT RABIES VACCINATION	+ 1

NEIGHBOR COMMENTS (Scored by Majority Opinion):	
(Two or More Neighbors Interviewed)	
ANIMAL NEVER OBSERVED AT LARGE	- 3 <u>-3</u>
ANIMAL NOT OBSERVED AGGRESSIVE	- 3 <u>-3</u>
ANIMAL OBSERVED AT LARGE <5X/YR	+ 1
ANIMAL OBSERVED AT LARGE >5X/YR	+ 2
ANIMAL OBSERVED BEING AGGRESSIVE	+ 2

DOGS BEHAVIOR: (If Observed by Officer)	
ANIMAL BEHAVES AGGRESSIVELY	+ 2
ANIMAL NOT AGGRESSIVE	- 2 <u>-2</u>
ANIMAL SHOWS UNSAFE BEHAVIOR	+ 1

Confinement / Fencing:

THE BACK YARD IS CONFINED BY A 5 FOOT TALL SECURE WALL WITH A LOCKED WROUGHT IRON GATE.

General Comments:

AFTER COMPLETING NEIGHBOR INTERVIEWS I LEARNED THAT KATA DOES NOT HAVE A HISTORY OF BEING AT LARGE OR BEING AGGRESSIVE.
KATA IS NOT DEEMED DANGEROUS AT THIS TIME.

EKL OFFICER # 19216

TOTAL SCORE: +4

A SCORE OF TEN POINTS OR HIGHER SHALL BE DEEMED A DANGEROUS ANIMAL

____ DANGEROUS
X NOT DANGEROUS

We have determined that your dog displays or has a tendency, disposition, or propensity to injure, bite attack, chase or charge, OR attempt to injure ,bite, attack, chase or charge a person or domestic animal in a threatening manner OR bare its teeth or approach a person or domestic animal in a threatening manner City Code 4-13 / County Code 6.04.150. The owner has ten (10) days in the City, five (5) days (County & other jurisdictions) as to appeal the declaration of dangerous by filing a request for a dangerous dog hearing, providing the dog has not been declared vicious by a court. The owner may obtain this form at PACC **IN PERSON**.

**Pima Animal Care Center
Animals on Hold Report**

Animals listed are currently listed as
being on hold without an outcome date.
They are grouped by the type of hold

kennel_no

HOLD TYPE ENFORCEMEN

Number on Hold **15**

A12-102940

K14-175847 A247678 DOG SATIVA ROTTWEILER/
11/6/14 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN AGGRESSIVE Activity:A12-102940

Kennel Comment: chip 494D4C3F3D
DO NOT RELEASE!
Bond hold.1926 SAFE LOCK
KCS 4/13/15

D122

R

06/12/2015 JCHAVEZ 6/12/15 13:00
 6-12-15
 Current update form PCAO:

Nothing definitive, I'm afraid. We just got notice yesterday from the Superior Court that they have received Mr. Westfall's and our briefs and that Mr. Westfall as the appellant now has 30 days to pay the applicable fee, after which the Court will consider the appeal (or if he doesn't pay, the appeal will be dismissed). 1914

02/17/2015 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 2/17/15 16:09
 2-17-15

Per the county attorney:

We finally obtained a copy of the justice court order that although it was signed by the judge on January 12th, it wasn't scanned into the system until January 23rd and was never sent to Mr. Westfall. Because Mr. Westfall never received a copy of the order, there was no way for him to know about or calculate the appeal deadline, so in an abundance of caution, our office is mailing a copy of the scanned order to Mr. Westfall today and are calendaring an additional 14 days for him to appeal the order. So, please don't take any further action regarding Sativa until we get back to you.

1914
 12/17/2014 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 12/17/14 17:42
 12-16-14 OSC hearing scheduled for 1-2-15. 1914

11/17/2014 DTENKATE 11/17/14 13:35
 11/16/14 The dog owner signed and received a copy of the Bond form and has until 11/26/14 7pm to post the bond amount of \$675.00. (for an Order to Show Cause Hearing)

If the bond amount is not paid by 7pm on 11/26/14 the Rottweiler A247678 named Sativa will be forfeited to PACC. 1911

11/06/2014 ENFORCEM EKLEIN 11/6/14 20:29
 11-6-14, Do not release Sativa. Owner must meet with enforcement.1926

11/10/2014 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 11/10/14 10:14

If Mr Westfall comes to redeem Sativa
 (1)serve the premise inspection ordering a wellness exam be done on Patches by a licensed veterinarian to ensure she was not injured on November 3rd,2014. PACC will not be taking possession of her unless it is ordered by a judge because pacc has not received reports of patches displaying any aggression.
 (2)Serve the Bond on Sativa.And explain to Mr Westfall that he MUST post all of the bond amount to PACC within 10 days. Not 10 business days but 10 straight days as pacc is open 7 days a week.
 (3) issue the following citations regarding Sativa:70757.A,B,C,D,E DD at large,Preventing inspection of a DD,Failure To comply ,No Insurance ,No license and 70758 A,B,C no rabies vaccination,DD attack (attempt on the animals) ,DD attack (Attempt on a human)
 (4) issue the following citations regarding Patches : 70759 A,B,C Leash Law, no License and No Rabies vaccination.

All of the documents are in a folder in my investigator box.
 Once Mr Westfall has been served and the citations have been issued a copy of everything needs to be sent to Paula Perrera and Barbara Burstein. They are aware that Sativa is currently at PACC. 1926

11-10-14 The dog owner Mr. Westfall called the center to inquire about his dog being released . I advised him of the above pending actions and advised him he needed to come into PACC and meet with an investigator or supervisor either today before 7pm or on wednesday 11-12-14 before 7pm. 1914

01/08/2015 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 1/8/15 13:00
 1-8-15

The OSC hearing was held the Judge took it under advisement and a decision is pending. 1914

03/05/2015 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 3/5/15 11:25
 3-5-15

Accordin to PCAO the owner has put in an appeal to superior court the dog will be on hold until further notice. 1914

02/06/2015 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 2/6/15 10:03
 2-6-15

The Court has ordered the animal forfeited to PACC on January 12. Now the owner has the right file an appeal to the Superior Courts. The owner has until 2-9-15 to file, until then the animal will be on hold. 1914

07/08/2015 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 7/8/15 10:20 kennel no
7-8-15

No information received from PCAO, regarding the appeal. 1914
12/11/2014 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 12/11/14 10:35
12-4-14 The bond was paid on 11-26-14. The dog will be held further until the Order to Show Cause hearing is set up and conducted. 1914

A15-173855

K15-193074 A508155 DOG DAHG PIT BULL/MIX
6/23/15 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN BEH MANAGE Activity:A15-173855 **D120**
Kennel Comment: hold for DD evaluation R

DO NOT PTS!!! See memo

06/23/2015 ENFORCEM MHENDRIC 6/23/15 21:14
06/23/15 21:13 hold Dahg for a DD evaluation per supervisor Konst. 2066
01/22/2015 DHINTE 1/22/15 23:22
Quarantined for bite. B15-022274 QRD 1/31/15

2068
07/08/2015 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 7/8/15 10:36
7-8-15

On going DD investigation. 1914

A15-174527

K15-193888 A526021 CAT SYLVESTER DOMESTIC SH/
7/3/15 CONFISCATE POLICE AGED Activity:A15-174527 **I013**
Kennel Comment: Chip #135536116A R
DO NOT CONTACT OWNER, SEE ENFORCEMENT SUPERVISOR

07/03/2015 THAYNES 7/3/15 4:09
See Enforcement Supervisor
07/08/2015 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 7/8/15 11:49
7-8-15

The sheriff's department is attempting to make contact with the owner for their investigation. The cat will be released on the release date 7-11-15

A15-174540

K15-193906 A526039 DOG RASCAL LABRADOR RETR/MIX
7/3/15 STRAY FIELD OWN AGGRESSIVE Activity:A15-174540 **D106**
Kennel Comment: A15-174522; A15-174531; A15-172081; A14-158630 3c3c3c DD hold R
unable to scan; unknown if biter

07/03/2015 ENFORCEM nkonst 7/3/15 11:54
07/03/15 Killed another dog. 3c3c3c3 DD HOLD...2oo2

K15-193907 A326936 DOG MAX MASTIFF/MIX
7/3/15 STRAY FIELD OWN AGGRESSIVE Activity:A15-174540 **D106**
Kennel Comment: A15-174522; A15-174531; A15-172081; A14-158630 3c3c3c DD hold R
0A1249473E

07/03/2015 tfoster 7/3/15 11:46
Dog was involved with a dog on dog attack that resulted in the death of the victim dog. Pacc has several activities in reference to this dog and kennel mates being at large and aggressive. I was able to scan this dog, no human bites known. 2042

7/5/15 CONFISCATE NIGHT OWN INJ MINOR Activity:A15-174708
Kennel Comment: 7/5/2015--SEE ACTIVITY MEMO. 1929

kennel no

D100

R

3C 3C 3C 3C 3C 3C

07/05/2015 ENFORCEN
7/5/2015--HOLD FOR OWNER NOTIFICATION.

DATTEBER 7/6/15 0:57

DOG MUST BE QUARANTINED FOR A PERIOD OF 45 - 180 DAYS DEPENDING ON RABIES SHOT STATUS.

MET W/ ENFORCMENT SUPERVISOR TO DETERMINE QUARANTINE STATUS. 1929

A15-174778

K15-194288 A526436 DOG CANDY TERRIER/

7/6/15 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A15-174778

Kennel Comment: unable to scan

DR014

R

K15-194289 A526437 DOG TERRIER/

7/6/15 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A15-174778

Kennel Comment: unable to scan

DR014

R

07/08/2015
7-6-15

JCHAVEZ 7/8/15 11:57

If owner comes to redeem, please cite on behalf of Officer Hinte 2068 for the following:

Tucson Jurisdiction
100 block W Oklahoma St
7/6/15 @ 3:30 PM

Leash law x1 for A526416
Biting animal x1 for A526416 (3PC for victim of A15-174778)

Tucson Jurisdiction
100 block W Oklahoma St
7/6/15 @ 4:50 PM

Leash law x3 for A526416 & A526436 & A526437
Biting animal - attempt to bite x1 for A526416

07/08/2015
7-6-15

JCHAVEZ 7/8/15 11:57

If owner comes to redeem, please cite on behalf of Officer Hinte 2068 for the following:

Tucson Jurisdiction
100 block W Oklahoma St
7/6/15 @ 3:30 PM

Leash law x1 for A526416
Biting animal x1 for A526416 (3PC for victim of A15-174778)

Tucson Jurisdiction
100 block W Oklahoma St
7/6/15 @ 4:50 PM

Leash law x3 for A526416 & A526436 & A526437
Biting animal - attempt to bite x1 for A526416

A15-174901

K15-194402 A526582 DOG GERM SHEPHERD/

7/8/15 STRAY FIELD ILL SEVERE Activity:A15-174901

JWFLOOR
R

Kennel Comment: Didn't bite, No micro chip found
3C3C3C3C3C

07/08/2015 ENFORCEM tfoster 7/8/15 12:12

No chip found, didn't bite. dog on Enf hold due to condition. If owner comes to redeem please notify Enforcement.

NO ACTIVITY NUMBER RECORDED

K15-194232 A526376 CAT SNOWSHOE/MIX

7/6/15 STRAY OTC NORMAL Activity:

1016
R

Kennel Comment: no bite/ no chip. See memo under animal Id for hold . 2030

HOLD TYPE VET

Number on Hold 1

kennel_no

NO ACTIVITY NUMBER RECORDED

K15-193777 A525888 CAT GOATIE DOMESTIC SH/

7/1/15 EUTH REQ OTC OWNED NORMAL Activity:

Kennel Comment: No Bite / No Chip

JW001

R

PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 2015 OPERATIONAL REPORT

	THIS MONTH			THIS YEAR TO DATE			LAST YEAR TO DATE			YEAR TO YEAR	
	TUCSON	COUNTY	TOTAL	TUCSON	COUNTY	TOTAL	TUCSON	COUNTY	TOTAL	DELTA	%+/-
SHELTER OPERATIONS											
ALL ANIMALS HANDLED											
DOGS	597	502	1,099	7,849	7,213	15,062	8,220	7,314	15,534		
CATS	559	235	794	4,319	2,569	6,888	4,923	3,128	8,051		
OTHERS	24	49	73	294	528	822	308	439	747		
TOTAL ANIMALS HANDLED	1,180	786	1,966	12,462	10,310	22,772	13,451	10,881	24,332	-1560	-6%
Live Animals Handled	1,056	718	1,774	10,532	8,930	19,462	11,998	9,813	21,811	-2349	-11%
IMPOUNDED ANIMALS											
ADOPTED											
DOGS	273	249	522	2,947	2,957	5,904	2,883	2,582	5,465		
CATS	245	99	344	1,896	1,219	3,115	1,243	905	2,148		
OTHER	1	1	2	12	17	29	43	14	57		
TOTAL ADOPTED	519	349	868	4,855	4,193	9,048	4,169	3,501	7,670	1378	18%
RETURNED TO OWNER											
DOGS	83	71	154	1,060	824	1,884	880	665	1,545		
CATS	3	2	5	45	55	100	73	61	134		
OTHER	0	14	14	13	31	44	7	13	20		
TOTAL RETURNED	86	87	173	1,118	910	2,028	960	739	1,699	329	19%
RESCUED											
DOGS	82	65	147	1,113	1,268	2,381	1,171	1,360	2,531		
CATS	63	25	88	945	576	1,521	1,072	665	1,737		
OTHER	0	1	1	14	45	59	67	48	115		
TOTAL RESCUED	145	91	236	2,072	1,889	3,961	2,310	2,073	4,383	-422	-10%
*TOTAL LIVE RELEASES	750	527	1,277	8,045	6,992	15,037	7,439	6,313	13,752	1285	9%
**TOTAL LIVE RELEASE RATE	90%	85%	88%	84%	85%	84%	1	1	76%		
EUTHANIZED											
DOGS	72	89	161	1,620	1,454	3,074	1,915	1,724	3,639		
CATS	33	20	53	361	252	613	1,532	1,009	2,541		
OTHER	6	6	12	66	82	148	37	78	115		
TOTAL EUTHANIZED	111	115	226	2,047	1,788	3,835	3484	2811	6295	-2460	-39%
(-)Owner Requested Euthanasia	28	22	50	537	514	1,051	1024	1023	2047		
Adjusted Total Euthanasia	83	93	176	1,510	1,274	2,784	2,460	1,788	4,248		
***EUTHANASIA RATE	10%	15%	12%	16%	15%	16%	0	0	24%		
OTHER	147	82	229	2,384	1,681	4,065	1,720	1,260	2,980	1085	36%
ENFORCEMENT CALLS FOR SERVICE											
Requested	1,488	979	2,467	19,452	12,836	32,288	19,912	12,481	32,393	-105	0%
Total Responses	1,383	916	2,299	17,015	11,343	28,358	17,853	11,075	28,928	-570	-2%
Welfare Responses	327	178	505	2690	1448	4138	2552	1170	3722	416	11%
LICENSING OPERATIONS											
ALTERED	4,096	4,862	8,958	41,721	54,114	95,835	43,226	54,787	98,013		
UNALTERED	215	266	481	2,418	2,990	5,408	2,947	3,882	6,829		
OTHER	78	101	179	824	1,128	1,952	860	1,169	2,029		
TOTAL SOLD	4,389	5,229	9,618	44,963	58,232	103,195	47,033	59,838	106,871	-3,676	-3%

*Total Live Releases(TLR)=Total Adopted+Total Returned+Total Rescued

**Live Release Rate=TLR/(TLR+Adjusted Total Euthanasia)

***Euthanasia Rate=(Adjusted Total Euthanasia)/(TLR+Adjusted Total Euthanasia)

Date: July 9, 2015

To: Chair and Members, Pima Animal Care Center Advisory Committee

From: Kim Janes, Executive Secretary 

Re: July Manager's Report

The following report is provided for your information.

1. During the June 19, 2015 Advisory Committee Meeting:

- The Committee requested rechecks and an update on the following cases:
 - A15-172564 **Officer Report:** 06/03/15 16:20 Arrived to the residence, no answer at the door. I walked the property and did not see any waste in the yard.
 - A15-172621 **Officer Report:** There will not be a recheck given the number of calls in our traffic and being short staffed. To include given the circumstances, the dog was removed from the tieout and is normally kept indoors majority of the time this is not a high risk case. The owner received a citation for the tieout and was informed on the animal laws and the liabilities if dog is found on the tieout again. Also, our records show no history at this address or the owner.
 - A15-172302 **Officer Report:** 6-7-15 I am (at the direction of 1911) downgrading the call to a waste complaint since the welfare requirements have been addressed satisfactorily at this time. Reset 2042. A recheck of the waste will not be conducted, a supervisor spoke to the owner about the animal waste not being in covered containers and the owner said she will have her son cover them and dump them in the city container, the animal waste was picked up just not disposed of at that time. There was a miscommunication between the officer and Dr. Wilcox and the larvae sample that was collected was not tested.
 - A15-170618 **Officer Report:** 07/08/15 1012 hrs I arrived at 1692 W. Wood Bridge and observed no dog on the patio area of the home I received no answer at the door.
 - A15-172005 **Officer Report:** 07/08/15 18:42 I Officer Hendrickson #2066 arrived at 2124 N Forgeus Ave in response to a "must get" welfare check on the dog Coco. I arrived and was able to look through a largely gaped fence panel and observed the yard with no animals. I knocked on the door and did not receive an answer. I did not hear any animals inside the home. I posted a notice, 2066. We have no muzzle policy. There are no laws that regulate the use of muzzles. We have to take into consideration if it involves mistreatment of the animal and unnecessary cruelty.

- The pets were not redeemed in:
 - A15-173091
 - A15-173120 and
 - A15-173125
- The status on A12-102940, Sativa’s Order to Show Cause hearing. The judge ordered the dog forfeited to PACC. The owner appealed the decision. The appeal hearing has yet to be scheduled. Staff discussed this delay with the PCAO on July 8. PCAO will advise the staff on the scheduled hearing date and if any alternative process can be used for animal related appeals.

2. The committee asked if we microchip cats handed off to the CCP. These cats are not micro-chipped but are ear tipped at time of alteration.

3. The Chair requested the status of filling current vacancies. One new Enforcement Officer was just brought on board. One Shelter Supervisor, two new animal care techs, and a program coordinator will be brought on in the next month.

4. The Committee had questions relating to how donations are applied to the PACC budget. Due to the generous donations received over the past two years, PACC has been able to grow its budget from just over \$6 million to over \$8.1 million in the last two years. Donation revenue must be included in the budget in order to fund and provide the services that donors most want to support. The majority of donations are earmarked for veterinary medical care of Shelter pets and Spay/Neuter services. Smaller donations are received for outreach and education efforts. The chart below is provided to demonstrate how donations are allocated against expenses prior to the remaining expenses being allocated to the jurisdictions based on the jurisdictions usage of each category of service. The attached financial report further demonstrates how the donations are allocated against specific needs.

Donation Impact Year to Date Through March 31, 2015					
	Adopted Budget	YTD Expense	Donations	TNR Program	Net Expenses Charged to Jurisdictions
TOTAL			-		
OPER. EXP.	\$8,191,648.00	\$6,502,699.59	\$449,053.16	-\$85,066.61	\$5,968,579.82

5. The following community spay neuter program information is provided for your consideration.

Annual Spay Neuter Expenses and Surgeries:

Contract Year 14-15 Community Spay Neuter Costs					
Agency	Surgery Costs	2% Admin Fee	Total Expense	# Surgeries	Average Cost/Surgery
Animal Welfare Alliance of Southern Arizona	\$247,920.00	\$5,516.35	\$253,436.35	4014	\$63.14
Animal League of Green Valley	\$70,000.00	\$0.00	\$70,000.00	1077	\$64.00
Spay Neuter Solutions	\$65,930.00	\$0.00	\$65,390.00	964	\$67.83
Best Friends Animal Society Community Cat Program	\$120,000.00	\$0.00	\$120,000.00	2400	\$50.00
Total	\$503,850.00	\$5,516.35	\$516,613.35	8455	N/A

*Contract Year- March 12 2014-March 11, 2015. Average Surgery Cost Not to Exceed \$70

**BFAS Contract Year-July 1, 2014-June 30 2015. Contracted surgery cost per community cat-\$50. Program was not fully implemented until January 2015.

In FY 2015-2016, County budgeted \$600,000 for the community spay neuter program. Staff is contracted for a total of \$600,000 with the same four agencies for the next contract year.

6. The following information associated with 7/16/15 Meeting Agenda items is provided for your convenience.

July Elections: As you may know, this year is the year for electing a new Chair and Vice Chair for the Committee. Pursuant to the Advisory Committee By-Laws, election of officers shall take place every other year at the regular meeting in July. Furthermore, pursuant to Pima County Code 6.04.100.D.7, "...A member holding any office may not succeed himself or herself in office...."

To date, staff has received the following nominations:

Chair:

Pat Hubbard

Vice Chair

Jack Neuman

Please provide any other nominations as far in advance but not later than the election as possible. Elections will be held as the last item of business on the July agenda.

ORDINANCE 2015- _____

AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA, RELATING TO ANIMALS; AMENDING PIMA COUNTY CODE CHAPTER 6.04 TO INCREASE DOG LICENSING FEES

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA, FINDS THAT:

1. The Board of Supervisors has authority under A.R.S. § 11-1008 to set dog licensing fees.
2. It is in the best interests of the County to eliminate the reduced unaltered dog license fees in order to encourage all dog owners to spay or neuter their pets.

THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA:

SECTION 1: Section 1 of Ordinance No. 2011-69 and subsections 6.04.070(B) and (H) of the Pima County Code are amended to read as follows:

CHAPTER 6.04

ANIMAL CONTROL REGULATIONS

. . .

6.04.070 - Dog vaccinating, licensing and permitting procedure and fees within county limits.

. . .

B. The licensing fees for dogs three months of age or over which are kept within the boundaries of the county for at least thirty consecutive days are as follows:

1. Regular, unaltered dog—sixty dollars.

2. Regular, altered dog—fifteen dollars.
3. Dogs declared dangerous or vicious—one hundred dollars.
- ~~4. Senior/disabled citizen owner, unaltered dog (limit four discounted dog licenses per household)—seventeen dollars.~~
- ~~4~~ 5. Senior/disabled citizen owner, altered dog (limit four discounted dog licenses per household)—ten dollars.
- ~~5~~ 6. Dogs ten years of age or older—fifteen dollars.
- ~~6~~ 7. A dog owner with a household income below the federal poverty level is eligible for an eleven ~~eight~~ dollar dog licensing fee per altered dog (limit four discounted dog licenses per household).
- ~~7~~ 8. An altered guide dog belonging to a blind person who is a resident within Pima County, or an altered dog certified, in writing, as being trained to the standards of a service animal by a nationally recognized service dog training agency belonging to a resident within Pima County shall be licensed pursuant to this article without payment of a fee.
8. An active or retired law enforcement working dog belonging to a law enforcement agency or a resident within Pima County shall be licensed pursuant to this article without payment of a fee.
9. Processing/Postage fee per license, one dollar.

. . .

SECTION 2. This Ordinance is effective 30 days after the date of adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Supervisors, Pima County, Arizona, this _____ day of _____, 2015.

Chair, Board of Supervisors

Date

ATTEST:

Clerk of the Board

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Deputy County Attorney

July 9, 2015

Mr. Mark Killian
Director
Arizona Department of Agriculture
1688 W. Adams Street
Phoenix AZ 85007

Re: Castaway Treasures Animal Sanctuary located in Tucson, Arizona

Dear Mr. Killian,

I was provided with a copy of your response to Mr. Huckelberry, Pima County Administrator, regarding welfare concerns with the animals at Castaway Treasures Sanctuary located in Tucson, Arizona. I was included because, as Chairman of the Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) Advisory Committee, I previously wrote to Governor Ducey regarding this issue without response. (Copies of correspondence are enclosed.)

In reading your response, I'm very pleased to hear you are a horse owner and take these concerns regarding the welfare of the horses at Castaway Treasures very seriously. I'm also relieved to know you have investigated this situation and will continue to monitor the living conditions for the horses there. Complaints from various community members and rescue groups have been lodged for decades against this facility and it certainly does warrant continued review.

The PACC Advisory Committee passed a motion asking me to ensure you are provided with a copy of a video prepared by Member Jane Schwerin. This video was taken earlier this year from the road adjoining the Castaway's property, and it shows a horse clearly in pain and unable to stand on four legs. This horse has since died. (Also enclosed are photos from Ms. Schwerin showing another horse needing medical care.) It's important to the PACC Advisory Committee that you have this information to show conditions at Castaway Treasures as provided to the Committee by Ms. Schwerin.

Thank you again for overseeing this sad situation and for upholding the laws against animal cruelty. Please feel free to contact me if you wish to discuss further.

Sincerely,



Jack Neuman
PACC Advisory Committee Chairman and Volunteer Representative
2021 N Coral Bells Drive
Tucson AZ 85745
(520) 373-3358

Enclosures

Donation Activity

Period:

06-01-15

To:

06-30-15

Donation Code	Amount
DONATION	\$70.00
DONATION ADOP	\$389.00
DONATION GEN	\$24,495.22
DONATION OUTR	\$53.00
DONATION S/N	\$12,199.00
DONATION SAMS	\$4,722.00
Grand Total	\$41,928.22

Donation Activity

Period:

07-01-14

To:

06-30-15

Donation Code	Amount
DONATION	\$230.00
DONATION ADOP	\$7,460.86
DONATION GEN	\$287,491.32
DONATION OUTR	\$4,202.00
DONATION S/N	\$159,782.96
DONATION SAMS	\$97,450.05
DONATION SHEL 0974	\$20,585.00
Grand Total	\$577,202.19

Complaints and Commendations for the Month of June 2015

6-2-15 Complaint came through District 5 Supervisor's Office
Complaint
Citizen is afraid neighbor's pit bull will jump 40 inch wall. PACC sent a letter to neighbor telling him to raise the wall up, but neighbor has no intention of doing so.
Course/Action

6-4-15 Letter sent to County Administrator's Office
Complaint
Dogs getting out of yard
Course/Action
Dogs got out again on 6-5-15, PACC responded, dogs impounded, citations issued, two aggressive dogs relinquished and euthanized. County Administrator sent a reply letter.

6-15-15 Complaint came through District 3 Supervisor's Office
Complaint
Continually barking dogs – reportedly told by PACC staff that animals have rights and are allowed to bark....
Course/Action
Chief of Operations called complainant

6-11-15 Thank you letter
Commendation
Citizens took a mother cat and kitten to another agency and were told they needed an appointment and the agency was not taking any more animals. They then took the cats to PACC where the cats were taken in and where the staff was caring and friendly.

6-29-15 Owner of lost dog came to PACC
Commendation
Licensing staff member helped the person who found the lost dog connect with the owner to get the pet to the designated person while the owner was on vacation.

Michael Schlueter

From: Jose Chavez
Sent: Monday, July 06, 2015 1:40 PM
To: Michael Schlueter
Subject: RE: District 4 constituent concern

This is the officer report:

06/08/15 0839 hrs I arrived at _____ and met with the homeowners an elderly couple that moved to Green Valley in early May. They advised that they have received the complaint letters and have contacted resources to assist with the problem, she advised that the dog cannot get its head over the call and that it can simply place its paws on the call and stretch to view over the wall. She advised that the neighbor complaining is simply afraid of pit bulls and has voiced that countless times before, She showed me multiple areas where new brick had been added to the top of the call and the homeowner advised it will be raised so that the dog cannot see over the wall at all. She advised that they cannot raise the wall themselves due to health reasons however have a young man coming to work on it on the weekends and will continue to do so until the issue is resolved. I advised of licensing requirements and was provided with current rabies vaccinations and the previous current license from Montana where they had moved from. She advised that she was told by PACC that she could do it at a vet in Green Valley but are now aware that they cannot and will be going to PACC ASAP to get the license taken care of in Pima County. I will reset the call to check back next week to see if progress has been made on raising the wall. The call is currently about 5 feet high in most areas and 4 feet in lower areas which they will raise. 2057.

The complaint is still in our traffic for a follow up, we haven't had the opportunity to do one. I have had any calls from the complainant who I provided my direct line.

Jose

From: Michael Schlueter
Sent: Monday, July 06, 2015 11:11 AM
To: Jose Chavez
Subject: FW: District 4 constituent concern

I'm getting ready for the next PCACAC meeting, so I'm going through the complaints. Did anything happen with this?

Thanks for your assistance,

From: Kim Janes
Sent: Wednesday, June 03, 2015 10:40 AM
To: Michael Schlueter
Subject: FW: District 4 constituent concern

FYI

Kim



From: Kim Janes
Sent: Tuesday, June 02, 2015 1:11 PM
To: Vanessa Schmidt
Cc: Jose Chavez; Kristin Barney
Subject: RE: District 4 constituent concern

Good afternoon Ms. Schmidt, thanks for forwarding this to me. I am sharing it with PACC Enforcement for their information and action.

They will advise us of next steps.

Respectfully,

Kim



From: Vanessa Schmidt
Sent: Tuesday, June 02, 2015 12:30 PM
To: Kim Janes
Subject: District 4 constituent concern

Mr. Janes,

I received a constituent concern in Green Valley from [redacted]. She's concerned about her neighbor's pit bull that tries to jump over the 40 inch tall wall that they share. She claims that the dog is tall enough to stand and peer over the wall. She reported the situation to Pima County Animal Control and they sent the neighbor a letter telling him that he must raise the wall height by May 30th. Yesterday, Ms. Wollmuth asked the neighbor about the wall and he said that he has no intention of changing anything. She is very concerned for her safety and the safety of others because this dog is very aggressive. I would greatly appreciate your help in addressing this issue or pointing me in the right direction.

Thank you!

Vanessa Schmidt
Special Staff Assistant to Ray Carroll
Pima County Board of Supervisors, District 4
520.724.8094
vanessa.schmidt@pima.gov

Michael Schlueter

From: Jose Chavez
Sent: Monday, July 06, 2015 1:16 PM
To: Michael Schlueter
Subject: RE: Concerns with Pima Animal Care Center

The dogs were removed, two dogs were relinquished to PACC the third was bonded. The owner did not post bond, the dog was automatically forfeited to PACC.

Jose

From: Kim Janes
Sent: Friday, June 12, 2015 3:06 PM
To: Michael Schlueter
Subject: FW: Concerns with Pima Animal Care Center

Kim Janes
Division Manager
Community Health Assurance Division
520-724-7776



From: Deborah Haro
Sent: Friday, June 12, 2015 1:56 PM
To:
Cc: Kim Janes; Kristin Barney; Celina Cuaron; Jan Leshner; Francisco Garcia; Mary Ellen Yandow
Subject: Concerns with Pima Animal Care Center

Good afternoon,

Please see the attached correspondence from Mr. Huckelberry regarding Pima Animal Care Center. The original letter will be provided to you via US mail.

Thank you.
Debbie

Deborah Haro
520-724-8770
520-770-4201 Right Fax
Mail Drop: DT-AB10-101

Pima County Administrator's Office
130 W. Congress Street, Floor 10
Tucson, Arizona 85701



COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE

PIMA COUNTY GOVERNMENTAL CENTER
130 W. CONGRESS, FLOOR 10, TUCSON, AZ 85701-1317
(520) 724-8661 FAX (520) 724-8171

C.H. HUCKELBERRY
County Administrator

June 12, 2015

Tucson, Arizona

Re: Your June 4, 2015 Letter Regarding Concerns with Pima Animal Care Center

Dear

Thank you for your June 4, 2015 letter. I have forwarded it to our Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) staff for appropriate review and action. It would appear that, based on your documentation, certain actions need to be taken by PACC staff, on behalf of the residents. We will do so as soon as possible.

As you know, Pima County operates and provides animal care services by consent of the City of Tucson through an intergovernmental agreement. We will take action regarding this matter, but the sections of the Code you cite are contained in City of Tucson ordinances. We will investigate all five of the requests identified in your letter and provide an appropriate response.

On July 1, 2015, unless an intergovernmental agreement is approved by the City to continue animal care services within the City of Tucson, our regulatory authority will expire, and we will not be able to respond. I am hopeful an agreement will be renewed.

Thank you for bringing this matter to my attention, as I was not previously aware of it.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "C.H. Huckelberry". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long, sweeping underline that extends to the right.

C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator

c: Jan Leshar, Deputy County Administrator for Medical and Health Services
Dr. Francisco Garcia, Director, Health Department
Kim Janes, Chief of Internal Affairs, Pima Animal Care Center
Kristin Barney, Chief of Operations, Pima Animal Care Center

Cyndi Tuell, Esq.
903 N. Alder Avenue
Tucson, Arizona 85705
Tel 520-404-0920
cctuell@hotmail.com



JUNE 4, 2015

✉ **Chuck Huckelberry, Pima County Administrator**
130 W. Congress Street, 10th Floor
Tucson, AZ 85701

Richard Elias, Pima County Supervisor
130 W. Congress Street, 11th Floor
Tucson, AZ 85701

Pima County Animal Control
Jose Chavez, Director of Operations
4000 N. Silverbell Rd.
Tucson, AZ 85745
contactpacc@pima.gov

Dear Mr. Huckelberry, Mr. Elias, and Mr. Chavez,

I have lived in the Dunbar Spring neighborhood since 2012. I live here with my 6 year old son and our five chickens, which we regard as pets.

At approximately 8:45am on Wednesday, May 27, 2015, two large dogs broke into my yard through a closed gate and attacked one of my chickens. Luckily, my chicken survived the initial attack and I hope that she survives the next few days. I am very grateful that the dogs attacked my chicken and *not* my 6 year-old child. This incident has caused my neighbors and me great concern because it comes after months of complaints to Pima County Animal Control and repeated calls to the police.

We are asking for your immediate assistance in dealing with this issue of safety in our neighborhood. We are also sending this letter to ensure that Pima County, Pima County Animal Control, the dog owner, and the property owner where the dog resides are aware of their liability for the future actions of these dogs.

The three dogs¹ that are owned and/or controlled by a tenant at _____, on the southwest corner of _____, have been repeatedly leaving their yard for at least the last 6 months. My neighbors and I have called Pima County Animal Control and 9-1-1 several times because when the dogs are roaming the neighborhood they appear to be very aggressive, especially towards other animals. These dogs have repeatedly tried to break through fences and gates to reach our pets. Pima

¹ All grey or grey and white pit-bull crosses; one male adult, one female adult and one puppy probably 6 months old or more.

County Animal Control has responded a few times to our calls, but the dogs continue to escape their yard and we feel our right to live peaceably in our homes is being infringed upon and we have no recourse.

After the incident on the morning of May 27, 2015, a Pima County Sheriff officer and Officer Meek from Pima County Animal Control responded to the scene while the dogs were still loose in our neighborhood. Officer Meek spoke to the dog owner then came to speak to me. Officer Meek asked if I wanted a citation issued and I explained that I was afraid of these dogs, afraid for the safety of my family and pets and that I wanted the dogs removed before a child or another animal were hurt. Officer Meek explained that he couldn't take my neighbor's property (the dogs) and that she did not want the dogs removed.

I explained to officer Meek that this was not acceptable and that I believed failing to take action after my yard was invaded and my animals attacked was a bad idea that exposed the County, Pima County Animal Control, and others to liability if anyone is harmed in any way by these dogs in the future. I insisted that Officer Meek issue a citation and I explained that I was very willing to attend any court hearings related to this incident.

Officer Meek explained to me that there are very few² Pima County Animal Control officers that must respond to thousands of calls like mine and, simply put, there aren't enough resources to manage situations like the one I was dealing with. I explained that I sympathized with the lack of resources, but that did not change the fact that our neighborhood is currently dealing with a dangerous situation that Pima County and Pima County Animal Control are responsible for handling.

Officer Meek did not seem to agree with me that the dogs were "dangerous," but I respectfully disagree based on a review of Pima County Municipal Code (PCMC) 6.04.150 Definitions:

6.04.150(A)(1)(b)(1) "Dangerous animal" means one which: Displays a tendency, disposition or propensity, as determined by Pima Animal Care, pursuant to guidelines developed for that purpose, to: Injure, bite, attack, chase or charge without provocation, or attempt to injure, bite, attack, chase or charge without provocation a person or domestic animal in a manner which poses a threat to public safety.

See also 6.04.120(A)(2) "Destructive animal" means any animal that has a propensity to destroy, damage or cause damage to the property of a person other than the animal's owner; and 6.04.120(A)(4) "Vicious animal" means any animal that bites, attempts to bite, endangers or otherwise injures or causes to be injured human beings or other animals, except as provided in Section 6.04.120D or one that has been declared vicious pursuant to this section.

² Though we note that the Pima County Animal Control website says there are 22 officers.
http://webcms.pima.gov/community/animal_care/reporting_complaints/

Please note that two of the dogs in question broke through a closed gate to enter my yard to attack my chicken, clearly demonstrating a tendency, disposition or propensity to injure, bite, attack, chase or charge a domestic animal without provocation. This is reinforced by the fact that these dogs have repeatedly escaped their yard and have attempted to enter other people's yards to attack their dogs.

Based on this information and the PCMC sections cited above as well as 6.04.120(B)(1)³ and 6.04.130(A)(3)⁴ Officer Meeks could have, and should have, removed the dogs from our neighborhood. The Pima County Sheriff that responded to our call for help could also have ordered the dogs removed.

In addition, the person residing at _____ is in violation of similar City of Tucson Ordinance: Chapter 4, Article I, Section 4-7(1)(b) and (d) and Section 4-7(2). Under City of Tucson Ordinance Chapter 4, Article 1, Section 4-10(A)(3) and Chapter 4, Article V, Section 4-97, the Tucson Police have authority to remove the dogs from the residence.

We are asking that immediate action be taken to ensure the dangerous situation in our neighborhood does not result in a tragedy. We fear for our children, our animals, and visitors to our homes. We feel unsafe when we leave our homes for any reason – when we take bike rides to the grocery store or park, when we wait for the bus with our children, when we walk our children to school, or when we simply want to walk across the street to visit each other. We worry that if we leave our home our yards will be invaded and our pets attacked while we are away. We have watched as the dogs chased a mail delivery person into their truck out of fear of being attacked.

I was hopeful that the fence around my yard would keep my family and pets safe, but this is clearly not the case. The dogs that broke into my yard did so through a closed gate which they forced open.

We also have concern for the dogs that are roaming our neighborhood. It is not fair to the dogs to live with an irresponsible dog owner incapable of keeping her animals in her yard and who has made inadequate attempts to properly train her dogs. The dogs are at risk of injury from fighting with other dogs, getting hit by cars, or getting injured by a neighbor defending their family or pets. These dogs are not altered, escape regularly, and are a menace to our neighborhood. The dog owner approached me and three other people on the street on the morning of the incident, while the dogs were still roaming. She angrily confronted us demanding to know where her dogs were. One of the people she confronted asked her to leave because we were all very upset about what happened and she refused. Instead, she began to yell at us and tell us the dogs were not dangerous. When we explained that her dogs broke into a yard and attacked chickens she seemed amused, smiled, and said that her dogs don't hurt people. There was no apology for her dogs' behavior or damage to our pet. There was no understanding of our fear for our children. This is completely unacceptable behavior in a dog owner.

³ Prohibited activity - It is unlawful for any person to keep, control, harbor or otherwise have under control any animal which is vicious or destructive.

⁴ A peace officer or a Pima Animal Care officer is hereby authorized and empowered to remove and impound any animal in plain view, or pursuant to a valid search warrant if the officer has probable cause to believe any of the following:

Based on the foregoing information, we respectfully request the following:

1. The dogs currently owned by the person residing at _____ are immediately taken into the custody of the Pima County Animal Control or an appropriate pit-bull rescue organization.
2. The person currently residing at _____ is prohibited from owning or having control of any dogs, regardless of where she resides.
3. If the person currently residing at _____ has removed the dogs from her custody or control, she should be instructed to notify Pima County Animal Control where the dogs are currently located so that a "dangerous dog assessment" can be conducted.
4. The Property Owner of _____ is prohibited from allowing tenants to have custody or control of dogs (because the yard is unsuitable as an effective enclosure and not remotely compliant with PCMC 6.04.150(D)(1)(a-d) (Fencing and Confining Animal).
5. If the Property Owner of _____ is not prohibited from allowing tenants to have custody or control of dogs on that property, the Property Owner and any tenant/dog owner must comply with PCMC 6.04.150(D)(4) (Liability Insurance Requirements).

We hope that this issue can be quickly resolved and that our families and pets can again live without the near constant fear of being attacked by dogs because of the irresponsible actions of the dog owner and the failure to act by Pima County and Pima County Animal Control. We sincerely hope that this issue will be resolved before a child or another animal is harmed.

Thank you,

(chicken owner, attorney)

(neighbor, attorney)

(chicken owner)

(neighbor)

(chicken owner, 6 years old)

(neighbor)

CC: Ward 1 Tucson City Council, Regina Romero:

(neighbor)

Resident at
Owner of property at

11 years old
age 7

Michael Schlueter

From: Kim Janes
Sent: Monday, July 06, 2015 2:40 PM
To: Michael Schlueter
Subject: FW: Dogs Barking

Kim Janes
Chief of External Affairs



From: Jennifer Cabrera
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2015 9:53 AM
To: Kim Janes
Cc: Kiki Navarro; Anissa Ramirez; Kristin Barney
Subject: RE: Dogs Barking

Good Morning Kim,

I realized I did not put [redacted] phone number in the email:

Jenn Cabrera
Supervisor Sharon Bronson's Office
District 3
520-724-8051

From: Kim Janes
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2015 4:37 PM
To: Jennifer Cabrera
Cc: Kiki Navarro; Anissa Ramirez; Kristin Barney
Subject: RE: Dogs Barking

Good afternoon Ms. Cabrera, Ms. Kristin Barney, the Chief of Operations at PACC will certainly look into complaint. This does not sound like what I know Ms. Barney expects of her staff and she will take appropriate actions.

Respectfully,

Kim



From: Jennifer Cabrera
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2015 4:27 PM
To: Kim Janes
Cc: Kiki Navarro; Anissa Ramirez
Subject: FW: Dogs Barking

Good Afternoon Kim,

Our office received the following call:

constituent, called regarding her neighbor's 3 dogs at (directly behind her) constantly barking all day and night.

She called PACC at about 3:15pm today and spoke with a woman there who told her that "animals have rights and they are allowed to bark all day and all night" I let her know that the dog has to be barking more than 15 minutes continuously for it to be a violation; she said the dogs bark all day and night.

Ms. Martinez also informed me that, instead of helping her, the PACC employee told her that her dog (great dane) was in violation because she can reach the top of the wall. Ms. Martinez is talking to her HOA now about raising the wall so she is not in violation but this still doesn't help the barking dog issue.

She is very frustrated that she has gotten no help when calling PACC. She mentioned one other time that she called to report an unlicensed, loose dog running around in a park that came right up to her and her dog in an aggressive manner... she said she was told by PACC that all they care about is if the dog has water.

Can you please call Ms. Martinez and have someone address her complaint?

Also, please make sure that PACC employees answering phones are aware of what constitutes as a violation and how to appropriately and professionally handle calls. I know that people contacting PACC are probably more frustrated than not due to whatever the issue is but staff still needs to be handling the calls in a professional and courteous manner. This is not the first complaint we have received regarding issues with PACC operators being unprofessional or unhelpful.

Thank you for your help Kim.

Jenn Cabrera
Supervisor Sharon Bronson's Office
District 3
520-724-8051

11 June 2015

Director:
Pima Animal Care Center
400 N. Silverbell Rd
Tucson, AZ 85745-9412

To whom it may concern:

I have made many donations to the Humane Society over the years because animal safety and security are very important to me.

Recently, my neighbor (who has also contributed to the HS over the years) found a cat and four kittens under her shed. The mother cat was obviously abandoned because she was tame and loving. Two of the kittens were given homes and one was killed by a dog, leaving the Mom and one kitten.

My neighbor and I took them to the HS and were told we needed an appointment, but they were not taking any more animals. We were quite shocked at the unfriendly, indifferent, and uncaring attitude and rude attitude of the employee. One would think that an employee in this position would be more sympathetic not only to the animal but to the concerned individual as well: this person's attitude does not speak well of public relations for the HS.

We then took them to the Pima Animal Care Center where we were immediately put at ease: they were caring and friendly and took mom and her kitten in. We also made donations to the facility at that time, and all of my future donations (and my friend's) will now go to PACC and not to the HS.

Sincerely

cc: Humane Society of Southern Arizona

Michael Schlueter

From: Michelle Moore
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 8:15 AM
To: Kim Janes
Cc: Michael Schlueter
Subject: FW: customer appreciation
Attachments: Kelly LOA 6-29-15.docx

FYI – For PACCAC packet.

Michelle Moore

Pima Animal Care Center, 4000 N. Silverbell Rd., Tucson, AZ 85745

PLEASE NOTE NEW PHONE NUMBERS

PH: 520 724-5934

FAX: 520 724-5954



A Healthy Pima County: Everyone. Everywhere. Everyday.


From: Jennifer Neustadter
Sent: Monday, June 29, 2015 4:52 PM
To: Kristin Barney
Cc: Michelle Moore
Subject: customer appreciation

Please see attached memo that I did for Sherri today. The guy personally drove all the way down here to say thank you and tell us how much he appreciated Sherri. I CC'd Francisco on the memo, but did not include him in this email./ Please see that he gets it.

Thanks



Jennifer Neustadter
Licensing Supervisor
Pima Animal Care Center
520-724-5914
jennifer.neustadter@pima.gov



4000 N. Silverbell Road Tucson, AZ 85745 – (520) 724-5900 – [www.pima.gov/animal care](http://www.pima.gov/animal%20care)

MEMO

DATE: June 29, 2015
TO: Sherri Kelly – Licensing OSLIII
FROM: Jennifer Neustadter – Licensing Supervisor
SUBJECT: Employee Appreciation

On June 29, 2015 Mr. _____ came into the lobby and wanted to let me know how much he appreciated all your efforts in getting his dog back to him. He stated that he was in Seattle on vacation and had left the dog with someone in Arizona City. The dog escaped and a lady found his dog. She contacted us, who you helped getting her his information so that she could get the dog back to the proper person while he was still in Seattle. He came down to personally acknowledge you and to let me know how much he appreciated your great customer service and the “above and beyond” measures you took. He was extremely worried about his dog and was happy to know that you were able to assist the person that found his dog and that his dog would then be safe until he returned from vacation.

Your work and attitude reflects greatly on our Center. Good job and thank you.

CC: Francisco Garcia, Director, Pima County Health Department
Kristin Barney, Manager, Pima Animal Care Center
Pima Animal Care Center Advisory Committee

July 16, 2015

Southern Arizona Veterinary Medical Association
PO Box 65832
Tucson, Arizona 85728-5832

Dear Members of the Veterinary Community:

On behalf of the Pima Animal Care Center Advisory Committee, I am writing this letter as a request for assistance from you to increase awareness among your clients and the pet owners in Pima County and its incorporated areas regarding dog licensing as well as recommended pet recovery measures.

As you are all aware, the State of Arizona mandates that dogs over three months of age must be vaccinated by a licensed veterinarian against rabies. Along with this requirement, local ordinances require that dogs must be licensed annually. In Pima County and its incorporated areas, failure to do so is a Class 2 misdemeanor which has significant fines for pet owners whose animals are discovered to be without a current license. It has come to the attention of some advisory committee members that many dog owners who vaccinate against rabies are unaware of the necessity of a dog license. This situation may have arisen in recent years due to the fact that the Pima Animal Care Center does not supply the veterinary community the former three-part rabies vaccination certificate form unless they are requested by a veterinary practice. As the majority of dog owners receive critical animal care information from you, we are requesting your help in creating awareness of the licensing requirement. A sign posted at your check-out area, or a statement printed on the vaccination receipt may help. *If you are interested, we do have partner veterinarians who serve their clients as a licensing agent for the Pima Animal Care Center. (Participating clinics do receive \$2 per license application received.) You may contact the Center at 520-792-5914 for more information about this program.*

The Committee is also requesting assistance with educating pet owners about the benefits of microchipping their pets. Heartache for a lost pet might be shortened if pet owners are encouraged to microchip their pets and, at every visit, each animal is scanned for a microchip when brought into your clinic, whether it is the first time or a subsequent visit. This number should be checked the first time the animal is seen. This will insure that lost pets can be quickly reunited with their owners and that a chip is still working. Note: equipment may need to be recalibrated by the manufacturer to read older chips every few years. For your information, since 2004, all animals adopted/recovered from the Pima Animal Care Center are microchipped upon release to owner/adopter as a result of an animal which was lost.

Thank you for your consideration and assistance with creating awareness of licensing requirements and of the need for microchip identification in by our community pet owners and for your service in keeping the animals in our community healthy and safe.

Sincerely,

Chair