1. Call to Order

Ms. Emptage called the meeting to order at 5:44 pm

- Attendance

Present:
Tamara Barrick, Pima Paws for Life
Nancy Emptage, Chair, Animal Welfare Coalition
Helen Mendelsohn, Disabled Community
Erin O'Donnell, DVM, Southern AZ Veterinary Medical Association
Jane Schwerin, People for Animals in the Prevention of Cruelty and Neglect
Gail Smith, MD, Board of Health
Marcy Flanagan, Health Department Deputy Director, Ex-Officio

Absent:
Pat Hubbard, Humane Society of Southern Arizona
Pat Jacobs, Tucson Kennel Club
Sophia Kaluzniacki, DVM, SPCA of AZ, Inc
Derek Marshall, Public Education
Jack Neuman, Vice-Chair, PACC Volunteers

- Pledge of Allegiance

2. Adoption of the Minutes

- Adoption of the December 17, 2015 Meeting Minutes

The motion was made and seconded (Mendelsohn/Smith) that the December 17, 2015 meeting minutes be adopted as written. The motion carried (6-0).

3. Animal Welfare and Dangerous Animal Cases for December 2015 and Recent Holds Snapshot

Ms. Schwerin said in welfare case one she felt the information should be more detailed as to what citations were issued. She added that the owner should not have been allowed to keep one dog saying the owner had already proven to be a bad owner. She continued by saying compliance at a later date doesn’t mean an owner won’t revert to old ways. Dr. Smith asked about what happened with the third dog in this case, to which Field Supervisor Neil Konst replied the dog is still at PACC available for adoption.

Ms. Emptage pointed out there was a comment on welfare case two, from Ms. Mendelsohn, requesting the court put a ban on the owner from owning dogs. She also asked what happened to the dog. Supervisor Konst replied the dog was sent to rescue. Ms. Schwerin pointed out that Oro Valley has a bond ordinance. Supervisor Konst explained animals are considered property. PACC cannot deny ownership. If PACC takes a dog it is bonded and then it’s up to a judge to determine ownership. The bond covers the cost of keeping and feeding the dog at PACC pending the hearing. At the
hearing the owner can plead his/her case to keep the dog and PACC can argue the case against the owner keeping the dog. Ms. Schwerin pointed out that if an owner relinquishes the dog then there is no hearing. She continued that the hearing is supposed to take place within a specified time limit. Supervisor Konst replied that the hearings do take place as specified, but then the judge takes a long time to render a judgment after the hearing. Ms. Emptage requested this topic be on the agenda next month. Dr. O'Donnell discussed with Supervisor Konst that as a veterinarian if the owner of an animal with a bad medical condition wants to leave her office taking the animal without treatment, they may do so, but then she should report it to PACC which has authority to impound. Supervisor Konst added that the more evidence the veterinarian can provide the better. Ms. Schwerin said that peace officers can also impound animals.

Ms. Emptage read Dr. Smith’s comment asking what the time limit is to have the dogs in welfare case three licensed. Supervisor Konst replied there is no time limit; it could be six months; it’s up to the judge. The motion was made and seconded (Emptage/Smith) that the time frame to license dogs be a topic of discussion at the next meeting. The motion carried (6-0).

Regarding welfare case four the question was asked if there was a recheck to see if a tie-out was again in use and/or if the fence situation was remedied. Supervisor Konst replied that no recheck has been made due to staffing. Ms. Barrick asked if there are more consequences if there is a second violation and Supervisor Konst replied depending on the conditions, there are. Supervisor Konst added that for some owners tie-outs are their only current means of confinement; he has experience some veterinarians who have actually issued authorizations for tie-outs; and for some people who come from other states, tie-out are legal in the state they come from. He continued that many owners need education and paying a fine is typically a good education. Ms. Emptage asked if PACC shares the names of individuals not allowed to adopt from PACC with other agencies to keep bad owners from just going to another agency which doesn’t know not to adopt to them. Supervisor Konst said there is no shared list at present and cautioned that there could be people with the same name, and if so then dates of birth or other information would be needed, and there are certain risks associated with disseminating that type of information. Ms. Schwerin asked to get a copy of the pamphlet being provided to educate owners on alternatives to tie-outs. Supervisor Konst said they give out a copy of the laws which covers a number of requirements, and said he will check on the pamphlet.

Ms. Schwerin referred to welfare case six, which involved four pit bulls jumping the fence, she opined that the owner might improve for a short time, but will likely go back to old ways. Ms. Emptage commented that it is very smart dog to be able to open and close a sliding glass door. Supervisor Konst said the dogs were gone at the recheck and have not been licensed. Supervisor Konst added that he saw other questions about license and vaccination and when a dog comes to PACC they do not cite for license and vaccination because these requirements will be taken care of at PACC. Additionally, the law does not express a penalty for in the County, although it does in the city of Tucson. Health Department Director Francisco García confirmed the county law currently does not have a penalty; however, last Tuesday the Board of Supervisors passed the updated licensing ordinance which corrects that omission in addition to updating the licensing fees.

Ms. Schwerin referred to welfare case seven; said the owner was allowed to redeem; and again opined that the owner will likely go back to old ways.

Ms. Schwerin referred to welfare case nine and said there should have been citations for no shelter. There was also a question about licensing, but the report said there was a citation for no license.
Supervisor Konst said there was no mention in the report about a lack of shelter and said he would have to check on the shelter question.

Ms. Schwerin referred to dangerous dog case three and asked why the dog Lulu, which was noted as showing “unsafe behavior,” was declared not dangerous. Supervisor Konst discussed there is a point system and the points did not add up to declaring the dog dangerous. Ms. Emptage requested the dangerous dog form and point system be discussed at the next meeting.

4. Call to the Audience

There were no speakers from the audience.

5. Management Report

Ms. Flanagan reported on three topics. At the recent quality budget meeting it was noted that PACC’s budget is actually on track to not draw funds from the main Health Department budget for the first time in a long time. The renderings for the new animal care center should be done in the spring and there will be open house meetings to show the renderings. Phase one of the construction should be done around November of 2017, with phase two being completed in 2018. Finally, as mentioned during the welfare cases discussion, the licensing ordinance passed. The new law eliminates discounted fees for unaltered dogs, except for service dogs and law enforcement dogs. It also provides for enforcement of the vaccination licensing component in Pima County. Ms. Schwerin asked about the language she wanted included in the ordinance. Ms. Flanagan said she did pass on her information to the County Attorney, but it did not go before the Board of Supervisors due to required review and posting time constraints.

6. Old Business

- Use of Comment Sheet for Welfare Reviews

Ms. Emptage started discussion on what schedule should be followed to get the Welfare Report from staff, have time for Mr. Schlueter to generate the comment sheets, have time for members to make their comments and send them in for inclusion into the packets. Dr. Smith commented on use of the comment sheets (This was the first month,) being more efficient. Various ideas were considered. The general consensus was to keep doing whole calendar months, but stagger back one month. Instead of reviewing January cases at the February meeting, they will be reviewed at the March meeting to provide time for all the necessary steps; then February cases will be reviewed in April and so on. There was also some discussion on what should or should not be redacted from welfare reports and Ms. Flanagan said she will check with the County Attorney’s Office for direction on redacting.

7. New Business

- Shortening Lengthy Animal Holds

Ms. Flanagan reported PACC as a whole has been meeting with Managers Jose Ocano and Justin Gallick regarding short term and long term objectives, one of which is reducing the length of stay for dogs. An internal committee is being formed to work with the County Attorney’s Office on this issue to include lengthy holds as well as mandatory hold times for strays. Ms. Flanagan wants to allow the
internal PACC committee to draft language to reduce lengths of stay and bring the draft language back to the Advisory Committee. There was general agreement with Ms. Flanagan’s request. There was a brief discussion about the dog Sativa, which was the center of a dangerous dog case and held at PACC for roughly one year. The owner kept appealing, which prolonged the case. Ms. Schwerin said County Code 6.04.140 and 6.04.150 refer to a special action appeal to a higher court, which she said should make the process faster. Ms. Schwerin asked about the recent suggestion of inviting the County Attorney to come to a Committee meeting. Ms. Flanagan said the County Attorney didn’t refuse to come; the attorney would come to educate the Committee, but would not come to a meeting as a working session to work through language; which is what is to be done in the internal PACC committee. Ms. Flanagan said a judge isn’t going to come to the meeting as recommended in a previous meeting. Ms. Flanagan said the internal committee includes Mr. Gallick, Mr. Ocano, the attorney and her. Dr. García explained the problem is multi-jurisdictional, requiring buy-in from other jurisdictions as well as consistent language.

- Proposed Ordinance Regarding Pima County Code 6.04.100 Regarding Pima County Animal Care Advisory Committee

Dr. García said he wanted to come back to discuss the proposed ordinance (It was on last month’s agenda.) to make sure there was clear feedback. He lauded the support and advocacy the Committee has provided for the pets of our community and the many improvements the Committee has influenced. PACC has changed considerably in a short period of time. PACC and the Health Department as a whole are striving to employ evidence based best practices and have made significant strides. Dr. Garcia continued, as PACC looks to new ways and is getting a new building there is a need to modernize the Advisory Committee. The original ordinance language generates situations wherein the organizations expressed in the code no longer exist. Also there is a plea from the County Attorneys Office for consistency across boards, commissions and committees (BCCs) within the County, which caused staff to look at the code and ask, is there a better or different way to do things. The proposed ordinance is not designed to purge all the existing members; change is to be phased in with existing terms to continue until an expiration date. Dr. García provided a proposed expiration schedule. (Include in record.) He said the change is to bring new voices, skills and ideas to the table as well as bring interconnection with the jurisdictional partners. He added, at a recent jurisdictional partners meeting trepidation was expressed regarding attending Advisory Committee meetings because the jurisdictional partners believe the current structure to be hostile to the jurisdictions. The proposed structure includes an appointee from each of the supervisorial districts, which affords the Board the influence they are elected to have. At the last meeting it was stated that the appointments will be political appointments; this is the case with most BCCs. At the last meeting fear was expressed that the new structure would eliminate animal advocates from the Committee, to which Dr. García stated he seriously doubts the Board would appoint people without expertise in animal welfare. Furthermore, the Department is advising the individual Board members of those currently on the Committee residing within their individual districts. Dr. García added, last meeting’s suggestion to add the Board of Supervisor appointees to the current structure creates too large of a body and staff will not be moving that suggestion forward. He concluded by soliciting the Committee’s advice and support on the proposed ordinance.

Discussion and questions ensued. Ms. Emptage expressed concern regarding too many bureaucrats and number crunchers reducing animal welfare progress. Dr. García replied stating her concern is valid and is the reason why the PACC jurisdictional partners meet separately from the Advisory Committee; however, there still needs to be some cross communication between the two groups. He
continued by saying changing the Committee all at once would not be good for consistency, adding the by-laws will also need to be changed. Ms. Emptage asked how many other BCCs are being reset; to which Dr. García replied there are various changes occurring: some involving composition; some involving by-laws; and some involving narrowing of scope, but all are being at least looked at. Dr. O'Donnell asked if the Board of Supervisors’ and County Administrator appointees would all be employees or people from the community. Dr. García replied that the County Administrator can appoint whomever he wants and the Board appointees will most likely all be from the community. He went on to touch on other seats, which include a representative from the PACC volunteers, one from Friends of PACC and one from the Southern Arizona Veterinary Medical Association (SAVMA). There was confusion / concern regarding the terms of the organization appointees since the language in that section (B) is different from the language in the sections for the Board of Supervisors’ and County Administrator’s appointees (sections C and D). Dr. García said all positions must have an expiration date. Ms. Emptage asked if, for example, the SAVMA member serving on the Committee has to be replaced. Dr. García replied that SAVMA could reappoint the same person until s/he dies and that would be permissible. Ms. Emptage asked how the volunteer representative will be selected. Dr. García acknowledged the details are not all worked out, but the general assumptions include putting out a call for interest, giving an orientation to interested parties, and bringing the interested candidates names to the volunteers for them to vote on. Ms. Schwerin asked if there was anything preventing a current representative from serving again; and Dr. García replied, no.

Dr. O'Donnell stated she thinks there should be a veterinarian on the Committee; Dr. Garcia shared his agreement, but wanted to know if SAVMA was a large enough, representative enough group to be expressed in the code. Dr. O'Donnell said SAVMA has approximately 120 members. There was discussion that there are different types of veterinarians, including those who have the credentials, but are not actually practicing. There was discussion on whether the SAVMA representative needed to be better defined or narrowed down. Dr. O'Donnell suggested the ordinance specify a “practicing community veterinarian” who is a member of the Southern Arizona Veterinary Medical Association. The motion was made and seconded (Emptage/Smith) that the Committee supports the inclusion of the Dr. O'Donnell’s aforementioned suggested language. The motion carried (6-0).

Dr. Smith stressed that the Committee’s current membership is in place for the welfare of the animals and expressed she hopes that fact doesn’t change. Dr. García spoke about assisting the Board with lists of qualified candidates and how there is hope for balance in diversity. Ms. Schwerin said she is opposed to the proposed ordinance, stating it puts too many people in place who do not have the interests of the animals at heart. She continued there will be too many with their eyes on money; referred to the jurisdictions wanting all donations going to offset their operational costs; and added a comment about the County Administrator’s past suggestion of a PACC drop-off fee. Ms. Emptage underscored the lengthy battle for PACC to have no drop-off fee, no pick-up fee, no euthanasia fee and for PACC to be a safe haven for community pets. She then expressed fear of losing ground in these fights if the Committee is reconstructed. Dr. García stressed that the Board of Supervisors has bought into PACC and is definitely in tune with the voters who convincingly passed the PACC new facility bond while all other bonds failed. Dr. Smith urged the current members to talk to their individual Supervisors about their desire to serve on the Committee and help animals. Dr. O'Donnell pointed out the proposed new Committee composition is an opportunity to educate stakeholders with different perspectives to look at more than just the money. Dr. García said he thinks part of the Committee’s role should be to educate.
Dr. Smith asked when the ordinance is scheduled to go to the Board of Supervisors. Dr. García replied the ordinance isn’t scheduled yet because he wanted to get more input from the Committee, even though the County Attorney’s Office advised him he did not need to do so. He continued that March or April is the likely time frame for the item to go to the Board. The motion was made and seconded (Smith/Barrick) that the Committee support the proposed ordinance amending Pima County Code 6.04.100 with the added “practicing community veterinarian” language; and that Dr. García relay, to the Board of Supervisors, the Committee’s concerns for the Committee to remain a voice for animal welfare. The motion carried (3-2), with Ms. Barrick, Dr. O'Donnell and Dr. Smith for; Ms. Emptage and Ms. Schwerin against; and Ms. Mendelsohn abstaining.

- Pima Animal Care Center Reorganization

Ms. Emptage acknowledged the Committee saw communication or the reorganization. Dr. García said he had a staff member send out an e-mail about the reorganization; however, the actual attachment on the reorganization was not included thus making the Committee’s notification late, for which Dr. García apologized.

- Animal Care Center Main Phone Tree Message

Ms. Emptage briefly stated she has concerns about the phone tree message because there is no statement about calling 911 if there is an emergency; you have to have to listen to the whole message; there is no dial “O” to get out; and because it is confusing.

8. Donations: A total of $81,966.33 in donations was received during the month of December.

There was no discussion on this agenda item

9. Complaints and Commendations: There were no complaints and two commendations received by staff during December.

The Committee commented that one of the commendations was from Congresswoman McSally.

10. Call to the Audience

There were no speakers from the audience.

11. Announcements, Schedules and Proposed Agenda Items

Ms. Emptage suggested the Committee discuss having a sticker like on license plates on the back of license tags. The sticker should have PACC’s current phone number on it.

12. Next Meeting – February 18, 2016

The next meeting will be at PACC.

13. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:48 pm.
NOTICE
PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
PIMA COUNTY ANIMAL CARE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
January 21, 2016 – 5:30 p.m.
Pima Animal Care Center
4000 N Silverbell Road
Admin Building
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 (PACC); 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
   - Roll Call
   - Establishment of Quorum and Pledge of Allegiance

2. Review and Adoption of Minutes:
   - Adoption of December 17, 2015 meeting minutes

3. Animal Welfare and Dangerous Animal Cases for December 2015 and Recent Holds Snapshot

4. Call to the Audience

5. Management Report

6. Old Business
   - Use of Comment Sheet for Welfare Reviews

7. New Business
   - Shortening Lengthy Animal Holds
   - Proposed Ordinance Regarding Pima County Code 6.04.100 Regarding Pima County Animal Care Advisory Committee
   - Pima Animal Care Center Reorganization
   - Animal Care Center Main Phone Tree Message

8. Donations: A total of $81,966.33 in donations was received during the month of December.

9. Complaints and Commendations: There were no complaints and two commendations received by staff during December.

10. Call to the Audience

11. Announcements, Schedules and Proposed Agenda Items

12. Next Meeting – February 18, 2016

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.
1. Call to Order

Ms. Emptage called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm

- Attendance

Present:
Tamara Barrick, Pima Paws for Life
Nancy Emptage, Chair, Animal Welfare Coalition
Pat Hubbard, Humane Society of Southern Arizona
Pat Jacobs, Tucson Kennel Club
Sophia Kaluzniacki, DVM, SPCA of AZ, Inc
Derek Marshall, Public Education
Helen Mendelsohn, Disabled Community
Jack Neuman, Vice-Chair, PACC Volunteers
Erin O'Donnell, DVM, Southern AZ Veterinary Medical Association
Jane Schwerin, People for Animals in the Prevention of Cruelty and Neglect
Gail Smith, MD, Board of Health
Marcy Flanagan, Health Department Deputy Director, Ex-Offico

Absent:
None

- Pledge of Allegiance

2. Adoption of the Minutes

- Adoption of the November 19, 2015 Meeting Minutes

Ms. Schwerin referred to item ten and said she did not use the word “bond” as written in the draft minutes. She wants the County Attorney to be part of the discussion on animals being held at PACC for a long time.

The motion was made and seconded (Hubbard/Smith) that the November 19, 2015 meeting minutes be adopted with Ms. Schwerin’s correction. The motion carried (10-0); (Ms. Mendelsohn not present yet).

3. Animal Welfare and Dangerous Animal Cases August through November 2015 and Recent Holds Snapshot

Ms. Emptage referred to September’s welfare case one, which included a comment stating the dog involved was adopted from PACC back in January by a first time pet owner. The dog had to be euthanized. Ms. Emptage stressed that being a first time pet owner is no excuse for allowing a dog to deteriorate to the point of needing euthanasia.
Ms. Schwerin referred to August’s welfare case six and said it was notable due to the extreme cruelty and because the dog was adopted from PACC. She said she finds it hard to believe the officer actually reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner as noted in the report and suggested that such wording is automatically placed in these reports.

Ms. Schwerin referred to August’s welfare case seven, in which 69 animals were impounded, but one or two cats were left behind. She wanted to know if PACC staff would go back and check on the one or two cats.

Ms. Schwerin referred to September’s welfare case one, said the dog involved was euthanized and was adopted from PACC. The report states the dog was impounded at no charge to the owner, so she asked why that comment was made and if they every charge owners for impounding. Supervisor Tenkate said the owner was cited and put on a do not adopt list, and clarified that PACC does not charge for welfare impounds just pick-ups. Ms. Schwerin continued that adopters should be carefully screened and said she is opposed to free adoptions. Mr. Neuman asked what repercussions there are for those who abuse animals. Supervisor Tenkate said animals can be impounded and owners can be cited; she added rechecks can be done if animals are left with the owner. She continued that license and vaccination records are verified and citations are issued for any failure to comply with these requirements.

Discussion turned to October’s welfare case two which included a Bichon Frise on a tie-out, but also included a Chihuahua in a crate. The crate also contained some waste. The Bichon Frise was impounded, but the Chihuahua was left. Some Committee members voiced questions and concerns about the Chihuahua. Supervisor Tenkate said the crate was large; there was one to two days of waste present; and the dog had clean water and ventilation. There was concern about the tarp over the cage. Mr. Neuman suggested the tarp might have been employed to hide the dog; however, Mr. Jacobs said he has used a tarp to provide shade. There was also concern about the waste. Supervisor Tenkate said in the County waste has to be removed every 72 hours. In the judgment of the officer who handled the case, conditions for the Chihuahua were adequate according to the legal standards; however, a dog on a tie-out is considered in distress, which is why the Bichon Frise was impounded. Mr. Jacobs said he would like the Committee to review the aforementioned 72-hour waste standard. Ms. Schwerin voiced that she is against keeping animals in cages or crates; said she has been concerned about people doing so for 20 years; and called animals being confined in a cage or crate extreme cruelty. However, Ms. Hubbard and Mr. Jacobs said they crate their animals; and Mr. Jacobs said he would like the topic of crating placed on the agenda for discussion. Ms. Hubbard said the issue of crating has been discussed by the Committee in the past. Supervisor Tenkate reported that at a recheck the Chihuahua was in the house and the Bichon Frise was in a fenced area.

Ms. Schwerin referred to October’s welfare case seven; said the owner cannot afford veterinary care; and asserted PACC is adopting out animals to too many owners who cannot afford veterinary care. Mr. Jacobs asked if the animal in this particular case was adopted from PACC and the answer was no. Ms. Schwerin acknowledged this case doesn’t involve an animal from PACC, but said several do.

Ms. Schwerin referred to November’s welfare case three, which involved two emaciated dogs, and asked what is happening with the case. Enforcement Manager Jose Chavez said the owner paid the bond and a hearing is pending. Ms. Schwerin said she would like to attend the hearing and ask to be notified when it is scheduled.
Ms. Schwerin referred to November’s welfare case four, which involved a matted dog relinquished for euthanasia. The report states the officer provided the owner information on low/no cost veterinarian care. Ms. Schwerin asserted that low/no cost veterinarian care is not as it was presented by the officer and requested a copy of the low/no cost veterinarian information PACC provides. Ms. Emptage requested everyone get a copy. Ms. Schwerin said the dog is blind in one eye, has seizures and tremors and she questioned how humane it is to keep the dog alive as PACC has been doing. She also asked about the dates on this case, which jump from September 3 to November 29. Supervisor Tenkate said the owner dropped off the dog and left, and then it took until November 29 to contact and cite the owner. Supervisor Tenkate went over some of the medical history provided. Ms. Emptage stated she assumed the dog in this case would be a special needs adoption and asked if the medical history goes with the dog when it is adopted; Supervisor Tenkate said it does.

Ms. Emptage brought up that a couple of the dangerous dog cases involved a minor in charge of a pit bull the minor could not control. Mr. Jacobs suggested this topic could be something the Committee would want to look into. She asked about accountability in such cases. Supervisor Tenkate said the adult owner is held responsible. Mr. Jacobs asked if in these cases juveniles are cited into juvenile court, and Supervisor Tenkate said they are not.

Ms. Emptage mentioned an English bulldog reportedly was given away after it bit someone and was taken to Mexico where the owner vaccinated the dog himself. She asked how the dog can be licensed without proof of vaccination. Supervisor Tenkate said if the licensing staff licensed the dog then the necessary documentation had to be shown.

4. **Call to the Audience**

There were no speakers from the audience.

5. **Management Report**

Ms. Flanagan said after the last meeting there were questions from volunteers about the monthly statistical report that has been regularly provided. The report has for a long time been generated through Kim Janes (former ex-officio). Currently it is unknown how the numbers are systematically generated or pulled, so Ms. Flanagan will be working with Finance to build a new monthly report.

Ms. Flanagan reported that PACC’s Volunteer Coordinator has moved on to other employment; the position has been advertised and there is already a list of quality applicants.

Ms. Flanagan advised the Committee that a representative from the County Attorney’s Office was not available for the December meeting, but can come for the January meeting to discuss lengthy animal holds. Ms. Schwerin pointed out that Mr. Jacobs had requested a judge or court administrator be invited to the discussion on lengthy animal holds. Ms. Flanagan said she talked to the County Attorney about that request and was told it is highly unlikely either would attend a Committee meeting; however, the Committee can make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors and the Board may forward those recommendations to the court.

6. **Old Business**

- Procedures Related to Agenda Items
Ms. Emptage stated that any member can put an item on the agenda and said this item does not need to be on the agenda going forward.

7. **New Business**

- **Proposed Ordinance Amending Pima County Code 6.04.070 Related to Licensing Fees**

Ms. Emptage pointed out licensing fees have been a topic of discussion at recent meetings. A proposed ordinance was provided (included in the packet and record) by staff for consideration. Ms. Emptage continued that some of the recent discussion included not giving a break for unaltered animals and that she has been told by knowledgeable people in the service industry, service animals should be altered to prevent distraction. Ms. Mendelsohn pointed out there could be an exception if a veterinarian identifies a medical problem, such as an animal having trouble with anesthesia, but added a very low percentage are in this category. Dr. Smith pointed out item five in the proposed ordinance addresses dogs that cannot be altered for health reasons. Ms. Emptage requested item seven in the ordinance include the word “altered.” Through general discussion it was also commented that only dogs are service animals and the licensing provision only applies to dogs, therefore it was suggested the word “animal” be replaced with the word “dog” in item seven.

Ms. Schwerin stated she is opposed to item five, saying she has known of veterinarians who have given out the certificate (saying the dog cannot be altered) when the dog could have been altered. The motion was made and seconded (Schwerin/Kaluzniacki) that the Committee recommend striking item five. Discussion followed. Dr. Kaluzniacki asserted that the overwhelming majority of veterinarians are honest and that she does not think item five should be removed. There was some discussion on whether the certification in item five requires a reason be stated. Dr. O'Donnell added she knows veterinarians who will not anesthetize dogs over ten years of age, which she does not consider a valid reason to not alter a dog. The motion failed (2-9), with Ms. Emptage and Ms. Schwerin as the two votes for the motion. After the vote Mr. Jacobs stated he is still opposed to item four in the proposed ordinance.

The motion was made and seconded (Neuman/Smith) that the Committee supports the proposed ordinance with the aforementioned edits, adding the word “altered” and changing “animal” to “dog” in item seven. Ms. Schwerin stated she had a change she wants in the proposed ordinance and provided her proposed new wording for 6.04.050 in the proposed ordinance (included in the record). She read her proposed language. She added that Mr. Janes suggested her language be sent to the County Attorney. The motion was made and seconded (Schwerin/Kaluzniacki) to amend the motion on the floor, Mr. Neuman’s motion, to include Ms. Schwerin’s additional language. Mr. Jacobs asked if the County Attorney’s Office reviewed and approved of the ordinance language as presented by staff, to which Ms. Flanagan replied they had. Mr. Neuman asserted that when the proposed ordinance language states “animal care enforcement officers are authorized to enforce….” it does not say so to the exclusion of any other entity doing so. Ms. Schwerin asserted the proposed ordinance language is incomplete and that it is desirable to have the “whole story” in one place which her proposed language accomplishes. A vote was taken on Ms. Schwerin’s motion; the motion failed (1-9), with Ms. Schwerin as the one vote for her motion and Ms. Emptage abstaining. A vote was then taken on Mr. Neuman’s motion; the motion carried (8-3), with Ms. Emptage, Mr. Jacobs and Ms. Schwerin voting against. The motion was made and seconded (Kaluzniacki/Smith) to submit Ms. Schwerin’s proposed language to the County Attorney for review and possible inclusion in the proposed ordinance. The motion carried (10-1); Mr. Jacobs voted against the motion.
Proposed Ordinance Amending Pima County Code 6.04.100 Related to the Pima County Animal Care Advisory Committee

Ms. Flanagan said the proposed ordinance, (included in the packet and record), which deals with the composition of the Animal Care Advisory Committee, was produced by the County Attorney’s working with Deputy County Administrator Jan Lesher, who had input from the Board of Supervisors. She continued that the proposed new composition includes appointees from the Board of Supervisors similar to other public bodies such as the Board of Health. If adopted, the ordinance will require the Committee’s by-laws be updated. Ms. Flanagan requested the Committee’s support of the ordinance and/or comments. Ms. Mendelsohn asked if the proposal is removing all the current positions. Ms. Flanagan answered that the current members would stay put until their scheduled term expiration, which would include a few in June of 2016, a few in June of 2016, and so on. However, the Committee seat origins as currently defined in 6.04.100 would be redefined, largely eliminating current Committee seat origins, which are mostly associated with organizations. Dr. Smith asked why not have people on the Committee from the animal welfare community. Ms. Flanagan answered that the Board would pick individuals from their districts with animal welfare experience and knowledge, just like they pick members for the Board of Health with health related backgrounds, not random inexperienced individuals. Dr. Smith suggested adding Board of Supervisors appointees in addition to leaving the current membership in place, emphasizing the current members live and breathe animal welfare and adding she couldn’t imagine the Committee without the people who care for animals so much. Ms. Emptage voiced concern with the proposed jurisdictional representative, saying programs that have made great strides will lose funding as donations go to offset jurisdictional administrative costs instead. Ms. Flanagan replied that the Committee is advisory and as such can make recommendations, but the Board of Supervisors has the decision making authority concerning the use of funding, not the Committee. Ms. Hubbard said that committees need diversity.

Health Department Director Francisco García provided background information on the proposed ordinance to give context. The County Attorney’s Office was reviewing all boards, commissions and committees (BCCs) with an eye for how representative they are of the jurisdictions, their uniformity and accountability. The County Attorney’s Office determined the original ordinance as crafted probably doesn’t make sense any more in that many of the entities have changed. As a result the County Attorney’s Office, Ms. Lesher and Dr. García started working on what the Committee should look like. Their first priority was to preserve the historical knowledge built within the Committee, which is why the current membership stays in place until their scheduled term expiration. Secondarily the intent is to bring some accountability to the districts members serve as is the case with other BCCs. Part of the process for the Department is to submit to the individual Supervisors a list of current Committee members who reside in their districts to aid in their decision making process. Dr. García asserted that it is not politically likely for any new Committee composition to not include representation connected with major animal welfare organizations. He continued that the new structure is also intended to bring in new faces with different skill sets.

If passed, once the transition is completed the proposed ordinance’s Committee composition would include 11 representatives as follows:

- one appointed by the Southern Arizona Veterinary Medical Association;
- one appointed by the Pima Animal Care Center Partners, (which is comprised of one representative of each of the jurisdictions that have an intergovernmental agreement with Pima County);
- one appointed by Friends of Pima Animal Care Center, (the nonprofit fundraising arm of PACC);
- one appointed by the registered volunteers of the Pima Animal Care Center
• one appointed by each member of the Board of Supervisors (five total);
• one appointed by the County Administrator;
• one staff member appointed by the County Administrator.

Ms. Hubbard voiced her support and said change is good. The motion was made and seconded (Hubbard/Neuman) that the Committee support the proposed ordinance. Mr. Jacobs expressed he didn’t have enough time to digest the ordinance and felt the public needed more notice to provide input. It was pointed out the ordinance was posted on the Board of Supervisors’s website and the Advisory Committee’s website. Dr. Smith made an amended motion for the Committee to support adding the additional positions from the ordinance, but keep the existing Committee seats. Mr. Jacobs seconded her motion. Ms. Schwerin asserted County Administrator Huckelberry has made some terrible suggestions in the past, citing a suggested drop-off fee as an example. She continued by saying she is opposed to some of the additional positions. Ms. Hubbard rebutted Ms. Schwerin’s statement, saying many organizations have intake fees. Mr. Jacobs stated he interprets the ordinance as an indication the animal community will need to be politically aware, politically astute and forceful in position in a political way to the Board of Supervisors and County administration.

A vote was taken on Dr. Smith’s amended motion. The motion failed (1-4). Dr. Smith voted for the motion; Ms. Schwerin, Ms. Hubbard, Mr. Jacobs and Dr. O'Donnell voted against the motion; and Mr. Marshall, Dr. Kaluzniacki, Ms. Barrick, Ms. Mendelsohn, Ms. Emptage and Mr. Neuman abstained from the vote.

A vote was taken on the original motion from Ms. Hubbard. The motion failed (2-4). Ms. Hubbard and Mr. Neuman voted for the motion; Dr. Smith, Ms. Schwerin, Mr. Jacobs and Ms. Mendelsohn voted against the motion; and Dr. O'Donnell, Dr. Kaluzniacki, Ms. Emptage, Mr. Marshall and Ms. Barrick abstained from the vote.

The motion was made and seconded (Jacobs/Mendelsohn) that the Committee thank the Board of Supervisors for the opportunity to discuss this matter (the proposed ordinance on the Committee’s composition). The motion carried (9-1) Ms. Schwerin voted against and Mr. Marshall abstained.

• Use of Pima Animal Care Center Donations and Bequests

Dr. Garcia, Health Department Director, introduced Development Director Karen Hollish who shared a PowerPoint presentation regarding PACC’s Development Program. The Development Program raises much needed funds. PACC’s annual budget is roughly $8.8 million; however, comparing PACC to comparable shelters the budget should be around $13 million. Ms. Hollish is working to create a culture of philanthropy; market PACC’s successes; and build a positive public image. In the 20 months she has been with PACC $1.4 million in cash has been raised for PACC and its partners. Adding planned gifts raises that amount to $2.9 million. Additionally $700,000 in in-kind donations has been raised during the same time frame. Funds are raised through direct mail appeals, grant writing, on-line campaigns, matching campaigns, planned and major gifts, and special events. Currently a goal of $600,000 in donations is built into the budget. These funds are necessary to underwrite PACC’s medical program. Ms. Hollish’s second goal is to build a robust independent non-profit partner for PACC. Currently Friends of Pima Animal Care Center is a project fund under the Community Foundation for Southern Arizona, but work is underway to secure independent 501c3 status. Donations to Friends of Pima Animal Care Center can be used more flexibly.
Dr. García emphasized that PACC wants to do way more than the legal minimum mandates, but has limited resources, which is why fund development is so important. He also pointed out that spending authority is part of the budget requirements and funds donated cannot be spent unless spending authority has been granted, which is why the $600,000 goal is expressed in the budget.

Dr. García highlighted that animal welfare is a passionate cause for many people who are willing to put their money where their hearts are, even in giving to government which is extremely rare. He contrasted PACC with the main, non-PACC, Health Department which would love to do many wonderful but un-mandated things to promote health, but the passion and associated donations to underwrite these pursuits doesn’t flow like it does for animal welfare. Recently PACC has been named as beneficiary of two very generous gifts from two women, Ella Jane Burson and Marilynn Rasmussen. These gifts total approximately $1.3 million. The Department wants to honor the wishes of the donors and has developed an investment plan that covers four areas. Roughly $500,000 is to be set aside to continue the Community Cat Program (trap/neuter/release) which currently is funded through a grant contract which expires in fiscal year 2017/2018. Secondly $296,000 is to be used to address animal behavioral health issues. Thirdly $189,000 is to be used for owner / adopter support to help pet owners succeed as owners. This amount is tied to approximately $149,000 from PetSmart Charities. And the last investment is $110,000 to build PACC’s capacity for development / enhance the development program. Dr. García said the Department wants to be a good steward of the money and all investments are non-mandated. In contrast to the Department’s investment plan, the jurisdictions want the gifts to be used to offset their bill(s). Dr. García asked for the Committee’s opinion; does the Committee support the Burson and Rasmussen bequests investment plan or does it support the position expressed by the jurisdictions?

Mr. Jacobs asked about donations in excess of the $600,000 budgeted amount, referring to the $1.4 million figure mentioned by Ms. Hollish. Dr. Garcia replied that agency donations such as from PetSmart are treated as contracts. The funds are used for the specific purpose(s) expressed in the contract, not general operations. Mr. Jacobs also asked how gifts can be given to ensure they are not used to support the regular budget. Dr. García replied the simplest way is to give to Friends of PACC; and they have a list of priorities they support. The second way is to have your own foundation and through the foundation enter into an agreement with PACC to provide a specified service or services.

The motion was made and seconded (Smith/Neuman) that the Committee send a letter to the Board of Supervisors in support of the Burson and Rasmussen bequest investment plan as presented. Prior to the vote Mr. Neuman stated the community’s support for general animal welfare and PACC is obvious as demonstrated by its strong support for the new animal care center bond proposal which passed while all other recent bond proposal failed, and asked when can it be expected that PACC will be properly funded to a necessary level. Dr. García replied he will continue to advocate for resourcing PACC, but he doesn’t anticipate any big changes in the PACC budget, but rather expects a slow and steady climb. A vote was taken on Dr. Smith’s motion; the motion carried 8-0, with Ms. Schwerin abstaining from the vote. Two Committee members had already left the meeting prior to the vote.

- Pima County Animal Care Advisory Committee By-Laws

There was no discussion on this agenda item.

- Proposal to have Comment Sheet for Welfare and Dangerous Dog Reviews
Ms. Emptage suggested a new method for the Committee to review and comment on welfare cases. She generated a single page with four sections or windows. The first had a report snapshot; the second contained the Animal Care Officer summary comments; the third contained the officer’s written case report; and the bottom section provided space for comments from a Committee member. She suggested that every month Mr. Schlueter (Committee Coordinator) generate these four-section pages for each of the reported welfare cases (usually ten). She continued that the full welfare case documentation, as it has been, plus this extra page for each case could be provided to members in an email unless Committee members request paper copies. Then members can record any comments and return the one page to Mr. Schlueter, who will compile the comments and provide them in the meeting packets for all members to read. Her hope is that the comments will be concise and that the Committee will be able to go through these cases quicker during the meetings. There was some concern about there being enough time to get the welfare cases to the Committee; have the members review them and comment; send the comments back to Mr. Schlueter; and get everything back out to the Committee. Mr. Jacobs commented he is more concerned about specificity than timeliness. Generally, comments were positive regarding Ms. Emptage’s proposal. Through discussion it was touched on that members don’t have to comment on all welfare cases. Ms. Flanagan suggested the proposal be tried out for the next meeting and staff will track how much time it takes. Ms. Emptage took a vote on trying her suggestion and it was 11-0 in favor. Mr. Jacobs later added that the comments page should include requests, suggested actions and/or outcomes, not just comments.

- Animal Care Center Main Phone Tree Message

There was no discussion on this item.

8. A total of 1,131 individuals gave $26,810.12 in donations during the month of November.

There was no discussion on this agenda item

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

There was no discussion on this agenda item.

10. Call to the Audience

There were no speakers from the audience.

11. Announcements, Schedules and Proposed Agenda Items

There was no discussion on this agenda item.


The next meeting will be at PACC.

13. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:34 pm.
TO: Marcy Flanagan, Deputy Director
FROM: Jose Chavez, Enforcement Operations Manager
DATE: 12-31-15
SUBJECT: Welfare report for December 2015

1. A15-182964 Three animals were relinquished to PACC. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. One dog was euthanized due to aggression, second dog was adopted, third dog is pending an outcome. A recheck was found in compliance.

2. A15-184234 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 later adopted. This complaint is closed.

3. A15-184180 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. A15-184334 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.

5. A15-184698 One sick animal was relinquished to PACC for euthanasia. After a medical examination was conducted a welfare case was initiated for failure to provide vet care by the Enforcement Supervisor and PACC Veterinarian. At a later date staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited the owner at their residence. The animal was euthanized due to the severity of the illness. This complaint is closed.

6. A15-184807 No animals were impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. A recheck was found in compliance.

7. A15-184744 One dog was impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at PACC. The animal was redeemed. This complaint is closed.

8. A15-184937 One dog was relinquished to PACC. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner cited at the scene. The animal was euthanized due to severity of the illness. This complaint is closed.

9. A15-185124 No animals were impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. This complaint is closed.
INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-182964
ACO name & Badge: Attebery, 1929

On 11/15/2015 at around 1036 am, Pima Animal Care Center received a phone call stating that 4 pit bulls at Morris Blvd were kept on tie outs without water or shelter. The dogs looked sick.

On 12/2/215 at around 0307 pm, I, Pima Animal Care Officer Attebery, 1929, arrived at Morris Blvd for a welfare check on the dogs.

As I approached enclosed front yard, I noted a grey/white pit bull dog on the south west side of property with about a 4' nylon leash attached to its collar and other end attached to piece of wood stuck in ground. Bowls were overturned next to dog and no water was seen. Where dog was tied was a piece of plywood on top of other items. Dog appeared healthy and well fed.

I went to the front door and met with Margie Amarillas who lives here. Margie claimed to own 4 pit bulls as well as a Pomeranian mix dog. I explained purpose of visit and filled out a welfare inspection form for the dogs.

There were 3 Pomeranian mix dogs running loose inside the house. One belonged to Margie and the other 2 belonged to Margie Amarillas' mother, Margaret Amarillas, who also resides here. Pomeranian mix dogs were alert and healthy. Dogs had access to potable water in a small bowl in kitchen area. Also inside house was a red/white female pit bull dog inside a wire cage carrier with no water. Pit bull dog looked healthy and alert.

In enclosed back yard was 1 white/tan female pit bull. Pit bull had access to smaller fenced area on south east side that had a 4th pit bull, red/white male, on a cloth type rope about 4' long attached to its collar and other end tied to fence. Both dogs looked alert and healthy. Dogs had a 5 gallon bucket with no water and a 3 sided structure with a dirt floor.

After discussing welfare violations and citations associated with the violations, Margie opted to sign over ownership of 3 of the pit bull dogs. The forth pit bull dog, the grey/white dog, in the front yard she decided to keep.

Per Margie, a friend brought dog over about 2 months ago and she has been caring for the dog. Margie admitted to buying food for the animal. Dog was brought into the house and citations issued for welfare violations for that dog.
Margie was also cited for no license/no rabies shots on her dogs. Margie also signed welfare premise inspection form that listed violations found. Form also noted that a Pima Animal Care Officer would return in 7 days to ensure compliance with the welfare laws.

Officer's Signature: A. Heberg

Date: 1/29
INVESTIGATION REPORT

Pima County Health Department
Pima Animal Services Center
4000 N Silverbell Rd
Tucson, Arizona 85751
Phone: (520) 243-6900
Fax: (520) 243-6990
www.pimaanimalservices.org

SUSPECT

Renee Marin Patria

ACO NAME / BADGE #
D. Hinte 2068

COMPLAINT NUMBER
A15-184234

BITES: WELFARE: DANGEROUS: OTHER:

CODE IF OTHER:

SUSPECT'S ADDRESS

Oracle Rd.

ZIP 85718 CITY Tucson STATE AZ

SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS

Skyline Rd.

ZIP 85718 CITY Tucson STATE AZ

SEX F WEIGHT 130 IBS HEIGHT 5'3" EYES BLU HAIR BLN

LOCATION OF INCIDENT

Oracle Rd.

DATE AND TIME REPORTED 12/10/15 / 1334

DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 12/10/15 / 1441

FOOD WATER SHELTER INJURED/ILL VENTILATION ABANDONED TIEOUT BEATEN WASTE OTHER (EXPLAIN)

VICTIM/COMPLAINT NAME
Officer D. Hinte 2068

D.O.B RESIDENCE PHONE NO. BUSINESS PHONE NO.

REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. B 22-4465(B) and B 22-296 (B)

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE
Pima Animal Care Center

ZIP 85745 CITY Tucson STATE AZ

DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER

OTHER AGENCY CASE # V1512530

FOLLOW UP REQUEST

SO TPD

OTHER:

ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM VET CLINIC

PHONE NUMBER

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL

ANIMAL'S NAME color Black SEX M

LICENSE # INJ A543382

VICTIM OWNER

VICTIM OWNER

VICTIM OWNER

VICTIM OWNER

VICTIM OWNER

VICTIM OWNER

WITNESS 1

M F 10 DOB 11000 N La Canada Dr

WITNESS 2

M F 10 DOB

WITNESS 3

M F 10 DOB

WITNESS 4

M F 10 DOB

REVIEWED BY 12-13-15

BIK 9/11
INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-184234

ACO name & Badge: D. Hinte 2068

On December 10, 2015 at 1:34 PM, Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) dispatch received a call from Oro Valley Police Department (OVPD) requesting assistance with a dog in immediate distress.

On December 10, 2015 at 2:41 PM, I, Officer Hinte 2068, arrived at Oracle Rd. I met with staff member Russell and OVPD Officer Hallberg #V165 who had responded under OVPD case number V15120530. She stated that she arrived and found the dog's head stuck in the several inch gap at the bottom of the patio wall. She found the dog to be in immediate distress and asked the apartment staff to allow access to the unit under exigent circumstances. Staff member Russell advised that a maintenance technician named Richard opened the unit for Officer Hallberg. Once inside, Officer Hallberg was able to remove the dog's head from the gap. She observed no water or shelter on the patio. There was a small bowl with minimal food and a second empty small bowl. Officer Hallberg placed the dog just inside the sliding glass door to provide some shade. She also filled the empty bowl with water.

Upon my arrival, I observed the black Pug lying laterally near the sliding glass door with the bowl of water next to him. The dog's breathing was labored. He made no attempt to move at any point while I was present. He would open his eyes on occasion but appeared to be ultimately unresponsive. There appeared to be vomit covering his mouth and nose. His was severely emaciated. I could clearly see all rib bones, hip bones, and spine through his coat. I performed a skin tent test and observed the skin remain elevated for several seconds, indicating the dog may be dehydrated to some extent.

I observed and photographed the patio where the dog was originally located. There was no adequate shelter available for the dog. There was one blanket on the floor of the patio. There was an accumulation of at least 2-3 days of dried animal waste on the floor. There was a small amount of food, approximately ¼ cup, in a ceramic bowl. Per Officer Hallberg, there was a second bowl outside that was empty and dry, however, she filled it with water before my arrival.
Officer Hallberg provided the owner information as follows: Renee Patric [illegible]; Clayton Zimmer DOB 04/18/91 [illegible]. Both individuals live in unit #, but Ms. Patric claimed ownership of the dog. Officer Hallberg advised that she had spoken to the owner and inquired about the dog's condition. The owner reportedly told her that the dog was left on the patio at 6:00 PM the night before and was in good condition. The owner stated she was driving back to Tucson from Phoenix at the time of the phone call. Officer Hallberg advised her that she had made entry into the apartment and the dog would be impounded for its continued well-being.

I left a notice advising of impound on the kitchen counter of the apartment. I returned to the truck for a carrier to transport the dog, named Diesel. When I returned, Officer Hallberg advised that Diesel had a long and violent seizure immediately after I exited the apartment. I carefully loaded Diesel into the carrier and then into the truck.

Once at PACC, I immediately brought the dog to the treatment staff. Dr. Carlson and her medical staff drew blood and provided fluids, as well as an overall examination. Dr. Carlson described the dog's body condition/weight as a 2 out of 9 (5 being ideal). She also advised that results of the blood tests showed the dog was moderately malnourished and dehydrated. She stated that the dog's emaciated state would have occurred over at least three weeks, not one day as the owner had reported to Officer Hallberg.

On December 10, 2015 at 6:30 PM, I, Officer Hintz 2068, met with the owner Renee Patric at PACC when she came to redeem her dog Diesel. I explained the reason for impound and Diesel's current condition.

I inquired about Diesel's weight, as I found him to be emaciated. Ms. Patric stated that she had purchased an extra-large bag of the "cheapest food sold at Walmart." She stated that she noticed Diesel began losing weight three to four weeks prior. She advised that four to five days before Diesel was impounded, she began feeding a more expensive brand of kibble supplemented with steak, eggs, and potatoes which she cooked herself. She stated that she observed a small amount of weight gain in that period of 4-5 days.

I inquired about Diesel's most recent vet visit. She stated that he was seen by a vet approximately one year prior and was found to be healthy aside from age-related gum disease. She could not recall which vet he was seen by, as she has used several different vets in the past. She did not have the records with her at the time. I asked why she didn't seek vet care when Diesel began losing weight. She stated that she thought the problem could be resolved by simply switching his food to a more nutrient dense brand.

I informed her that there was no shelter available for Diesel on the patio that I had observed. She stated that she was not aware it was required and advised that Diesel "loved to lay in the sun." I also informed her that the small bowl that was presumably used for water was observed to be empty by the responding OVPD Officer. I explained that there must be water available at all times.
I issued Ms. Patrie citations in Oro Valley for 1x neglect - non-nutritive food, 1x neglect - no shelter, 1x neglect - no vet care, and a third-party citation for 1x neglect - no water on behalf of OVPD Officer Hallberg #V165. I explained each citation as well as her court date, time, and location. She stated that she understood, signed, and received her copy.

Supervisor Ten Kate 1911 and I explained that OVPD had requested that the dog be bonded due to the neglect violations. We explained that the dog would be held at PACC for ten days and that she must petition the Oro Valley courts for an order to show cause hearing. We provided her with copies of the OV ordinance pertaining to OSC hearings and a listing of the court fees. She stated that she understood.

Ms. Patrie asked to observe Diesel in his current condition to determine if she should relinquish ownership for his continued well-being. I escorted her to the treatment area. I met with PACC vet Dr. Carlson. I explained the situation and asked if she may allow the owner to view Diesel and explain his current medical condition.

Ms. Patrie was allowed to see Diesel. Dr. Carlson explained to her that Diesel was currently comatose and experiencing frequent seizures. She further explained that he would need to be remain under 24-hour observation at this time and it was unclear whether or not he would survive.

Ms. Patrie decided to relinquish ownership of Diesel to PACC. I thoroughly explained the release of ownership form and that she would not be able to redeem or adopt Diesel once completed. She stated that she understood and signed the form.

Officer's Signature: [Signature]  
Date: 12/12/15
# Pima Animal Care Center

## MEDICAL HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ANIMAL ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIESEL</td>
<td>A543382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BREED</th>
<th>WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PUG</td>
<td>11.70 LBS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLOR</th>
<th>ESTIMATED DATE OF BIRTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>12/10/2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>9 YRS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| MICROCHIP | 982000402126639 |

## VACCINATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vaccination</th>
<th>Provider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/14/15</td>
<td>DHPP 02121655A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INB 00541339A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RABIES 107409A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SPAY/NEUTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Visit Type</th>
<th>Completed By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T15-803417</td>
<td>Dr. Jennifer Wilcox, D.V.M.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TREATMENTS/VACCINATIONS

(Recorded by the Pima Animal Care Center)
Presented as a confiscation. Neighbor found dog stuck in fence. Had a seizure prior to arrival per ACO. Per ACO, was being fed the cheapest food available at Walmart starting about 3-4 months ago and this was the time the owners noted he was losing weight. They started feeding better food a couple days ago.

S: Obtunded
Hydration- ~5% dehydrated
Pain- None appreciated

O: Wt- 11.7 lb, Temp- 100.5 dF, BCS 2/9
EENT- Lenticular sclerosis OU with corneal pigmentation OU, nose has moderate mucoid discharge OU, ears free from debris/inflammation, marked dental disease, brachycephalic; crusting around mouth - vomitus
CV- HR 140 BPM, no murmur or arrhythmias ausculted - referred upper airway sounds bilaterally
Femoral pulses thready and synchronous, MM pink and moist- ptyalism, CRT < 2 sec
Resp- 40 BrPM, referred upper airway sounds bilaterally
Abd- Soft and non-painful with no distinct abnormalities noted
UG- NAF, 2 testicles descended and are soft and symmetrical
MS- Non-ambulatory
Lymph- Lymph nodes soft and of appropriate size
Neuro- Obtunded. Pupils symmetrical and miotic but PLRs present (direct and consensual)
Integ- Full haircoat with minimal scaling and free of apparent ectoparasites; bruising on left and right (R>L) shoulders

CBC: Mild, normocytic, normochromic, nonregenerative anemia (HCT 35%); moderate leukocytosis (26k) characterized by a neutrophilia (23k) with a left shift and a thrombocytosis (562)
Chemistry: BUN 38, crea 0.8, phos 9.9, K at upper end of normal (5.7), alb 2.5, ALT 739, ALP 489
Lateral/VD thorax: Heart appears rounded on the right - R/O breed variation. No abnormal pulmonary patterns. Extrathoracic structures WNL

A: Seizures - R/O secondary to hypoxic event, other underlying disease process
Comatose
Emaciated - R/O underlying disease vs starvation.
Elevated ALT and ALP - R/O hepatic hypoxic event, underlying hepatitis, other
Mild, nonregenerative anemia - R/O anemia of chronic dz, other

P: IVC placed and blood was drawn for sampling. Administered 200 ml bolus LRS over 15 minutes then placed on 15 ml/hr (maintenance).

Appeared to be having focal seizures with occasional eye roll and opening of eyes. Generalized seizure followed and he was administered 0.5 ml diazepam IV. Intubated and inflated cuff. Maintained this for the evening and no additional sedation was required. Cushing's response noted (bradycardia but MAP of 115). Administered mannitol 26 ml (5.2g) over 10 min. See following....
12/10/2015  INTERNAL   OTHER   T15-802773
9PM TRansported to J. Wilcox home for overnight monitoring and IV fluid support. Erratic respiratory rate but oral MM pink and euripnic. Remained sedated for first few hours. Gave second Cefazolin dose IV at 12A.

12/11 early AM- audible fluid accumulating in ET tube. Pulled tube and found distal portion occluded with thick green/yellow mucous. Respiratory distress developed almost immediately on extubation, so cleared tube and replaced with additional diazepam dosing to facilitate re-intubation. Dog had abundant saliva, nasal discharge, and respiratory gurgling, so D/C IVF around 1AM fearing fluid overload. Had to repeat ET tube removal, clean free of mucous and re-intubate few hours later.

6AM- Dog more alert, responding to voice/name though unable to support self in sternal posture. Urine in bedding. Transported back to PACC.

JW

12/10/2015  INTERNAL   OTHER   T15-802777
12/10 con't.... Following mannitol, heart rate increased slightly. Administered 0.05 mg/kg dose hydromorphone IV for possible pain associated with trauma of being stuck in fence.

Will go home with JW this evening.

KLC

12/11/2015  INTERNAL   OTHER   T15-802781
Transferred care from JW. Administered 0.003 mg/kg dexamethomidine IV to facilitate sedation to keep ET tube in as he was dyspneic without.

Recheck thoracic radiographs: Mild interstitial pattern of the left lung fields but not significantly changed from last night.

Lat/VD abdominal rads: Decreased serosal detail. Bladder full and gas filled intestines.

Continuous monitoring with Cardell and placed back on half maintenance fluid rate (7 ml/hr). Once sedation wore off, removed ET tube and he seemed to be breathing comfortably without increase in effort. Copious, mucoid nasal discharge.

Offered food which he ravenously ate. Moved to kennel and discontinued fluids. He has been very mobile this evening but remains nonambulatory tetraparetic. Dull mentation, present and crisp PLR's, absent menace OS but present OD. Continues to produce mucoid nasal discharge but is able to lick and swallow it away.

KLC
### 12/11/2015
**INTERNAL**
**OTHER**
**TREATMENT NO.** T15-802782

**8AM** - Somewhat responsive to surrounding upon arrival at PACC. With increase activity, dog began paddling and pre-ictal altered mentation (seizure).

**9** - Gave 0.5mls/2.5mg diazepam IV.

**930** - Continued paddling quietly. Gave 1ml propofol over 20min IV. Dog alternated between ictal altered mentation and reactivity to ET-tube.

**10AM** - Gave 0.1ml/0.2mg hydromorphone for sedation. 30min later severe progressive bradycardia/hypotension developed. Restarted IV fluids at 15mls/hr. Reversed with 0.3mls/0.12mg naloxone IV. Tachycardia, hypertension, and hyperexcitability ensued. Eyes central position with responsive pupils.

**11AM** - Coughing and chewing ET tube. Extubated, though respiratory distress (stertor) audible with cyanosis. Re-intubated with slightly larger tube and 0.3mls/1.5mg diazepam IV.

**11:15** Per SAVS neurologist recommendation, gave 5mg DexSP IV (0.1mg/kg). Started slow push of Propofol to maintain sedation. Transferred dog to AZ room for closest monitoring.

---

**12/12/2015**
**INTERNAL**
**OTHER**
**TREATMENT NO.** T15-803090

**Recheck:**

Prior to PE, Diesel had a generalized seizure which responded to 2.5 mg diazepam. Once the diazepam wore off slightly, he was ambulatory with moderate ataxia. Great appetite to the point of borderline polyphagia and drinking.

**Recheck bloodwork:**

CBC: Mild, normocytic, normochromic regenerative anemia (HCT 30%, retic 119k); mild leukocytosis (19k) characterized by a mild neutrophilia (14k) with a left shift and a mild monocytosis (1.6k)

Chemistry: M

**Medication** 0.25 MONITOR OUTSIDE VET MEDS JW 3.00 TIMES/DAY FOR 14.00 DAYS

---

**12/13/2015**
**INTERNAL / OTHER**
**NORMAL**
**TREATMENT NO.** T15-803131

**BAR.**

Ambulating on all 4 limbs with mild paresis of the hindlimbs. Has a wide base stance of the forelimbs when standing to eat.

Eating voraciously when offered canned food.

Mentation is significantly improved than when first presented.

**EENTO;** moderate amt of mucoid nasal discharge from nares. Sneezing.

**P:**

Rx: Doxycycline 50 mg PO q 24 x 7 days.

---

**SLR**

**Medication** 0.50 DOXYCYCLINE JW 1.00 TIMES/DAY FOR 7.00 DAYS

---

**12/14/2015**
**INTERNAL**
**OTHER**
**TREATMENT NO.** T15-803297

wt=11.4# BAR, ambulating very well. *Visual*. Excellent appetite for canned food. Static mod-severe calculus/halitosis. Marked referred upper resp sound (brachycephalic) but pink oral MM and CRT<2sec. Skin trauma to right shoulder - surface intact but skin very thickened- may become devitalized and slough. Only mild mucoid nasal discharge at left nostril.

A: Continue to monitor carefully.

P: Pug rescue may be interested. If not needs dental and neuter once weight gain verified.

**JW**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type/Reason</th>
<th>Type/Reason</th>
<th>Medication</th>
<th>Medication</th>
<th>Medication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/14/2015</td>
<td>INTERNAL</td>
<td>NORMAL</td>
<td>DHPP 02121655A</td>
<td>INB 00541339A</td>
<td>RABIES 107409A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you or your veterinarian have any questions about the medical treatment your pet has received, please contact our Clinic Staff at (520) 724-5939.

For any other questions, please contact the Pima Animal Care Center via:

**MAIL:** 4000 N. Silverbell Rd  
Tucson, AZ 85745  
**PHONE:** (520) 724-5900  
**FAX:** (520) 724-5960
INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-184180

ACO name & Badge: D. Hinte 2068

On December 9, 2015 at 2:19 PM, Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) dispatch received a call concerning an abandoned female dog and her nine puppies at W Davis Pl.

On December 9, 2015 at 2:51 PM, I, Officer Hinte 2068, arrived at W Davis Pl. I met with the complainant Virginia Flores. She stated that the residents had been evicted on 12/1/15. She believes that they had been returning to the property without permission, but had not seen anyone since 12/5/15. She entered the home today to find a female Rottweiler and her nine puppies. There was no food or water available for the dogs.

I observed a female Boxer in the front yard. She appeared healthy and of good body weight. I could not determine if water or food was available from my vantage point. There was a covered front porch with wooden lattice panels on the sides that would suffice as shelter.

Before I could enter the yard or home to examine the dogs and their conditions, an unidentified adult female arrived and began yelling in Spanish. Ms. Flores responded and the exchange quickly became heated. I asked dispatch to contact PCSO to assist in keeping the peace.

PCSO Deputy Garcia #5794 arrived and provided his case number of 151209173. At the same time, the resident and dog owner, Jose Bojorquez arrived. Deputy Garcia spoke with all parties to determine the situation. Mr. Bojorquez stated that although he was evicted on the 1st, he had an agreement with Ms. Flores' son Robert allowing him to leave the dogs on the property until he could secure another place for them. He stated that he had been coming onto the property and caring for the dogs. He stated that he was at the property the night before. He placed the Rottweiler, named Tiffany, and her nine puppies inside to protect them from the cold. He stated that he provided food and water at that time.
Mrs. Flores advised that her son Robert was on his way to clear up the confusion. Officer Garcia and I entered the yard with the permission of Mr. and Mrs. Flores. I photographed the eviction notices clearly posted on the front of the home. I observed a large bucket of water that was mostly full with clean water in the yard. He allowed us inside the house where I observed the mom and puppies in the kitchen area. The puppies, only several weeks old, were on a large filled comforter type blanket. There were two bowls next to them, both of which were empty. The puppies appeared healthy and of good body weight. I observed Tiffany to be slightly thin, but otherwise healthy. I observed her to be actively lactating. There was milk leaking from her teats.

Mrs. Flores' son Robert arrived on the property. He advised that he allowed Mr. Bojorquez to temporarily keep the dogs on the property. He stated that he had been leaving the gate unlocked so that they may care for the dogs. Robert also stated that he felt Mr. Bojorquez had been given plenty of time and needed to remove his dogs at this time.

I met with Mr. Bojorquez and advised him of the violation I had observed. I inquired about licenses for both adult dogs. He stated that neither dog was licensed or currently vaccinated against rabies. I performed a records search and found no record of Mr. Bojorquez or anyone else under the address. I asked for his ID and he complied. I issued Mr. Bojorquez citations in the County for 2x no license and 1x neglect-no water. I explained that I was not issuing no water citations for all nine puppies because I observed Tiffany to still be producing a significant amount of milk and the puppies were still actively nursing. He stated that he understood, signed, and received his copy.

Mr. Bojorquez loaded the animals and some of his belongings into his vehicle. He transported the animals to his grandmother's house at 1600 S Davis Ave. I followed him to the property to ensure that all welfare requirements would be met. I observed the yard to be fully confined by 4-5 foot chain link. There was a large wooden shed, approximately 8x12 feet, which may be used when they are outside. He also brought with him the large five gallon bucket and an extra-large airline-type carrier. He advised that he would put blankets inside the carrier inside of the shed to provide warmth for Tiffany and her puppies. I provided him with a law brochure and informed him how to license Tiffany and Canela. He stated that he understood.

Officer's Signature: [Signature] Date: 12/11/15
**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**

Mario Alberto Pesquera

**SUSPECT’S ADDRESS**

4 S Clark Ave

**SUSPECT’S BUSINESS ADDRESS**


**SEX**  M 215  **WEIGHT**  5'10"  **HEIGHT**  **EYES**  GRN  **HAIR**  BN  **ORIGIN**  DOB  SSN

**LOCATION OF INCIDENT**

S Clark Ave

**DATE AND TIME REPORTED**

12/12/15 / 1035

**DATE AND TIME OCCURRED**

12/12/15 / 1037

**FOOD**  WATER  SHELTER  INJURED/MARRIAGE  VENTILATION  ABANDONED  TIEOUT  BEATEN  WASTE  OTHER

**VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME**

Officer D. Hinte 2068

**VICTIM’S ADDRESS**

Pima Animal Care Center

**VICTIM’S BUSINESS ADDRESS**

4000 N Silverbell Rd

**NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE**

(F applicable)

**ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM**

**RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM**

**PHONE NUMBER**

**LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS**

**CLINIC’S ADDRESS**

**QUARANTINE**

10 15 45 160 0  

**3RD PARTY CITATIONS**

**CITING ACCO**

D. Tenkate 1911

**PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS**

**PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER**

**OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS**

**REVIEWED BY**

12-16-15

**REVIEW BY**

DFR 1911

**CODE/TOBB VIOLATED**

4-32(E)(2)

**CITATIONS/NUMBERS**

74889 A

**BREED/DESCRIPTION**

Boxer

**VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE**

**VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL**

**ANIMAL’S NAME**

Nico

**COLOR**

Brown/white

**SEX**

M

**AGE**

2.5yr

**LICENSE #**

**VX CERTIFICATE #**

OK

**CNO**

**ANIMAL ID#**

A545499

**WITNESS 1**

M  F

**DOB**

**ADDRESS**

**RESIDENCE PHONE #**

**BUSINESS PHONE #**

**WITNESS 2**

M  F

**DOB**

**ADDRESS**

**RESIDENCE PHONE #**

**BUSINESS PHONE #**

**WITNESS 3**

M  F

**DOB**

**ADDRESS**

**RESIDENCE PHONE #**

**BUSINESS PHONE #**

**WITNESS 4**

M  F

**DOB**

**ADDRESS**

**RESIDENCE PHONE #**

**BUSINESS PHONE #**
INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-184334

ACO name & Badge: D. Hinte 2068

On December 12, 2015 at 10:37, I, Officer Hinte 2068, was patrolling the block of S Clark Ave for a stray aggressive dog. While patrolling the area, I observed a large male boxer on a tie-out at S Clark Ave. The front gate was left open. The dog was under the carport and had water within reach. The tie-out was approximately 6-8 feet in length and was anchored to the iron bars which covered a nearby window. I knocked on the front and side door several times. I also loudly announced my presence and the fact that the dog would be impounded if no contact was made. A neighbor came outside and advised me that the owner was at work.

I impounded the dog off the tie-out without incident. I posted a notice on the front door advising that tie-outs are prohibited and the dog was impounded. I left the tie out on the ground under the carport.

On December 12, 2015 at 4:15 PM, Supervisor Tenkate 1911 met with the dog owner Mario Pesqueira, who resides at S Clark Ave, when he came to redeem his dog at the Pima Animal Care Center. She spoke to Mr. Pesqueira about tie outs being illegal and he said his 2.5 year old Boxer Nico is tied out every day. He explained his neighbor does not have fencing and that leaves part of his yard open. He ties out Nico, for half an hour, when he takes his wife to work and comes right back home. Supervisor Tenkate explained the Tie Out Law again and he was provided with a copy of the laws, an alternative to tie out pamphlet and advised to either fence the yard or use a kennel run. Supervisor Tenkate also explained that if Nico is found tied out again the dog will be impounded and held for bond. Mr. Pesqueira said Nico is an inside only dog and said he will be leaving him inside the home whenever he leaves.

Mr. Pesqueira provided Supervisor Tenkate with his Arizona driver's license for identification. He signed and received a copy of citation #74889 A for Neglect Tie Out. He is aware of his court date, time and location.

Officer's Signature: [Signature] Date: 12/16/15
INVESTIGATION REPORT

Pima County Health Department
Pima Animal Care Center
4000 N Silverbell Rd
Tucson, Arizona 85750
Phone: (520) 724-5900
Fax: (520) 724-5900
www.pimanimalcare.org

Suspect
HAZEL BELINDA AGUILAR

Suspect's Address
E SPEEDWAY BLVD

Zip 857 CITY TUCSON STATE AZ RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER

ACO BADGE NUMBER COMPLAINT NUMBER
C. YOUNG 1908 A15-184698

Does this incident require victim request for waiver of rights? Yes ☐ No ☐

Victim/Complaintant Name DR. J. WILCOX, DVM

Suspect's Business Address
UNEMPLOYED

Zip CITY STATE BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER

DOB States OTHER

Does this incident require victim request for waiver of rights? Yes ☐ No ☐

Victim's Address
4000 N SILVERBELL RD

Zip CITY FILE TUCSON STATEAZ

Very Care

Location of Incident
4000 N SILVERBELL RD

Food, Water, Shelter, Ventilation, Abandoned, Tied Out, Beaten, Waste, Other (Explain)

Other (Explain)

Neglect-Vet Care

I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case.

I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.

Victim's Business Address

Name of Lawful Representative (If Applicable)

Address and Phone Number Same as Victim

Relationship to Victim

Address and Phone Number

Relationship to Victim

Address and Phone Number

Lawful Representative Address

Clinic's Address

3rd Party Citations

Citing ACO C. YOUNG 1908

Veterinary Clinic

Phone Number

Guarantor Date

Other Additional Reports

Victim or Lawful Representative Signature

Cited/Died Violated

4-3 (1), 4-3 (2)(D)

Citing Number/Numbers

73926 A, B

Breed/Description

Victim or Owner Animals

Animal's Name Color Sex Age Tag Color License # Vet Certificate # Cond Animal ID

Bull Maffish

Victim Owner

Victim Owner

Victim Owner

Victim Owner

Victim Owner

Victim Owner

Victim Owner

Victim Owner

Witness 1

STEPHANIE SCHELBE

DOB ADDRESS RESIDENCE PHONE

4000 N SILVERBELL RD

Witness 2

D. WINDAUER #1904

DOB ADDRESS RESIDENCE PHONE

4000 N SILVERBELL RD

Witness 3

DOB ADDRESS RESIDENCE PHONE

Witness 4

DOB ADDRESS RESIDENCE PHONE

Witness 5

DOB ADDRESS RESIDENCE PHONE

Witness 6

DOB ADDRESS RESIDENCE PHONE

Witness 7

DOB ADDRESS RESIDENCE PHONE

Witness 8

DOB ADDRESS RESIDENCE PHONE
INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-184698
ACO Name & Badge #: C. YOUNG 1908

On December 17, 2015 at approximately 13:30 hours Terry Aguilar of E Speedway Blvd # arrived at the Pima Animal Care Center with his large Bull Mastiff named "Lyra". Lyra was severely ill with a visible skin condition resulting in almost total hair loss, an open sore on one elbow, skin tags, weight loss and the dog was brought in lateral and was unable to stand or move. Mr Aguilar requested euthanasia for Lyra.

The intake Animal Care Tech, Stephanie Schelble, completed an intake questionnaire with Mr Aguilar where he admitted that the dog began losing weight six months ago but they could not afford a Vet and at 03:00 this morning the dog vomited, laid down and couldn’t get up so they decided to have the dog euthanized. Mr. Aguilar also admitted to the Animal Care Tech that the dog was last seen by a Veterinarian a year ago for skin issues. Mr. Aguilar’s dog was examined by Doctor J. Wilcox and euthanized. Due to the dog’s condition, Dr. Wilcox requested that criminal citations be issued to Mr. Aguilar for Animal Cruelty and Neglect.

Officer D. Windauer #1984 was contacted and asked to come and observe the dog’s condition. Officer Windauer took pictures of the deceased animal and noted the skin tags, swelling on rear legs, hair loss, poor condition of teeth and an open sore on the dog’s front elbow that was worn thru the skin. Officer Windauer then spoke with Supervisor D. Tenkate #1911 and it was agreed that citations should be issued to the dog owner for failure to provide Veterinarian care.

At approximately 15:55 hours on December 17, 2015 I, Officer C. Young #1908, arrived at E Speedway Blvd. to meet with Terry Aguilar. Mr Aguilar was not home but I was able to meet with Mrs Aguilar. I explained the reason for my visit and Mrs. Aguilar was very cooperative and provided her Arizona Drivers License for identification. I asked when the last time Lyra was taken to a Vet Clinic and she said she could not remember exactly but she does have records. I asked to see them, and she showed me an invoice from Septmeber 2013 showing that Lyra was treated for a skin condition. She was given a shampoo and medication. Mrs Aguilar said she was sure that Lyra was seen by a Veterinarian more recently but did not have proof. I issued citations as requested by Dr Wilcox. Mrs Aguilar signed the citation and accepted her copy. I then provided her with her court date and time. C. Young 1908

Officer’s Signature: [Signature]

Date: 12/18/15
### Pima Animal Care Center

**K15-207335**

### MEDICAL HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Death Date</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lyra</td>
<td>A232634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Bull</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Fawn</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>03/25/2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 YRS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VACCINATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vaccination</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/17/2015</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Obtunded at intake. BCS 2/9 Marked edema both hindlimbs. Lichenification and alopecia over limbs, ventrum. Full thickness decubital ulcer on left elbow. OK to proceed with PTS. Owner should be cited for failure to provide vet care or failure to provide humane euthanasia months ago. JW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SPAY/NEUTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T15-805382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you or your veterinarian have any questions about the medical treatment your pet has received, please contact our Clinic Staff at (520) 724-5939.

For any other questions, please contact the Pima Animal Care Center via:

**MAIL:** 4000 N. Silverbell Rd
Tucson, AZ 85745

**PHONE:** (520) 724-5900
**FAX:** (520) 724-5960

12/31/2015
**INVESTIGATION REPORT**

Pima County Health Department
Pima Animal Care Center
4000 N Silverbell Rd.
Tucson, Arizona 85745
Phone: (520) 243-5900
Fax: (520) 243-5990
www.pimaanimalcare.org

**SUBJECT**

Michael Rick Beach

**SUBJECT'S ADDRESS**

Gadwall Dr.

**ACO NAME / BADGE #**

D. Hinte 2068

D. Windauer 1984

**COMPLAINT NUMBER**

A15-184807

**DATE AND TIME REPORTED**

12/19/15 / 16:36

**DATE AND TIME OCCURRED**

12/19/15 / 15:31

**ZIP**

8565

**CITY**

Marana

**STATE**

AZ

**RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER**

520-

**ZIP**

85745

**CITY**

Tucson

**STATE**

AZ

**BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER**


**SEX**

M

**WEIGHT**

180

**HEIGHT**

6'0"'

**EYES**

HAZ

**HAIR COLOR**

BRO

**ORIGIN**

( )

**DOB**

( )

**SSN**

( )

**LOCATION OF INCIDENT**

11 N Gadwall Dr.

**FOOD**

WATER

**SHELTER**

INJURED/ILL

**VENTILATION**

ABANDONED

**TIEOUT**

BEATEN

**WASTE**

OTHER

**I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case**

☑

**I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case**

☐

**REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B) and § 13-396 (B)**

☐

**NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (if applicable)**

D.O.B.

Residence Phone No.

Business Phone No.

Victim's Address

Pima Animal Care Center

Victim's Business Address

4000 N Silverbell Rd.

Follow Up Request

☑

Violations

☑

Bite Severity:

Treated By

Phone Number

Date Quarantined

PACC

Vet

Home

Release Date

FQT

UQT

CLINIC'S ADDRESS

QUARANTINE

☑

Third Party Citations

Citing ACO

D. Hinte 2068

Previous Violations

☑

Previous Case Number

☑

Other Additional Reports

☑

Reviewed by 12-22-15

D.K. 11

**BREED/DESCRIPTION**

Victim or Owner Animal

**ANIMAL'S NAME**

**COLOR**

**SEX**

**AGE**

**LICENSE #**

**VX Certificate #**

**CNO#**

**ANIMAL ID#**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BID</th>
<th>Victim or Owner</th>
<th>Animal's Name</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>License #</th>
<th>VX Certificate #</th>
<th>CNO#</th>
<th>Animal ID#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BULL</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Black/white</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5yr</td>
<td>CITED</td>
<td>CITED</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>A544287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BULL</td>
<td>Abby</td>
<td>Blue/white</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7yr</td>
<td>CITED</td>
<td>CITED</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>A544284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BULL</td>
<td>Elsa</td>
<td>White/white</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8mo</td>
<td>CITED</td>
<td>CITED</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>A544283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BULL</td>
<td>Meika</td>
<td>White/brown</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8mo</td>
<td>CITED</td>
<td>CITED</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>A544288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-184807

ACO name & Badge: D. Hinten 2068

On December 19, 2015 at 4:36 PM, Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) dispatch received a call for assistance from Marana Police Department (MPD) regarding an aggressive dog at large.

On December 19, 2015 at 5:31 PM, I, Officer Hinten 2068, arrived at N Gadwall Dr. I met with Marana PD Officer Samorano #443 who provided his case number of 1512-0693. I observed a black and white Pitbull in the yard at . Officer Samorano stated that the dog had jumped into the yard from its own yard at 12260. He also stated that the complainant/resident of had advised it was not the first time one of the neighbor's dogs had jumped into their yard. I entered the yard to impound the dog. As I approached the dog, it ran towards the south side of the yard. The dog then turned around, ran northbound past me, and jumped the 5 foot wall back into its own yard. There were three other large Pitbulls in the backyard of , one blue/white and two white/brown. While looking into the backyard at from the yard of , I observed the dogs jump up and get their head over the shorter 4 foot section of the fence near the gate. I could not see water or adequate shelter from my vantage point.

I met with the complainant David Wood. He stated that this was the third time one of the neighbor's dogs had jumped the fence into his backyard. The first incident occurred approximately 1.5 months prior. The blue and white Pitbull jumped the fence into their yard. They were able to corral their dogs inside almost immediately without incident. An adult female came to retrieve the dog and asked if she had "done anything" when she jumped the fence. The second incident occurred on Saturday, 11/28/15. Mr. Wood's children were home alone playing in the backyard when one of the dog's jumped the fence. They believe it was also the blue and white dog on this occasion. Marana PD was called on this day regarding the leash law violation. Officer Samorano provided this case number for me: 1512-0016. I contacted Supervisor Tenkate 1911. I advised her of my observations as well as the previously reported violations of leash law. I was instructed to request assistance from a second officer and impound all four dogs for inadequate confinement. I asked dispatch for assistance and was informed via radio that a second officer was en route.
While waiting for assistance, I was able to impound two of the friendly dogs without incident. The female white/brown and the female blue/white came to the gate and jumped up, placing their front paws near the top of the gate. I leashed them one at a time over the gate and walked them out of the yard. They were placed in the truck kennel without incident. There were two dogs remaining in the yard, the black/white dog that was initially at large, and a second white/brown dog. I waited for assistance to impound due to their ability to jump the fence.

Officer Windauer 1984 arrived to assist. We entered the yard together. Marana PD stood watch at the gate in an attempt to prevent the dogs from jumping out of the yard. We tried to call to the dogs and lure them with food, but were unsuccessful. As we approached the dogs on the north side of the yard, they both ran to the corner. The white/brown dog tried to jump the fence but Officer Windauer was able to capture it using the snare pole. While transporting the dog to the truck from the backyard, the dog bit Officer Windauer’s snare pole repeatedly. Once in the truck kennel, Officer Windauer observed blood originating from the dog’s mouth.

While she was taking the dog to the truck, I stayed in the yard with the remaining black/white dog. I backed away to prevent the dog from feeling pressured to jump the fence. I photographed the yard to document the lack of water and adequate shelter as well as the presence of excessive animal waste. The dog ran around to the south side of the yard as I heard the MPD Officer yell that he had jumped the fence. I exited the yard and got into my truck to follow the dog. I drove around the block but did not observe the dog. I returned to the address where MPD advised me that the dog had jumped into the backyard at W Coppertail. At this same time, the dog owner returned home. Officer Windauer and I responded to W Coppertail. Officer Windauer observed the dog in question hiding underneath a trampoline. Both gates to the yard were padlocked and the resident was not answering the door. After several minutes, the owner was able to call the dog to jump back over the fence to him. I asked the man to place the dog securely inside the home so that we may discuss the night’s events. During this time, I contacted Supervisor Tenkate to discuss whether the dogs would be held for inadequate confinement or released to the owner. She stated that the dogs may be released to the owner under the condition that they are kept inside until the confinement is secure and only allowed outside under direct supervision.

I met with Michael Beach, who identified himself as the co-owner of all four dogs, along with his fiancée Danielle Cooper. He advised that Ms. Cooper would not be home for at least one hour. I informed him of the reason I had responded to his address. I informed him that I had observed the black and white dog, now identified as 5yo Max, jump the fence several times. Mr. Beach stated that he was aware of the issue and had been trying to get to a home improvement store to purchase the materials necessary to improve the fence line. He stated that he could not keep the dogs inside the home in the mean time because they would “pee all over his floor all day.”
I informed Mr. Beach that his other three dogs had been impounded due to the inadequate confinement. I also informed him that I did not observe any water or shelter available for the dogs. He stated that he has water inside the home for the dogs. I informed him that water must be available at all times. He stated that he leaves the sliding glass door open so that they may go in and out as they please. I informed him that the door was closed the entire time that I was present. He stated that the dogs have the ability to open and close the sliding glass door, so they could have gone inside the home for water or shelter at any time. I informed him that I did not observe the door to be open at any time or the dogs attempt to open the door.

I inquired about the names, ages, vaccinations, and licenses for all dogs. He stated that the blue/white is 7 yo Abbey, the white with small brown patches is 8 month old Elsa, and the white with larger brown patches is 8 month old Meika. He stated that all four dogs are current on rabies vaccinations, but he was unaware that the dogs had to be licensed. Mr. Beach went inside the home to locate the vaccination records. He came back with two booklets for Meika and Elsa showing that they received DHPP vaccinations. I could not find any indication of a rabies vaccination in the booklet and informed Mr. Beach of this fact. He stated that he had the records, but would need more time to locate them.

I explained to Mr. Beach that the dogs will be released to him only if he is able to keep them confined somewhere other than the yard until it is secure. He stated that he could keep them inside until he finds a solution for the confinement. I informed him that I had observed Max easily jump the 5 foot wall and that raising the fence line may or may not solve the problem. We discussed covered kennel runs, which he seemed open to trying. I emphasized that the dogs may not be in the yard without direct supervision until the repairs are made. He stated that he understood.

Officer Windauer and I explained that Meika had bitten the snare pole repeatedly while being impounded. We allowed him to remove her from the truck kennel and carry her inside the home while I completed the citations. Mr. Beach inquired about who would pay for veterinary care, if needed. I informed him that he was responsible as the dog owner.

I performed a records search and found no dogs licensed to Mr. Beach or Ms. Cooper. Before completing the citations, I asked Mr. Beach about Meika’s condition. He stated that she was “pretty bad.” I asked if I could observe her to determine whether or not she would need vet care and how soon she may need it. He allowed me inside the home to observe Meika. I observed the left side of her mouth to be swollen as if she had a “fat lip.” I could not take a photograph as she was fearful and would not come close to me and/or stay still. She was not actively bleeding at that time, though there was blood on her fur and the sidewalk where she was impounded. We discussed that she may need to see a vet to prevent infection. At this time, Mr. Beach’s fiancée Danielle Cooper entered the home. She began to examine Meika as I asked Mr. Beach to step outside with me to complete the citations.
We returned to the front yard with Officer Windauer and MPD Officer Samorano. Officer Samorano informed me that he had already issued a citation for the leash law violation we had observed. I issued Mr. Beach citations in Marana for 4x neglect – no water, 4x no license, and 4x no rabies vaccination. I explained his court date, time, and location. He stated that he understood, signed, and received his copy.

Ms. Cooper came outside appearing very upset. She asked who would pay for Meika’s vet care. I informed her that she and Mr. Beach are responsible for any vet costs as the owners. She became more irate, stating that we shouldn’t be “ripping [her] dog’s face open.” I informed her that no such thing happened. I explained that the dog had bitten the snare pole during impoundment. She began to walk back towards the house, but yelled back that she “comes from money” and would be getting a lawyer.

I issued Mr. Beach a premise inspection for vet care on Meika by 12/21/15. I also noted on the premise inspection that water, shelter, confinement and waste were unsatisfactory. I explained the improvements that must be made in each area. He stated that he understood, signed, and received his copy.
I returned the remaining two dog’s to Mr. Beach’s custody.

Officer's Signature: 

Date: 12/22/15
- **Victim/Complainant Name:** M. Ganz 2051/C. Young 1908
- **Date of Birth:**
- **Residence Phone:** 520-724-5900
- **Street Address:** 4000 N Silverbell Rd
- **City:** Tucson
- **State:** Az
- **Zip:** 85745
- **Other Agency Case #:**
- **Other:**
- **Violation:** 4-3(2)(B) neglect no water, 4-3(2)(C) neglect no shelter
- **Citation #:** 74911 A-B
- **License #:** L15-262839
- **Condition:** Normal
- **Animal ID #:** A544178
- **Veterinarian:**
- **Witnesses:**
  - **Witness 1:**
  - **Witness 2:**
  - **Witness 3:**
  - **Witness 4:**
INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-184744

ACO Name & Badge: S. Adkins 1961

On 12-18-15 at approximately 16:49 hours Officer Glanz #2651 and Officer Young #1908 arrived at E 4th Street regarding a neglect complaint. Officer Glanz and Officer Young observed a male black and brown German Shep in an enclosed yard to the side of the home. The dog appeared to be in good weight and there were empty dog food cans outside the yard. Officer Glanz knocked on the front door and rang the doorbell, but didn’t receive an answer. Officer Young #1908 entered the yard and observed that the dog had no water or shelter. Officer Young offered the dog water which he readily drank. The dog was impounded without incident for its continued wellbeing. Officer Glanz posted a notice on the front door.

On 12-20-15 at 14:40 I, Officer Adkins 1961 met with dog owner Yulong Jiang at Pima County Animal Care Center when he came to redeem his dog. I explained why the dog was impounded and then issued citation 74911 A-B for neglect no water and no shelter on Officer Glanz photos and memo. Mr Jiang signed and received a copy of the citation with the court date, time, and location. Mr Jiang stated to me he would be keeping his dog inside his home and only letting the dog out into the yard when he is home to go to the bathroom. Mr Jiang redeemed his dog.

Officer’s Signature: [Signature]

Date: 12/24/15
**INVESTIGATION REPORT**

**Pima County Health Department**

**Pima Animal Care Center**

4000 N. Silverbell Rd.

Tucson, Arizona 85745

Phone: (520) 243-5900

Fax: (520) 243-5980

www.pimaanimalcare.org

---

**SUSPECT**

ABLE RIVAS VILLALOBOS

**Breed/Description**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOXER MIX</th>
<th>CHICO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SEX**

M

**WEIGHT**

160

**HEIGHT**

5-8

**EYES**

BR

**Hair**

BLK

**DOB**


**Social Security Number**


**Suspect's Business Address**

TUCSON

STATE

AZ

ZIP

85745

**Assistance Phone Number**


**DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS?**

YES [x] NO [ ]

---

**Victim/Complainant Name**

OFFICER K. WALTON #1925

**Victim's Address**

4000 N. SILVERBELL

**City**

TUCSON

**State**

AZ

**Zip**

85745

---

**Name of Lawful Representative (if applicable)**

DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED

**DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER**


**Other Agency Case #**

[ ] SHERIFF DEPT [ ] TUCSON POLICE

[ ] FIRE [ ] OTHER:

**Follow Up Request**

[ ] SO [ ] TPD

[ ] OTHER:

---

**Address and Phone Number Same as Victim**

[ ] NO

[ ] YES

---

**Relationship to Victim**

PHONE NUMBER

**Veterinarian**

**Address**

**City**

**State**

**Zip**

---

**Victim or Lawful Representative Signature**

CODE/ORDER VIOLATED

4-3(2)(D)

CITATIONS/NUMBERS

4-3046

---

**Breed/Description**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOXER MIX</th>
<th>CHICO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Animal's Name**

CHICO

**Color**

WHT/BLK

**Sex**

M

**Age**

9y

**License #**

ILL

**Condition**

A544608

---

**Witness 1**

[ ] M [ ] F

DOB

ADDRESS

RESIDENCE PHONE #

BUSINESS PHONE #

---

**Witness 2**

[ ] M [ ] F

DOB

ADDRESS

RESIDENCE PHONE #

BUSINESS PHONE #

---

**Witness 3**

[ ] M [ ] F

DOB

ADDRESS

RESIDENCE PHONE #

BUSINESS PHONE #

---

**Witness 4**

[ ] M [ ] F

DOB

ADDRESS

RESIDENCE PHONE #

BUSINESS PHONE #

---

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

---

**REVIEWED BY**

GNY/24/15

**BOND**

[ ] YES [ ] NO
INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-184937
ACO Name & Badge: K. Walton #1925

On December 22nd 2015 at 1319 hours, I, Officer K. Walton #1925, arrived at the residence of S. Amigo regarding a welfare case.

The case was regarding a dog with sores on its body and foul smelling. I met with the owner Abel Rivas Villalobos, and a male which I believe was his son. They showed me the dog, which appeared to be a white Boxer mix with black spots. The dog had a growth on his nose, a large red swollen mass with green discharge and some blood on the stomach pelvic area and an open wound on front left leg. In my experience, it appeared to me the growths might be possible cancer. He advised me 2 stray dogs got into his yard and attacked his dog, and he thought the injuries were from that and did not get vet care due to being unemployed. He checked into having the dog euthanized, but places charged too much. The dog had shelter, shade, water, and was in good weight for its age of 9+ years. He has had the dog since it was a puppy, and believes the last time the dog was seen at a vets office was when it younger to get shots. I advised him he could sign the dog over to Pima animal care center with fees waived and the dog would be evaluated, but he would be cited for neglect vet care Per Supervisor Tenkate. The son translated for me just in case he did not understand things I said. He signed the dog over and received his citation. His identification stated Villalobos was his last name, but he stated Rivas was his last name. 1925
**Pima Animal Care Center**

**MEDICAL HISTORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>CHICO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BREED</td>
<td>BOXER MIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOR</td>
<td>WHITE / BLACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>MALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICROCHIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ANIMAL ID  | A544608     |
| WEIGHT     | UNKNOWN     |
| ESTIMATED DATE OF BIRTH | 12/22/2006 |
| AGE        | 9 YRS       |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VACCINATIONS</th>
<th>SPAY/NEUTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE ORDERED</td>
<td>INTERNAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREATMENT NO</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE VISIT TYPE COMPLETED</td>
<td>T15-808008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12/22/2015

Multilobulated 2cm pedunculated pink skin tumor stemming from margin of right nasal philtrum. Large, coalescing bleeding skin tumors over ventral abdomen and prepuce. Due to size and behavior, suspect masses are neoplastic/aggressive and inoperable due size. OK to proceed with PTS. Recommend citations for failure to provide timely vet care.

JW

---

If you or your veterinarian have any questions about the medical treatment your pet has received, please contact our Clinic Staff at (520) 724-5939.

For any other questions, please contact the Pima Animal Care Center via:

**MAIL:**
4000 N. Silverbell Rd
Tucson, AZ 85745

**PHONE:**
(520) 724-5900

**FAX:**
(520) 724-5960
**INVESTIGATION REPORT**

Pima County Health Department
Pima Animal Care Center
4000 N. Silverbell Rd
Tucson, Arizona 85745
Phone: (520) 791-5600
Fax: (520) 791-5500
www.pimaanimalcare.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUSPECT</th>
<th>Adelita Maciel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUSPECT'S ADDRESS</strong></td>
<td>W. Guy St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP</td>
<td>857.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER</td>
<td>520-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DRIVERS LICENSE</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEX</strong></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEIGHT</strong></td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEIGHT</strong></td>
<td>5-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EYES</strong></td>
<td>BRN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAIR COLOR</strong></td>
<td>BRN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORIGIN</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOB</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SSN</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOCATION OF INCIDENT**

| I: W. Guy St |

**DATE AND TIME OCCURRED**

| 12/26/15 / 1018 |

**FOOD**

| WATER |

**SHelter**

| INJURED/DISEASED |

**VENTILATION**

| ABANDONED |

**TIEOUT**

| BEATEN |

**WASTE**

| OTHER (EXPLAIN) |

| ☑ |

**NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE**

| (IF APPLICABLE) |

| YES | NO |

**ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM**

| VET CLINIC |

| PHONE NUMBER |

| OWNER NUMBERS OF VICTIM |

| ☑ |

**RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM**

| PHONE NUMBER |

**LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS**

| CLINIC'S ADDRESS |

| QUARANTINE |

| ☑ |

| PRA HEAD |

| ☑ |

**Victim or Lawful Representative Signature**

| CODE/ORD VIOLATED |

| 6.04.070, 6.04.110(B)(2), 6.04.110(B)(5) |

| CITATIONS/NUMBERS |

| 74720 |

**BREED/DESCRIPTION**

| VICTIM or OWNER ANIMAL |

| Rottweiler Mix |

| Owner |

| Victim |

| Rajah |

| Brindie |

| M |

| 1yr |

| N/A |

| Labrador Retriever |

| Owner |

| Victim |

| Prieta |

| Black |

| F |

| 8yr |

| 13-108149 |

| A544914 |

| N |

| A256305 |

| N |

**WITNESS 1**

| M |

| F |

| DOB |

| ADDRESS |

| RESIDENCE PHONE # |

| BUSINESS PHONE # |

**WITNESS 2**

| M |

| F |

| DOB |

| ADDRESS |

| RESIDENCE PHONE # |

| BUSINESS PHONE # |

**WITNESS 3**

| M |

| F |

| DOB |

| ADDRESS |

| RESIDENCE PHONE # |

| BUSINESS PHONE # |

**WITNESS 4**

| M |

| F |

| DOB |

| ADDRESS |

| RESIDENCE PHONE # |

| BUSINESS PHONE # |
INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-185124

ACO name & Badge: C. Martinez #2067

On December 26, 2015 at approximately 1200 hours I, Officer Martinez #2067 arrived at W. Guy St in regards to a complaint of a dog on a tie out. Upon my arrival I knocked on the door of the trailer and was met by Adelita Maciel. I informed her of the complaint and why I was there. She admitted to having her Dog, Rajah, on a tie out because he is a jumper and had been getting out. I asked to see him and she walked me to her back yard. I saw a large Brindle dog tied to a tree with a short chain that was approximately 2-3 feet. There was a black container upside down, and a dog bed nearby. The black container wasn’t in reach of the dog. I asked about water and Ms. Maciel stated the black container was for his water but that he plays with the bowl and must have tipped it over. I asked when the last time they had checked on the dog was and she stated it had been last night. I could hear another dog barking and asked if that was another dog on a tie out and she showed me over to where the other dog was being housed. I saw a black Lab in a confined area with shade, shelter and water. I advised her that tie outs are illegal and then asked about rabies vaccine and license status. She stated she thought both her dogs were current. I checked Chameleon but found her black lab had an expired license and Rajah was not listed. While I was checking license status she and her son put Rajah in the confined area with the other dog. Rajah went straight for the water and began to drink for a couple minutes. I gave some recommendations such as looking into a no jump harness.

I asked Ms. Maciel for her ID as I was going to have to issue citations.
I issued citations to Ms. Maciel into county court for neglect- tie out, neglect- no water for Rajah and no license for both dogs. Citations were discussed, signed and she received her copy along with her ID.

Officer’s Signature: C. Martinez #2067

Date: 12/27/15
On 11/15/2015 at around 10:36 am, Pima Animal Care Center received a phone call stating that 4 pit bulls at Morris Blvd were kept on tie outs without water or shelter. The dogs looked sick. On 12/12/215 at around 03:07 pm, I, Pima Animal Care Officer Attebery, 1929, arrived at Morris Blvd for a welfare check on the dogs. As I approached enclosed front yard, I noted a grey/white pit bull dog on the south west Side of property with about a 4’ nylon leash attached to its collar and other end attached to piece of wood stuck in ground. Bowls were overturned next to dog and no water was seen. Where dog was tied was a piece of plywood on top of other items. Dog appeared healthy and well fed. I went to the front door and met with Margie Amarillas who lives here. Margie claimed to own 4 pit bulls as well as a Pomeranian mix dog. I explained purpose of visit and filled out a welfare inspection form for the dogs. There were 3 Pomeranian mix dogs running loose inside the house. One belonged to Margie and the other 2 belonged to Margie Amarillas’ mother, Margaret Amarillas, who also resides here. Pomeranian mix dogs were alert and healthy. Dogs had access to potable water in a small bowl in kitchen area. Also inside house was a red/white female pit bull dog inside a wire cage carrier with no water. Pit bull dog looked healthy and alert. In enclosed back yard was a white/tan female pit bull. Pit bull had access to smaller fenced area on south east side that had a 4th pit bull, red/white male, on a cloth type rope about 4’ long attached to its collar and other end tied to fence. Both dogs looked alert and healthy. Dogs had a 5 gallon bucket with no water and a 3 sided structure with a dirt floor. After discussing welfare violations and citations associated with the violations, Margie opted to sign over ownership of 3 of the pit bull dogs. The forth pit bull dog, the grey/white dog, in the front yard she decided to keep. Per Margie, a friend brought dog over about 2 months ago and she has been caring for the animal. Dog was brought into the house and citations issued for welfare violations for that dog. Margie was also cited for no license/ no rabies shots on her dogs. Margie also signed welfare premise inspection form that listed violations found. Form also noted that a Pima Animal Care Officer would return in 7 days to ensure compliance with the welfare laws.

Summary

Three animals were relinquished to PACC. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. One dog was euthanized due to aggression, second dog was adopted, third dog is pending an outcome. A recheck was found in compliance.

Committee Member Comments/ Request for Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T. Barrick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Emptage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Hubbard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Jacobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Kaluzniacki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Marshall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Mendelsohn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Neumann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. O’Donnell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Schwerin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tucson Rep.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What happened with the other dog taken to PACC?
On December 10, 2015 at 1:34PM, Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) dispatch received a call from Oro Valley Police Department (OVPD) requesting assistance with a dog in immediate distress. On December 10, 2015 at 2:41 PM, I, Officer Hinte 2068, arrived at Oracle Rd. I met with staff member Russell and OVPD Officer Hallberg #V165 who had responded under OVPD case number V15120530. She stated that she arrived and found the dog's head stuck in the several inch gap at the bottom of the patio wall. She found the dog to be in immediate distress and asked the apartment staff to allow access to the unit under exigent circumstances. Staff member Russell advised that a maintenance technician named Richard opened the unit for Officer Hallberg. Once inside, Officer Hallberg was able to remove the dog's head from the gap. She observed no water or shelter on the patio. There was a small bowl with minimal food and a second empty small bowl. Officer Hallberg placed the dog just inside the sliding glass door to provide some shade. She also filled the empty bowl with water. Upon my arrival, I observed the black Pug lying laterally near the sliding glass door with the bowl of water next to him. The dog’s breathing was labored. He made no attempt to move at any point while I was present. He would open his eyes on occasion but appeared to be ultimately unresponsive. There appeared to be vomit covering his mouth and nose. His was severely emaciated. I could clearly see all rib bones, hip bones, and spine through his coat. I performed a skin tent test and observed the skin remain elevated for several seconds, indicating the dog may be dehydrated to some extent. I observed and photographed the patio where the dog was originally located. There was no adequate shelter available for the dog. There was one blanket on the floor of the patio. There was an accumulation of at least 2-3 days of dried animal waste on the floor. There was a small amount of food, approximately \( \frac{1}{4} \) cup, in a ceramic bowl. Per Officer Hallberg, there was a second bowl outside that was empty and dry, however, she filled it with water before my arrival. Officer Hallberg provided the owner information as follows: Renee Patrie, Clayton Zimmer DOB 04/18/91. Both individuals live in unit #, but Ms. Patrie claimed ownership of the dog. Officer Hallberg advised that she had spoken to the owner and inquired about the dog's condition. The owner reportedly told her that the dog was left on the patio at 6:00 PM the night before and was in good condition. The owner stated she was driving back to Tucson from Phoenix at the time of the phone call. Officer Hallberg advised her that she had made entry into the apartment and the dog would be impounded for its continued well-being. I left a notice advising of impound on the kitchen counter of the apartment. I returned to the truck for a carrier to transport the dog, named Diesel. When I returned, Officer Hallberg advised that Diesel had a long and violent seizure immediately after I exited the apartment. I carefully loaded Diesel into the carrier and then into the truck. Once at PACC, I immediately brought the dog to the treatment staff. Dr. Carlson and her medical staff drew blood and provided fluids, as well as an overall examination. Dr. Carlson described the dog's body condition/weight as a 2 out of 9 (5 being ideal). She also advised that results of the blood tests showed the dog was moderately malnourished and dehydrated. She stated that the dog’s emaciated state would have occurred over at least three weeks, not one day as the owner had reported to Officer Hallberg. On December 10, 2015 at 6:30 PM, I, Officer Hinte 2068, met with the owner Renee Patrie at PACC when she came to redeem her dog Diesel. I explained the reason for impound and Diesel's current condition. I inquired about Diesel's weight, as I found him to be emaciated. Ms. Patrie stated that she had purchased an extra-large bag of the "cheapest food sold at Walmart." She stated that she noticed Diesel began losing weight three to four
weeks prior. She advised that four to five days before Diesel was impounded, she began feeding a more expensive brand of kibble supplemented with steak, eggs, and potatoes which she cooked herself. She stated that she observed a small amount of weight gain in that period of 4-5 days. I inquired about Diesel's most recent vet visit. She stated that he was seen by a vet approximately one year prior and was found to be healthy aside from age-related gum disease. She could not recall which vet he was seen by, as she has used several different vets in the past. She did not have the records with her at the time. I asked why she didn't seek vet care when Diesel began losing weight. She stated that she thought the problem could be resolved by simply switching his food to a more nutrient dense brand. I informed her that there was no shelter available for Diesel on the patio that I had observed. She stated that she was not aware it was required and advised that Diesel "loved to lay in the sun." I also informed her that the small bowl that was presumably used for water was observed to be empty by the responding OVPD Officer. I explained that there must be water available at all times. I issued Ms. Patrie citations in Oro Valley for 1x neglect- non-nutritive food, 1x neglect - no shelter, 1x neglect - no vet care, and a third-party citation for 1x neglect - no water on behalf of OVPD Officer Hallberg #V165. I explained each citation as well as her court date, time, and location. She stated that she understood, signed, and received her copy. Supervisor Tenkate 1911 and I explained that OVPD had requested that the dog be bonded due to the neglect violations. We explained that the dog would be held at PACC for ten days and that she must petition the Oro Valley courts for an order to show cause hearing. We provided her with copies of the OV ordinance pertaining to OSC hearings and a listing of the court fees. She stated that she understood. Ms. Patrie asked to observe Diesel in his current condition to determine if she should relinquish ownership for his continued well-being. I escorted her to the treatment area. I met with PACC vet Dr. Carlson. I explained the situation and asked if she may allow the owner to view Diesel and explain his current medical condition. Ms. Patrie was allowed to see Diesel. Dr. Carlson explained to her that Diesel was currently comatose and experiencing frequent seizures. She further explained that he would need to remain under 24-hour observation at this time and it was unclear whether or not he would survive. Ms. Patrie decided to relinquish ownership of Diesel to PACC. I thoroughly explained the release of ownership form and that she would not be able to redeem or adopt Diesel once completed. She stated that she understood and signed the form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Member Comments/ Request for Information</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per accuweather.com Oro Valley experienced temperatures ranging from 46 to 79 degrees Fahrenheit. Due severity of dog's condition—please place on do not adopt list and suggest a restraining order preventing pet ownership for designated period of time. Not cited under 18-2 regarding licensing/vaccinations—Current? Not noted on report.</td>
<td>T. Barrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N. Emptage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P. Hubbard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P. Jacobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. Kaluzniacki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can we request that she be prevented from owning dogs?</td>
<td>H. Mendelsohn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Neumann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. O'Donnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Schwerin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments state dog later adopted? Did he go to Pug rescue or was he adopted as special needs dog. Last comment by Dr. Wilcox states to continue to monitor carefully and either go to Pug Rescue needs neutering and dental care once weight gain verified. This was on 12/14. What was the outcome?

| G. Smith |
| City of Tucson Rep. |
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Report Snapshot

Officer's Case Report

Officer's Case Report

On December 9, 2015 at 2:19 PM, Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) dispatch received a call concerning an abandoned female dog and her nine puppies at W Davis Pl. On December 9, 2015 at 2:51 PM, I, Officer Hinte 2068, arrived at W Davis Pl. I met with the complainant Virginia Flores. She stated that the residents had been evicted on 12/1/15. She believes that they had been returning to the property without permission, but had not seen anyone since 12/5/15. She entered the home today to find a female Rottweiler and her nine puppies. There was no food or water available for the dogs. I observed a female Boxer in the front yard. She appeared healthy and of good body weight. I could not determine if water or food was available from my vantage point. There was a covered front porch with wooden lattice panels on the sides that would suffice as shelter. Before I could enter the yard or home to examine the dogs and their conditions, an unidentified adult female arrived and began yelling me in Spanish. Ms. Flores responded and the exchange quickly became heated. I asked dispatch to contact PCSO to assist in keeping the peace. PCSO Deputy Garcia #5794 arrived and provided his case number of 151209173. At the same time, the resident and dog owner, Jose Bojorquez arrived. Deputy Garcia spoke with all parties to determine the situation. Mr. Bojorquez stated that although he was evicted on the 1st, he had an agreement with Ms. Flores’ son Robert allowing him to leave the dogs on the property until he could secure another place for them. He stated that he had been coming onto the property and caring for the dogs. He stated that he was at the property the night before. He placed the Rottweiler, named Tiffany, and her nine puppies inside to protect them from the cold. He stated that he provided food and water at that time. Mrs. Flores advised that her son Robert was on his way to clear up the confusion. Officer Garcia and I entered the yard with the permission of Mr. and Mrs. Flores. I photographed the eviction notices clearly posted on the front of the home. I observed a large bucket of water that was mostly full with clean water in the yard. He allowed us inside the house where I observed the mom and puppies in the kitchen area. The puppies, only several weeks old, were on a large filled comforter type blanket. There were two bowls next to them, both of which were empty. The puppies appeared healthy and of good body weight. I observed Tiffany to be slightly thin, but otherwise healthy. I observed her to be actively lactating. There was milk leaking from her teats. Mrs. Flores’ son Robert arrived on the property. He advised that he allowed Mr. Bojorquez to temporarily keep the dogs on the property. He stated that he had been leaving the gate unlocked so that they may care for the dogs. Robert also stated that he felt Mr. Bojorquez had been given plenty of time and needed to remove his dogs at this time. I met with Mr. Bojorquez and advised him of the violation I had observed. I inquired about licenses for both adult dogs. He stated that neither dog was licensed or currently vaccinated against rabies. I performed a records search and found no record of Mr. Bojorquez or anyone else under the address. I asked for his ID and he complied. I issued Mr. Bojorquez citations in the County for 2x no license and 1x neglect-no water. I explained that I was not issuing no water citations for all nine puppies because I observed Tiffany to still be producing a significant amount of milk and the puppies were still actively nursing. He stated that he understood, signed, and received his copy. Mr. Bojorquez loaded the animals and some of his belongings into his vehicle. He transported the animals to his grandmother’s house at N Davis Ave. I followed him to the property to ensure that all welfare requirements would be met I observed the yard to be fully confined by 4-5 foot chain link. There was a large wooden shed, approximately 8x12 feet, which may be used when they are outside. He also brought with him the large five gallon bucket and an extra-large airline-type carrier. He advised that he would put

Summary

No animals were impounded. Staff reviewed the animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. This complaint is closed.
blankets inside the carrier inside of the shed to provide warmth for Tiffany and her puppies. I provided him with a law brochure and informed him how to license Tiffany and Canela. He stated that he understood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Member Comments/ Request for Information</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reviewed</td>
<td>T. Barrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N. Emptage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P. Hubbard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P. Jacobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. Kaluzniacki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please follow up condition, vaccinations and licensing</td>
<td>H. Mendelsohn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Neumann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. O'Donnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Schwerin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the time limit to get the dog licenses? Also Rabies Shots? Has this been done yet for the Rottie and Boxer?</td>
<td>G. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Tucson Rep.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On December 12, 2015 at 10:37, I, Officer Hinte 2068, was patrolling the block of S Clark Ave for a stray aggressive dog. While patrolling the area, I, observed a large male boxer on a tie-out at S Clark Ave. The front gate was left open. The dog was under the carport and had water within reach. The tie-out was approximately 6-8 feet in length and was anchored to the iron bars which covered a nearby window. I knocked on the front and side door several times. I also loudly announced my presence and the fact that the dog would be impounded if no contact was made. A neighbor came outside and advised me that the owner was at work. I impounded the dog off the tie-out without incident. I posted a notice on the front door advising that tie-outs are prohibited and the dog was impounded. I left the tie out on the ground under the carport.

On December 12, 2015 at 4:15PM, Supervisor Tenkate 1911 met with the dog owner Mario Pesqueira, who resides at : . S Clark Ave, when he came to redeem his dog at the Pima Animal Care Center. She spoke to Mr. Pesqueira about tie outs being illegal and he said his 2.5 year old Boxer Nico is tied out every day. He explained his neighbor does not have fencing and that leaves part of his yard open. He ties out Nico, for half an hour, when he takes his wife to work and comes right back home. Supervisor Tenkate explained the Tie Out Law again and he was provided with a copy of the laws, an alternative to tie out pamphlet and advised to either fence the yard or use a kennel run. Supervisor Tenkate also explained that if Nico is found tied out again the dog will be impounded and held for bond. Mr. Pesqueira said Nico is an inside only dog and said he will be leaving him inside the home whenever he leaves. Mr. Pesqueira provided Supervisor Tenkate with his Arizona driver's license for identification. He signed and received a copy of citation #7 4889 A for Neglect Tie Out. He is aware of his court date, time and location.

Summary
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Member Comments/ Request for Information</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No notation regarding vaccination or license?</td>
<td>T. Barrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N. Emptage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P. Hubbard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P. Jacobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. Kaluzniacki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up for enclosed fencing, tie out</td>
<td>H. Mendelsohn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Neumann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. O’Donnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Schwerin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Tucson Rep.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any follow up on drive by to see if dog is not being tied outside?
On December 17, 2015 at approximately 13:30 hours Terry Aguilar of: 400 N Speedway Blvd, arrived at the Pima Animal Care Center with his large Bull Mastiff named "Lyra". Lyra was severely ill with a visible skin condition resulting in almost total hair loss, an open sore on one elbow, skin tags, weight loss and the dog was brought in lateral and was unable to stand or move. Mr Aguilar requested euthanasia for Lyra. The intake Animal Care Tech, Stephanie Scheible, completed an intake questionnaire with Mr Aguilar where he admitted that the dog began losing weight six months ago but they could not afford a Vet and at 03:00 this morning the dog vomited, laid down and couldn't get up so they decided to have the dog euthanized. Mr. Aguilar also admitted to the Animal Care Tech that the dog was last seen by a Veterinarian a year ago for skin issues. Mr. Aguilar's dog was examined by Doctor J. Wilcox and euthanized. Due to the dog's condition, Dr. Wilcox requested that criminal citations be issued to Mr. Aguilar for Animal Cruelty and Neglect. Officer D. Windauer #1984 was contacted and asked to come and observe the dog's condition. Officer Windauer took pictures of the deceased animal and noted the skin tags, swelling on rear legs, hair loss, poor condition of teeth and an open sore on the dog's front elbow that was worn thru the skin. Officer Windauer then spoke with Supervisor D. Ten Kate #1911 and it was agreed that citations should be issued to the dog owner for failure to provide Vet care. At approximately 15:55 hours on December 17, 2015 I, Officer C. Young #1908, arrived at ‘E’ Speedway Blvd to meet with Terry Aguilar. Mr Aguilar was not home but I was able to meet with Mrs Aguilar. I explained the reason for my visit and Mrs. Aguilar was very cooperative and provided her Arizona Drivers License for identification. I asked when the last time Lyra was taken to a Vet Clinic and she said she could not remember exactly but she does have records. I asked to see them, and she showed me an invoice from September 2013 showing that Lyra was treated for a skin condition. She was given a shampoo and medication. Mrs Aguilar said she was sure that Lyra was seen by a Veterinarian more recently but did not have proof. I issued citations as requested by Dr Wilcox. Mrs Aguilar signed the citation and accepted her copy. I then provided her with her court date and time. C. Young 1908

Summary

One sick animal was relinquished to PACC for euthanasia. After a medical examination was conducted a welfare case was initiated for failure to provide vet care by the Enforcement Supervisor and PACC Veterinarian. At a later date staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited them to their residence. The animal was euthanized due to the severity of the illness. This complaint is closed.

Committee Member Comments/ Request for Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Comments/ Request for Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T. Barrick</td>
<td>Again, no notation if the animal was current on vaccinations or licensed. Did anyone check with veterinarian regarding last visit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Emptage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Hubbard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Jacobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Kaluzniacki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Marshall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Mendelsohn</td>
<td>Request be prevented from owning dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Neumann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. O'Donnell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Schwerin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Smith</td>
<td>Dog owner should be tagged in computer to not be permitted to adopt from PACC again, due to neglectful care of this poor dog. Also do we share the names of neglectful owners with Humane Society as well as with our Rescue Partners?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tucson Rep.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Officer’s Case Report

On December 19, 2015 at 4:36 PM, Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) dispatch received a call for assistance from Marana Police Department (MPD) regarding an aggressive dog at large. On December 19, 2015 at 5:31 PM, I, Officer Hinte 2068, arrived at N Gadwall Dr. I met with Marana PO Officer Samorano #443 who provided his case number of 1512-0693. I observed a black and white Pitbull in the yard at . Officer Samorano stated that the dog had jumped into the yard from its own yard at 12260. He also stated that the complainant/resident of : had advised it was not the first time one of the neighbor's dogs had jumped into their yard. I entered the yard to impound the dog. As I approached the dog, it ran towards the south side of the yard. The dog then turned around, ran northbound past me, and jumped the 5 foot wall back into its own yard. There were three other large Pitbulls in the backyard of , one blue/white and two white/brown. While looking into the backyard at 1 I from the yard of , I observed the dogs jump up and get their head over the shorter 4 foot section of the fence near the gate. I could not see water or adequate shelter from my vantage point. I met with the complainant David Wood. He stated that this was the third time one of the neighbor's dogs had jumped the fence into his backyard. The first incident occurred approximately 1.5 months prior. The blue and white Pitbull jumped the fence into their yard. They were able to corral their dogs inside almost immediately without incident. An adult female came to retrieve the dog and asked if she had "done anything" when she jumped the fence. The second incident occurred on Saturday, 11/28/15. Mr. Wood's children were home alone playing in the backyard when one of the dog’s jumped the fence. They believe it was also the blue and white dog on this occasion. Marana PD was called on this day regarding the leash law violation. Officer Samorano provided this case number for me: 1512-0016. I contacted Supervisor Tenkate 1911. I advised her of my observations as well as the previously reported violations of leash law. I was instructed to request assistance from a second officer and impound all four dogs for inadequate confinement. I asked dispatch for assistance and was informed via radio that a second officer was on route. While waiting for assistance, I was able to impound two of the friendly dogs without incident. The female white/brown and the female blue/white came to the gate and jumped up, placing their front paws near the top of the gate. I leashed them one at a time over the gate and walked them out of the yard. They were placed in the truck kennel without incident. There were two dogs remaining in the yard, the black/white dog that was initially at large, and a second white/brown dog. I waited for assistance to impound due to their ability to jump the fence. Officer Windauer 1984 arrived to assist. We entered the yard together. Marana PO stood watch at the gate in an attempt to prevent the dogs from jumping out of the yard. We tried to call to the dogs and lure them with food, but were unsuccessful. As we approached the dogs on the north side of the yard, they both ran to the corner. The white/brown dog tried to jump the fence but Officer Windauer was able to capture it using the snare pole. While transporting the dog to the truck from the backyard, the dog bit Officer Windauer's snare pole repeatedly. Once in the truck kennel, Officer Windauer observed blood originating from the dog's mouth. While she was taking the dog to the truck, I stayed in the yard with the remaining black/white dog. I backed away to prevent the dog from feeling pressured to jump the fence. I photographed the yard to document the lack of water and adequate shelter as well as the presence of excessive animal waste.

The dog ran around to the south side of the yard as I heard the MPD Officer yell that he had jumped the fence. I exited the yard and got into my truck to follow the dog. I drove around the block but did not observe the dog. I returned to the address where

Summary

No animals were impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. A recheck was found in compliance.
MPD advised me that the dog had jumped into the backyard at W Coppertail. At this same time, the dog owner returned home. Officer Windauer and I responded to W Coppertail. Officer Windauer observed the dog in question hiding underneath a trampoline. Both gates to the yard were padlocked and the resident was not answering the door. After several minutes, the owner was able to call the dog to jump back over the fence to him. I asked the man to place the dog securely inside the home so that we may discuss the night’s events. During this time, I contacted Supervisor Ten kate to discuss whether the dogs would be held for inadequate confinement or released to the owner. She stated that the dogs may be released to the owner under the condition that they are kept inside until the confinement is secure and only allowed outside under direct supervision. I met with Michael Beach, who identified himself as the co-owner of all four dogs, along with his fiancee Danielle Cooper. He advised that Ms. Cooper would not be home for at least one hour. I informed him of the reason I had responded to his address. I informed him that I had observed the black and white dog, now identified as Syo Max, jump the fence several times. Mr. Beach stated that he was aware of the issue and had been trying to get to a home improvement store to purchase the materials necessary to improve the fence line. He stated that he could not keep the dogs inside the home in the mean time because they would “pee all over his floor all day.” I informed Mr. Beach that his other three dogs had been impounded due to the inadequate confinement I also informed him that I did not observe any water or shelter available for the dogs. He stated that he has water inside the home for the dogs. I informed him that water must be available at all times. He stated that he leaves the sliding glass door open so that they may go in and out as they please. I informed him that the door was closed the entire time that I was present. He stated that the dogs have the ability to open and close the sliding glass door, so they could have gone inside the home for water or shelter at any time. I informed him that I did not observe the door to be open at any time or the dogs attempt to open the door. I inquired about the names, ages, vaccinations, and licenses for all dogs. He stated that the blue/white is 7 YO Abbey, the white with small brown patches is 8 month old Elsa, and the white with larger brown patches is 8 month old Meika. He stated that all four dogs are current on rabies vaccinations, but he was unaware that the dogs had to be licensed. Mr. Beach went inside the home to locate the vaccination records. He came back with two booklets for Meika and Elsa showing that they received DHPP vaccinations. I could not find any indication of a rabies vaccination in the booklet and informed Mr. Beach of this fact. He stated that he had the records, but would need more time to locate them. I explained to Mr. Beach that the dogs will be released to him only if he is able to keep them confined somewhere other than the yard until it is secure. He stated that he could keep them inside until he finds a solution for the confinement. I informed him that I had observed Max easily jump the 5 foot wall and that raising the fence line may or may not solve the problem. We discussed covered kennel runs, which he seemed open to trying. I emphasized that the dogs may not be in the yard without direct supervision until the repairs are made. He stated that he understood. Officer Windauer and I explained that Meika had bitten the snare pole repeatedly while being impounded. We allowed him to remove her from the truck kennel and carry her inside the home while I completed the citations. Mr. Beach inquired about who would pay for veterinary care, if needed. I informed him that he was responsible as the dog owner. I performed a records search and found no dogs licensed to Mr. Beach or Ms. Cooper. Before completing the citations, I asked Mr. Beach about Meika’s condition. He stated that she was “pretty bad.” I asked if I could observe her to determine whether or not she would need vet care and how soon she may need it. He allowed me inside the home to observe Meika. I observed the left side of her mouth to be swollen as if she had a “fat lip.” I could not take a photograph.
as she was fearful and would not come close to me and/or stay still. She was not actively bleeding at that time, though there was blood on her fur and the sidewalk where she was impounded. We discussed that she may need to see a vet to prevent infection. At this time, Mr. Beach’s fiancée Danielle Cooper entered the home. She began to examine Meika as I asked Mr. Beach to step outside with me to complete the citations. We returned to the front yard with Officer Windauer and MPD Officer Samorano. Officer Samorano informed me that he had already issued a citation for the leash law violation we had observed. I issued Mr. Beach citations in Marana for 4x neglect - no water, 4x no license, and 4x no rabies vaccination. I explained his court date, time, and location. He stated that he understood, signed, and received his copy. Ms. Cooper came outside appearing very upset. She asked who would pay for Meika’s vet care. I informed her that she and Mr. Beach are responsible for any vet costs as the owners. She became more irate, stating that we shouldn’t be “ripping [her] dog’s face open.” I informed her that no such thing happened. I explained that the dog had bitten the snare pole during impoundment. She began to walk back towards the house, but yelled back that she “comes from money” and would be getting a lawyer. I issued Mr. Beach a premise inspection for vet care on Meika by 12/12/15. I also noted on the premise inspection that water, shelter, confinement and waste were unsatisfactory. I explained the improvements that must be made in each area. He stated that he understood, signed, and received his copy. I returned the remaining two dog’s to Mr. Beach’s custody.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Member Comments/ Request for Information</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dogs had ability to open and CLOSE sliding glass door?</td>
<td>T. Barrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Beach inquired about who would pay for veterinary care, if needed. I informed him that he was responsible as the dog owner. Recheck?</td>
<td>N. Emptage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does dangerous dog affect this? Does not seem safe to leave these dogs there</td>
<td>P. Hubbard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P. Jacobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. Kaluzniacki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. Mendelsohn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Neumann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. O’Donnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Schwerin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do we know outcome of court case, have the dogs received Rabies Vaccines, or does the recheck and found in compliance mean that all requirements are fulfilled, shots, licensing and yard made acceptable to prevent dogs from jumping the fence?</td>
<td>G. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Tucson Rep.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12/15 WC6 page3
Officer's Case Report

On 12-18-15 at approximately 16:49 hours Officer Glanz #2051 and Officer Young #1908 arrived at, E 4th Street regarding a neglect complaint. Officer Glanz and Officer Young observed a male black and brown German Shep in an enclosed yard to the side of the home. The dog appeared to be in good weight and there were empty dog food cans outside the yard. Officer Glanz knocked on the front door and rang the doorbell, but didn’t receive an answer. Officer Young #1908 entered the yard and observed that the dog had no water or shelter. Officer Young offered the dog water which he readily drank. The dog was impounded without incident for its continued wellbeing. Officer Glanz posted a notice on the front door. On 12-20-15 at 14:40 I, Officer Adkins 1961 met with dog owner Yulong Jiang at Pima County Animal Care Center when he came to redeem his dog. I explained why the dog was impounded and then issued citation 74911 A-B for neglect no water and no shelter on Officer Glanz photos and memo. Mr Jiang signed and received a copy of the citation with the court date, time, and location. Mr Jiang stated to me he would be keeping his dog inside his home and only letting the dog out into the yard when he is home to go to the bathroom. Mr Jiang redeemed his dog.

Summary

One dog was impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at PACC. The animal was redeemed. This complaint is closed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Member Comments/ Request for Information</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost 2 full days before dog owner responded to impound.</td>
<td>T. Barrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N. Emptage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P. Hubbard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P. Jacobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. Kaluzniacki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. Mendelsohn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Neumann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. O'Donnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Schwerin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Tucson Rep.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On December 22nd 2015 at 1319 hours, I, Officer K. Walton #1925, arrived at the residence of welfare case. S. Amigo regarding a dog with sores on its body and foul smelling. I met with the owner Abel Rivas Villalobos, and a male which I believe was his son. They showed me the dog, which appeared to be a white Boxer mix with black spots. The dog had a growth on his nose, a large red swollen mass with green discharge and some blood on the stomach pelvic area and an open wound on front left leg. In my experience, it appeared to me the growths might be possible cancer. He advised me 2 stray dogs got into his yard and attacked his dog, and be thought the injuries were from that and did not get vet care due to being unemployed. He checked into having the dog euthanized, but places charged to much. The dog had shelter, shade, water, and was in good weight for its age of 9+ years. He has had the dog since it was a puppy, and believes the last time the dog was seen at a vets office was when it younger to get shots. I advised him he could sign the dog over to Pima animal care center with fees waived and the dog would be evaluated, but he would be cited for neglect vet care Per Supervisor Tenkate. The son translated for me just in case be did not understand things I said. He signed the dog over and received his citation. His identification stated Villalobos was his last name, but be stated Rivas was his last name. 1925

Summary

One dog was relinquished to PACC. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner cited at the scene. The animal was euthanized due to severity of the illness. This complaint is closed.

Committee Member Comments/ Request for Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T. Barrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Emptage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Hubbard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Jacobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Kaluzniacki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Mendelsohn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Neumann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. O'Donnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Schwerin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Smith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do we know when court date is...this man let his dog suffer when he could have brought him to PACC. These injuries were not from a dog attack a couple weeks ago...

City of Tucson Rep.
### Officer's Case Report

On December 26, 2015 at approximately 1200 hours I, Officer Martinez #2067 arrived at W. Guy St in regards to a complaint of a dog on a tie out. Upon my arrival I knocked on the door of the trailer and was met by Adelita Maciel. I informed her of the complaint and why I was there. She admitted to having her Dog, Rajah, on a tie out because he is a jumper and had been getting out. I asked to see him and she walked me to her back yard. I saw a large Brindle dog tied to a tree with a short chain that was approximately 2-3 feet. There was a black container upside down, and a dog bed nearby. The black container wasn't in reach of the dog. I asked about water and Ms. Maciel stated the black container was for his water but that he plays with the bowl and must have tipped it over. I asked when the last time they had checked on the dog was and she stated it had been last night. I could hear another dog barking and asked if that was another dog on a tie out and she showed me over to where the other dog was being housed. I saw a black Lab in a confined area with shade, shelter and water. I advised her that tie outs are illegal and then asked about rabies vaccine and license status. She stated she thought both her dogs were current. I checked Chameleon but found her black lab had an expired license and Rajah was not listed. While I was checking license status she and her son put Rajah in the confined area with the other dog. Rajah went straight for the water and began to drink for a couple minutes. I gave some recommendations such as looking into a no jump harness. I asked Ms. Maciel for her ID as I was going to have to issue citations. I issued citations to Ms. Maciel into county court for neglect- tie out, neglect-no water for Rajah and no license for both dogs. Citations were discussed, signed and she received her copy along with her ID.

### Summary

No animals were impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. This complaint is closed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Member Comments/ Request for Information</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>License # listed as N/A—why?</td>
<td>T. Barrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N. Emptage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P. Hubbard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P. Jacobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. Kaluzniacki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please follow up vaccinations, license, and tie outs</td>
<td>H. Mendelsohn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Neumann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. O'Donnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Schwerin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did owners follow up with licensing and rabies shots?</td>
<td>G. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Tucson Rep.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Marcy Flanagan, Deputy Director
FROM: Debra Tenkate, Animal Care Field Supervisor
DATE: January 4, 2016
SUBJECT: Dangerous Dog Cases for December 2015

Tucson:

1. A15-181952 Guerro; A dog named Rizzy was declared dangerous by Investigator Eckelbarger. The dog was impounded and the owner did not come into compliance. The dog was euthanized at PACC.

2. A15-182683 Dubbs; A dog named Toby was declared dangerous by Investigator Eckelbarger. The dog owner relinquished ownership and the dog was euthanized at PACC.

3. A15-183092 Rosales; Four dogs Pantera, Buddy, Lulu and Stephanie were declared not dangerous by Investigator Eckelbarger.

4. A15-163269 Loebig; Two dogs Truman and Cabo were declared vicious by Judge Berning. The case was assigned to Investigator Eckelbarger who is monitoring compliance.

Pima County:

5. A15-174383 Munoz; A dangerous dog evaluation was ordered by Judge Felix on a dog named Buzz. Investigator Eckelbarger evaluated the dog and Buzz was declared not dangerous.
### INVESTIGATION REPORT

**Pima County Health Department**  
**Pima Animal Care Center**  
4400 N. Silverbell Rd.  
**Tucson, Arizona 85745**  
**Phone:** (520) 243-5600  
**Fax:** (520) 243-5690  
[www.pimaanimalcare.org](http://www.pimaanimalcare.org)

**Suspect:**  
Melissa Shawn Brasher

**ACO Name / Badge #**  
C. Meek 2015  
A15-181952

**Activity / Site Number**  

**City:**  
Tucson

**State:**  
AZ

**Zip:**

**Suspect’s Business Address**  

**City:**

**State:**

**Zip:**

**BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER**

**SEX**

**WEIGHT**

**HEIGHT**

**EYES**

**HAIR**

**BIRTH**

**DRIVERS LICENSE**

**SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER**

**DATE AND TIME OF INCIDENT**  
10/31/15 1530

**DATE AND TIME REPORTED**  
11/02/15 0723

**FOOD**

**WATER**

**SHELTER**

**VENTILATION**

**ABANDONED**

**THEFT**

**BEATER**

**WASTE**

**ILL / INJ**

**OTHER (EXPLAIN)**

**LOCATION OF INCIDENT**

**NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)**

**ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM**

**RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM**

**PHONE NUMBER**

**LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS**

**CLINIC’S ADDRESS**

**GUARDIAN / INHIBIT (DAVID)**

**DATE GUARANTEES**

**DATE RELEASED**

**FOLLOW UP REQUEST**

**PACX**

**VET**

**HOME**

**NO**

**VIOLATION**

**BITE SEVERITY:**

**PART OF BODY BITEN:**

**TREATED BY**

**PHONE NUMBER**

**DATE GUARANTEES**

**DATE RELEASED**

**PACX**

**VET**

**HOME**

**NO**

**ADDRESS**

**ADDRESS**

**ADDRESS**

**ADDRESS**

**ADDRESS**

**COURT DATE**

**CITATIONS / NUMBERS**

**BREED / DESCRIPTION**

**ANIMAL’S NAME**

**COLOR**

**SEX**

**AGE**

**LICENSE #**

**CONDITION**

**ANIMAL ID #**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breed / Description</th>
<th>Animal’s Name</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>License #</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Animal ID #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pit Bull</td>
<td>Rizzy</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>M/N</td>
<td>2Y</td>
<td>258756</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>A515988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Witness 1**

**Witness 2**

**Witness 3**

**Witness 4**
INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-181952
ACO Name & Badge: C. Meek 2015, M. Hendrickson 2066

On 11/02/15 at 07:23 hours Pima Animal Care Center received a call from a bite victim who stated he was bitten on the left arm by a brown Pit Bull type dog on 10/31/15. He stated he was walking out of the Fry's Grocery store when he observed the dog along with a man and woman at a table near the entrance. He could not recall whether the dog's leash was being held by the owners. The man and woman stated that when he walked by the table the dog lunged and grabbed him on the arm causing a severe bite. He stated that when he walked by the table the dog lunged and grabbed him on the arm causing a severe bite. He stated that the wound required several hours of surgery and that the bite damaged arteries in his arm.

On 11/03/15 09:59 hours Officer Hendrickson badge number 2066 stated she arrived at the Banner University Hospital at 1501 N Campbell Ave to meet with the victim of a reported dog bite. Officer Hendrickson stated she met with a man who showed her his dog bite wound on his left lower arm. The wound had multiple stitches and was approximately three inches wide located horizontally on his forearm.

The dog was advised Officer Hendrickson on October 31st, 2015 around 15:30 he was walking by a seating area outside of a Fry's food store located at the University Mall.

He stated he walked past a Hispanic male and a heavy set female sitting down with their brownish gray pit bull on leash. He stated when he passed them and the Pit Bull lunged out toward him and bit a "Chunk of flesh" out of his left arm. He stated the dog owners attempted to leave the scene but a security guard that witnessed the incident stopped them and contacted their information. He stated the dog bit his artery and he was spraying blood until a good samaritan took their shirt off and compressed the wound. Afterward he was transferred to the hospital for treatment.

He stated he didn't get a clear description of the biter dog but knows it was a possible brown or gray pit bull. He stated the dog was on leash and was wearing a collar but he didn't know the color. Officer Hendrickson stated she informed him Pima Animal Care Center would quarantine the dog and return to have him positively identify a photograph. He stated he didn't have an address to be reached at other than that his sisters on where he gets his mail.

Advised Officer Hendrickson to call his cell phone (that works sometimes) to reach him.

He stated he returned to the hospital today to get his bandages changed and the hospital staff noticed the wound was infected. Officer Hendrickson informed him of his rights to request citations and of the 365 day allowance time.

He stated pursuing prosecution was the last thing on his mind but he does want the dog owners to be educated so the dog couldn't have the opportunity to hurt anyone again.

On 11/03/15 Officer Hendrickson badge number 2066 stated she arrived at the possible dog owner's address of N. Broadmoor Road. Officer Hendrickson stated she saw two dogs confined in the yard, one a predominantly white female Mastiff with brown spots and the other a white and brown Heeler Mix. Officer Hendrickson stated she did not get a response from within the residence and posted a notice to contact Pima Animal Care Center.

On 11/03/15 at 1808 hours I Officer Meek badge number 2015 responded to follow up on a bite complaint and meet with the biting dog owner and initiate the quarantine process.

I arrived at the address and was able to meet with a man advised me that she was in control of the dog that bit but that particular dog was not on the property. I observed the two dogs photographed by the Officer who visited earlier in the day. I asked Ms. Brasher where the biter dog was currently and she advised me that the dog was around the corner at a friend's residence. Ms. Brasher stated I could follow her there to meet the dog.

I then followed Ms. Brasher to the residence. Ms. Brasher then introduced me to the biter dog named Rizzy. I photographed Rizzy at the residence. Ms. Brasher then advised me of how the bite occurred and that she herself was really unsure of how it happened. Ms. Brasher described what appeared to be a homeless man walking into the Fry's store and possibly stepping on Rizzy. Ms. Brasher thought that because Rizzy was recently altered that's why he bit.
INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-181952
ACD Name & Badge: C. Meek 2015, M. Hendrickson 2066

I advised Ms. Brasher that the bite was extremely bad and the victim was hospitalized. Ms. Brasher stated she knew it was bad after it occurred as there was a large amount of blood. I advised Ms. Brasher that because of the bite severity I would be impounding Rizzy and he would be held at Pima Animal Care Center for a dangerous dog evaluation. Ms. Brasher stated she understood and loaded Rizzy into the truck at which point I transported him to Pima Animal Care Center.

11/04/15 at 08:30 hours Officer Henderson badge number 1904 stated he arrived at the Fry’s on I and contacted store manager l. Officer Henderson stated he asked him about the reported dog bite which he was aware of. Officer Henderson asked him about any possible video footage the store may have. l said the store did not have any video of the incident and indicated he has looked at the video from that date and time and said the incident occurred out of range of their cameras. l explained the cameras are set to cover certain zones and the incident was not within one of those zones. l did not know the details of the incident either. There was also no security officer on duty at the complex, and no one at the store who could provide me with the name of the alleged officer who witnessed the incident.

11/04/15 18:12 hours Officer Delgadillo badge 2047 arrived to Banner Medical center and met with bite victim, l. Officer Delgadillo provided l three photos, a gray and white pit bull being held a person, a white and tan Pit Bull and a dog in the yard that was brown and white. l stated that he wasn’t sure if any of the dogs in the photos provided was the attacking dog. l kept referring to the Security Guard and that she wrote a report. l stated that it happened so fast and he was in shock. l stated that she (the Security Officer) would be able to identify the dog.

Officer Delgadillo stated she then went to bite incident location and met with l of Securitas security. He provided me the report and a photograph was taken of the report. Officer Delgadillo stated she asked if the reporting Officer was on duty and was advised that she was just filling that day. Roger provided the name of the Securitas Supervisor, l. Officer Delgadillo stated she attempted to contact the staff on duty stated that he does not return until 9am. After the meeting with Roger the bite victim made contact with Pima Animal Care Center and did request citations.

On 11/4/15 Supervisor Tenkate received a call from the dog owner a Mr. Ernesto Guerro asking about his dog "Rizzy" and the quarantine and the dangerous dog assessment. Mr. Guerro admitted that he and his mother Ms. Melissa Brasher were both at the Fry’s at l on 10/31/15 and that "Rizzy" did bite a man but he was not close enough to see why the dog bit as he was walking into the store. Supervisor Tenkate then explained that the victim had been hospitalized due to the bite he said the victim had medical issues. Supervisor Tenkate then explained that very few dog bite victims require hospitalization and that the bite wound severed an artery. Supervisor Tenkate then explained that due to the severity of the bite that his dog would be declared dangerous. Supervisor Tenkate told him that an Investigator from Pima Animal Care Center would be in touch with him about the assessment.

On 11/09/15 at 11:58 hours Officer Hendrickson badge number 2066 arrived at and met with the Securitas Security Guard l to see if she could positively identify the stated biter dog. Officer Hendrickson questioned Ms. Quiroz about what the biter dog looked like and she stated it was a short Muscular Black/Gray and white pit Bull. Officer Hendrickson asked if she recalls if the victim had fallen on the dog or walked by the dog. l stated a pillar in front of the store was obstructing her complete view and she was unsure if the victim had fallen onto the dog but what she observed was the dog while it bit the victim's arm. Officer Hendrickson showed l photographs of different dogs along with the reported biter and she was able to positively identify the biter dog Rizzy out of the pictures.
INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-181952

ACD Name & Badge: C. Meek 2015, M. Hendrickson 2066

Officer Hendrickson stated she advised that there was a potential that she would have to appear in court and advised Officer Hendrickson that she understood.

On 11/13/15 at 1008 hours I Officer Meek badge number 2015 responded to ___ to follow up on a bite complaint and to issue citations to Ms. Melissa Brasher who was in care and custody of the dog when the bite occurred.

I was able to meet with Ms. Brasher and advised her that citations were requested and I had to issue today. Ms. Brasher advised me that she understood and provided me with her Arizona identification. I issued Ms. Brasher the appropriate citations and advised her that with the citations she would need to appear in court and I provided her with the date. Ms. Brasher stated she understood her need to appear and signed her copy of the citations.

Officer's Signature: [Signature]

Date: 11/14/15
DECLARATION OF DANGEROUS / VICIOUS ANIMAL

YOUR ANIMAL HAS BEEN DECLARED TO BE A DANGEROUS ANIMAL FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON(S):

X An animal can be declared a dangerous animal if it, without provocation, bites or otherwise causes injury to a person which results in significant medical intervention/treatment.

_____ An animal can be deemed dangerous if it, without provocation, kills or severely injures a domestic animal.

_____ An animal declared vicious by a magistrate shall be automatically deemed dangerous.

OFFICER COMMENTS:

The dog "Rizzy" is declared dangerous as a result of biting and severely injuring a man, while in violation of the leash laws (dog not under control).

OWNER: Ernesto Guerrero
ADDRESS: 
PHONE: 

ANIMAL NAME: Rizzy
ANIMAL ID#: A515986
SEX: M COLOR: WHITE BREED: Pitbull

NOTICE

YOUR ANIMAL HAS BEEN DECLARED TO BE DANGEROUS PURSUANT TO LOCAL JURISDICTION'S ORDINANCE / CODE.

If the dog has not been declared vicious by a court, you may appeal the declaration of dangerous. You have (5) days if cited in Pima County, Marana, Sahuarita or South Tucson; OR 10 days, if cited in Tucson; to appeal the declaration of dangerous by filing a request for a dangerous dog hearing. You may obtain the request form at PACC IN PERSON.
**INVESTIGATION REPORT**
Pima County Health Department
Pima Animal Care Center
4000 N. Silverbell Rd.
Tucson, Arizona 85745
Phone: (520) 243-5900
Fax: (520) 243-5900
www.pimaanimalcare.org

**Suspect:**
Dayna Rae Dubbs

**ACO NAME / BAR #**
C. Meek 2015

**ACTIVITY/SITE NUMBER**
A15-182683

**City:**
Tucson

**State:**
AZ

**Zip:**

**Resident's Driving Number:**

**Sex:**

**Weight:**

**Height:**

**Eyes:**

**Hair:**

**Origin:**

**DOB:**

**Social Security Number:**

**Does this incident require victim request for waiver of rights?**
Yes

**Location of Incident:**

**Date and Time of Incident:**
11/12/15 2130

**Date and Time Reported:**
11/12/15 1856

**Food:**

**Water:**

**Shelter:**

**Ventilation:**

**Abandoned:**

**Torture:**

**Beaten:**

**Waste:**

**Inj. / Ill.:**

**Other:**

**Date of Birth:**

**Vehicle Number:**

**Business Phone:**

**Victim/Complainant Name:**

**City:**
Tucson

**State:**
AZ

**Zip:**

**Victim's Address:**

**Request/Waiver Exception per A.R.S. 13-4405 (D) and 13-286 (B):**

**Name of Lawful Representative (If Applicable):**

**Status of assessment requested:**

**Restitution Requested:**

**Dangerous Case Number:**

**Other Agency Case #:**

**Sheriff Dept:**

**Tucson Police:**

**Fire:**

**Other:**

**Follow up request:**

**So:**

**TPD:**

**Other:**

**Address and Phone Number Same As Victim:**

**Relationship to Victim:**

**Phone Number:**

**Lawful Representative Address:**

**Clinic's Address:**

**Paragraph:**

**Veterinarian:**

**Phone Number:**

**Owner Knows of Bite:**

**Phone Number:**

**Owner Knows of Bite:**

**Date Quarantined:**

**Release Date:**

**Parasite:**

**Vet:**

**Home:**

**Violations:**

**Non-violation:**

**Part of Body Bitten:**

**Treated by:**

**Date Quarantined:**

**Release Date:**

**Witnesses:**

**Citations/Numbers:**

**Breed/Description:**

**Animal's Name:**

**Color:**

**Sex:**

**Age:**

**License #:**

**Condition:**

**Animal ID:**

**Witness 1:**

**DOB:**

**Address:**

**Residence Phone #:**

**Business Phone #:**

**Witness 2:**

**DOB:**

**Address:**

**Residence Phone #:**

**Business Phone #:**

**Witness 3:**

**DOB:**

**Address:**

**Residence Phone #:**

**Business Phone #:**

**Witness 4:**

**DOB:**

**Address:**

**Residence Phone #:**

**Business Phone #:**
INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-182683

ACO Name & Badge: C. Meek 2015, M. Hendrickson 2066

On 11/12/15 at 18:56 hours Pima Animal Care Center received a complaint stating the victim was bitten trying to save her dog from an aggressive dog, which drug its owner when it attacked. The victim stated the aggressive dog pulled the victim's dog from her arms was seriously injured. There was also another complaint number provided (A15-182015). The victim gave her availability.

On 11/16/15 10:18 hours Officer Hendrickson badge number 2066 stated she arrived at to meet with the victim in response to a reported dog bite. Officer Hendrickson stated she knocked on the door and didn't receive a response. Officer Hendrickson stated she posted a notice to contact Pima Animal Care Center.

Officer Hendrickson stated she relocated to unit 10 and met with who also witnessed the reported dog attack the victim on 11/12/15 and also had her dog attacked by the same dog on 11/02/15. and reportedly witnessed both incidents. stated that a very large brown black and white German Shepherd looking dog on leash dragged the dog owner residing in unit #7 across the courtyard toward the victim and her dog.

stated the victim's dog was attacked and had to be euthanized due to its injuries. stated on 11/02/15 around 17:27 she went outside with her dog on leash and the dog owner and stated the sheperu mix was outside of the apartment (unit #7). She said the Shepherd was on leash but was able to drag the dog owner to her dog and started to attack him. stated her dog didn't get any injuries from the attack but two men had to pull the attacking dog off. isn't requesting any citations for the incident because to injuries were found on her dog but does want the issue resolved.

Officer Hendrickson stated she relocated to the dog owner's apartment and knocked on the door but received no answer. Officer Hendrickson stated she posted a notice requesting contact.

On 11/17/15 at 1615 hours I Officer Meek badge number 2015 responded to follow up on a bite complaint and to meet with the bite victim.

I arrived at the address and was able to meet with , the bite victim. I asked what happened that led up to her calling Pima Animal Care Center. went on to advise me that on 11/12/15 at approximately 2130 hours she went out for a walk with her dog, a Chihuahua mix named Sunny. advised me that she and Sunny came back into the complex through a rear gate and as they came into the common area one of her neighbors was out with their dog at which point it attacked Sunny.

• advised me the dog, she described as a large St. Bernard size lunged at her and Sunny and was able to bite Sunny and pull him from her arms. showed her hand that that had puncture wounds and in addition to her hand wounds she was bitten on her foot. • also advised me that she had a large bruise on her ribs from falling down. I photographed punctures and bruises. • advised me that the dog shook Sunny violently. • became emotional and advised me that Sunny was injured severely and once she was able to free him from the dog's mouth and rushed him to a the vet.

showed me several photographs on her cell phone that showed Sunny with an extremely large gash across the abdomen. I provided my Pima Animal Care Center email to and asked her to forward he me the photos. • advised me that Sunny had to be euthanized as a result of the attack and that she would like to pursue prosecution as well as a dangerous dog evaluation. I advised that I would meet with her neighbor and issue the citations and initiate the dangerous dog process. I concluded my meeting with :
INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-182683
ACO Name & Badge: C. Meek 2015, M. Hendrickson 2066

I made my way to unit number 7 the attacking dog owner’s address. I was able to meet with a Ms. Dayna Dubbs and her dog Tobby. Ms. Dubbs was very aware of the complaint. I asked Ms. Dubbs if Tobby had a current rabies vaccination. Ms. Dubbs advised me that Tobby rabies vaccination was expired. I advised Ms. Dubbs that I would need to impound Tobby because of his rabies vaccination being expired and due to the severity of the attack on the other dog. I advised Ms. Dubbs that the other dog did pass away as a result of the attack. Ms. Dubbs advised me that she was aware that the other dog passed. I advised Ms. Dubbs that I would need to issue her citations. Ms. Dubbs stated she understood and provided me with her Arizona identification. I issued Ms. Dubbs the appropriate citations and advised her that with the citations she would need to appear in court and provided her with the date. Ms. Dubbs stated she understood her need to appear and signed her copy of the citations.
DECLARATION OF DANGEROUS / VICIOUS ANIMAL

YOUR ANIMAL HAS BEEN DECLARED TO BE A DANGEROUS ANIMAL FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON(S):

☐ An animal can be declared a dangerous animal if it, without provocation, bites or otherwise causes injury to a person which results in significant medical intervention/treatment.

☒ An animal can be deemed dangerous if it, without provocation, kills or severely injures a domestic animal.

☐ An animal declared vicious by a magistrate shall be automatically deemed dangerous.

OFFICER COMMENTS:

The dog "Toby" is declared dangerous, after attacking (not under control) causing the death of another dog while in violation of the leash law.

OWNER: Dayna Dubbs
ADDRESS: ____________________________________________
PHONE: ____________________________________________

ANIMAL NAME: Toby
ANIMAL ID#: A341134
SEX: ______ COLOR: ______ BREED: Australian Shepherd

NOTICE

YOUR ANIMAL HAS BEEN DECLARED TO BE DANGEROUS PURSUANT TO LOCAL JURISDICTION'S ORDINANCE / CODE.

If the dog has not been declared vicious by a court, you may appeal the declaration of dangerous. You have (5) days if cited in Pima County, Marana, Sahuarita or South Tucson; OR 10 days, if cited in Tucson; to appeal the declaration of dangerous by filing a request for a dangerous dog hearing. You may obtain the request form at PACC IN PERSON.
**INVESTIGATION REPORT**

**Pima County Health Department**

**Pima Animal Care Center**

4000 N. Silverbell Rd.

Tucson, Arizona 85745

Phone: (520) 243-5800

Fax: (520) 243-5850

www.pimaanimalcare.org

---

**Suspect:**

Mari Guadalupe Rosales

**ACD Name / Date:**

C. Meek 2015

**ACD Name / Date:**

A15-183092

---

**Inmate Information**

**City:**

Tucson

**State:**

AZ

**Zip:**


**Suspect's Address:**

**Residence Phone Number:**


**Suspect's Business Address:**

**Business Phone Number:**


**Sex:**


**Height:**


**Weight:**


**Eyes:**


**Hair:**


**Origin:**


**DOB:**


**Social Security Number:**


---

**Location of Incident:**


**Date and Time of Incident:**


**Date and Time Reported:**


**Food:**


**Water:**


**Shelter:**


**Ventilation:**


**Abandoned:**


**Threatened:**


**Beaten:**


**Waste:**


**Inj/Ill:**


**Other (Explain):**


---

**Victim/Complainant Name:**


**Date of Birth:**


**Resident's Phone:**


**Business Phone:**


---

**Victim's Address:**


**City:**

Tucson

**State:**

AZ

**Zip:**


**Victim's Business Address:**


**City:**


**State:**


**Zip:**


---

**Name of Lawful Representative (if Applicable):**


**DANGEROUS:**


**ASSESSMENT REQUESTED:**


**YES NO**


**YES NO**


**OTHER AGENCY CASE #:**


**1511200155**

**Sheriff Dept:**


**Tucson Police:**


**Fire OTHER:**


Rosado 412

---

**REQUEST/WAIVER Exception per A.R.S. 3-4405 (B) and 4-206 (B):**

---

**Address and Phone Number Same as Victim:**

---

**Relationship to Victim:**

---

**Phone Number:**

---

**Lawful Representative Address:**


**Clinic's Address:**


**G 10 15 45 180 0**

**Fra Head:**

---

**Victim or Lawful Representative Signature:**

**Code/Ord Violated:**

4-97, 4-7(2)(B)

Citing ACD

C. Meek 2015

PREVIOUS VIOATIONS

YES NO

PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER

YES NO

OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS

---

**Breed/Description**

**Animal's Name**

**Color**

**Sex**

**Age**

**License #**

**Condition**

**Animal ID#**

---

**Pit-X**

Pantera

Black

F

4Y

249943

ok

A521983

---

**Pit-X**

Buddy

Wht/Brn

M

3Y

091246

ok

A541642

---

**Pit-X**

Lulu

Wht/Brn

F

1.5Y

091247

ok

A541643

---

**Pit-X**

Stephanie

Beige

F

1.5Y

091248

ok

541644

---

**Pug**

Mimi

Tan/Blk

F

---

---

**Witness 1**

---

**Witness 2**

---

**Witness 3**

---

**Witness 4**

---
INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-183092
ACO Name & Badge: C. Meek 2015

On 11/20/15 10:22 hours Pima Animal Care Center dispatch received a complaint from Tucson Police Department (T.P.D.) dispatch Rodriguez and stated an Officer was at 2560 N. 14th Ave. Dispatch was advised that dogs were sicked on another dog out for a walk. TPD dispatch asked if PACC could respond to assist the Officer on scene.

On 11/20/15 at 1830 hours I Officer Meek badge number 2015 responded to the 2500 block of N. 14th Avenue to assist T.P.D. with a leash law dog on dog attack complaint.

I arrived in the area and made contact with T.P.D. Officer Rosado badge 53349 who provided the case number of 1511200155. Officer Rosado advised me that at approximately 0951 hours a 911 call was received that ended up centering on the dogs residing at the dogs at the residence were able to break out of an unlocked fence and then attacked a woman walking her dog. Officer Rosado provided me with the victim's information. I was also advised the victim dog was injured and it was bleeding when she arrived. I was advised that the victim dog owner was transported back to her residence by another responding Officer so that she could take her dog to a veterinarian. Citations were requested by the victim.

I then was able to meet with a Ms. Maria Rosales who was in care and custody of the dogs at the time of the attack. Officer Rosado translated for me as I advised Ms. Rosales of the complaint. Ms. Rosales took full responsibility for the events earlier in the day. Ms. Rosales stated that the dogs, four in total were able to escape the fence because the front gate was not latched as it is usually padlocked. It should be noted all the dogs were confined on my arrival. I presented Ms. Rosales with the option of signing the dogs over to Pima Animal Care Center and she elected to keep them. I advised Ms. Rosales that citations were requested by the victim, and Ms. Rosales provided me with her AZID. I issued Ms. Rosales a total of 8 citations, 4 leash law and 4 biting animal (dog). I advised Ms. Rosales that with the citations she would need to appear in court and I provided her with the date. Ms. Rosales stated she understood her need to appear and signed her copy of the citations. I then asked Ms. Rosales to see and photograph her dogs. Ms. Rosales then presented me with her dogs which were photographed. I did not observe any obvious weaknesses in the fencing which consists of approximately 5 foot chain link. While meeting with Ms. Rosales the property manager approached us and advised us that he would be serving a ten day notice to have the dogs removed from the property and Ms. Rosales signed the document. I concluded my meeting with Ms. Rosales.

Once I concluded my meeting with Ms. Rosales I made contact with the dispatch department to contact the victim dog owner in an effort to see where the dog was taken and if there was a possibility to meet with her. I was advised that the victim dog owner was currently at Vet Specialty Center.

I was able to make my way to the facility and meet with the victim dog owner confirmed the statement given by Officer Rosado. again requested citations and I advised her that they have been issued. I also discussed Dangerous Dog evaluations and she asked for that process to be initiated. I then checked in with clinic staff that showed me to the triage center.

I observed a dog, a Pug named Mimi to have several punctures and was waiting for an X-ray to ensure that there was no internal damage. I took several photographs of Mimi. I then provided my Pima Animal Care Center email address to the attending veterinarian and asked that any records resulting from the attack be forwarded to me. I then concluded my meeting with clinic staff.

I met again with and her mother who also inquired about what happened (she was not present). I was then advised that Mimi would be transferred to another veterinarian to continue with care.
**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.** A16-183740  
**OWNER:** Mari Beales  
**ANIMAL NAME:** Buddy

---

**EVALUATION CRITERIA**

**REPORTED BITES:**  
- Non-Violation Bite: +3  
- Violation Bite: +6

**SEVERITY OF INJURY TO HUMANS:**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Break in Skin</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break in Skin or Bruising</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Care (Released)</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Bites-Single Incident</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bite Down and Shock Victim</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Care (Hospitalization)</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Animal Complaints or Violations:**  
- Leash Law Violations: +2  
- Leash Law Complaints: +1  
- Attemted Bite Citations: +2  
- Animal Attack Citations: +3  
- Other Citations / Complaints: +1

**SEVERITY OF INJURY TO ANIMALS:**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attack with No Injury</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries Treated by Owner</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet Care (1 To 2 Visits)</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive Vet Care (&gt;2 Visits)</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries Resulted in Death</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONFINEMENT MEASURES:** (Check one factor only)  
- Secure Fence/Wall and Gates: -5  
- Inadequate Fencing or Gates: +5

**OWNER ACCOUNTABILITY / RESPONSIBILITY:**  
- Repaired Deficient Confinement: -3  
- Animal is Neutered / Spayed: -1  
- Owner Aware of Any Aggression: +1  
- Owner Failed to Repair Confinement: +5  
- Currently Licensed Lic #: -1  
- No Current License: +1  
- No Current Rabies Vaccination: +1

**NEIGHBOR COMMENTS** (Scored by Majority Opinion):  
- Animal Never Observed at Large: -3  
- Animal Not Observed Aggressive: -3  
- Animal Observed at Large <=6x’y’r: +1  
- Animal Observed at Large >6x’y’r: +2  
- Animal Observed Being Aggressive: +2

**DOGS BEHAVIOR:** (if observed by officer)  
- Animal behaves aggressively: +2  
- Animal Not Aggressive: -2  
- Animal Shows Unsafe Behavior: +1

---

**Confinement / Fencing:**  
- Street face w/ one locked gate

---

**General Comments:**  
- Buddy scored a +3 and is therefore not declared dangerous at this time

---

**TOTAL SCORE:** +3

---

**DANGEROUS**  
**NOT DANGEROUS**

---

**OFFICER # 1942 Eckelbarger**

---

**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 this 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.
### CASE NO: A15-183740
### OWNER: Mario Rosales
### ANIMAL NAME: Pantera

### EVALUATION CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORTED BITES:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NON-VIOLATION BITE</td>
<td>+ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIOLATION-BITE</td>
<td>+ 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEVERITY OF INJURY TO HUMANS:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO BREAK IN SKIN</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREAK IN SKIN OR BRUISING</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAL CARE (RELEASED)</td>
<td>+ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE BITES-SINGLE INCIDENT</td>
<td>+ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIT DOWN AND SHOCK VICTIM</td>
<td>+ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAL CARE (HOSPITALIZATION)</td>
<td>+ 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEVERITY OF INJURY TO ANIMALS:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATTACK WITH NO INJURY</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INJURIES TREATED BY OWNER</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VET CARE (1 To 2 Visits)</td>
<td>+ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTENSIVE VET CARE (≥ 2 VISITS)</td>
<td>+ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INJURIES RESULTED IN DEATH</td>
<td>+ 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONFINEMENT MEASURES: (Check one factor only)
- SECURE FENCE/WALL AND GATES: 5
- INADEQUATE FENCING OR GATES: 5

### OWNER ACCOUNTABILITY / RESPONSIBILITY:
- REPAIRED DEFICIENT CONFINEMENT: 3
- ANIMAL IS NEUTERED / SPAVED: 1
- OWNER AWARE OF ANY AGGRESSION: 1
- OWNER FAILED TO REPAIR CONFINEMENT: 5
- CURRENTLY LICENSED LIC #: 15-2499 (3)
- NO CURRENT LICENSE: 1
- NO CURRENT RABIES VACCINATION: 1

### NEIGHBOR COMMENTS (Scored by Majority Opinion):
- ANIMAL NEVER OBSERVED AT LARGE: 3
- ANIMAL NOT OBSERVED AGGRESSIVE: 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
- ANIMAL SHOWS UNSAFE BEHAVIOR: 1

### Confinement / Fencing:
5-foot fence with locked gate

### General Comments:
Pantera scored a +2 and therefore not declared dangerous at this time.

### OFFICER #: 1942 Eckelberger

### TOTAL SCORE: +2

**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 4:19 / County Code 6:04:130. 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
PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER
4000 N. SILVERBELL RD. TUCSON, AZ 85745
(520) 724-5960 FAX (520) 724-5960
www.pima.gov/animalcare

CASE NO: A15-183940
OWNER: Maric Rosales
ANIMAL NAME: Lulu

ADDRESS: [Redacted]
SEX: F BREED: Pitx
COLOR: Brown/White DATE: 12-8-15

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 [+] 1
OWNER FAILED TO REPAIR CONFINEMENT + 5 [+] 5
CURRENTLY LICENSED LIC # [-1] [-1]
NO CURRENT LICENSE + 1 [+] 1
NO CURRENT RABIES VACCINATION + 1 [+] 1

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

DOGS BEHAVIOR: (If Observed by Officer)
ANIMAL BEHAVES AGGRESSIVELY + 2 [+] 2
ANIMAL NOT AGGRESSIVE - 2 [-2]
ANIMAL SHOWS UNSAFE BEHAVIOR + 1 [+] 1

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

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

Total Score: 16

Confinement / Fencing:
Start face in one locked gate.

General Comments:
Lulu scored a +6 + 15 therefore not declared dangerous at this time.

OFFICER # 1942 Edelhage

TOTAL SCORE: 16

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 8.04.150.

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.
CASE NO: A6-183740
OWNER: Mari Rosales
ANIMAL NAME: Stephanie

EVALUATION CRITERIA
REPORTED BITES:
NON-VIOLATION BITE + 3
VIOLATION-BITE + 6

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
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 VIOLATIONS + 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:
Street Grace w/ine locked Gate

GENERAL COMMENTS:
Stephanie scored a 3 and is therefore not declared dangerous at this time.

TOTAL SCORE: 7.3

OFFICER # 1912 Ebelanger

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 attempts 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.
### Investigation Report

**County:** Pima County Health Department  
**Address:** 4000 N. Silverbell Rd.  
**Phone:** (520) 243-5800  
**Fax:** (520) 243-5880  
**Website:** www.pimaanimalcare.org

**Suspect:** Paul Joseph Loebig  
**ACN Name/Badge #:** T. Foster #2042  
**ACN/Case #:** A15-163269

**Suspect's Address:** Tucson, Az  
**City:** Tucson  
**State:** Az  
**Zip:**  
**Business Address:** N/A  
**Business Phone:** N/A

**Date of Incident:** 01/05/15 16:40  
**Date of Report:** 01/05/15 16:49

**Incident:**  
- **Date and Time:** 01/05/15 16:40  
- **Time of Incident:** 01/05/15 16:49

**Incident Details:**  
- **Location:** N/A  
- **Suspect's Business Address:** N/A  
- **Suspect's Phone:** N/A

**Victim's Name:** N/A  
**Victim's Address:** N/A  
**Victim's Phone:** N/A

**Incident:**  
- **Nature:** N/A  
- **Severity:** N/A  
- **Location:** N/A

**Lawful Representative:**  
- **Name:** N/A  
- **Address:** N/A  
- **Phone:** N/A

**Citations/Numbers:**  
- **#74001 (A, B, C, D)**  
- **4-97; 4-7 (2) (B)**

### Animal Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breed/Description</th>
<th>Animal Name</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>License #</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Animal ID #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mastiff Mix</td>
<td>Truman</td>
<td>Tricolor Ticked</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A506327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastiff Mix</td>
<td>Cabo</td>
<td>Fawn</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A506326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corgi Mix</td>
<td>Karmel</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9Y</td>
<td>L14-064886</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A876373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Witness Information

| Witness 1        | M | F | 668 |  
| Witness 2        | M | F | 963 |  
| Witness 3        | M | F | 689 |  
| Witness 4        | M | F | 669 |  

**Witnesses:**

- **Witness 1:**  
- **Witness 2:**  
- **Witness 3:**  
- **Witness 4:**
INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-163269
ACO Name & Badge: T. Foster #2042

01/05/15 17:09 I, Officer Foster 2042 arrived in front of a residence and was met in the street by a group of people who witnessed the dog on dog attack. One of the by-standers was a woman who stated that at exactly 16:40 hours the victim was walking past the residence at which the incident took place. She also stated that the responding firemen had walked the victim back to her residence after they gave her a ride to the hospital. I thanked her and was preparing to walk to the attacking dog owner’s residence when he approached me.

The dog owner invited me into his home and I asked for his permission to photograph the dogs and he agreed. I then asked him for proof of current vaccinations and license. Mr. Loebig, the dog owner stated that he was not aware of license requirements and stated that these two dogs are the first he has ever owned. He and his wife Nancy stated that they know for sure that the dogs are current on their shots but were not sure where the records were as they had just moved to their current address. I advised them that I would walk up to the victim’s residence and conduct the victim interview and give them additional time to locate the records. I also advised them that if the victim requested citations that I would have to issue them as requested. They stated that they understood and told me they would continue to look for the shot records. I then walked up to the victim’s address and knocked on the door to conduct the interview.

As I approached the front door of the victim, her address, there was a dog barking. She was standing in the doorway and invited me into her home. I asked her if she could tell me what happened. She stated that approx 16:40 hours she and her friend were walking south bound on a very large dog ran out of the front door and charged her and her elderly dog Karmet. She went on to state that all three dogs were running around her in circles and I was screaming "NO" and "Help" the entire time. At some point I became entangled in her dog’s leash and was knocked to the ground causing extensive abrasions to her right forearm from elbow to knuckles. She stated that none of the dogs bit her but could not rule out the possibility that saliva from either of Mr. Loebig’s dogs came in contact with her injuries.

I asked Mr. Loebig if his dog sustained injuries and he stated that she did not believe so and showed me some areas on Karmet’s back that had dried saliva but no apparent injuries. I asked if she was requesting citations. She asked me for an explanation of why she would need to request them. Once I explained the third party citation procedures she stated that she was not requesting citations at that time. I advised several times that if she changed her mind about citations to contact Pima Animal Care Center within one year and request that her call be re-opened. I then asked her if I could photograph her injuries and she gave me permission and unwrapped her arm. I then took the photos and asked her if she had any other questions or concerns. She stated that she did not and I left her residence and returned to the Dog owners’ address.

Samaritans were able to separate the dogs and Mr. Loebig returned his two dogs to the house and returned with a clean towel for his arm. She went on to state that at some point he returned to his house a second time and when he entered the house the two dogs were able to escape again but the owner and bystanders were able to contain the dogs further. Mr. Loebig also fell and sustained injuries to his knuckles. A neighbor called 911 and Tucson Fire Department responded and placed a pressure bandage on his injured arm.

I asked Mr. Loebig if his dog sustained injuries and she stated that she did not believe so and showed me some areas on Karmet’s back that had dried saliva but no apparent injuries. I asked if she was requesting citations. She asked me for an explanation of why she would need to request them. Once I explained the third party citation procedures she stated that she was not requesting citations at that time. I advised several times that if she changed her mind about citations to contact Pima Animal Care Center within one year and request that her call be re-opened. I then asked her if I could photograph her injuries and she gave me permission and unwrapped her arm. I then took the photos and asked her if she had any other questions or concerns. She stated that she did not and I left her residence and returned to the Dog owners’ address.

Officer’s Signature: see page two

Date:
INVESTIGATION REPORT CONTINUATION

Activity Number: A15-163269
ACD Name & Badge: T. Foster #2042

01/05/15 19:13 Pima Animal Care Dispatch received call from victim/owner, who stated that upon closer examination she found a horizontal laceration that measured approximately a half an inch and 2 puncture wounds both on the lower left rear leg of her dog. She stated she has no means to photograph the injuries and is not currently contemplating seeking vet care for her dog.

01/06/15 15:23 Pima Animal Care Center Dispatch received call from who confirmed the injuries reported last night were to her dog. She stated she is trying work out the vet care.

On 02/02/15 Supervisor Konst met with the violation dogs' owner Paul Loebig at Pima Animal Care Center. Mr. Loebig wanted to submit a photograph of his hand and have a few questions answered. He stated he had been in contact with victim Bonnie Levinson. She wanted him to pay $250.00 cash for veterinarian expenses for her dog's injuries. He told her he had submitted it to his insurance agent and she need to talk to said agent. Mr. Loebig stated his agent left her a message to call him but she never called him back. Then he stated she hated insurance companies and did not want to talk to him.

Mr. Loebig had a arraignment coming up for a dog license citation, told him that she would give him a letter stating there was no bite and she did not want charges. Mr. Loebig stated she again told him she was not bit by his dogs. He was not happy because she withheld the letter when he refused to pay her the $250.00 in cash. Supervisor Konst explained the letter would of made little difference since the citation was from the Officer and had nothing to do with her contact with his dogs. Supervisor Konst explained that even though his dogs did not bite, they were at large and engaged in activities that caused the injuries sustained by

Supervisor Konst explained to Mr. Loebig that has requested third party citations be issued to him for the incident that took place on 01/05/15. Supervisor Konst then had me issue the citations to Mr. Loebig.

02/02/15 18:20 Officer Foster 2042 met with Paul Loebig at Pima Animal Care Center and issued citations for a Biting Animal and an Attempt to Bite as well as two Leash Law violations for the incident that occurred on 01/05/15 at 16:40 Hours. Mr. Loebig acknowledged, signed, and accepted his copy of the citations. I returned Mr. Loebig's ID to him and provided him with his court date, time, and new court house location.

02/10/15 called Pima Animal Care Center and spoke with the Enforcement Director J. Chavez #1914. told Mr. Chavez that she was calling to clear up some discrepancies regarding her case and told him that she is refuting her earlier statement that Mr. Loebig's dogs running around her during the incident on 01/05/15 at 16:40 hours caused her to fall after she became entangled in her leash. She also stated that she had wanted Mr. Loebig cited for her injuries as well as those sustained by her dog Karmel. She stated that I had issued the citations for her injuries but failed to issue those for her dog. Mr. Chavez then re-opened the case and I attempted to make contact with Mr. Loebig at his home.

02/20/15 19:47 Mr. Loebig contacted Pima Animal Center and made arrangements to come to the facility and meet with Supervisor Konst to receive his citations for the dog on dog attack that took place on 01/05/15 at 16:40 hours

02/23/15 Mr. Loebig arrived at Pima Animal Care Center and met with Supervisor N. Konst, badge #2002. Supervisor Konst had requested I prepare the citations in advance of Mr. Loebig's arrival. Supervisor Konst presented the citations to Mr. Loebig and provided him with his court date, time, and location. Mr. Loebig signed and accepted copies of his citations.

Officer's Signature: J. Foster #2042 Date: 02/28/15
DECLARATION OF DANGEROUS / VICIOUS ANIMAL

YOUR ANIMAL HAS BEEN DECLARED TO BE A DANGEROUS ANIMAL FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON(S):

____ An animal can be declared a dangerous animal if it, without provocation, bites or otherwise causes injury to a person which results in significant medical intervention/treatment.

____ An animal can be deemed dangerous if it, without provocation, kills or severely injures a domestic animal.

____ An animal declared vicious by a magistrate shall be automatically deemed dangerous.

OFFICER COMMENTS:
The dog "Truman" was declared vicious by Tucson City Court Judge Bemming on 11-20-15.

OWNER: Paul Laebig
ADDRESS: 
PHONE: 

ANIMAL NAME: Truman
ANIMAL ID#: A506390
SEX: M, COLOR: GR; BREED: LAB/MASS

NOTICE

YOUR ANIMAL HAS BEEN DECLARED TO BE DANGEROUS PURSUANT TO LOCAL JURISDICTION'S ORDINANCE / CODE.

If the dog has not been declared vicious by a court, you may appeal the declaration of dangerous. You have (5) days if cited in Pima County, Marana, Sahuarita or South Tucson; OR 10 days, if cited in Tucson; to appeal the declaration of dangerous by filing a request for a dangerous dog hearing. You may obtain the request form at PACC IN PERSON.
DECLARATION OF DANGEROUS / VICIOUS ANIMAL

YOUR ANIMAL HAS BEEN DECLARED TO BE A DANGEROUS ANIMAL FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON(S):

_____ An animal can be declared a dangerous animal if it, without provocation, bites or otherwise causes injury to a person which results in significant medical intervention/treatment.

_____ An animal can be deemed dangerous if it, without provocation, kills or severely injures a domestic animal.

_____ An animal declared vicious by a magistrate shall be automatically deemed dangerous.

OFFICER COMMENTS:

The dog "Cabo" was declared vicious by Tucson City Court Judge Bening on 11-20-15.

OWNER: Paul Cabot  ANIMAL NAME: Cabo
ADDRESS:  ANIMAL ID#: A506383
PHONE:  SEX: M COLOR:  BREED: Lab/Mastiff

NOTICE

YOUR ANIMAL HAS BEEN DECLARED TO BE DANGEROUS PURSUANT TO LOCAL JURISDICTION'S ORDINANCE / CODE.

If the dog has not been declared vicious by a court, you may appeal the declaration of dangerous. You have (5) days if cited in Pima County, Marana, Sahuarita or South Tucson; OR 10 days, if cited in Tucson; to appeal the declaration of dangerous by filing a request for a dangerous dog hearing. You may obtain the request form at PACC IN PERSON.
INVESTIGATION REPORT
Pima County Health Department
Pima Animal Care Center
4000 N Silverbell Rd.
Tucson, Arizona: 85745
Phone: (520) 243-5900
Fax: (520) 243-5980
www.pimaanimalcare.org

SUSPECT
Jason Munoz

ACG NAME / BARB #  S. Adkins 1961
ACTIVITY/BITE NUMBER A15-174383

BITER □ WELFARE □ DAMAGED □
OTHER □ leash law/attempt to bite

CITY Tucson
STATE Az ZIP 5
RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER □

SEX □ WEIGHT □ HEIGHT □ EYES □ HAIR □ ORIGIN □ BIRTH □ SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER □

LOCATION OF INCIDENT

FOOD WATER SHELTER VENTILATION ABANDONED TERRORIZED BEATING WASTE IN/OUT OTHER (EXPLAIN)

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

LOCATION OF INCIDENT

DATE AND TIME OF INCIDENT 6/30/15 18:07
DATE AND TIME REPORTED 6/30/15 18:12

FOOD WATER SHELTER VENTILATION ABANDONED TERRORIZED BEATING WASTE IN/OUT OTHER (EXPLAIN)

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)

ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM □

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

PHONE NUMBER

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

ERLINS ADDRESS

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

6.04.030 leash law, 6.04.120(B)(2) attempt to bite

73242 A-B

BREED/DESCRIPTION Border Collie

ANIMAL'S NAME Roxy
COLOR White/Black
SEX S/F
AGE 2 yr
LICENSE # L15-247761
CONDITION Normal
ANIMAL ID # A503860

WITNESS 1

WITNESS 2

WITNESS 3

WITNESS 4
INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-174383

ACD Name & Badge: S. Adkins 1961

06/30/15 18:51 I, Officer Adkins 1961 arrived at 150630310 and Pima County Sheriff Deputy Bowe badge 6553 case 1 stated around 1807 hours he heard some dogs in his yard and looked out his house window and saw the dog Roxie from in his backyard and went out to chase to dog out. When he walked out into his yard about 25 feet he did not see Roxie and headed back towards his home. When he reached the patio Roxie had charged at him from a hole in the fence near his barbeque grill. A kicked Roxie and she bit him on his right foot with no break in skin. A stated this has been an ongoing issue and all he asked was the neighbor repair the holes the dog owner's dog caused in the fence. The neighbor Jason Munoz was on the other side of the fence repairing it while I was in his yard. A is requesting citations for leash law violation and attempt to bite. Also A wants restitution for the damage done to his fence by Mr Munoz dog. I then went and met with Mr. Munoz who had finished fixing the holes in the fence when I arrived at his residence. I issued citation 73242 A-B law and attempt to bite third party citations. Mr. Munoz signed and received a copy of the citations for leash with the court date, time, and location. S. Adkins 1961
CASE NO: A15-184362
OWNER: Jason Muraz
ANIMAL NAME: Buzz

EVALUATION CRITERIA
REPORTED BITES:
NON-VIOLATION BITE + 3
VIOLATION-BITE + 6

SEVERITY OF INJURY TO HUMANS:
(Check One Factor Only Per Victim)
NO BREAK IN SKIN + 1
BREAK IN SKIN OR BRUISE + 2
MEDICAL CARE (RELEASED) + 3
MULTIPLE BITES-SINGLE INCIDENT + 4
BIT DOWN AND SHOCK 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

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

OWNER ACCOUNTABILITY / RESPONSIBILITY:
REPAIRED DEFICIENT CONFINEMENT - 3
ANIMAL IS NEUTERED / SPAYED - 1
OWNER AWARE OF ANY AGGRESSION + 1
OWNER FAILED TO REPAIR CONFINEMENT + 5
CURRENTLY LICENSED LIC # - 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
ANIMAL NOT OBSERVED AGGRESSIVE - 3
ANIMAL OBSERVED AT LARGE <5X5YR + 1
ANIMAL OBSERVED AT LARGE >5X5YR + 2
ANIMAL OBSERVED BEING AGGRESSIVE + 2

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

Confinement / Fencing:
5/16-Inch wooden fence w/1 x 2 Gates leading into a yard

General Comments:
The dog "Buzz" scored a -2 and is therefore not declared dangerous at this time.

OFFICER # 1942 Eckelberger

TOTAL SCORE: -2

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 8.04.150. 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.
 Animals listed are currently listed as being on hold without an outcome date. They are grouped by the type of hold.

**HOLD TYPE ENFORCEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOLD TYPE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>ANIMAL</th>
<th>BREED</th>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A15-183295</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>K15-205817</td>
<td>A358506</td>
<td>DOG</td>
<td>COOPER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/24/15 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN</td>
<td>ILL SEVERE</td>
<td>D163</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennel Comment: no bite/chip 0a11044f75/tag 160227 HOLD FOR COURT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOLD TYPE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>ANIMAL</th>
<th>BREED</th>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A15-183295</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>K15-205819</td>
<td>A358505</td>
<td>DOG</td>
<td>DAISY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/24/15 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN</td>
<td>ILL SEVERE</td>
<td>D163</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennel Comment: no bite/tag 160226 3c3c3c3c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOLD TYPE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>ANIMAL</th>
<th>BREED</th>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A16-185904</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>K16-208948</td>
<td>A546432</td>
<td>DOG</td>
<td>PIT BULL/MIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/7/16 CONFISCATE FIELD</td>
<td>NORMAL</td>
<td>D207</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennel Comment: 3C 3C 3C -left notice hold for owner. Trying to contact owner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/2016 confinement not secure, inadequate shelter /84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOLD TYPE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>ANIMAL</th>
<th>BREED</th>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A16-185904</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>K16-208949</td>
<td>A546433</td>
<td>DOG</td>
<td>PIT BULL/MIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/7/16 CONFISCATE FIELD</td>
<td>LACTATING</td>
<td>D099</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennel Comment: 3C 3C 3C -left notice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/2016 unsecure confinement, inadequate shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOLD TYPE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>ANIMAL</th>
<th>BREED</th>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A16-185921</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>K16-208993</td>
<td>A546447</td>
<td>DOG</td>
<td>BART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8/16 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN</td>
<td>NORMAL</td>
<td>D118</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennel Comment: Unable to scan in field, didnt bite <em><strong>D-D-HOLD</strong></em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/2016 ENFORCE tfoster 1/8/16 11:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dog is held on a D-D-HOLD, see activity notes for details. 3c3c3c3c 2042

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOLD TYPE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>ANIMAL</th>
<th>BREED</th>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A16-185921</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>K16-208995</td>
<td>A543571</td>
<td>DOG</td>
<td>PRINCESS PRINCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8/16 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN</td>
<td>NORMAL</td>
<td>D118</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennel Comment: Unable to scan in field, didnt bite <em><strong>DD-HOLD</strong></em> 982000402836322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/2016 ENFORCE tfoster 1/8/16 11:11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dog is held on a D-D-HOLD, see activity notes for details. 3c3c3c3c 2042

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOLD TYPE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>ANIMAL</th>
<th>BREED</th>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A16-185927</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>K16-208959</td>
<td>A546446</td>
<td>DOG</td>
<td>BEAGLE/MIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8/16 CONFISCATE POLICE</td>
<td>NORMAL</td>
<td>D196</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennel Comment: need to scan. 2021rt 3C 3C 3C 3C 3C 3C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/14/16 15:31
### A16-185942

**K16-209125**  | A546665  | DOG  | ROTTWEILER/MIX  | 1/10/16  | CONFISCATE FIELD OWN  | NORMAL | Activity:A16-185942  | D192  | R

Kennel Comment: no chip see act for owner info

01/11/16  
If owner Daniel Nolan comes to redeem, please issue citations in the County for:

1x abandonment
14710 N Bowman Dr
01/10/16 10:14 hrs

### A16-186009

**K16-209108**  | A546650  | DOG  | PIT BULL/MIX  | 1/9/16  | STRAY  | FIELD  | INJ MINOR | Activity:A16-186009  | D210  | R

Kennel Comment: 3C 3C 3C

01/09/2016  
If owner claims, cite No Lic/No Vacc other 3 dogs per pics. Also issue cites per dog on dog 3PC info if received./84

### A16-186014

**K16-209167**  | A546710  | DOG  | BENJAMIN  | LABRADOR RETR/MIX  | 1/10/16  | CONFISCATE FIELD OWN  | NORMAL | Activity:A16-186014  | D193  | R

Kennel Comment: need to scan. 2021rt 3C 3C 3C 3C 3C 3C

**K16-209168**  | A546711  | DOG  | DIAMOND  | CHIHUAHUA SH/MIX  | 1/10/16  | CONFISCATE FIELD OWN  | NORMAL | Activity:A16-186014  | D193  | R

Kennel Comment: need to scan. 2021rt 3C 3C 3C 3C 3C 3C

### A16-186090

**K16-209179**  | A546730  | DOG  | AUST SHEPHERD/MIX  | 1/11/16  | CONFISCATE FIELD OWN  | NORMAL | Activity:A16-186090  | D262  | R

Kennel Comment: no chip ****move slow****

**K16-209180**  | A546731  | DOG  | PIT BULL/CHINESE SHARPEI  | 1/11/16  | CONFISCATE FIELD OWN  | NORMAL | Activity:A16-186090  | D263  | R

Kennel Comment: no chip ****move slow****

### A16-186127

**K16-209271**  | A546834  | DOG  | HAZEL  | DOBERMAN PINSch/MIX  | 1/12/16  | CONFISCATE FIELD OWN  | NORMAL | Activity:A16-186127  | D251  | R

Kennel Comment: P387529
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/4/16</td>
<td>STRAY NIGHT</td>
<td>DEAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/04/2016</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>DATTEBEI 1/4/16 2:39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ORDINANCE 2015- ______

AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA, RELATING TO ANIMALS; AMENDING PIMA COUNTY CODE CHAPTER 6.04.100 TO MODIFY THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND ITS PURPOSE

SECTION 1: Section 6.04.100 of the Pima County Code is amended to read as follows:

CHAPTER 6.04

ANIMAL CONTROL REGULATIONS

6.04.100 - Advisory committee—Established—Powers and duties.

A. An advisory committee known as the Pima County animal care advisory committee shall be established by the board of supervisors. The purpose of this committee shall be to:

1. Serve in an advisory capacity to the board of supervisors and to the manager of the Pima Animal Care Center; and

2. Review and evaluate the operations of the center in order 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 resolving them to the proper authority.

B. The membership of this committee shall consist of a representative from the Southern Arizona Veterinary Medical Association, the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals of Arizona, Inc., the Humane Society of Southern Arizona, the Tucson Kennel Club, the Animal Welfare Coalition, a public educator, a member of the Pima County board of health, Pima Paws for Life, the People for Animals in the Prevention of Cruelty and Neglect, Inc., a resident of Pima County who needs and uses the assistance of a certified service dog as representative of the disabled community, the city of Tucson, and a registered volunteer with the Pima Animal Care Center. The manager of the center shall serve as an ex officio member.

C. Appointment of members shall be the responsibility of each of the organizations and governments represented on this committee. The registered volunteer shall be selected by the members of the Pima Animal Care Center advisory committee from a list of no fewer than three volunteers recommended by the manager of the center. Terms shall be four years for all members.

D. Responsibilities of each member shall be to:

Animal Control – Advisory Committee
1. Attend all meetings; and
2. Inform the individual organizations and governments of formal actions taken by the committee; and
3. Represent the individual organizations, governments and the interest of the general public in advising the board of supervisors on policy decisions regarding the Pima Animal Care Center; and
4. Reports emanating from the committee shall be adopted by majority vote of the committee and submitted to the county board of supervisors; and
5. A copy of the minutes of each meeting shall be submitted to the governing body of each political jurisdiction that the center serves after adoption by the committee; and
6. Establish by-laws that govern procedures for meetings and official correspondence; and
7. Select members of the committee to serve as chairperson and vice chairperson for a term of two years. A member holding any office may not succeed himself or herself in office. Selection of chairperson and vice chairperson shall be held thirty days from the effective date of the ordinance.

A. An Advisory Committee known as the Pima County Animal Care Advisory Committee is established by the Board of Supervisors. The purpose of this committee is to:

1. Serve in an advisory capacity to the Board of Supervisors and to the manager of the Pima Animal Care Center;
2. Review and evaluate the general operations of the Center in order to make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors for the purpose of assuring that:
   a. The Center’s operations promote the public health and safety; and
   b. The Center safeguards the health and well-being of dogs and cats and is consistent with best practices and procedures of animal control and welfare; and
   c. Establish by-laws that govern procedures for meetings and official correspondence.

Membership of this committee consists of the following:

B. Community Organizations and Partners

1. Each of the following organizations or associations appoints one committee member: the Southern Arizona Veterinary Medical Association; Pima Animal Care Center Partners, which is comprised of one representative of each of the jurisdictions that have an intergovernmental agreement with Pima County; Friends of Pima Animal Care Center, the nonprofit fundraising arm of PACC; and the registered volunteers with Pima Animal Care Center.
2. The term of appointment for committee members appointed pursuant to B.1. begins July 1, 2016.

3. At the first Advisory Committee meeting following July 1, 2016, the committee members appointed by organizational partners as delineated in B.1. shall, through random selection, identify two members to serve four year terms through June 30, 2020 and two members to serve two year terms through June 30, 2018.

C. Board of Supervisors Appointees

1. Each member of the Board of Supervisors of Pima County appoints one individual to serve as a member of the Advisory Committee.

2. The term of appointment for committee members appointed pursuant to C.1. begins July 1, 2016.
   a. At the first Advisory Committee meeting following July 1, 2016, the committee members appointed by members of the Board of Supervisors shall, through random selection, identify three members to serve four year terms through June 30, 2020 and two members to serve two year terms through June 30, 2018.
   b. Each subsequent appointment, other than for the purposes of filling the remainder of an unexpired term, is for four years.

D. County Administrator Appointees

1. The County Administrator appoints one committee member.
   a. The initial committee member appointed by the County Administrator pursuant to D.1. serves a two year term beginning July 1, 2016
   b. Each subsequent appointment, other than for the purposes of filling the remainder of an unexpired term, is for four years.

2. The County Administrator appoints one staff representative to serve as a committee member.
   a. The initial staff representative appointed by the County Administrator pursuant to D.2. serves a two year term beginning July 1, 2016.
   b. Each subsequent appointment, other than for the purposes of filling the remainder of an unexpired term, is for four years.

E. Existing members.

1. The terms of any committee members serving at the time this Section is adopted with terms scheduled to expire in 2016 or 2017 expire June 30, 2016.

2. The terms of any committee members serving at the time this Section is adopted with terms scheduled to expire in 2018 or 2019 expire June 30, 2018.
F. Responsibilities of each committee member:
   1. Attend all meetings; and
   2. Be informed about the Pima Animal Care Center’s mission, services, policies and programs.

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
## Donation Activity

**Period:** 12-01-15  
**To:** 12-31-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donation Code</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DONATION</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION ADOP</td>
<td>$1,944.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION GEN</td>
<td>$29,645.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION OUTR</td>
<td>$149.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION S/N</td>
<td>$15,039.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION SAMS</td>
<td>$35,218.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total:** $81,996.33
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donation Code</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DONATION</td>
<td>$483.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION ADOP</td>
<td>$3,944.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION GEN</td>
<td>$121,277.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION LIC 0973</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION OUTR</td>
<td>$358.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION S/N</td>
<td>$65,059.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION SAMS</td>
<td>$88,047.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$279,190.90</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 12-7-15 E-mail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thank you e-mail to staff and volunteers for adoption experience; family adopted two dogs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12-11-15 Letter from Congresswoman Martha McSally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thank you letter for rescuing and returning a dog to owner in Idaho.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject: FW: Feedback Form 2015-12-07 01:59 PM Submission Notification

From: Jose Ocano
Sent: Monday, December 07, 2015 3:08 PM
To: Robert Hendrix
Cc: Justin Gallick; Andrew Stocker; Kristin Barney
Subject: Re: Feedback Form 2015-12-07 01:59 PM Submission Notification

Yay! A good one!

José Ocaño
Director of Shelter Operations
Pima Animal Care Center
520-247-2171

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 7, 2015, at 3:04 PM, Robert Hendrix <Robert.Hendrix@pima.gov> wrote:

From: notification@pima.gov
Sent: Monday, December 07, 2015 2:00 PM
To: ContactPACC
Subject: Feedback Form 2015-12-07 01:59 PM Submission Notification

Feedback Form 2015-12-07 01:59 PM was submitted by Guest on 12/7/2015 1:59:55 PM (GMT-07:00) US/Arizona

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Jessica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Message subject Thank you!
Thank you to all your wonderful staff and volunteers over the Thanksgiving weekend who helped our family find two amazing, sweet, and fun dogs to join our family! My kids now want to volunteer as well! As soon as they are old enough we will be there! Thank you again

-Jessica, Kaiden, Laila -Pets Sarge, Girly-Girl, Bear (new family member... who is doing gre with his three legs), and Oreo (new family member formerly known as Chapo)

Thank you, Pima County, Arizona
Dear Jennifer,

Thanks to the PACC team for rescuing Cooper and getting him back to his pet-mom in Idaho. What a holiday gift for Jaylene. Keep up the great work helping animals in our community and in this case, across the country!

In Service,

Martina McSally