

1. Call to Order

Mr. Neuman called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm; Ms. Emptage was delayed.

- Attendance

Present:

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
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:

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

- Pledge of Allegiance

2. Adoption of the Minutes

- Adoption of the January 21, 2016 Meeting Minutes

The motion was made and seconded (Hubbard/Smith) that the January 21, 2016 meeting minutes be adopted as written. The motion carried (7-0). (Mr. Marshall and Ms. Emptage arrived after the vote on the minutes.)

3. Recent Animal Care Center Holds Snapshot

There was no discussion on this item.

4. Call to the Audience

There were no speakers at this call to the audience.

5. Management Report

Ms. Flanagan reported on four topics.

- Budget

Ms. Flanagan provided a handout on the Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) budget (included in the record). The handout showed personnel, operations and total budget, as well as revenue figures, including total budget, actual year to date figures, and straight line year to date projections. Personnel expenditures are slightly above projections; however, they are better than in years past. Operations expenditures are lower than the straight line projections; however, the summer months are normally busier. Year to date revenue well exceeds the projection. Ms. Flanagan asked for input on the information presented. The comments were positive. Additionally, there was some discussion on monthly budgets and adjusted predictions versus straight line predictions due to fluctuations and the seasonal nature of animal care.

Mr. Neuman referred to previous budget discussions and asked if Health Department Director García would be coming to a future meeting to talk about the budget. Ms. Flanagan said the Department's Business Manager, Garrett Hancock, is more closely involved with the budget and she could request he come to the next meeting. Mr. Neuman requested a budget discussion be on the next agenda with Mr. Hancock participating in the meeting.

Mr. Jacobs asked about the statistical reports the Committee had been receiving in the past. Ms. Flanagan explained no one could identify and duplicate how those reports were generated. Therefore she has tasked PACC's Chameleon (electronic animal management system) expert to generate new reports to ensure the numbers are accurate. She said different individuals using different methods have come up with different numbers in the past, so staff wants to ensure the data is authentic. There was concern voiced about being able to compare new data with old data to show trends. Ms. Flanagan said there has been considerable discussion on what should be counted and she felt confident historical data can be produced from the Chameleon system for comparison purposes.

- Personnel Updates

PACC is in the process of recruiting a Pet Support Coordinator and a new Enforcement Operations Manager. Both positions have garnered strong interest nationally. The new Volunteer Coordinator starts Monday and is to be introduced at the next meeting. Ms. Hubbard said positive things about the new coordinator who is being hired away from her organization.

- PACC Satellite Site

The Health Department recently combined two previously separate clinics into one facility and as a result can repurpose the old Walter Rogers clinic facility located at 175 West Irvington. By the end of May the Department expects to start weekend micro-chipping, vaccine and spay neuter clinics, as well as special events at this location. Also a County charter school will occupy a large portion of the building and one of the Department's WIC (women, infants and children nutrition program) offices will be moved there. Discussion brought out that the location already has clinical space which is highly suitable for the aforementioned clinics. Ms. Flanagan suggested the Committee could hold a meeting at the satellite location.

- Current Events

Ms. Flanagan reported that activities pursuant to the new animal care center will require the admin trailer, which is where the Committee typically meets, to be moved fairly soon. In light of this, the motion was made and seconded (Emptage/Mendelsohn) that the Committee will meet back at the Abrams building. The motion carried (8-0), Ms. Schwerin abstained.

6. Old Business

- Shortening Lengthy Animal Holds

Ms. Flanagan reported that the internal group she talked about at the last meeting has met twice with the County Attorney's Office (PCAO) on this issue. She broke the issue down into two categories: stray holds, and owner bond and appeal holds. Concerning strays some of the jurisdictions have a seven-day hold for licensed pets, while the State requirement is only five days. Staff prefers the five day hold. The thought is to work with the City of Tucson and explain the financial benefit of five days versus the seven. Hopefully once they see the benefit they will change their code to five days and the other jurisdictions will follow. PCAO is already working on updated language for the animal care IGA contracts.

Concerning owner bond and appeal holds Ms. Flanagan reported PCAO said the State Legislature would have to enact changes to impact hold times on appeals to Superior Court. PCAO will be doing research to reduce hold times on holds not appealed to Superior Court. Ms. Flanagan presented to PCAO the Committee's request for a judge to attend a Committee meeting and was told it would be against judicial code of conduct for a judge to do so; it would be inappropriate and PCOA wanted nothing to do with the request. Dr. Smith asked about using fosters for animals on holds. Ms. Flanagan said PACC does use fosters when appropriate, but the situation has to be very safe and well contained because of liabilities associated with animals escaping and/or being aggressive. There are liabilities if a held animal attacks someone. Also PACC would have to pay for the value of an animal if it is lost. Mr. Neuman suggested legitimately purchasing a held dog could be cheaper to the County than a lengthy hold process. Ms. Mendelsohn suggested binding arbitration and Ms. Flanagan said she will research it.

Ms. Schwerin said bonding is for animals in distress or danger. She went on to refer to Tucson City Code, Section 4-11. Procedure to remove and forfeit animals; notice; order to show cause hearing; disclosure; appeal, which states in part:

(j) After a hearing conducted under this section, the magistrate or special limited magistrate shall issue an order that includes written findings of fact and conclusions of law.

She compared that to Section 4-13. Dangerous animals, which states in part:

(9) The hearing officer shall make a written decision within five (5) working days of the hearing and notify the owner of the animal of the decision.

Ms. Schwerin said the County Code has a similar comparison wherein the dangerous dog code is stronger, requiring the five day decision; and suggested code regarding animals in distress should be

amended to require a decision within five working days like in Section 4-13. Ms. Flanagan said when it comes to Superior Court City and County code does not apply, but acknowledged the local codes could be updated to tighten up timeframes for before any appeals to Superior Court. She said she would discuss it with PCAO. Ms. Schwerin asked if there have been many appeals to Superior Court. Supervisor Tenkate said there have been such appeals, but not many and none have won. She said one dangerous dog case took six months. Mr. Jacobs asked about numbers of case completely handled in the lower courts compared to those going to Superior Court. Supervisor Tenkate said very few go up into Superior Court. A quick recollection of animals currently on holds came up with ten or so animals, of which four cases were involved with Superior Court. Supervisor Tenkate indicated the four is atypically high. A rough estimate of less than ten percent going to Superior Court was mentioned. It was stated (Hubbard) that it is not good for any animal, even one, to be confined for a lengthy time period due to court proceedings. However, it was also pointed out (Jacobs) that it is a hard sell to go to the legislature and ask them to go through the time and expense of changing State Law for one dog. Ms. Emptage requested this item be on next month's agenda.

7. New Business

- 72-Hour Pet Waste Law

There was no discussion on this item.

- Timeframe to License Dogs

Ms. Emptage referred to discussion at a previous meeting wherein it was stated that judges sometimes give cited individuals months to license unlicensed dogs. The motion was made and seconded (Smith/Mendelsohn) that the Committee recommends owners be required to license their dogs within 30 days of a no-license citation. Supervisor Tenkate gave an example of an owner with numerous dogs given approximately a year and a half to comply with licensing. The motion carried (8-1), Mr. Jacobs voted against.

- Dangerous Dog Form and Point System

Copies of the dangerous dog evaluation form were provided. Supervisor Tenkate said a dangerous dog evaluation can be requested by a bite victim or a dog on dog attack victim; it can be due to frequent aggression, initiated by an officer or initiated by the court. Once a dangerous dog has been determined guilty of a bite or an attempted bite it is declared vicious; and only a judge or magistrate can declare a dog vicious. Dangerous dog evaluations are assigned to an investigator. The investigator does research in Chameleon and does neighborhood interviews. If an owner has lived at a current address less than a year, then the previous address is also researched. Ms. Emptage asked about if a dog bites a burglar and Supervisor Tenkate called that scenario a provoked bite which would not be counted against the dog. She referred to bites in the home as no-violation bites, worth three points on the form; whereas a violation bite is worth six points on the form. Regarding quarantine, she said if a bite does not break the skin the animal is not quarantined. Supervisor Tenkate went over points for severity of injury to humans, citations and severity of injury to animals. She continued that if a person is hospitalized or severely injured, or a domestic animal is killed the attacking dog is automatically declared dangerous. Supervisor Tenkate said investigators are trained with a PowerPoint presentation and by senior investigators. Discussion brought out that the point system was believed to be established by PACC officers many years ago and there are no known

national standards for dangerous dog determination. Supervisor Tenkate said investigators look for tendency, propensity and disposition.

Ms. Schwerin referred to a recently discussed case in which a dog on a leash bit and injured another dog and an officer said the dog in question showed unsafe behavior, but the dog was declared not dangerous. She used that example to say there is something wrong with the point system. She also said that to her it doesn't take repeated bites for a dog to show it has a tendency to bite; one bad bite is enough. She said former Tucson Mayor George Miller was the one who got the dangerous dog law passed. She continued that a law is supposed to mean what the enactor's intended it to mean. She referred to a letter the Mayor Miller wrote saying that the intention of the legislative body regarding the dangerous dog law is not being followed. Ms. Schwerin said Mayor Miller made the point that the innate characteristics of the animal are what make it dangerous, not the wall surrounding the animal. Ms. Schwerin contended that a dog being dangerous has nothing to do with confinement. She added that Mayor Miller said dangerous animals should be spayed or neutered. Supervisor Tenkate confirmed dangerous dogs are spayed or neutered. However, Ms. Schwerin said former Mayor Miller's point was dogs which should be declared dangerous are not, and are therefore not automatically spayed or neutered and are able to reproduce. Ms. Emptage asked if staff encourages spaying and neuter to owners of dogs under investigation, to which Supervisor Tenkate said staff are continually educating the public. Ms. Emptage requested a copy of the spay/neuter information provided to the public. Dr. Smith asked what Supervisor Tenkate thought about the score sheet, and she replied that she felt the neighborhood comments should carry more weight.

Discussion included possibly changing the form. Mr. Jacobs suggested any changes go through legal representation. The motion was made and seconded (Mendelsohn/Hubbard) that the Committee requests staff review the dangerous dog form and get back with the Committee to discuss any recommended changes. The motion carried (8-0), Ms. Schwerin abstained.

- Dog License Sticker Suggestion

Ms. Emptage said currently there are many dogs with permanent tags which don't have PACC's current phone number. She suggested that, just as with license plates, the tags could have a sticker. The sticker could show the license is current and have PACC's current phone number. Dr. Smith was concerned about the cost. Dr. Kaluzniacki pointed out that the permanent tag doesn't mean much, in that it doesn't indicate the dog is currently licensed. Ms. Hubbard expressed that she liked it better when there was a new color-coded tag each year as opposed to the current permanent tag. The motion was made and seconded (Kaluzniacki/Mendelsohn) recommending staff investigate either new tags every year or a sticker for the permanent tag. The motion carried (9-0).

8. Donations: A total of \$54,671.88 in donations was received during the month of January.

There was no discussion on this agenda item.

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

There was no discussion on this agenda item.

10. Call to the Audience

There was one speaker from the audience, Marcie Velen. Ms. Velen said No-Kill Pima County has been collecting raw data from PACC since 2012 and she reviews the data. She said the data indicates consistent improvements in many areas, and gave the example of adoptions recently going up to 61 percent compared to 55 percent for the prior six month period. She said the data has never matched. She referred to a modified rate which she said does not include owner requests for euthanasia. Foster care has been a nightmare for her statistically; if fosters are not taken into consideration, then those animals can be double counted, which influences the live release rate. Ms. Velen referred to the discussion on reducing the standard seven-day hold for licensed animals to five days, which she said she has no problem with. She continued that someone has proposed changing the three-day hold for strays down to two days, which she is not in favor of.

11. Announcements, Schedules and Proposed Agenda Items

Ms. Emptage said in light of the potential for the Committee to be restructured in the near future she is compiling an electronic list of relevant animal statutes as a reference tool.

12. Next Meeting – March 17, 2016

As established during the Management Report, Current Events, the next meeting will be at the Abrams building.

13. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:22 pm.



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

February 18, 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Roll Call• Establishment of Quorum and Pledge of Allegiance
2.	Review and Adoption of Minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Adoption of January 21, 2016 meeting minutes
3.	Recent Animal Care Center Holds Snapshot
4.	Call to the Audience
5.	Management Report <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Budget• Personnel Updates• PACC Satellite Site• Current Events
6.	Old Business <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Shortening Lengthy Animal Holds
7.	New Business <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 72-Hour Pet Waste Law• Timeframe to License Dogs• Dangerous Dog Form and Point System• Dog License Sticker Suggestion
8.	Donations: A total of \$54,671.88 in donations was received during the month of January.
9.	Complaints and Commendations: There were no complaints or commendations received by staff during January.
10.	Call to the Audience
11.	Announcements, Schedules and Proposed Agenda Items
12.	Next Meeting – March 17, 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.

Draft

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. García 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. García 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.

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

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

kennel_no

Number on Hold 15

HOLD TYPE ENFORCEMEN

A15-179672

K16-211242 A550414 DOG CHIUAHUA SH/MIX
2/9/16 STRAY FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A15-179672 **D186**
Kennel Comment: 3c3c3c3c R

A16-185921

K16-208993 A546447 DOG BART ENG SPRNGR SPAN/
1/8/16 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A16-185921 **D116**
Kennel Comment: Unable to scan in field, didnt bite R
DD-HOLD

01/08/2016 ENFORCE tfoster 1/8/16 11:10

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

K16-208995 A543571 DOG PRINCESS CHOW CHOW/
1/8/16 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A16-185921 **D116**
Kennel Comment: Unable to scan in field, didnt bite R
DD-HOLD
982000402836322

01/08/2016 ENFORCE tfoster 1/8/16 11:11

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

A16-186023

K16-210892 A549734 DOG KANE PIT BULL/MIX
2/4/16 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A16-186023 **D227**
Kennel Comment: left notice with mother, 3C 3C FOR CONFINEMENT CHECK R

A16-187127

K16-210582 A549108 DOG NINA PIT BULL/CHINESE SHARPEI
1/30/16 CONFISCATE CRUELTY INJ SEVERE Activity:A16-187127 **JW003**
Kennel Comment: 3c 3c 3c R

01/30/2016 DWINDAU 1/30/16 19:03
to cite dog owner for Neglect-No Water, Neglect-No vet care. 1984

A16-187372

K16-210726 A549356 DOG PUG/MIX
2/2/16 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A16-187372 **D256**
Kennel Comment: 3c3c3c R
Go slow!!!
no bite,chip found

02/02/2016 ENFORCE MGlanz 2/2/16 10:02
If Destiny Bennett, Marco Chavez or Munirih Nichols come to redeem Bella- cite for abandonment,
neglect-no water, neglect-no food and tie-out; Tucson city code on 2-2-16 at 09:17 hours. 2051

2/10/16 STRAY NIGHT NORMAL Activity:A16-187885
Kennel Comment: 2/10/2016--SEE ACTIVITY MEMO. HOLD FOR DD EVALUTATION. 1929

kennel_no

D106

R

02/10/2016 ENFORCE DATTEBEF 2/10/16 1:31
2/10/2016--Stray dog in enclosed yard w/ dead dog. Stray dog w/ dried reddish substance over body and no signs of injury.

Review for dangerous dog evaluation. 1929

K16-211301 A550580 DOG PIT BULL/
2/10/16 STRAY NIGHT NORMAL Activity:A16-187885
Kennel Comment: 2/10/2016--SEE ACTIVITY MEMO. HOLD FOR DD EVALUTATION. 1929

D118

R

02/10/2016 ENFORCE DATTEBEF 2/10/16 1:30
2/10/2016--Stray dog in enclosed yard w/ dead dog. Stray dog w/ dried reddish substance over body and no signs of injury.

Review for dangerous dog evaluation. 1929

A16-486023

K16-210893 A549735 DOG STEPHANIE PIT BULL/MIX
2/4/16 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A16-486023
Kennel Comment: left notice with mother, 3C 3C FOR CONFINEMENT CHECK

D227

R

Donation Activity

Period: 01-01-16 To: 01-31-16

Donation Code	Amount
DONATION	\$27.00
DONATION ADOP	\$9,603.16
DONATION ENFORCE 0972	\$0.00
DONATION GEN	\$18,215.10
DONATION OUTR	\$39.00
DONATION S/N	\$11,553.08
DONATION SAMS	\$15,234.54
Grand Total	\$54,671.88

Donation Activity

Period: 07-01-15 To: 01-31-16

Donation Code	Amount
DONATION	\$510.02
DONATION ADOP	\$13,547.57
DONATION ENFORCE 0972	\$0.00
DONATION GEN	\$139,493.02
DONATION LIC 0973	\$20.00
DONATION OUTR	\$397.00
DONATION S/N	\$76,612.83
DONATION SAMS	\$103,282.34
Grand Total	\$333,862.78