1. Call to Order

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

- Attendance

Present:
Tamara Barrick, Pima Paws for Life
Nancy Emptage, Animal Welfare Coalition
Pat Hubbard, Humane Society of Southern Arizona
Helen Mendelsohn, Disabled Community
Jack Neuman, Chair, PACC Volunteers
Jane Schwerin, People for Animals in the Prevention of Cruelty and Neglect
Gail Smith, MD, Board of Health

Absent:
Pat Jacobs, Tucson Kennel Club
Sophia Kaluzniacki, DVM, SPCA of AZ, Inc
Derek Marshall, Public Education
Erin O'Donnell, DVM, Southern AZ Veterinary Medical Association
Marcy Flanagan, Health Department Deputy Director, Ex-Offico (Health Department Director, Dr. Francisco García served in Ms. Flanagan’s place.)

- Pledge of Allegiance

2. Adoption of the Minutes

- Adoption of the March 17, 2016 Item Three Meeting Minutes

The motion was made and seconded (Emptage/Mendelsohn) that the March 17, 2016 item three meeting minutes be adopted with the proposed updated language. (Ms. Schwerin had requested a specific dialogue from the meeting be included.) The motion carried (7-0).

- Adoption of the April 21, 2016 Meeting Minutes

The motion was made and seconded (Hubbard/Barrick) that the April 21, 2016 meeting minutes be adopted as written. The motion carried (7-0).

3. Call to the Audience

There were no speakers from the audience.

4. Management Report
Dr. García introduced Deputy County Attorney Rona Kreamer. Ms. Kreamer has been with the Pima County Attorney’s Office (PCAO) for about nine and a half years and has been the lead felony issuer for animal cruelty cases for four years. She said County Attorney LaWall is committed to prosecuting animal cruelty crimes and invested in sending Ms. Kreamer to a National Animal Cruelty Conference approximately two years ago. Recently, contacts from that conference helped PCAO achieve a defendant pleading to an indictment as charged in a bestiality case.

Animal cruelty cases are investigated by either animal care personnel or by both animal care and law enforcement personnel. The Tucson Police Department and Pima County Sheriff’s Department have designated detectives who have experience in animal cruelty cases. Officers on scene, evidence, witness statements and the timeframe between when the crime was committed and reported all factor in on whether cases are pursued. PCAO’s standard for pursuing a case is the substantial likelihood of conviction at trial. The lack of photographs, missing police and veterinary reports, and the lack of a necropsy report, when applicable, are all examples of barriers to the substantial likelihood of conviction at trial. Law enforcement officers can typically get a telephonic search warrant in 15 to 20 minutes and seize valuable evidence which will assist PCAO. Good veterinary reports which include forensic information are also very helpful.

There are only five crimes listed in ARS 13-2910 as felonies; the rest are misdemeanors. There are other felonies, such as cockfighting and using a vicious dog for aggravated assault, listed elsewhere in the law. The five ARS 13-2910 felony charges are all class six felonies, which is the lowest level felony and judges can automatically designate them as misdemeanors. Ms. Kreamer said sentences in Justice Court are often stiffer than those handed down in felony court. When asked why, Ms. Kreamer said Justice Court Judge Felix has special training and understands the link between violence against animals and violence against people; judges dealing with felonies see far worse human on human crimes; there is a push to not institutionalize people, adding that incarceration is expensive; and because juries often knock felonies down to misdemeanors. Ms. Kreamer referred to an already adjudicated case wherein a mother dog and her puppies were starved. It took 30 days for the mother dog to get to a normal weight and 10 days for the puppies. The jury didn’t think the owner caused “serious physical injury” which is the felony statutory standard. The owner eventually received a sentence of six months in jail. Ms. Kreamer contrasted this case with another adjudicated case wherein an owner threw a dog against a wall, kicked and killed it. That owner received 12 months of probation and 10 days of suspended jail time; so that owner did not do any jail time.

The Committee provided questions and comments. When asked how her office decides whether or not to pursue a case as a felony, Ms. Kreamer referred to the substantial likelihood of conviction at trial standard; the quality of the evidence; and whether the violation is an omissive act or an affirmative act. She also referred to the record of how recent similar cases have gone. She added that felony court is expensive and includes a jury, whereas in Justice Court the judge decides the case. When asked about bans on animal ownership, Ms. Kreamer said she includes such bans in her plea agreements, but added that if there is a violation regarding one animal while other animals are well treated, then a ban on all animals doesn’t make sense, but checks by animals care and probation officers do. Mr. Neuman asked that if the reports are better is it better for Ms. Kreamer. She agreed the better the reports the better for her, but added that it is also important that rights not be violated because if they are then evidence will be suppressed. Ms. Mendelsohn asked if a dog bit someone then retreated onto its owner’s property but was not contained on that property. Ms. Kreamer said she
likes to error on the side of caution and suggested calling law enforcement. Ms. Schwerin asked if Ms. Kreamer has anything to do with cases wherein owners are cited but allowed to keep animals or redeem them. Ms. Kreamer is not involved in PACC’s decisions to seize animals. Ms. Emptage asked about situations where an animal is in distress and someone calls in to report the situation but the caller does not take any action to help the animal, can the caller be charged. Ms. Kreamer said the person who is not the owner has no legal requirement or authority to interview. She continued with the example of a dog in a hot car and cited the law that states a peace officer or animal control enforcement agent may use reasonable force in such a case. It was discussed that a court probably will not convict a citizen for breaking a window to save a dog’s life, although it is not legal to do so.

Ms. Schwerin referred to the dangerous animal law and PACC’s dangerous dog form, and said the form involves things that the law does not contemplate such as repairing a fence. She contended the deduction of points on the form is causing animals that should be declared dangerous to not be declared dangerous; and if not declared dangerous then they don’t have to be spayed or neutered and could be bred. Ms. Schwerin referred to a letter [Nov. 17, 1999] from former Tucson Mayor George Miller, which was congruent with her statements. Ms. Hubbard interjected that Mayor Miller was a painting contractor, not a dog expert and that not all dogs that bite are dangerous. She continued that any involvement by the Committee regarding dangerous dogs and animal behavior should include input from animal behavior professionals. Mr. Neuman interjected that in a recent meeting it was discussed that the form was developed many years ago through discussion and Dr. García had already agreed to have the new enforcement manager review PACC’s dangerous dog process. Ms. Kreamer added she has no involvement in the dangerous dog assessments. Dr. García confirmed the dangerous dog assessment is to be reviewed by staff and said it needs to be evidence based using best practices / industry standards.

There was some back and forth on whether the discussion should continue. Ms. Schwerin said the agenda item was supposed to be her agenda item and insisted she be allowed to continue. Mr. Neuman said she had five minutes. Ms. Schwerin went over a few dangerous dog cases wherein the dogs were not declared dangerous including revisiting two cases from the last meeting. The cases include dogs that ran out open doors and bit someone and a dog which reportedly had already killed another dog, but was not declared dangerous until it killed another dog. She commented common sense tells us these dogs should have been declared dangerous. She also commented that having a good fence is irrelevant when the dog runs out the door. She went on to quote a portion of Pima County Code 6.04.150:

> Whenever Pima Animal Care has reason to believe an animal may be dangerous, an evaluation of the animal shall be conducted pursuant to guidelines developed by Pima Animal Care. These guidelines provide for an evaluation of the animal's behavior both on and off of the premises of the owner, its behavior in and out of the owner's presence and its interactions with other persons and animals.

Ms. Schwerin said to follow the law, which states the evaluation is on the animal's behavior, there shouldn’t be any points deducted, such as when a fence is repaired.

Ms. Mendelsohn suggested the dangerous dog assessment be an agenda item sometime in the not too distant future. Supervisor Neil Konst commented that in the case where the dog had already killed another dog, if the first case was confirmed, then the dog would have automatically been declared dangerous, but sometimes the information is hearsay, not confirmed. He continued that within the
City of Tucson, if a dog bites it is declared vicious, which is very similar to being declared dangerous, with the exception on the insurance. Ms. Emptage said she would like to be able to have input on this matter.

- **Introduction of New Enforcement Manager, Adam Ricci**

Dr. García said PACC is becoming more and more professional and as such is able to attract more professional personnel. He then introduced PACC’s new Enforcement Manager, Adam Ricci, who briefly went over his background. Mr. Ricci came all the way from Maine. In Maine he served as a shelter intern, was a dog trainer, did a lot of breed specific work, served as an animal control officer and was as a police officer. As a police officer Mr. Ricci served as an evidence technician, doing crime scene processing. Dr. Garcia added that going forward regularly scheduled reports for the Committee need to be discussed, including enforcement reports.

- **Distribution of Submitted PACC FY 16/17 Budget**

The Committee’s packet included PACC’s Fiscal Year (FY) 16/17 budget as submitted to the Board of Supervisors. Dr. García said the total proposed budget is $9.1 million and pointed out the page comparing the FY15/16 and FY16/17 budgets. He invited the Committee to take their time to digest the budget documentation and then ask questions at next month’s meeting.

- **Building Update**

Dr. García reported the trailers / mobile buildings have been relocated, and shared some architectural renderings of the new facility. Mr. Neuman stressed that the Committee and community is counting on the new facility being completed on time and on budget. Dr. Garcia said the new structure is to be functional in November of 2017 and the remodel of existing space is to be done in 2018. Ms. Schwerin asked if the new facility will be able to house the same or more dogs and cats as it does now, to which Dr. García replied that it will.

5. **Welfare and Dangerous Dog Cases from April and Recent Animal Care Center Holds Snapshot**

Supervisor Neil Konst went over comments and questions regarding the welfare cases, provided prior to the meeting. Regarding welfare case one Mr. Konst said he saw the pictures and he would not have cited the complainant (reference to question from Ms. Emptage during Management Report discussion with Ms. Kreamer). The dog was on a tie-out and jumped the fence, which is another example of why tie-outs are bad. The dog’s back paws were on the ground. The dog was licensed. He continued that the owner was shown the pictures and was cited. He added the call came in at 8:11; was dispatched at 8:15; and an officer was on scene at 8:29. There was no recheck. Regarding welfare case two, which was a tie-out, but there wasn’t a build-up of waste. The owner redeemed the dog and the incident cost him $101 and a day in court. Ms. Emptage pointed out the license box was not checked on the report. The dog had to be licensed before it left PACC. Dr. Smith suggested volunteers could be utilized for drive-by rechecks. Mr. Konst cautioned that care would need to be taken to prevent overstepping bounds on such rechecks. Regarding welfare case three the impounded dogs were redeemed and the owner was cited for no water and no shelter. The complaint is still open for a recheck. Mr. Neuman asked how we know the owner will provide water and shelter after redeeming the dogs. Mr. Konst replied that we don’t know, but said it is typically an education issue. He talked about water containers that cannot be turned over and about what constitutes shelter versus what owners often
think is sufficient but is not. Welfare case four included reported noise. Mr. Konst said there is a pamphlet about dogs barking. Ms. Emptage requested a copy of the pamphlet. Two dogs were impounded and only one was redeemed. At a recheck the dogs which were not impounded were no longer on site. Ms. Schwerin felt the owner should not be allowed to redeem the dog that was in the crate. Welfare case five involved dogs at large and nine dogs were impounded. The owner did not come to PACC to redeem the animals, so staff went out and cited the owner. The question arose about what the criteria is for bonding animals versus allowing them to be redeemed, and Mr. Konst discussed that a simple tie-out is not sufficient; there has to be some danger. Ms. Emptage asked about associates adopting animals for those who do not redeem their animal(s). There is no policy aimed at preventing this, but there is a policy against individuals accompanying someone turned down for an adoption adopting an animal the same day their associate was turned down. In welfare case six no animals were impounded; the owner was cited and there is no follow-up. The dog has not been licensed yet. Welfare case seven involved an old dog in terrible shape brought in for euthanasia. Ms. Hubbard interjected that some people see it as a moral or religious right to allow an animal to die naturally. Mr. Konst said staff relies on the veterinarians to help determine if citations need to be issued. Ms. Schwerin contended that the second dog in this case, which was returned to the son, should not have been returned to the son. Mr. Neuman called for more defined procedures and Dr. García agreed that good procedures and good documentation are needed to take property.

6. Old Business

- Reaffirmation of Volunteer Code of Conduct, Social Media, and Communication Policies/Enforcement

Dr. García recapped that these policies (included in the record) had been a topic of discussion in a number of Committee meetings last year; after significant input they have been completed; and he is asking for the Committee’s vote of reaffirmation for the policies.

The motion was made and seconded (Hubbard/Emptage) that the Committee vote to accept the three policies as written. The motion carried (6-0), Ms. Schwerin abstained.

- Shortening of Shelter Animal Lengths of Stay (deferred to a future meeting)

There was no discussion on this agenda item.

7. New Business

- Committee’s Volunteer Representative Selection Process

Mr. Neuman said a letter has been sent out to the volunteers telling them if they are interested in being on the Committee they are to submit a communication with their background information, to be looked at by PACC managers Jose Ocano and Justin Gallick, and Mr. Neuman. The names of candidates with good backgrounds will be put out for the volunteers to vote on.

8. Donations: A total of $31,800.41 in donations was received during the month of April.

There was no discussion on this agenda item.
9. **Complaints and Commendations:** There were no complaints and no commendations received by staff during April.

Ms. Mendelsohn said she recently helped someone pick out a dog from PACC for Top Dog and the PACC veterinarian was very, very helpful.

10. **Call to the Audience**

There were no speakers from the audience.

11. **Announcements, Schedules and Proposed Agenda Items**

Ms. Emptage announced PACC’s phone tree was updated. Dr. García said the updates include the direction to call 911 if the call is an emergency and the option to talk to an actual person if the phone tree does not provide needed direction.

Mr. Neuman requested procedures for adoptions be on the next agenda.

12. **Next Meeting – June 16, 2016**

The next meeting will be at the Abrams building.

13. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 7:32 pm.
NOTICE
PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
PIMA COUNTY ANIMAL CARE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
May 19, 2016 – 5:30 p.m.
Abrams Building
3950 S. Country Club Road
Tucson, Arizona
Room 1108
(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 March 17, 2016 item 3 Meeting Minutes
   • Adoption of April 21, 2016 Meeting Minutes
3. Call to the Audience
4. Management Report
   • Deputy County Attorney Kreamer: Dangerous Dog Related Enforcement and Policies
   • Introduction of New Enforcement Manager, Adam Ricci
   • Distribution of Submitted PACC FY 16/17 Budget
   • Building Update
5. Welfare and Dangerous Dog Cases from April and Recent Animal Care Center Holds Snapshot
6. Old Business
   • Reaffirmation of Volunteer Code of Conduct, Social Media, and Communication Policies/Enforcement
   • Shortening of Shelter Animal Lengths of Stay (deferred to a future meeting)
7. New Business
   • Committee’s Volunteer Representative Selection Process
8. Donations: A total of $31,800.41 in donations was received during the month of April.
9. Complaints and Commendations: There were no complaints and no commendation received by staff during April.
10. Call to the Audience
11. Announcements, Schedules and Proposed Agenda Items
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.
Question from 3-17-16 Pima County Animal Care Advisory Committee Item 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schwerin</th>
<th>Let’s say I donate $500 and I earmark it for spaying and neutering, and you said it would be spent for spaying and neutering; but the big question is will it be spent for $500 more spaying and neutering than would have been done had I not given that money?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neuman</td>
<td>Good question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>And I think the answer to that is, no, because we virtually spay and neuter every animal, right, that we place out for adoption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emptage</td>
<td>No, no, no, there’s a difference here; you have spay and neutering for community services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flanagan</td>
<td>It would be above and beyond, because it’s two different kinds of spay and neuter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emptage</td>
<td>So where would it go, would it go into the shelter operations for altering or go out into the pet fix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard</td>
<td>We’ve already budgeted for the in-house spay and neuter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>Correct. So, I’m not sure I understood the question; I’m sorry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwerin</td>
<td>So what’s the point in donating money for spaying and neutering if you’re already doing it?  (Reflected in the draft minutes, but not word for word.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>(Answer reflected in the minutes.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible additional language for the 03-17-16 minutes:

Ms. Schwerin asked, “Let’s say I donate $500 and I earmark it for spaying and neutering, and you said it would be spent for spaying and neutering; but the big question is will it be spent for $500 more spaying and neutering than would have been done had I not given that money?” Ms. Flanagan responded that it would be above and beyond.
1. **Call to Order**

Mr. Neuman called the meeting to order at 5:35 pm.

- Attendance

Present:
- Tamara Barrick, Pima Paws for Life
- Nancy Emptage, Animal Welfare Coalition
- Pat Hubbard, Humane Society of Southern Arizona
- Jack Neuman, 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-Offico

Absent:
- Pat Jacobs, Tucson Kennel Club
- Sophia Kaluzniacki, DVM, SPCA of AZ, Inc
- Derek Marshall, Public Education
- Helen Mendelsohn, Disabled Community
- Erin O'Donnell, DVM, Southern AZ Veterinary Medical Association

- Pledge of Allegiance

2. **Adoption of the Minutes**

- Adoption of the February 18, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Ms. Schwerin said her discussion on page five of the draft minutes was recorded inaccurately in that it states: “However, Ms. Schwerin’s point was dogs which should be declared dangerous…” when it should reflect it was former Mayor Miller’s point she was bringing up. Ms. Schwerin chose to edit the text verbally in lieu of providing a written edit as requested by Mr. Neuman.

The motion was made and seconded (Smith/Emptage) that the February 18, 2016 meeting minutes be adopted with the aforementioned edit. The motion carried (6-0).

3. **Animal Care Center Budget Discussion**

Ms. Flanagan introduced Garrett Hancock, Health Department Business Manager, who utilized the attached PowerPoint presentation to explain how budgets are done in Pima County.

In June of 1980 Arizona voters amended the Arizona Constitution prescribing an expenditure limitation for each county, city, town, and community college district. The purpose of the expenditure limitation is to control expenditures and limit future increases in spending to adjustments for inflation; deflation; population growth. There are exceptions for natural or manmade disasters or if approved by two-thirds of the governing board and a majority of the qualified voters. The budget process cycle
begins in October for the fiscal year which begins the following July. Mr. Hancock discussed the budget timeline and in-process adjustments that occur, often due to State cost transfers and insurance cost changes. In May the Board of Supervisors passes a tentative budget, which sets the budget limit, and then the final budget adoption is in June. To come up with the Department’s total budget Finance starts with the current adopted budget figure and makes adjustments for any known differences. Anything in excess of the adjusted figure has to be pursued as a supplemental budget request and most of those do not get approved.

PACC’s budget is divided into three parts: the PACC special revenue fund (fund 2001), the PACC grants fund (fund 2042), and the PACC bequests fund (fund 2131). Mr. Neuman asked which fund general donations go into. Mr. Hancock said donations go into fund 2001; while a grant from PetSmart goes into fund 2042; and if someone dies and leaves PACC their house it (the money from the house) goes into fund 2131. Spending authority is based on projections. Mr. Neuman asked what happens if the projected revenue amount is exceeded. Money taken in in excess of the expenditure authority goes into an account. Mr. Hancock said it cannot be spent during the current fiscal year because it is not in the budget, but can be budgeted in future years. He gave the example of the bequest money coming in and being included in budgets going forward, but not in the budget year the money was received. Ms. Emptage asked about how general donations are divided out and Mr. Hancock said a portion goes to cover costs attributed to the various municipalities. Once the County puts money into PACC’s fund, the County cannot take it back. Dr. Smith asked if surplus funds in PACC’s account carried over to another year result in the County reducing the general fund contribution. Mr. Hancock said in theory the County could do so, but has not. He continued that this year is the first year of his three years with the Health Department wherein PACC is not over budget. PACC’s overages have been covered by the Health Department’s budget in years past. Ms. Barrick said that the Committee has trouble accepting that donations are being rolled into PACC’s budget to cover operations instead of for the animals specifically. Ms. Hubbard asked if money given for a specific purpose, such as spay and neuter, actually goes for that purpose. Mr. Hancock said it does. He continued that the County’s financial management system tracks all the money and has stops within the system to prevent spending beyond authorized thresholds for specific master agreements (contracts) and commodities. Ms. Schwerin asked why people should give donations for things PACC is already doing. Mr. Hancock said because PACC is traditionally over budget and could not do all the things they want to do without the donations. Mr. Neuman said there is a pie of money which comes into the County; asserted that the community wants PACC to have a larger portion of the pie; and continued that donations should not be considered part of the pie. Mr. Hancock said he, PACC and the Health Department administration all agree PACC needs more money. He went on to relay that prior to PACC’s tent going up the Board of Supervisors granted an extremely rare mid-year adjustment to cover the additional costs associated with erecting the tent, but PACC still went over budget due to the additional operating cost associated with housing the additional animals in the tent.

PACC’s fiscal year 2015/2016, current, budget is $8.8 million with projected revenues of just under $6.5 million. The difference is made up by the general fund subsidy. Next year’s budget is over $9.175 million. Dr. Smith asked if the revenues include donations; Mr. Hancock said they include anticipated donations based on trends, but would not include a bequest. In response to a question Mr. Hancock explained grants have reporting requirements and audits.
1. Call to Order

Mr. Neuman called the meeting to order at 5:37 pm.

- Attendance

Present:
Tamara Barrick, Pima Paws for Life
Nancy Emptage, 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, 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

Absent:
Marcy Flanagan, Health Department Deputy Director, Ex-Offico (Health Department Director, Dr. Francisco García served in Ms. Flanagan’s place.)

- Pledge of Allegiance

2. Adoption of the Minutes

- Adoption of the March 17, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Originally the motion was made and seconded (Hubbard/Emptage) to adopt the minutes as written. Ms. Schwerin said during last month’s Budget Discussion (item three), a question she had asked about if a donation for spay and neuter would purchase extra spaying and neutering over what would be done without the donation, and the question’s answer, were omitted from the draft minutes; she requested they be added to the minutes. Mr. Neuman requested Mr. Schluter go back to the recording and bring back details about the specific discussion Ms. Schwerin was referring to, for the next meeting. Ms. Schwerin continued that on page four of the draft minutes, item six, wherein Ms. Flanagan spoke about the Board of Supervisors passing the Advisory Committee ordinance, the draft minutes state, “The Board made some changes;” however, Ms. Schwerin stated Ms. Flanagan used the words, “minor changes.” Ms. Schwerin asserted that the changes were not minor to her; to her they were major changes, but she wanted the minutes to reflect Ms. Flanagan said, “minor changes.”

There was no vote on the first motion. A second motion was made and seconded (Mendelsohn/Emptage) that the March 17, 2016 meeting minutes be adopted in part (item three pending), as written, with the one amendment reflecting Ms. Flanagan said, “minor changes,” as requested by Ms. Schwerin. The motion carried (11-0).
3. **Animal Care Center Budget Discussion**

This item was duplicated on the agenda. Discussion recorded under item six, Management Report, Budget Update.

4. **Welfare and Dangerous Dog Cases from March and Recent Animal Care Center Holds Snapshot**

Dr. Smith asked what happened to the dog in welfare case one. Supervisor Tenkate said the dog is still at PACC and goes home every night with a PACC veterinarian who is fostering the dog. She added the owner is on the do-not-adopt list. Ms. Emptage requested the court be asked to ban the owner from owning animals, since the do-not-adopt list only keeps an individual from adopting from PACC, not other agencies. Ms. Schwerin said the owner in this case did not have money for the dog’s medical treatment and cited that as an example of the need for better screening for adoptions. Also the owner was giving the dog cranberry juice to treat a urinary tract infection and the PACC officer said such a remedy would only work at the onset of symptoms. Ms. Schwerin said in her experience the cranberry juice would not help. Dr. Kaluzniacki said the juice would not help the infection and cautioned against officers giving medical advice. Supervisor Tenkate acknowledged the caution and said typically officers do not give medical advice. Dr. García added that PACC doesn’t want to keep animals, such as the one in this case, in the shelter for a long time, so a foster or adoption placement is sought.

Dr. Smith asked what happened with the limping dog from welfare case two. Supervisor Tenkate said as of 3-16-16 the dog was no longer limping. She added the owner was cited for no license and no vaccination. At this time staff does not know if the dog has been licensed yet.

Ms. Emptage asked if there was a recheck on the dog from welfare case three. There had not, but PACC has not received any more complaints from the neighbor.

Dr. Smith asked if the aggressive dogs in welfare case four had dangerous dog evaluations. They had; were declared dangerous; and were euthanized at PACC. Ms. Emptage expressed that the lack of veterinary care for the injured dog to her was sufficient to not allow the owner to keep his/her other dogs. Dr. Smith asked if there is a continuum of levels of severity regarding neglect and if there are higher bonds for more severe cases. Supervisor Tenkate said it is up to the judge. Ms. Hubbard asked at what point does a case become a felony. Supervisor Tenkate said the cases are turned over to law enforcement for review and for a felony there has to be intent, which is hard to prove. Dr. García added that for a felony case the standard of evidence is very high. He continued that PACC cannot remove an animal without cause related to that animal; however judges have more discretion. An un-adjudicated bad outcome for one animal is not sufficient justification to confiscate another animal. Mr. Neuman asked what the liability would be if PACC took an animal that a judge says should not have been taken; would it just be give the dog back. Dr. García said the County Attorney says animals are property that cannot be seized without appropriate cause. Ms. Schwerin said the animals in distress law should be called the animals in distress or danger law and the law says animal care officers can take animals in danger. Dr. García said he will bring the issue back to the County Attorney’s Office for review. Ms. Schwerin said officers can cite for cruelty instead of neglect. She felt cruelty sounds worse than neglect. Supervisor Tenkate said charging for both cruelty and neglect would be duplicitous. Dr. Kaluzniacki commented that people get charged with two charges all the time.
Ms. Mendelsohn asked why the dog in welfare case five was not confiscated. Supervisor Tenkate said because the owner agreed to keep the dog inside and there have been no more complaints. Dr. García added the law requires PACC employee the least restrictive option. Ms. Schwerin said she had never heard of the least restrictive law. Dr. García said it is a judicial concept not a law. There was no dangerous dog assessment requested or done.

Dr. Smith said the owner in welfare case six should not be allowed to own a pet. Supervisor Tenkate said the owner is on the do-not-adopt list. Ms. Emptage asked if PACC shares the do-not-adopt list. They do not. Mr. Neuman requested sharing the list with other agencies be an upcoming agenda item. Ms. Schwerin asked why the citation for this emaciated dog was for neglect, not cruelty. Mr. Neuman suggested there is too much subjectivity in these cases. Supervisor Tenkate said staff is changing how they cite from citing on scene to citing after all information is available after the veterinary exam.

Mr. Neuman asked how many welfare cases the Committee actually sees. Supervisor Tenkate said all of them, one month at a time. From past conversations, members of the Committee were under the impression that there were hundreds of these cases and they only saw a select few. Dr. García said the new enforcement manager will be charged with looking at processes such as these citations. Mr. Neuman requested the new manager be introduced to the Committee once on board. Ms. Emptage added that the dangerous dog form could use some assessment as well. Ms. Mendelsohn requested when owners are placed on the do-not-adopt list that it be expressed in the information the Committee receives so the Committee doesn’t have to ask. Ms. Schwerin asked about leaving the names in the welfare cases; she wanted the names included. She added that the names of those accused of murder appear in the paper, so why not include the names in the welfare and dangerous dog report. Mr. Neuman questioned what having the names does for the Committee. Dr. García said he will consult with the County Attorney’s Office on the request.

Dr. Smith said welfare case eight was horrible; the dog had maggots and was dying. She felt the whole family should be on the do-not-adopt list. The owner was cited for neglect, no veterinary care. The Committee expressed several individual comments that the citation should be for cruelty. Dr. O'Donnell said there needs to be different levels of neglect and there should be a cruelty level of neglect.

Ms. Schwerin referred to dangerous dog case one in which a dog bit a mail carrier and charged at a PACC officer. The dog was declared not dangerous. Ms. Schwerin asserted that the dog was clearly dangerous and the system is not working. Dr. Smith pointed out the dangerous dog point system form was used; the score did not add up high enough; and stated the system is not perfect.

Ms. Schwerin referred to dangerous dog case three and said the report indicates the dog in question attacked another dog at an offsite adoption event; there was a note that it was aggressive towards smaller dogs; and there was a note that the dog exhibited fearful or unsafe behavior. She asserted the dog was obviously dangerous and the point system needs to be revised. Mr. Neuman stated in a past meeting when the point system was an agenda item it was discussed that the system was created through a non-scientifically based discussion roughly 16 years ago. He asked if the system could be reviewed and made more defensible. Dr. García said the dangerous dog instrument is one of the items to be reviewed by the new enforcement supervisor when he gets on board. Ms. Mendelsohn asked about PACC’s liability in light of the documented behavior. Dr. García said the liability issues are complicated, but that in this case the law says the liability is on the owner. Ms. Emptage also
expressed concern on the training for staff making dangerous dog determinations, in addition to the point system.

Ms. Schwerin said there will be an agenda item on next month’s agenda regarding the enforcement of dangerous animal laws and provided copies of a November 17, 1999 letter from George Miller, who was the Tucson Mayor at that time, regarding dangerous animals.

5. Call to the Audience

There were no speakers from the audience.

6. Management Report

Dr. García spoke for Ms. Flanagan who could not attend. He utilized a PowerPoint presentation (included in the record) to address several items.

- Building Update

There was no discussion on this item.

- Budget Update

Referring to Ms. Schwerin’s question at the last meeting, which she brought up during the minutes discussion in this meeting, Dr. García said if specific funds are donated for specific reasons, then there are two scenarios. The first scenario is a bequest; and with a bequest Dr. García is tasked with generating an investment plan to use the funds for a period of three to five years. The County Administrator and Board of Supervisors then has to approve the plan for PACC to spend the funds as requested. Day to day donations go to three main areas: medical, spay/neuter and shelter operations. PACC cannot spend funds beyond its spending authority, so roughly half a million dollars in spending authority is budgeted in anticipation and hope of receiving these funds.

In 2015 PACC received a significant donation from PetSmart and with those funds PACC has been able to increase pet adoptions, with a 210 percent increase in cat adoptions and a 147 percent increase in PetSmart adoptions overall.

Dr. García provided a one-page handout showing PACC’s mid-April budget situation (included in the record). Year to date costs hover just below prorated expenses and year to date revenues are slightly above the prorated revenue prediction. This is the first time in Dr. García’s administration that PACC has been on budget. He said reducing overtime; better utilization of staff and, of course, the volunteers are largely responsible for this achievement. Dr. Smith asked for a dollar value for the volunteer program. Dr. García said it is hard to quantify the numerous activities into dollar values. Mr. Neuman said the volunteers give PACC gave about 75,000 hours last year; and Ms. Hubbard said her organization figured their volunteers equated to 81 FTEs (full time employees) last year.

- Events

Friends of PACC raised $41,000 in the Arizona Gives Day fund raising effort. The funds will be used for special medical equipment.
PACC has recently dealt with three hoarding cases in three weeks, totaling over 100 pets. The overwhelming majority of the animals have been placed, including 28 small breed dogs.

With the ordinance on new Committee’s structure being passed by the Board of Supervisors the Deputy County Administrator and County Attorney’s Office is looking at how the Committee’s volunteer representative will be selected. At some point Dr. García wants to come back and report on what the recommendations are for the selection process.

A recent Best Friends / Points of Light Foundation award will give PACC access to a nationally recognized consultant in the area of animal welfare and volunteer programs. This is to help refine and improve PACC’s volunteer program and possibly go through volunteer certification.

7. Old Business

- Pima Animal Care Center Enforcement Officer Numbers

There was no discussion on this agenda item. It is to be carried over to the next meeting.

8. New Business

- Use of Welfare Case Comment Sheets to Streamline Welfare Case Discussion

Ms. Emptage asked if the comment sheets have been a good tool. There was general agreement that the comment sheets are a good tool. Mr. Schlueter said some of the comments come back a little late. Generally if the information is sent out in time, then he wants the comments back eight days prior to the meeting.

- Volunteer Code of Conduct, Social Media, and Communication Policies/Enforcement

Dr. García reminded the Committee that several months ago staff discussed establishing a volunteer code of conduct, social media policy and communication policy with the Committee at more than one meeting. He said staff received over 300 public comments and used the feedback to help shape these policies, which are in use. Dr. García said he wants the Committee to look over the final policies and reaffirm them. He continued that recent occurrences coupled with a request from the County Attorney’s Office to make the policies more explicit have shaped an effort to cause these policies to be more on people’s minds.

- Open-Adoptions Philosophy and Presentation

Dr. García utilized his PowerPoint presentation to speak on this topic. He opened by saying if we start with the perspective that people are coming to PACC with good intentions, we will have a much better success rate in terms of finding long term matches between people and pets. The open adoptions philosophy means looking for ways to say yes instead of reasons to say no. There are cases where no adoption is the correct decision, but these cases should be rare. Open adoption processes are considered industry standard and are supported by many major animal welfare organizations. Adoptions should be more people-work and less paperwork. Maintaining a low length of stay is crucial for all aspects of sheltering. In 2015 11,977 animals were adopted from PACC; 1,977 were returned to owners; 1,788 were euthanized; and 984 were transferred out. There was a question about
monthly statistical reports that the Committee used to receive, but have not been receiving lately, and a request for more regular statistical updates. There were only 500 returns which is a 4.1 percent return rate. The industry standard is about eight percent. Ms. Schwerin pointed out unsuccessful adoptions are not all returns; opined that the return figure is not significant because she believes only a few of the unsuccessful adoptions are actually returned; and stated it is unknown what happened to other unsuccessful adoptions, which could have been dumped in the desert for all we know. Dr. García said Ms. Schwerin makes a good point; however, the return rate is what the industry uses to judge progress and it gives PACC a common proportion to compare with other agencies. Dr. Kaluzniacki asked if relicensing of adopted animals could be used as an indicator of successful adoptions. Dr. García didn’t think so because relicensing compliance is poor. PACC intakes are down; live releases are up; and euthanasia numbers have never been lower. Ms. Hubbard added that the Humane Society’s intakes are also down. Spay and neuter efforts are believed to be the reason for decrease intakes. Ms. Hubbard also added the Humane Society used to look for reasons to not adopt and in so doing ended up killing a lot of animals. Now they look for reasons to adopt.

Dr. García went over the current adoption guidelines detailed in the PowerPoint presentation, which begin with the adopter being an adult with valid photo identification. He referred to guidance provided to him by [Deputy] County Attorney Paula [Perrera]. Although we have the ability to place some restrictions on who gets to adopt; any policy we implement cannot discriminate against any protected class of individuals; decisions must be based on objectively demonstrable standards of care; policies must be consistently and fairly applied; and any policy should avoid the use of discretion to the greatest extent possible to avoid inconsistent application and claims of arbitrary action on the part of PACC and the County government. PACC will be repurposing three staff positions to the adoption process, Currently the Adoption Coordinator spends significant time at offsite adoptions and there is very limited staff availability for volunteers who anchor the adoption program. Additionally two more staff members will join the adoption team within the next year. Dr. Garcia said there is a need for better training for staff and volunteers. The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and the Humane Society of the United States recommend following up with adopters at three days, three weeks and three months, which is something PACC is looking to do to increase retention and customer service. Some of this follow-up program will be automated.

Questions and discussion followed the presentation. Dr. Smith asked if adopters are given information on topics such as how much to feed an animal and when to seek veterinary care. Dr. García said there is a thick stack of information, but the information is not discussed with the adopters due to time constraints. He continued, in the new facility there will be a lounge area with tables and chairs, away from the noise of the shelter, to facilitate conversation based adoptions. Ms. Emptage requested a copy of the adoption packet and the general consensus was that copies should be provided to the entire Committee. Ms. Schwerin asked what the term “open adoptions” means. Dr. García said it is a philosophy; referred back to that particular presentation slide; and said it means looking for reasons to say yes rather than reasons to say no. Ms. Schwerin said she doesn’t think PACC is doing anything about helping adopters get veterinary care. Dr. García referred to health, whether animal or human, as a crapshoot, and said on the rescue side PACC is being very up front about the medical needs of animals. He continued that PACC will not be looking at adopters’ tax forms to determine whether or not they can afford veterinary care, saying PACC is not in the position to make that judgment call. However, as PACC does the three day, three week, three month checks that issue can be assessed for. He added that not all returns are failures and acknowledged the strategy is not perfect. Ms. Schwerin asked what happens if someone adopts a dog and then later it gets ran over by a car and the owner has no money for veterinary care. Dr. García acknowledged PACC is not
addressing such a scenario. Later in the discussion Dr. O’Donnell pointed out that the adoption packet includes a certificate for a free veterinarian visit and her clinic invests significant time discussing many topics, including veterinary care, to set adopters up for success. She added that she wanted the free visit certificate toward the top of the packet. Mr. Neuman stated donations are built into the budget; people are not giving to save taxes; and suggested donations could go into a fund as a resource for needs such as assisting with veterinary care. Dr. García referred to the forming of the 501c3 Friends of PACC entity which he said is able to do these types of things; then balanced that against accountability to PACC partners and their different budgets and priorities. Ms. Mendelsohn asked if there is a limit on the number of animals someone may adopt from PACC. Dr. García said he would have to check on the answer. Mr. Neuman said he doesn’t think the population is intrinsically good; referred to the presence of numerous law enforcement officers as evidence of his opinion; continued that law enforcement presence is there to ensure people don’t do bad things; and used his example to say that PACC needs to likewise ensure things are done right regarding animals being adopted. Mr. Jacobs provided a rebuttal to Mr. Neuman’s remarks, saying he believes everyone in the meeting loves animals; the people in PACC love animals; 90 percent of people are good; and that the presence of law enforcement does not indicate society is not good. Dr. García said he wants to make the right thing, regarding adoptions, the easy thing. Ms. Schwerin reminded the meeting that per the code adoptions need to be into a suitable home.

Mr. Neuman said he wanted reduction of the animal length of stay on the agenda again. Dr. García added that requesting the jurisdictional partners make their ordinances consistent in allowing shorter lengths of stay, for owned animals, was a major topic at the last jurisdictional partners meeting.

9. Donations: A total of $35,401.59 in donations was received during the month of March.

There was no discussion on this agenda item.

10. Complaints and Commendations: There were no complaints and one commendations received by staff during March.

There was no discussion on this agenda item.

11. Call to the Audience

There were no speakers from the audience.

12. Announcements, Schedules and Proposed Agenda Items

There were several agenda items mentioned, mostly during other discussions.

Ms. Emptage asked about an update on a suggestion from a previous meeting, about updating dog tags by adding a sticker similar to how stickers are added to license plates. Many of the current tags don’t have PACC’s current phone number.

Ms. Emptage wants to discuss the possibility of changing the courts’ authority to ban individuals from owning animals from three years to five years.

Mr. Neuman requested the sharing of the do-not-adopt list with other agencies be an agenda topic.
Ms. Schwerin said the enforcement of dangerous animal laws will be on the next agenda.

Mr. Neuman requested the shortening of shelter animal lengths of stay be added back onto the agenda.

Mr. Neuman requested the new enforcement manager be introduced to the Committee once on board.

At some point how the Committee’s volunteer representative will be selected should come back to the Committee.

The Pima Animal Care Center Enforcement Officer Numbers item and the Volunteer Code of Conduct, Social Media, and Communication Policies item from today’s agenda still need to be addressed.

13. **Next Meeting – May 19, 2016**

   The next meeting will be at the Abrams building.

14. **Adjournment**

   The meeting adjourned at 8:06 pm.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Marcy Flanagan, Deputy Director
FROM: K. Baugus, Field Officer #1918
DATE: May 5th 2016
RE: Welfare Report for April

1. A16-192323 One dog was impounded. The owner redeemed the dog and was cited for neglect, tie out. The dog was returned to the owner. This complaint is closed.

2. A16-191020 One dog was impounded, The owner redeemed the dog and was cited for neglect tie out. The dog was returned to the owner. This complaint is closed.

3. A16-192304 Two dogs were impounded. The owner redeemed both dogs and was cited for neglect, no water and neglect no shelter. The dogs were returned to the owner. This complaint is open pending a recheck for water and shelter.

4. A16-189386 Two dogs were impounded. The owner redeemed one dog and relinquished the other. The owner was cited for neglect, no shelter, and neglect, no exercise space. This complaint is closed.

5. A16191832 Nine dogs impounded. The owner was cited for leash law violations, neglect, no water, neglect, no shelter, neglect, no food, neglect, unsanitary shelter and no license. No animals were redeemed. This complaint in closed.

6. A16-191340 No animals were impounded. The animal owner was cited for neglect tie out and neglect, no shelter.

7. A16-190680 An animal was brought to Pima Animal Care Center for euthanasia. The animal owner was cited for neglect, no vet care. The animal was euthanized at PACC.
INVESTIGATION REPORT

Pima County Health Department
Pima Animal Services Program
4000 N Silverbell Rd
Tucson, AZ 85750
Phone: (520) 724-5900
Fax: (520) 724-5960

INVESTIGATION

NAME / RACE #: A. VARGAS #2060 A16-192323
ACTIVITY / SKU #: BITE ☑ WELFARE ☑ DANGEROUS ☑ OTHER ☑

LOCATION OF INCIDENT

NELSON DR

DATE AND TIME OF INCIDENT
04/26/16 0859

DATE AND TIME REPORTED
04/26/16 0811

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE
S. Elliott (2087)

VICTIM / COMPLAINTANT NAME
A. VARGAS #2060

VICTIM'S ADDRESS
4000 N SILVERBELL RD

VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS

SEX: M

WEIGHT: 200 lbs

HEIGHT: 5'10""

EYES: BROWN

HAIR: BROWN

ORIGIN: USA

DOB: 05/17/1964

SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER:

DANGEROUS

RESTRICTION

REQUESTED

YES ☑ NO ☑

YES ☑ NO ☑

YES ☑ NO ☑

YES ☑ NO ☑

YES ☑ NO ☑

OTHER AGENCY CASE #: ☑ SHERIFF DEPT ☑ TUCSON POLICE ☑ FIRE ☑ OTHER:

FOLLOW UP REQUEST:

YES ☑ NO ☑

ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

YES ☑ NO ☑

VIOLATION:

NON-VIOLATION:

PART OF BODY Bitten:

TREATED BY:

PHONE NUMBER:

DATE QUARANTINED:

P A S S:

YES ☑ NO ☑

RELEASE DATE:

YES ☑ NO ☑

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

Y E T CLINIC

PHONE NUMBER:

OWNER KnownS OF BITE:

YES ☑ NO ☑

CONTACT:

YES ☑ NO ☑

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

CLINIC'S ADDRESS

43rd PARTY CITATIONS

YES ☑ NO ☑

YES ☑ NO ☑

YES ☑ NO ☑

OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS

BARKY

YES ☑ NO ☑

BREED / DESCRIPTION

PIT BULL MIX

ANIMAL'S NAME

BRN/WHITE M 2YRS L16270834 NORMAL

LICENSE #

CONDITION

ANIMAL ID#

VICTIM:

OWNER:

VICTIM:

OWNER:

VICTIM:

OWNER:

VICTIM:

OWNER:

VICTIM:

OWNER:

VICTIM:

OWNER:

VICTIM:

OWNER:

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

PACC Activity: A16-192323

ACO & Badge A. VARGAS #2060

ON APRIL 26, 2016 I OFFICER ANDREW VARGAS BADGE #2060 ARRIVED AT THE THE COMPLAINANTS PROPERTY OF NELSON DR WHERE THE COMPLAINANT ADVISED ME OF A DOG THAT HAD JUMPED IT'S FENCE AND WAS HANGING NOW ON HIS SIDE OF HIS FENCE BY THE MEANS OF A TIE OUT. UPON REVIEWING WHERE THE DOG WAS TIED OUT, I OBSERVED THE DOG HANGING BY A TIE OUT AND BARELY ABLE TO TOUCH THE GROUND WITH IT'S REAR PAWS. IT WAS AT THIS TIME THAT I OBSERVED THAT THE DOG WAS TIED OUT BY THE MEANS OF A WIRE LEASH. I THEN USED A SET OF BOLT CUTTERS TO REMOVE THE DOG FROM THE TIE OUT. I THEN IMPounded THE DOG AND ATTEMPTED TO MAKE CONTACT AT THE DOG OWNERS ADDRESS OF NELSON DR. I DID NOT RECEIVE AN ANSWER AT THE DOOR AND WAS UNABLE TO MAKE CONTACT WITH THE DOG OWNER. A NOTICE WAS LEFT ON THE FRONT DOOR STATING THAT THE DOG WAS IMPounded ALONG WITH THE DOGS ANIMAL ID. NO FURTHER ACTION WAS TAKEN.

ON APRIL 26, 2016 AT 1817 HOURS OFFICER ELLIOTT (287) MET WITH DOG OWNER, (DOB AT THE PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER AFTER HE CAME IN TO REDEEM OFFICER ELLIOTT ISSUED NEGLECT-TIEOUT CITATIONS TO MR. UNDER CITY JURISDICTION. MR SIGNED AND RECEIVED HIS COPIES OF THE CITATIONS.

Officer's Signature: 

Date: 4/27/16
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BREED/DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ANIMAL’S NAME</th>
<th>COLOR</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>TAG COLOR</th>
<th>LICENSE #</th>
<th>VX CERTIFICATE #</th>
<th>COND</th>
<th>ANIMAL ID#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VICTIM</td>
<td>Black/tan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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: A16-191020

ACO name & Badge: 1942 Eckelarger

On 4-4-16 at 1045 hours I Investigator Eckelarger (1942) responded to Romero Rd unit where I observed a black and tan G. Shepherd puppy on a leash tie-out on the front porch. The tie-out was approximately 10 feet long connected to the front porch. The dog had access to shade and water. There was a few days of animal waste in the front yard area next to the front porch. I then impounded the dog and posted a notice of impoundment on the front door.

At 1045 hours I met with dog owner, (DOB ), at the Pima Animal Care Center after she came in to redeem her dog I then cited Ms. for neglect-tieout under City jurisdiction. Ms. signed and received her copy of the citation.

Officer's Signature: Date: 4-5-16
**INVESTIGATION REPORT**

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

---

**SUSPECT**

**ACO NAME / BADGE #**
R Tovar 2021
A16-192304

**ACTIVITY / BITE NUMBER**

---

**SEX**

**WEIGHT**

**HEIGHT**

**EYES**

**HAIR**

**DARWIN**

**DOB**

**SCHOOL NUMBER**

---

**CITY**

**STATE**

**ZIP**

**RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER**

---

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

**DATE OF INCIDENT**

**DATE AND TIME OF INCIDENT**

**DATE AND TIME REPORTED**

---

**FOOD**

**WATER**

**SHELTER**

**VENTILATION**

**ABANDONED**

**TREAT**

**BEATEN **

**WASTE**

**MA/J/FL**

**OTHER (EXPLAIN)**

---

**VICTIM / COMPLAINANT NAME**

**DATE OF BIRTH**

**RESIDENCE PHONE**

**BUSINESS PHONE**

---

**REQUEST / WATER exception per A.R.S. 6-4402 (BG) and 6-409 (BG)**

---

**NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE**

**DANGEROUS ASSOCIATION REQUESTED**

**RESTITUTION REQUESTED**

**DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER**

---

**CONTACT #**

**SHERIFF DEPT**

**TUSCSON POLICE**

---

**FOLLOW UP REQUEST**

**SS**

**TPD**

---

**ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM**

**VIOLATION**

**BITE SEVERITY**

**TREATED BY**

**PHONE NUMBER**

**DATE QUARANTINED**

**PADO**

---

**VIOLATION**

**PHONE NUMBER**

**DATE QUARANTINED**

**DATE OF INCIDENT**

**DATE AND TIME OF INCIDENT**

**DATE AND TIME REPORTED**

---

**RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM**

**NON-VIOLATION**

**PART OF BODY BITEN**

**DATE QUARANTINED**

**RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM**

---

**PET CLINIC**

**PHONE NUMBER**

**OWNER KNOWS OF BITE**

**FTO**

---

**LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS**

**CLINIC'S ADDRESS**

**VACCINE/ STD VIOLATION**

---

**3RD PARTY CITATIONS**

**CITING ACO**

**PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS**

**PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER**

---

**CITATIONS / NUMBERS**

**74897**

---

**BREED / DESCRIPTION**

**ANIMAL NAME**

**COLOR**

**SEX**

**AGE**

**LICENSE #**

**CONDITION**

**ANIMAL ID**

---

**Pit Bull**

**VICTIM**

**OWNER**

**VICTIM**

---

**Pit Bull**

---

**WITNESS**

**NAME**

**SEX**

**DOB**

**ADDRESS**

**RESIDENCE PHONE #**

**BUSINESS PHONE #**

---

**WITNESS 1**

**OFFICER ROBACHO #1990**

---

**WITNESS 2**

**WITNESS 3**

---

**WITNESS 4**

---

**REVIEWED BY**

**OCT 19, 2016**

---

**R Tovar #2021**

---

**PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER**

**OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS**

---

**PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS**

**PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER**

---

**REVIEWED BY**

**5-3-16**

---

**BOUND**

**YES**

---

**ANIMAL ID**

---
INVESTIGATION REPORT

PACC Activity: A16-192304

ACO & Badge Robert Tovar #2021

On April 25, 2016 at 1615 hours I, Officer Tovar #2021, asked dispatch to create a Neglect call for the address of ________ Street. I arrived at this address at 1445 hours this afternoon in reference to another call regarding the brown brindle pit bull in the yard. There was also a tan and white pit bull in the yard. I observed that there was no shelter for the dogs and no visible water. I did see two empty aluminum bowls and a clear plastic bowl that was upside-down. I called for a 2NH to assist me in impounding the two dogs. Officer Robledo #1990 arrived and we impounded the two pit bulls inside of the yard. I photographed the two aluminum bowls which were completely dry and had dust inside of them. I did not see water anywhere in the yard. I saw that there was also a lot of animal waste in the yard. I left a Notice advising the dog owner that I had impounded their dogs. I gave the dogs water to drink in the truck. It should be noted that the dogs are of good weight and appear healthy.

On April 25, 2016 at 1945 hours the Pima Animal Care Center received a call from the owner, who said that she will redeem her dogs as soon as possible.

On April 26, 2016 at 0850 hours Supervisor Tenkate met with the dog owner, who resides at ________ St, when she came to PACC to redeem her 2 impounded dogs. She explained that the dogs were impounded as the officer observed them without water or shelter and the yard contained excessive waste. Ms. ________ said she left the house at about 11:30am and the metal bowl was filled with water and they must have drank it. She said the dogs are inside most of the time and she did not know they needed access to shelter. Ms. ________ explained that she just had a baby 3 weeks ago and has been under doctor restrictions and was not able to pick up the animal waste. Supervisor Tenkate explained that she would need to get someone to pick up and dispose of the waste every 24 hours to be in compliance with the law. Ms. ________ provided Supervisor Tenkate with her Arizona drivers license for identification. She signed and received a copy of citation #74897 A-D for Neglect No Water and Neglect No Shelter for A558858 King and A558859 (A440085) Max. She also signed the premise inspection requiring water, shelter and to remove animal waste. Ms. ________ is going to redeem and keep both dogs inside as she is moving to ________ 3rd St on 5/7/16. The welfare recheck date is has been set for 5/9/16 at the new address.

Officer's Signature: Robert Tovar Date: 4-29-16

Revised 2x2 2.25.16 11
### Investigation Report

**Department:** Pima County Health Department
**Address:** 4000 N. Silverbell Rd.
**Phone:** (520) 724-5900
**Fax:** (520) 724-5960

---

**Suspect:**

**ACO Name/Badge #:** K.WALTON #1925
**Activity/Date Number:** A16-189386
**Bite □** Welfare □ Dangerous □ Other □

**Suspect's Business Address:**

**City:**
**State:**
**Zip:**
**Business Phone Number:**
**Driver's License Number:**
**Social Security Number:**

**Sex:**
**Weight:**
**Height:**
**Eyes:**
**Hair:**
**Origin:**
**Cub:**

**Social Security Number:**

---

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

- □ Yes
- □ No

**I choose "upon request" rights in this case.**

**I waive "upon request" rights in this case.**

---

**Victim/Complainant Name:** OFFICER K. WALTON #1925

**Date of Birth:**
**Residence Phone:** 724-5900
**Business Phone:**

**Victim's Address:**
**City:**
**State:**
**Zip:**

**Victim's Business Address:**
**City:**
**State:**
**Zip:**

---

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

**Address:**
**Phone Number:**

**Relationship to Victim:**

**Phone Number:**

---

**Lawful Representative Address:**

**Clinic's Address:**

**Phone Number:**
**Owner Knows of Bite:**

**Violations:**

**Bite Severity:**

**Treated By:**
**Phone Number:**
**Date Quarantined:**
**Release Date:**

**Pacs □** Vet □ Home □

---

**Lawful Representative Address:**

**Clinic's Address:**

**Quarantine Days:**

**Previous Violations:**
**Previous Case Number:**

**Other Additional Reports:**

**Code/Ord Violated:** 4-3(2)(C), 4-3(2)(E)(1)
**Citations/Numbers:** 73929

---

**Breed/Description:** TERRIER MIX

**Victim Owner:**

**Victim Owner:**

**Victim Owner:**

**Victim Owner:**

**Victim Owner:**

**Victim Owner:**

---

**Witness 1:**
**Address:**
**Residence Phone #:**
**Business Phone #:**

**Witness 2:**
**Address:**
**Residence Phone #:**
**Business Phone #:**

**Witness 3:**
**Address:**
**Residence Phone #:**
**Business Phone #:**

**Witness 4:**
**Address:**
**Residence Phone #:**
**Business Phone #:**

---

**Review by:**

**Date/Signature:** 4-7-16
INVESTIGATION REPORT

PACC Activity: A16-189386

ACO & Badge K. WALTON #1925

On March 29th 2016 1014 hours, I, Officer K. Walton 1925, arrived at Circle A Dr. regarding a welfare complaint on several dogs at this address. Complaint was in reference inadequate shelter on some dogs, a blk/wht puppy crying all day and night, and confinement on some dogs.

Upon arrival, I observed a blk/wht Pit bull mix known as Spade from the previous cases at this address. She was in the front yard, and appeared healthy. On the east side of the house, I observed a small brown dog house type structure with a wht/tan Chihuahua/Terrier mix inside which had no access out. Approximately 3ft away, I observed a "C" shaped pen with a blk/wht dog inside of it crying and barking. This appeared to be one of the dogs that the complainant called about. In the back yard I observed the pen and the other dog that the complainant called about, that dog was a tan/wht Pit bull mix.

I entered the yard, to check on the dogs and took photos. Inside the pen where the Chihuahua/Terrier was, I found excessive waste and the exercise space was too small. The dog had food and clean water, but also dirty water in one of the containers. The pen with the blk/wht dog, I observed no shelter, excessive waste, and dirty water. The pen in the back had dirty water, excessive waste and shelter. That dog had access to put his head through the fencing and was very aggressive.

I impounded the Chihuahua/Terrier and the blk/wht Pit bull pup for their welfare violations. I left notice on front gate.

Officer C. Young #1908, met with the dog owner at Pima Animal Care Center regarding the citations I requested. Ms. stated the blk/wht pup belonged to her ex husband and did not redeem that dog. She was issued citations for inadequate shelter and neglect exercise space. She redeemed her dog and was advised of the things she needed to fix for the other dogs at the residence. 1925 K. Walton

Officer’s Signature:

Date: 4-7-16
Investigation Report
Pinal County Health Department
Pinal Animal Health Department
4000 W Santa Cruz Road
Tucson, Arizona 85735
Phone: (520) 724-5900
Fax: (520) 724-5960

Acme Name / Badge #: Valdez / 2011
Activity / Site Number: A16-191832

Suspect's Name
City: Tucson
State: AZ
Residence Phone Number: 85735

Suspect's Business Address
City: Tucson
State: AZ
Zip: 85735
Business Phone Number:

Sex: 
Weight: 
Height: 
Eyes: 
Hair: 
Origin: 
DOB: 
Social Security Number: 

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

Injury to Victim: Sandario Ranch Trl.
Date and time of incident: 04/16/16 1600 hrs
Date and time reported: N/A

Food 
Water 
Shelter 
Ventilation 
Abandoned 
Threatened 
Beaten 
Waste 
Mild / Ill 
Other (Explain)

I CHOOSE "Upon request" rights in this case.

If I WAIVE "Upon request" rights in this case.

Request / Waiver exception per A.R.S. 6

54-406 (B) and 9-2-308 (B)

Victim's Address
City: 
State: 
Zip: 

Victim's Business Address
City: 
State: 
Zip: 

Name of Lawful Representative (If Applicable)
DANGEROUS 
Assessment Requested

Restitution Requested

DANGEROUS 
Case Number

Other Agency Case #

Sheriff Dept: 
Tucson Police: 
Fire: 
Other:

Follow up Request

SG: 
TPD:

Other:

Address and Phone Number Same As Victim

Violation: 
Non-Violation: 

Bite Severity: 

Treated By: 

Phone Number: 

Date Quarantined: 

Release Date: 

PACC: 
Vet: 
Home: 

Relationship To Victim

Phone Number: 

Vet Clinic: 

Phone Number: 

Owner Knows of Bite: 

Yes 
No

Lawful Representative Address

Clinic's Address

Quarantine (Days):

10 
15 
45 
180 

OTA Head:

3rd Party Citations

Previous Violations

Yes 
No

Victim or Lawful Representative Signature:

Code / Ord Violated:


Citations / Numbers:

75664, 75665, 75666, 75667, 75662, 75663, 75664, 75665

Reviewed By:

Citation:

Yes 
No

Breed / Description

Animal's Name

Color

Sex

Age

License #

Condition

Animal ID #

Chihuahua Mix

Victim Owner

Bean

BLK

M

2 Yr

L14-22511

Normal

Pit Mix

Victim Owner

Unknown

BL BRINDLE

M

6 M

N/A

Normal

Heeler Mix

Victim Owner

Unknown

BLU MERLE

F

U

N/A

Normal

Heeler Mix

Victim Owner

Unknown

BRO

F

U

N/A

Normal

Lab Mix

Victim Owner

Unknown

BLK

F

U

N/A

Normal

Heeler Mix

Victim Owner

Unknown

RED MERLE

F

2 Yr

N/A

Normal

Pit Mix

Victim Owner

Lola

WHT

F

6 M

N/A

Normal

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
(Continued)

BREED- ANIMAL'S NAME- COLOR- SEX- AGE- LICENSE #- CONDITION- ANIMAL ID#

Heeler Mix - U - BLK - F - U - N/A - Normal -
Heeler Mix - U - BRO - F - U - N/A - Normal -
Heeler Mix - U - RED MERLE - F - U - N/A - Normal -
Heeler Mix - U - BLU MERLE - F - U - N/A - Normal -

Officer Signature: [Signature]
Date: 04/27/16
INVESTIGATION REPORT

PACC Activity: A16-191832

ACO & Badge R. Valdez #2011

On 04/16/16 at approximately 1600 hrs while enroute to a separate call, I Officer Valdez (#2011) and Officer Baugus (#1918) came across a pack of 4 dogs lying under the shade of a nearby tree on the side of the road. The pack approached the truck and 2 were able to be impounded immediately, while the other 2 (lab mix & heeler mix) retreated to a nearby yard via an open gate. We proceeded into the yard of the residence and found no one at home. Upon further inspection of the yard there were 2 more dogs (small, black, Chihuahua & med., red, heeler mix) free roaming and 4 puppies confined in a kennel. There was not any source of water or food available for any the dogs. There was evidence water had once been available, but the containers were empty. The puppies in the kennel were living amongst multiple bags of trash and decaying livestock remains. All but the Chihuahua and a black, heeler mix were able to be impounded that day. We left food and water for the 2 remaining dogs at large and a notice on the door for the owner. While working this case a neighbor from the east brought another puppy stating it came from that residence into her yard.

On 04/26/16 at approximately 4:33 hrs. I Officer Valdez (#2011) and Officer Baugus (#1918) arrived at the residence and met with the dog owner who stated only 2 of the dogs at her residence are hers (A474279, A557825) and the rest are a result of her son's girlfriend (who also resides at the address) collecting stray dogs and keeping them there. She further stated strays find their way into her yard and she has called PACC multiple times to deal with this issue, but there is not any documentation in the computer system of any calls from this address. It was explained to Ms. the law states when a resident takes responsibility for an animal (ie providing food, sanctuary, etc) they are accountable for that animal's wellbeing and actions. She understood and accepted the citations for the animals harbored at her residence. MS. was issued citations for leash law, no lic, no food, no water, no shelter, and unsanitary shelter for the 5 puppies. MS. signed/received her copies of the citations and was advised of her court date/time and location.

Officer's Signature: [Signature] Date: 04/27/16
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**INVESTIGATION REPORT**

**Pima County Health Department**

**Pima Animal Services**

**4000 N Silverbell Rd**

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

**Fax**: (520) 724-5960

---

**Suspects Address**: Not Given

**City**: Tucson  **State**: Az  **Zip**: 85713

**Suspect's Business Address**: Not Given

**City**: NA  **State**: NA  **Zip**: NA  **Business Phone Number**: TRAVELER'S LICENSE

**Sex**: Male  **Weight**: NA  **Height**: NA  **PPW**: NA  **Hair**: NA  **Origin**: NA  **DOB**: NA  **Social Security Number**: NA

---

**Date and Time of Incident**: 4/30/16 1440h

**Date and Time Reported**: 04/08/16 1445h

**Location of Incident**: 2115 E 35th St

**Victim/Complainant Name**: PACC Officer S. Elliott

**Date of Birth**: Residence Phone: 724-5900

**Victim's Address**: City: Tucson  **State**: Az  **Zip**: 85745

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

**DMR #**: S. Elliott # 2087

**Breed/Description**: Pitbull

**Animal's Name**: Rusty  **Color**: Chocolate  **Sex**: M  **Age**: Adult  **License #:**: Normal

**Breed/Description**: Pitbull

**Animal's Name**: JD  **Color**: White/Gray  **Sex**: M  **Age**: Adult  **License #:**: Normal

---

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

PACC Activity: A16-191340

ACO & Badge S. Elliott #2087

On April 30th 2016 at 10:45 a.m., I Pima Animal Care Officer (PACC) S. Elliott #2087 and PACC Investigator Delgadillo #2047 arrived at 212 E. Bunker Hill Ave. in reference to a report of dogs being tied out. We attempted to make contact with the current resident with no response. In the back yard we observed a male gray and white Pit bull, later identified as JD, in a confined kennel dragging a short chain. We then observed a male chocolate Pit bull, later identified as Rusty, on a tie out in the middle of the yard. PACC Investigator Delgadillo photographed the dogs. Both dogs had access to water however there was no shelter for either animal. We met with the resident of the home and he stated that the dogs at the residence belonged to his brother in law. He then contacted the brother in law and asked him to meet us at the residence. The brother in law arrived approximately five minutes later. We explained to him that tie outs were illegal in Pima County. He stated he understood, signed his citations, and accepted his copy. He then removed Rusty from the tie out and moved him inside the home. We gave him suggestions to secure the yard and to create shelter. We also provided him with a copy of the Pima County Animal Laws brochure. We then left the scene.

Officer's Signature:  
Date: 5/3/2016
INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A16-190680

ACO name & Badge: D. Tenkate #1911

On 3/29/16 at 1050 hours The dog owner came to the Pima Animal Care Center to have her German Shorthair Pointer named euthanized. She said that had been healthy and within the past 3 days she did not eat or drink and could no longer stand up.

The County veterinarian Sarah Rios examined the dog and noted the following observations:

Brought in as an OPTS.
Dog was brought in lateral with increased effort in respiration.
Oral exam: Generalized tarter and calculus.
Integ: many masses on the body including a large (~10cm) firm mass between the shoulder blades. A soft SQ (~3 cm) mass located on the rostral right mandible.
Chronic dermatitis in the right and left inguinal areas.
Both ears erythematous and thickened. Appears to be due to chronic ear infections.
Repro: Enlarged vulva
M/S: Unable to stand.

A:
Geriatric, unable to walk.
chronic dermatitis
Several masses
Dental disease

P:
Due to poor prognosis patient was euthanized.

The dogs’ body was placed on hold due to the dog being microchipped (pending ownership per Home again microchip company)
On 3/29/16 at 1109 hours I Supervisor Tenkate #1911 arrived in the treatment room at the Pima Animal Care Center and observed a female German Shorthair Pointer that was lateral on some blankets. The dog had hair loss, numerous masses (tumors) on her body, her ears were infected (odorous), and nails were overgrown with open sores on her paws. I took photographs of the dogs' condition.

I then spoke with the Pima County Veterinarian Sarah Rios who had me contacted to document the condition of the German Shorthair Pointer that had been brought in by the owner for euthanasia. The dog owner had stated that the dog named had not been to a vet for about 4 years. Dr. Rios said that in her opinion that the dog did not receive medical care that was needed to treat her conditions.

I then met with the dog owner and I asked when was the last time that her dog had been treated by a veterinarian. She said in 2015 was taken to ABC Clinic on 22nd St and Craycroft Rd. She said that the vet said that the tumors were benign and not operable. She said she received medication for skin condition and her ears. She did not know the name of the medications or the date the dog was examined. When I told Ms that I would call and confirm that received treatment at ABC clinic in 2015 and she said she was not sure when the dog was last seen by a veterinarian. She provided me with an AZ identification card and she signed and received a copy of citation #74850 for neglect vet care. She is aware of her court date, time and location.

I contacted ABC clinic (1114 S Craycroft Rd-745-4564) and confirmed that brought Sara in for treatment on 12/11/14 for her skin condition and ear infection. Per the owner she had treated the dogs' skin condition with motor oil without improvement. The veterinarian assessed Sara and recommended bloodwork, skin scrape- mange and prescription shampoo which the owner declined. Ms. agreed to antibiotic, medicated ear drops and prednisone which would have treated the dog for 20 days. The owner was advised to call for a follow up appointment if Sara's conditions did not improve. Ms. did not bring her dog back for any treatment at the ABC clinic.

I was able to research the PACC database and found a previous activity A14-161686 where a Silver German Shorthaired Pointer named had been impounded on 12/9/14. The dog had hair loss and a large bulge on her left shoulder. The dog also had a microchip. The officer located and met with the adult son of the dog owner, who resides at Mann Ave. a signed a premise inspection which required vet care and secure confinement by 12/12/14 and the dog, was returned to him. Per the dog was 14 years old, deaf and almost blind.
did not seek veterinary treatment for her dog in over a year even though her health conditions continued to deteriorate.

Note:

We were able to contact the Home Again Microchip company and found the following:
Home again and they said that the chip was never registered and was sold to Hunt Kennels,
Per Stacey at Hunt Kennel Systems. She stated the chip was sold to Valley Pet Center on 01/2003 with the collar number and Invoice Number

Officer's Signature: D. Yon Kata Date: 4-10-16
ON APRIL 26, 2016 OFFICER ANDREW VARGAS BADGE #2060 ARRIVED AT THE THE COMPLAINANTS PROPERTY WHERE THE COMPLAINANT ADVISED ME OF A DOG THAT HAD JUMPED HIS FENCE AND WAS HANGING NOW ON HIS SIDE OF HIS FENCE BY THE MEANS OF A TIE OUT. UPON REVIEWING WHERE THE DOG WAS TIED OUT, I OBSERVED THE DOG HANGING BY A TIE OUT AND BARELY ABLE TO TOUCH THE GROUND WITH IT'S REAR PAWS. IT WAS AT THIS TIME THAT I OBSERVED THAT THE DOG WAS TIED OUT BY THE MEANS OF A WIRE LEASH. I THEN USED A SET OF BOLT CUTTERS TO REMOVE THE DOG FROM THE TIE OUT. I THEN IMPONDED THE DOG AND ATTEMPTED TO MAKE CONTACT AT THE DOG OWNERS ADDRESS OF NELSON DR. I DID NOT RECEIVE AN ANSWER AT THE DOOR AND WAS UNABLE TO MAKE CONTACT WITH THE DOG OWNER. A NOTICE WAS LEFT ON THE FRONT DOOR STATING THAT THE DOG WAS IMPONDED ALONG WITH THE DOGS ANIMAL ID. NO FURTHER ACTION WAS TAKEN.

ON APRIL 26, 2016 AT 1817 HOURS OFFICER ELLIOTT (2087) MET WITH DOG OWNER AFTER HE CAME IN TO REDEEM OFFICER ELLIOTT ISSUED NEGLECT-TIEOUT CITATIONS TO MR. INDER CITY JURISDICTION. HE SIGNED AND RECEIVED HIS COPIES OF THE CITATIONS.

Summary

Al6-192323 One dog was impounded. The owner redeemed the dog and was cited for neglect, tie out. The dog was returned to the owner. This complaint is closed.

Committee Member Comments/ Request for Information

What was response time to complaint? From report "UPON REVIEWING WHERE THE DOG WAS TIED OUT, I OBSERVED THE DOG HANGING BY A TIE OUT AND BARELY ABLE TO TOUCH THE GROUND WITH IT'S REAR PAWS. IT WAS AT THIS TIME THAT I OBSERVED THAT THE DOG WAS TIED OUT BY THE MEANS OF A WIRE LEASH." The dog was left in a precarious and possibly dangerous manner by the complainant. Was the situation grave enough for the complainant to be cited for cruelty or neglect?

T. Barrick

N. Emptage

P. Hubbard

P. Jacobs

S. Kaluzniacki

D. Marshall

H. Mendelsohn

J. Neumann

E. O'Donnell

J. Schwerin
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This dog could have easily been strangled due to hanging from his tie out, so this is not just a neglect case but should have been abuse as well, Has a recheck been done to be sure the dog is not tied out again?</th>
<th>G. Smith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Tucson Rep.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Officer's Case Report

On 4-4-16 at 1045 hours I Investigator Eckelbarger (1942) responded to where I observed a black and tan G. Shepherd puppy on a leash tie-out on the front porch. The tie-out was approximately 10 feet long connected to the front porch. The dog had access to shade and water. There was a few days of animal waste in the front yard area next to the front porch. I then impounded the dog and posted a notice of impoundment on the front door.

At 1045 hours I met with dog owner, (DOB ), at the Pima Animal Care Center after she came in to redeem her dog. I then cited Ms. for neglect-tieout on under City jurisdiction. Ms. signed and received her copy of the citation.

Summary

One dog was impounded. The owner redeemed the dog and was cited for neglect tie out. The dog was returned to the owner. This complaint is closed.

Committee Member Comments/ Request for Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T. Barrick</td>
<td>Was the license and vaccination status checked on this animal? It is not noted on the report---just that dog is 5 months old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Emptage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Hubbard</td>
<td>Were redemption fees also charged to the owner?</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>
On April 25, 2016 at 1615 hours I, Officer Tovar #2021, asked dispatch to create a Neglect call for the address of . I arrived at this address at 1445 hours this afternoon in reference to another call regarding the brown brindle pit bull in the yard. There was also a tan and white pit bull in the yard. I observed that there was no shelter for the dogs and no visible water. I did see two empty aluminum bowls and a clear plastic bowl that was upside down. I called for a 2NH to assist me in impounding the two dogs. Officer Robledo #1990 arrived and we impounded the two pit bull inside of the yard. I photographed the two aluminum bowls which were completely dry and had dust inside of them. I did not see water anywhere in the yard. I saw that there was also a lot of animal waste in the yard. I left a Notice advising the dog owner that I had Impounded their dogs. I gave the dogs water to drink in the truck. It should be noted that the dogs are of good weight and appear healthy. On April25, 2016 at 1945 hours the Pima Animal Care Center received a call from the owner, who said that she will redeem her dogs as soon as possible. On April26, 2016 at 0850 hours Supervisor Tenkate met with the dog owner who resides at , when she came to PACC to redeem her 2 impounded dogs. She explained that the dogs were Impounded as the officer observed them without water or shelter and the yard contained excessive waste. Ms. said she left the house at about 11:30am and the metal bowl was filled with water and they must have drank it. She said the dogs are inside most of the time and she did not know they needed access to shelter. Ms. explained that she just had a baby 3 weeks ago and has been under doctor restrictions and was not able to pick up the animal waste. Supervisor Tenkate explained that she would need to get someone to pick up and dispose of the waste every 24 hours to be in compliance with the law. Ms. provided Supervisor Tenkate with her Arizona drivers license for identification. She signed and received a copy of citation #74897 A-D for Neglect No Water and Neglect No Shelter for A558858 King and A558859 (A440085) Max. She also signed the premise inspection requiring water, shelter and to remove animal waste. Ms is going to redeem and keep both dogs inside as she is moving to on 5/7/16. The welfare recheck date is has been set for 5/9/16 at the new address.

Summary

Two dogs were impounded. The owner redeemed both dogs and was cited for neglect, no water and neglect no shelter. The dogs were returned to the owner. This complaint is open pending a recheck for water and shelter.
On March 29th 2016 1014 hours, I, Officer K.Walton 1925, arrived at regarding a welfare complaint on several dogs at this address. Complaint was in reference inadequate shelter on some dogs, a blklwht puppy crying all day and night, and confinement on some dogs. Upon arrival, I observed a blklwht Pit bull mix known as Spade from the previous cases at this address. She was in the front yard, and appeared healthy. On the east side of the house, I observed a small brown dog house type structure with a whtltan Chihuahua/Terrier mix inside which had no access out. Approximately 3ft away, I observed a "C" shaped pen with a blklwht dog inside of it crying and barking. This appeared to be one of the dogs that the complainant called about. In the back yard I observed the pen and the other dog that the complainant called about, that dog was a tan/wht Pit bull mix. I entered the yard, to check on the dogs and took photos. Inside the pen where the Chihuahua/Terrier was, I found excessive waste and the exercise space was to small. The dog had food and clean water, but also dirty water in one of the containers. The pen with the blk/wht dog, I observed no shelter, excessive waste, and dirty water. The pen in the back had dirty water, excessive waste and shelter. That dog had access to put his head through the fencing and was very aggressive. I impounded the Chihuahua/Terrier and the blk/wht Pit bull pup for their welfare violations. I left notice on front gate. Officer C. Young #1908, met with the dog owner, At Pima Animal Care Center regarding the citations I requested. Ms. stated the blklwht pup belonged to her ex husband and did not redeem that dog. She was issued citations for inadequate shelter and neglect exercise space. She redeemed her dog and was advised of the things she needed to fix for the other dogs at the residence.

Summary

Two dogs were impounded. The owner redeemed one dog and relinquished the other. The owner was cited for neglect, no shelter, and neglect, no exercise space. This complaint is closed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Member Comments/ Request for Information</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did anyone explain the excessive noise complaint as well to this owner?</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>Would like to see follow up</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>Was the dog in the back the tan and white pit bull? What happened to this dog? Is this the aggressive dog? This case is very confusing...there seems to be 4 dogs on this property. The chihuahua mix, the black and white pup who was crying, the aggressive dog in the back and Spade in the front.</td>
<td>City of Tucson Rep.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Officer's Case Report

On 04/16/16 at approximately 1600 hrs while enroute to a separate call, I Officer Valdez (#2011) and Officer Baugus (#1918) came across a pack of 4 dogs lying under the shade of a nearby tree on the side of the road. The pack approached the truck and 2 were able to be impounded immediately, while the other 2 (lab mix & heeler mix) retreated to a nearby yard via an open gate. We proceeded into the yard of the residence and found no one at home. Upon further inspection of the yard there were 2 more dogs (small, black, Chihuahua & med., red, heeler mix) free roaming and 4 puppies confined in a kennel. There was not any source of water or food available for any the dogs. There was evidence water had once been available, but the containers were empty. The puppies in the kennel were living amongst multiple bags of trash and decaying livestock remains. All but the Chihuahua and a black, heeler mix were able to be impounded that day. We left food and water for the 2 remaining dogs at large and a notice on the door for the owner. While working this case a neighbor from the east brought another puppy stating it came from that residence into her yard. On 04/12/16 at approximately 16:33 hrs. I Officer Valdez (#2011) and Officer Baugus (#1918) arrived at the residence and met with the dog owner who stated only 2 of the dogs at her residence are hers (A474279, A557825) and the rest are a result of her son's girlfriend (who also resides at the address) collecting stray dogs and keeping them there. She further stated strays find their way into her yard and she has called PACC multiple times to deal with this issue, but there is not any documentation in the computer system of any calls from this address. It was explained to Ms. the law states when a resident takes responsibility for an animal (ie providing food, sanctuary, etc) they are accountable for that animal’s wellbeing and actions. She understood and accepted the citations for the animals harbored at her residence. Ms. was issued citations for leash law, no lie, no food, no water, no shelter, and unsanitary shelter for the 5 puppies. Ms. signed/received her copies of the citations and was advised of her court date/time and location.

Summary

Nine dogs impounded. The owner was cited for leash law violations, neglect, no water, neglect, no shelter, neglect, no food, neglect, unsanitary shelter and no license. No animals were redeemed. 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>
<tr>
<td>City of Tucson Rep.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I think the girlfriend should also be cited, if she is of age, for the dogs and puppies she has “rescued”.

Collector?

Were the puppies also impounded?

Should be on do not adopt list.
### Officer’s Case Report

On April 30th 2016 at IPima Animal care Officer (PACC) S. Elliott #2087 and PACC Investigator Delgadillo #2047 arrived at in reference to a report of dogs being tied out. We attempted to make contact with the current resident with no response. In the back yard we observed a male gray and white Pit bull, later identified as JD, in a confined kennel dragging a short chain. We then observed a male chocolate Pit bull, later identified as Rusty, on a tie out in the middle of the yard. PACC Investigator Delgadillo photographed the dogs. Both dogs had access to water however there was no shelter for either animal. We met with the and he stated that the dogs at belonged to his brother in law, He then contacted and asked him to meet us at the residence. arrived approximately five minutes later. We explained to him that tie outs were illegal in Pima County was cited into Tucson City Court for Neglect-Tie out on Rusty and Neglect- No Shelter for both dogs. He was explained his court date, time and location. Stated he understood, signed his citations, and accepted his copy. He then removed Rusty from the tie out and moved him inside the home. We gave him suggestions to secure the yard and to create shelter. We also provided him with a copy of the Pima County Animal Laws brochure. We then left the scene.

### Summary

No animals were impounded. The animal owner was cited for neglect tie out and neglect, no shelter.

### Committee Member Comments/ Request for Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Member Comments/ Request for Information</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The report does not indicate the status of licenses nor vaccinations—were these checked? Report indicate citations for neglect tie out and neglect no shelter issued but nothing about vaccinations or licenses 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>Follow up if possible</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>Is there a plan to check the residence for compliance?</td>
<td>G. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Tucson Rep.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On 3/29/16 at 1050 hours The dog owner came to the Pima Animal Care Center to have her German Shorthair Pointer named euthanized. She said it had been healthy and within the past 3 days she did not eat or drink and could no longer stand up. The County veterinarian Sarah Rios examined the dog and noted the following observations:

Brought in as an OPTS. Dog was brought in lateral with increased effort in respiration.
Oral exam: Generalized tarter and calculus. Integ: many masses on the body including a large (~10cm) firm mass between the shoulder blades. A soft SQ (~3 cm) mass located on the rostral right mandible. Chronic dermatitis in the right and left inguinal areas. Both ears erythematos and thickened. Appears to be due to chronic ear infections. Repro: Enlarged vulva MIS: Unable to stand.

A: Geriatric, unable to walk, chronic dermatitis, Several masses, Dental disease

P: Due to poor prognosis patient was euthanized. The dog's body was placed on hold. (pending ownership per Home again microchip company)

On 3/29/16 at 1109 hours I Supervisor Tenkate #1911 arrived in the treatment room at the Pima Animal Care Center and observed a female German Shorthair Pointer that was lateral on some blankets. The dog had hair loss, numerous masses (tumors) on her body, her ears were infected (odoruous), and nails were overgrown with open sores on her paws. I took photographs of the dog's condition. I then spoke with the Pima County Veterinarian Sarah Rios who had me contacted to document the condition of the German Shorthair Pointer that had been brought in by the owner for euthanasia. The dog owner had stated that the dog named had not been to a vet for about 4 years. Dr. Rios said that in her opinion that the dog did not receive medical care that was needed to treat her conditions. I then met with the dog owner and I asked when was the last time that her dog had been treated by a veterinarian. She said in 2015 was taken to ABC Clinic on 22nd St and Craycroft Rd. She said that the vet said that the tumors were benign and not operable. She said she received medication for skin condition and her ears. She did not know the name of the medications or the date the dog was examined. When I told Ms that I would call and confirm that received treatment at ABC clinic in 2015 and she said she was not sure when the dog was last seen by a veterinarian. She provided me with an AZ identification card and she signed and received a copy of citation #74850 for neglect vet care. She is aware of her court date,
time and location. I contacted ABC clinic (1114 S Craycroft Rd-745-4564) and confirmed brought Sara in for treatment on 12/11/14 for her skin condition and ear infection. Per the owner she had treated the dogs' skin condition with motor oil without improvement. The veterinarian assessed Sara and recommended bloodwork, skin scrape- mange and prescription shampoo which the owner declined. Ms. agreed to antibiotic, medicated ear drops and prednisone which would have treated the dog for 20 days. The owner was advised to call for a follow up appointment if Saras' conditions did not improve. Ms. did not bring her dog back for any treatment at the ABC clinic. I was able to research the PACC database and found a previous activity A14-161686 where a Silver German Shorthaired Pointer named had been impounded on 12/9/14. The dog had hair loss and a large bulge on her left shoulder. The dog also had a microchip The officer located and met with the adult son of the dog owner, who resides at Mann Ave . a signed a premise inspection which required vet care and secure confinement by 12/12/14 and the dog, was returned to him. Per the dog was 14 years old, deaf and almost blind. did not seek veterinary treatment for her dog even though her health conditions continued to deteriorate. Note: in over a year we were able to contact the Home Again Microchip company and found the following: Home again and they said that the chip was never registered and was sold to Hunt Kennels, Per Stacey at Hunt Kennel Systems. She stated the chip was sold to Valley Pet Center on 01/2003 with the collar number and Invoice Number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Member Comments/ Request for Information</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please note: individuals cannot plead ignorance of law….past relationship with PACC</td>
<td>T. Barrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can we get a not allowed to adopt on the owner?</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>

A horrible case of neglect. Motor oil? For dermatitis???? I feel like this dog suffered with little or no treatment the person should not be allowed to adopt from PACC in the future..
ON APRIL 26, 2016 OFFICER ANDREW VARGAS BADGE #2060 ARRIVED AT THE COMPLAINANT'S PROPERTY WHERE THE COMPLAINANT ADVISED ME OF A DOG THAT HAD JUMPED HIS FENCE AND WAS HANGING NOW ON HIS SIDE OF HIS FENCE BY THE MEANS OF A TIE OUT. UPON REVIEWING WHERE THE DOG WAS TIED OUT, I OBSERVED THE DOG HANGING BY A TIE OUT AND BARELY ABLE TO TOUCH THE GROUND WITH ITS REAR PAWS. IT WAS AT THIS TIME THAT I OBSERVED THAT THE DOG WAS TIED OUT BY THE MEANS OF A WIRE LEASH. I THEN USED A SET OF BOLT CUTTERS TO REMOVE THE DOG FROM THE TIE OUT. I THEN IMPOUNDED THE DOG AND ATTEMPTED TO MAKE CONTACT AT THE DOG OWNERS ADDRESS OF NELSON DR. I DID NOT RECEIVE AN ANSWER AT THE DOOR AND WAS UNABLE TO MAKE CONTACT WITH THE DOG OWNER, A NOTICE WAS LEFT ON THE FRONT DOOR STATING THAT THE DOG WAS IMPOUNDED ALONG WITH THE DOGS ANIMAL ID. NO FURTHER ACTION WAS TAKEN.

ON APRIL 26, 2016 AT 1817 HOURS OFFICER ELLIOTT (2087) MET WITH DOG OWNER AFTER HE CAME IN TO REDEEM OFFICER ELLIOTT ISSUED NEGLECT-TIEOUT CITATIONS TO MR. INDER CITY JURISDICTION. HE SIGNED AND RECEIVED HIS COPIES OF THE CITATIONS.

Owner should not have been allowed to redeem. Complaint should have been cited for allowing dog to hang with its rear paws barely able to touch the ground.
On 4-4-16 at 1045 hours Investigator Eckelberger (1942) responded to where I observed a black and tan G. Shepherd puppy on a leash tie-out on the front porch. The tie-out was approximately 10 feet long connected to the front porch. The dog had access to shade and water. There was a few days of animal waste in the front yard area next to the front porch. I then impounded the dog and posted a notice of impoundment on the front door.

At 1045 hours I met with dog owner, (DOB ), at the Pima Animal Care Center after she came in to redeem her dog. I then cited Ms. for neglect-tie out under City jurisdiction. Ms. signed and received her copy of the citation.

One dog was impounded. The owner redeemed the dog and was cited for neglect tie out. The dog was returned to the owner. This complaint is closed.
On April 25, 2015 at 18:15 hours, Officer Tovar #2021 asked dispatch to create a Neglect call for the address of Dr. Griselle. I arrived at this address at 1446 hours this afternoon in reference to another call regarding the brown brindle pit bull in the yard. There was also a tan and white pit bull in the yard. I observed that there was no shelter for the dogs and no visible water. I did see two empty aluminum bowls and a clear plastic bowl that was upside down. I called for a 2NH to assist me in impounding the two dogs. Officer Robledo #1250 arrived and we impounded the pit bull inside the yard. I photographed the two aluminum bowls which were completely dry and had dust inside of them. I did not see water anywhere in the yard. I saw that there was also a lot of animal waste in the yard. I left a Notice advising the dog owner that I had impounded their dogs. I gave the dogs water to drink in the truck. It should be noted that the dogs are of good weight and appear healthy. On April 25, 2015 at 1846 hours the Pima Animal Care Center received a call from the owner, who said that she will redeem her dogs as soon as possible. On April 26, 2015 at 0950 hours Supervisors Tenkate met with the dog owner who resides at, when she came to FACO to redeem her 2 impounded dogs. She explained that the dogs were impounded as the officer observed them without water or shelter and the yard contained excessive waste. Ms. said she left the house at about 11:30 am and the metal bowl was filled with water and they must have drank. She said the dogs are inside most of the time and she did not know they needed access to shelter. Ms. explained that she just had a baby 3 weeks ago and has been under doctor's restrictions and was not able to pick up the animal waste. Supervisor Tenkate explained that they would need to get someone to pick up and dispose of the waste every 24 hours to be in compliance with the law. Ms. provided Supervisor Tenkate with her Arizona drivers license for identification. She signed and received a copy of citation #77897 A-3 for Neglect No Water and Neglect No Shelter for A588561 King and A588565 Max. She also signed the premise inspection requiring water, shelter and to remove animal waste. Ms. is going to redeem and keep both dogs inside as she is moving to on 5/8/16. The welfare check date is unknown. The welfare check date is set for 5/8/16 at the new address.

**Summary:**
Two dogs were impounded. The owner redeemed both dogs and was cited for neglect, no water and neglect no shelter. The dogs were returned to the owner. This complaint is open pending a recheck for water and shelter.

---

**What did the recheck show?**

---

**Member Comments/Request for Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Member</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T. Barriot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Emplege</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Hubbard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Jacobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Kaluznikaki</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>

---

**WC3 page 1**
On March 29th, 2016, 10:14 hours, Officer K. Walton #1925, arrived at an address regarding a welfare complaint on several dogs at this address. The complaint was for neglect, inadequate shelter, and confinement on some dogs. Upon arrival, I observed a black and white Pit Bull mix known as "Spade" from the previous cases at this address. She was in the front yard, appeared healthy. On the east side of the house, I observed a small brown dog house type structure with a whippet/Chihuahua/Terrier mix inside which had no access out. Approximately 15 feet away, I observed a "C" shaped pen with a black and white Terrier mix inside of it crying and barking. This appeared to be one of the dogs that the complainant called about. In the back yard I observed the pen and the other dog that the complainant called about, that dog was a tan and white Pit Bull mix. I entered the yard, checked on the dogs, and took photos. Inside the pen where the Chihuahua/Terrier was, I found excessive waste and the exercise space was too small. The dog had food and clean water, but also dirty water in one of the containers. The pen with the black and white dog, I observed no shelter, excessive waste, and dirty water. The pen in the back had dirty water, excessive waste and shelter. That dog had access to get his head through the fencing and was very aggressive. I impounded the Chihuahua/Terrier and the black and white Pit Bull pup for their welfare violations. I left notice on front gate. Officer C. Young #1908, met with the dog owner at Pima Animal Care Center regarding the citations I requested. Ms. stated the black and white pup belonged to her ex-husband and did not redeem that dog. She was issued citations for inadequate shelter and neglect exercise space. She redeemed her dog and was advised of the things she needed to fix for the other dogs at the residence.

Two dogs were impounded. The owner redeemed one dog and relinquished the other. The owner was cited for neglect, no shelter, and neglect, no exercise space. This complaint is closed.

Committee Member Comments/Request for Information:

T. Barrick
N. Empson
P. Ballard
P. Jacobs
S. Kuluzniacki
D. Marshall
H. Mendelson
J. Neumann
E. O'Donnell
J. Scherlin
G. Smith
City of Tucson Rep.
On 04/16/16 at approximately 1600 hrs while enroute to a separate call, I Officer Valdez (#2011) and Officer Baugus (#1916) came across a pack of 4 dogs lying under the shade of a nearby tree on the side of the road. The pack approached the truck and 2 were able to be impounded immediately, while the other 2 (lab mix & heeler mix) retreated to a nearby yard via an open gate. We proceeded into the yard of the residence and found no one at home. Upon further inspection of the yard there were 2 more dogs (small, black, Chihuahua & med., red, heeler mix) free roaming and 4 puppies confined in a kennel. There was not any source of water or food available for any of the dogs. There was evidence water had once been available, but the containers were empty. The puppies in the kennel were living amongst multiple bags of trash and decaying livestock remains. All but the Chihuahua and a black, heeler mix were able to be impounded that day. We left food and water for the 2 remaining dogs at large and a notice on the door for the owner. While working this case a neighbor from the east brought another puppy stating it came from that residence into her yard. On 04/12/16 at approximately 16:33 hrs, I Officer Valdez (#2011) and Officer Baugus (#1916) arrived at the residence and met with the dog owner who stated only 2 of the dogs at her residence are hers (A474279, A557825) and the rest are a result of her son’s girlfriend (who also resides at the address) collecting stray dogs and keeping them there. She further stated strays find their way into her yard and she has called PACC multiple times to deal with this issue, but there is not any documentation in the computer system of any calls from this address. It was explained to Ms. the law states when a resident takes responsibility for an animal (ie providing food, sanitation, etc) they are accountable for that animal’s wellbeing and actions. She understood and accepted the citations for the animals harbored at her residence. Ms. was issued citations for stray law, no license, no food, no water, no shelter, and unsanitary shelter for the 5 puppies. Ms. signed/received her copies of the citations and was advised of her court date/time and location.

Committee Member Comments/Request for Information

T. Barrick
N. Empfage
P. Hubbard
P. Jacobs
S. Kaluzniacki
D. Marshall
H. Mendelson
J. Neumann
E. O'Donnell
J. Schwerin
G. Smith
City of Tucson Rep.
On April 30th 2016 at Pima Animal Care Officer (PACC) S. Elliott #2087 and PACC Investigator Delgadillo #2047 arrived at in reference to a report of dogs being tied out. We attempted to make contact with the current resident with no response. In the back yard we observed a male gray and white Pit bull, later identified as JD, in a confined kennel dragging a short chain. We then observed a male chocolate Pit bull, later identified as Rusty, on a tie-out in the middle of the yard. PACC Investigator Delgadillo photographed the dogs. Both dogs had access to water however there was no shelter for either animal. We met with the and he stated that the dogs at belonged to his brother in law. He then contacted and asked him to meet us at the residence. arrived approximately five minutes later. We explained to him that tie-outs were illegal in Pima County was cited into Tucson City Court for Neglect-Tie out on Rusty and Neglect- No Shelter for both dogs. He was explained his court date, time and location. Stated he understood, signed his citations, and accepted his copy. He then removed Rusty from the tie out and moved him inside the home. We gave him suggestions to secure the yard and to create shelter. We also provided him with a copy of the Pima County Animal Laws brochure. We then left the scene.

No animals were impounded. The animal owner was cited for neglect tie out and neglect, no shelter.
An animal was brought to Pima Animal Care Center for euthanasia. The animal owner was cited for neglect, no vet care. The animal was euthanized at PACC.

On 3/29/16 at 10:50 hours the dog owner came to the Pima Animal Care Center to have her German Shorthair Pointer named euthanized. She said it had been healthy and within the past 3 days she did not eat or drink and could no longer stand up. The County veterinarian Sarah Rios examined the dog and noted the following observations:

Brought in as an OPTS. Dog was brought in lateral with increased effort in respiration...

Oral exam: Generalized tartar and calculus. Integ: many masses on the body including a large (10cm) firm mass between the shoulder blades. A soft SQ (3 cm) mass located on the rostral right mandible. Chronic dermatitis in the right and left inguinal areas. Both ears erythematous and thickened. Appears to be due to chronic ear infections. Repro: Enlarged vulva MIS. Unable to stand.

A: Geriatric, unable to walk, chronic dermatitis. Several masses. Dental disease.

Due to poor prognosis patient was euthanized. The dogs' body was placed on hold due to the dog being microchipped. (Pending ownership for home again microchip company)

On 3/29/16 at 11:09 hours the supervisor Tenkale #1911 arrived in the treatment room at the Pima Animal Care Center and observed a female German Shorthair Pointer that was lateral on some blankets. The dog had hair loss, numerous masses (tumors) on her body, her ears were infected (odorous), and nails were overgrown with open sores on her paws. I took photographs of the dogs' condition. I then spoke with the Pima County Veterinarian Sarah Rios who had me contact to document the condition of the German Shorthair Pointer that had been brought in by the owner for euthanasia. The dog owner had stated that the dog named had not been to a vet for about 4 years. Dr. Rios said that in her opinion that the dog did not receive medical care that was needed to treat her conditions. I then met with the dog owner and I asked when was the last time that her dog had been treated by a veterinarian. She said in 2015 was taken to ABC Clinic on 22nd St. and Craycroft Rd. She said that the vet said that the tumors were benign and not operable. She said she received medication for skin condition and her ears. She did not know the name of the medications or the date the dog was examined. When I told Ms. that I would call and confirm that received treatment at ABC clinic in 2015 and she said she was not sure when the dog was last seen by a veterinarian. She provided me with an AZ identification card and she signed and received a copy of citation #74805 for neglect vet care. She is aware of her court date.
time and location, I contacted ABC clinic (1114 S Craycroft Rd-745-4564) and confirmed that Sara was in for treatment on 12/11/14 for her skin condition and ear infection. Per the owner, she had treated the dog's skin condition with motor oil without improvement. The veterinarian assessed Sara and recommended bloodwork, skin scrape–mange and prescription shampoo which the owner declined. Ms. agreed to antibiotic, medicated ear drops and prednisone which would have treated the dog for 20 days. The owner was advised to call for a follow up appointment if Sara's condition did not improve. Ms. did not bring her dog back for any treatment at the ABC clinic. I was able to research the PACC database and found a previous activity A14- 161666 where a Silver German Shorthaired Pointer named had been impounded on 12/9/14. The dog had hair loss and a large bulge on her left shoulder. The dog also had a microchip. The officer located and met with the adult son of the dog owner, who resides at Mann Ave., signed a premise inspection which required vet care and secure confinement by 12/12/14 and the dog was returned to him. Per the dog was 14 years old, deaf and almost blind, did not seek veterinary treatment for her dog even though her health conditions continued to deteriorate.

Note: in early January we were able to contact the Home Again Microchip company and found the following: Home again and they said that the chip was never registered and was sold to Hunt Kennels, Per Stacey at Hunt Kennel Systems. She stated the chip was sold to Valley Pet Center on 01/03/2003 with the collar number and Invoice Number.

Committee Member Comments/ Request for Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T. Barrick</td>
<td>Terrible and outrageous! Not only this case, but also the previous case which sounds similar, which was returned to the owner even though deaf and blind. What happened in the court case?</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. Schwenk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tucson Rep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Marcy Flanagan, Deputy Director
FROM: Debra Tenkate, Animal Care Field Supervisor
DATE: May 3, 2016
SUBJECT: Dangerous Dog Case for April 2016

Tucson:

1. A15-168322 A dog named Kuma was impounded and declared dangerous by Investigator Delgadillo. The dog was relinquished by the owner and euthanized at PACC.

2. A16-190297 Two dogs named Meat Bone and Leo were impounded and declared dangerous by Investigator Delgadillo. Both dogs were relinquished by the owner and euthanized at PACC.

3. A16-191584 A dog named Kilo was impounded and declared dangerous by Investigator Delgadillo. The dog was relinquished by the owner and euthanized at PACC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Owners Last Name</th>
<th>Number of Not Dangerous Animals Declared</th>
<th>Number of Dangerous Animals Declared</th>
<th>Number of Assessed Animals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A16-191594</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16-190297</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15-186222</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**City of Tucson**

**Pima County Animal Care Center**

**Dangerous Dog Cases for April 2016**

**Monthly Investigations Report**
INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-168322

ACO name & Badge: J RADEMAKER 2019

March 21, 2015 at 1:59PM Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) dispatch received a fax from a hospital stating that was bitten on the arm by her neighbor’s dog.

On March 21, 2015 at 6:13PM I, Officer Rademaker 2019, went to  (rear unit) and met with bite victim has an accent and English isn’t her first language but we were able to communicate without problem. She told me she has 2 dogs, Mopo a Bichon X and Coco a lab X. She told me that she had her 2 dogs in the carport area behind her residence when she heard Mopo scream and saw it under the common fence with the neighbor at . She said it was being dragged by the 3 dogs at the neighbors and that she instinctively got on her knees and grabbed her dog pulling it back into her yard. She was bitten on her left forearm in the process and received a large scratch on her right arm. She did not know which dog bit her. I asked her several times if she had seen how the incident started and she replied that she had not and that the first thing she had seen was her dog already partially under the fence. There were no other witnesses. I told her that citations would not be appropriate as it was unknown who went under the fence first. I explained that all 3 dogs would be quarantined as the actual biter wasn’t known.

I then inquired about rabies vaccinations and licenses for her dogs. Her husband came home at that time. He went to the neighbors to ask if they would pay his vet bills, which said were already over $2000.00 at Pima Pet. He returned and I restated everything that had been discussed. PACC records show neither licenses nor vaccinations for the dogs. They were not able to provide any vet documentation. I told them I would have to issue citations for those violations and said he would take them.

I was writing the citations in my vehicle when the  approached me. said that there had been a communication problem between myself and his wife due to her not understanding my questions regarding her seeing the start of the incident and that she had, in fact, seen the neighbors dog’s head under the fence into their yard grabbing Mopo.
I said that I had carefully questioned her on that and that I took her original replies as fact and would not issue citations. I said that they were welcome to discuss this with an Enforcement Supervisor and explained how to do that. They said they would do so Monday.

I issued citations for no license and no rabies vaccinations for both dogs, explained court and compliance and he said he understood.

On March 23, 2015 at 08:50AM, I came into PACC to speak with a supervisor. There were no supervisors here this morning so Officer K Saline 1918 took their statements. The wanted to clarify that did in fact witness the event and she was unable to clearly understand some of the English terms being used by Officer Rademaker and was unable to explain in English the events as they happened. saw one of the neighbors dogs with his head through the fence pulling her dog Mopo into the neighbor’s yard. There are three dogs in the neighbor’s yard that all look similar. The dog is described as a large breed black dog, short hair, long tail. One of the dogs may have white on the chest. Once Mopo was pulled into the neighbor’s yard, all three dogs attacked Mopo. reached under the fence and with both arms retrieved her dog Mopo and had to jump into the neighbor’s yard to pull the dogs off his dog. The attacking dogs owner came out at that time and helped pull his dogs off Mopo and carried them into the home. The female dog owner was unable to help because she said she was scared of the dogs and they do not listen to her.

The would like citations issued to the dog owner for leash law, dog on dog attack, for the human bite and they would like restitution for the vet bill and hospital bill and would like a Dangerous Dog evaluation done on the attacking dogs as they have been an issue for the last three years.

On March 27, 2019 at 9:42 AM Officer Henderson 1904 contacted at his home. He was aware of the incident but not aware of the neighbor being bit. I informed claim of being bit on her left arm. The 3 dogs in question per Officer Rademaker’s interview are Kuma, Meat Bone and Leo. All three dogs are currently licensed. On inspection of the perimeter of the property, the confinement appears to be secure. Officer Henderson approved a home quarantine and issued to Mr Irwin premise quarantine agreements on all 3 dogs, which expires 03/30/15.

On March 27, 2015 came into PACC to relate the circumstances of the incident. He met with Enforcement Operations Manager (EOM) J. Chavez 1914 and stated that on 3-21-15 approximately 0645 hours his wife was outside their house with their dog named "Mopo" off leash. Mopo approached the neighbor’s fence line and started fence fighting with the neighbor’s 3 dogs (all similar in color). One of the dogs stuck his head out from underneath the bottom of the fence and started to attack Mopo. The attacking dog grabbed Mopo and began to pull Mopo underneath the fence, his wife ran over and grabbed Mopo attempting to pull Mopo away from the dog’s clutch and got bit on her left arm inflicting lacerations.
The attacking dog eventually pulled Mopo completely into the neighbor's yard and all three dogs in the yard attacked Mopo. I heard his wife yelling he ran outside and jumped over the neighbor's fence and attempted to separate the dogs from attacking Mopo. The neighbor dog owner also went out to his yard and helped separate the dogs from the attack by picking each one of them up and putting them inside the house. He and his wife took Mopo to Pima Pet Clinic where Mopo was treated for multiple lacerations throughout the body, stated Mopo's chest was ripped open. The vet bill was $2,500.00. I took Mopo to UMC hospital for the bite wounds. I said the dogs have history of sticking their heads from underneath the fence when people and other dogs walked by, the neighbor dogs would always act aggressively barking and snapping at people walked by. Mopo is requesting citations for the dog on dog attack and his wife getting bit to include dangerous dog evaluation, restitution for the vet bills and possibly his wife's hospital bills (she is on Access).

Manager Chavez directed that citations be issued to the dogs owner for the dog on dog attack by all 3 dogs and one dog for biting.

On April 6, 2015 at 10:47 AM Officer Meek 2015 responded to _______ to follow up on a bite complaint and to meet with the bite victim. He arrived at the address and was able to meet with the bite victim. Again, again recounted what happened when her bite occurred. I again advised him that her dog Mopolino was running off leash in a common area of her duplex unconfined by a fence and not under her control on a leash when he encounter the dogs residing at the 1 behind their fence not running at large. I advised Officer Meek that she saw Mopolino being drug under the fence by the dogs residing at the _______ and when she rendered aid to Mopolino she was bitten. I again showed Officer Meek the spot in the shared fencing where the attack and bite occurred. He observed the hole where the attack and bite occurred to be blocked.

Officer Meek advised I _______ that Mopolino could not run loose and had to be on a leash when outside of her fencing in a common area where there is access to the public. He advised _______ that he would have to issue her a leash law citation because Mopolino was running loose unconfined and in a common area. I stated she already received a citation and had to go to court. Officer Meek ask _______ in Spanish if she went to court for a license and rabies vaccination citations to which she replied she did. She asked if I would speak to her husband. Officer Meek advised _______ that he would have no problem speaking with her husband and provided his name and PACC's telephone number and concluded his meeting with her.

On April 8, 2015 EOM J Chavez 1914 meet with _______ at PACC. _______ stated he is willing to take the leash law violation citations instead of his wife. EOM Chavez told him that would be allowed since he was also present during the attack.
He asked if the other dog owner has been cited. EOM Chavez told him we have not made contact with the owner to issue the citations. said he and his wife are home all day Thursdays and Fridays. EOM Chavez told him an Officer will meet with him tomorrow morning and hopefully also with the dog other dog owner.

On April 24, 2015 at 4:16PM I, Officer Rademaker 2019, met with and discussed the citation for Mopo being at large in the common area driveway/carport on the morning of the bite incident, 03/21/15 at 0630hrs. I issued the citation for leash law violation as instructed in the memo from EOM Chavez, explained court and he said he understood. We discussed dangerous dog evaluations and I explained that the dogs would be declared vicious in Tucson Court if found guilty. He said he would not have a dangerous dog evaluation done by PACC in lieu of the court declaration.

On April 25, 2015 at 3:05PM I went to and met with owner 1. I explained that the had requested that citations be issued on their behalf for the dog on dog biting incident and for the bite I had received on 03/21/15. I explained the citations and court and he said he understood and signed the citations. I gave him law and dangerous dog brochures.

Officer's Signature: 

Date: 4/25/15

2019
**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:** Alle-190842

**OWNER:**

**ANIMAL NAME:** Kuma 2218721

**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: (Check One Factor Only Per Victim)</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 SHOOK VICTIM</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAL CARE (HOSPITALIZATION)</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal Complaints or Violations:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEASH LAW CITATIONS</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEASH LAW COMPLAINTS</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTEMPTED BITE CITATIONS</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIMAL ATTACK CITATIONS</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER CITATIONS / OR COMPLAINTS</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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 (&gt;2 VISITS)</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INJURIES RESULTED IN DEATH</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Confinement / Fencing:**

The residence is fenced with field fencing, although the dog is not on a leash. The Confinement is at risk.

**General Comments:**

On March 25, 2021, the victim was walking near the residence. When three dogs attacked, causing injury to the victim. The immediate police responded. The dogs are deemed dangerous.

**TOTAL SCORE:** +11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DANGEROUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT DANGEROUS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

**OFFICER #** R#2047
**INVESTIGATION REPORT**

**Pima County Health Department**

**Pima Animal Care Center**

4000 N. Silverbell Rd.

Tucson, Arizona 85745

Phone: (520) 724-5900

Fax: (520) 724-5960

---

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

**ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM**

**RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM**

**LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS**

**VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE**

---

**BREED/DESCRIPTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breed</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>Lab Mix</td>
<td>Kuma</td>
<td>Black/White</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>current</td>
<td></td>
<td>218721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Mix</td>
<td>Meat Bone</td>
<td>Black/White</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>current</td>
<td></td>
<td>326020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit Mix</td>
<td>Leo</td>
<td>Black/White</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>current</td>
<td></td>
<td>481961</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**WITNESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Residence Phone #</th>
<th>Business Phone #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INVESTIGATION REPORT

PACC Activity: A16-190297

ACO & Badge X. Delgadillo#2047

On March 24, 2016 at approximately 19:00 I, Investigator Delgadillo #2047, arrived to meet with the bite victim.

I met with [redacted] and observed a couple of blocks ahead of her three black dogs at large. A white SUV came up to her and advised her to be careful. [redacted] then crossed the road to walk on the opposite side of the dogs. She looked back and the white SUV was using her vehicle to corral the dogs. The dogs went back into their yard through open gate. The woman had corralled them in the yard and used her SUV to block the gate, did not see her attempt to get out and close the gate.

I called to the woman(later identified as [redacted]) and asked if she needed assistance. As soon as she called out to her, the dogs saw her and started charging towards her. [redacted] started to climb the wall and before she could climb over, the dog(s) bit her on both legs, on the calf area. She also sustained injuries to her left wrist and both elbow areas from attempting to climb the wall. She stated that she did not know if one dog bit or all three dogs.

I explained third party citations to [redacted] and she stated that she is requesting citations and restitution. She has not received the bill from the medical visit, amount is not available at this time.

[redacted] also is requesting a dangerous dog evaluation on all three dogs. [redacted] is requesting contact with the dog owners and she stated that her phone number and name could be provided to them as well to the witness identified as [redacted]

At approximately 2010 hours, I arrived to the dog owners residence of [redacted] and met with [redacted].

I explained the purpose of my visit and advised that the bite is a violation bite and that the dogs would need to be taken for quarantine. [redacted] brought out the dogs and they were impounded.

I explained that the bite victim is requesting citations and I explained the third party citations. [redacted] stated that they had a witness that only one dog bit and they provided contact information for Pam. I explained that the bite victim could not positively identify which dog was the biter and the quarantine would apply to all three dogs.

Officer's Signature: [Signature]

Date: 3/30/16
was cited into Tucson City Court for leash law and biting animal for Kuma 218721, Meat Bone 326020 and Leo 481961. signed his citations; received a copy and was provided his court date and time.

On March 26, 2016 at approximately 15:28 I, Investigator Delgadillo # 2047, arrived to met with explained that she witnessed the incident involving . She explained the events as stated by . When the dogs charged at I she drove her vehicle to where she was; honking her horn to get the dogs away from her. She stated that Meatbone and Kuma were in the area but it was Leo who bit

Officer Signature

Date 3/30/16
**EVALUATION CRITERIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORTED BITES:</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NON-VIOLATION BITE</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIOLATION-BITE</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEVERITY OF INJURY TO HUMANS:**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONFINEMENT MEASURES:</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SECURE FENCE/WALL AND GATES</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INADEQUATE FENCING OR GATES</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OWNER ACCOUNTABILITY / RESPONSIBILITY:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OWNER ACCOUNTABILITY / RESPONSIBILITY:</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REPAIRED DEFICIENT CONFINEMENT</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIMAL IS NEUTERED / SPAYED</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWNER AWARE OF ANY AGGRESSION</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWNER FAILED TO REPAIR CONFINEMENT</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENTLY LICENSED LIC #</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO CURRENT LICENSE</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO CURRENT RABIES VACCINATION</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEIGHBOR COMMENTS (Scored by Majority Opinion):**

(Chain or More Neighbors Interviewed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEIGHBOR COMMENTS:</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANIMAL NEVER OBSERVED AT LARGE</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIMAL NOT OBSERVED AGgressive</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIMAL OBSERVED AT LARGE ≤5xYR</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIMAL OBSERVED AT LARGE &gt;5xYR</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIMAL OBSERVED BEING AGgressive</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DOGS BEHAVIOR: (If Observed by Officer)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOGS BEHAVIOR:</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANIMAL BEHAVES AGGRESSIVELY</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIMAL NOT AGGRESSIVE</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIMAL SHOWS UNSAFE BEHAVIOR</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Score:** 11

**OFFICER #**

**GENERAL COMMENTS:**

The residence is fenced junk field. Although the yard is fenced, the fencing is of poor quality. The property is present.

On March 25, 2016, the Animal Control Officer was called to the residence when three dogs attacked a person entering the property. The residence was located in the City of Tucson. The dogs were not on a leash.

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 in each additional jurisdiction 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.

**PACC-DD1**
CASE NO: A110-190383
OWN: 
ANIMAL NAME: leo A434161
EVALUATION CRITERIA
REPORTED BITES:
NON-VIOLATION BITE + 3 
VIOLATION-BITE + 6 15
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 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 + 3 
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 <6X/YR - 1 
ANIMAL OBSERVED AT LARGE >6X/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 
The residence is fenced with a solid fence.
Although no dogs are visible, the confinement was observed. The probability to
bark is present.

Total Score: 71

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 injury by 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) 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.

OFFICER #

DANGEROUS
NOT DANGEROUS

PACC-001
<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>Kilo</td>
<td>Blue/White</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>current</td>
<td></td>
<td>529399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poodle Mix</td>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>Black/White</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>deceased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Witnesses:**

1. [M] [ ] [DOB] [ADDRESS] [RESIDENCE PHONE #] [BUSINESS PHONE #]
2. [M] [ ] [DOB] [ADDRESS] [RESIDENCE PHONE #] [BUSINESS PHONE #]
3. [M] [ ] [DOB] [ADDRESS] [RESIDENCE PHONE #] [BUSINESS PHONE #]
4. [M] [ ] [DOB] [ADDRESS] [RESIDENCE PHONE #] [BUSINESS PHONE #]
INVESTIGATION REPORT

PACC Activity: A16-191584

ACO & Badge X. Delgadillo#2047

On April 13, 2016 at approximately 07:24 Officer J. Henderson #1904 responded to reference to Leash Law/Animal Attack to Assist Tucson Police Department.

Officer Henderson met with Tucson Police Officers Coons #42391, Thrall #42410, Little #100952 and Hoyte #40358, TPD Case#1604130108. The attacking dog (blue and white pit bull) was already contained; victim dog and owner had left the scene to obtain vet care.

TPD Officers explained that the attacking dog was first observed at large at ; the dog was chased away but then returned. The victim dog and owner exited their residence at approximately 06:55; the pit bull saw the poodle and charged at the dog. This was witnessed by the Maintenance staff on site by the name of he also assisted with breaking up the attack on the poodle. TPD advised Officer Henderson that the victim dog owner is requesting citations.

The dog owner, arrived and stated that he was looking for his dog; he was directed to where the dog was contained and identified the attacking as Kilo.

was cited by Officer Henderson into Tucson City Court for Leash Law and Biting Animal. Mr. signed his citations; received a copy and was provided his court date and time.

On April 15, 2016 at approximately 11:53 Pima Animal Care Dispatch received a call from Victim dog owner who stated that her dog had to be euthanized due to the severity of the injuries and is requesting restitution in the amount of $800.00 and also requested a dangerous dog evaluation.

On April 15, 2016 at approximately 18:47 I, Investigator Delgadillo #2047 and Officer Elliott #2087, arrived to and met with victim dog owner .

explained that on April 13, 2016 at approximately 07:00, she and her dog Lucy, exited the gate of her residence, she observed a blue and white pit bull running loose; the dog then charged at her. She lifted Lucy up the leash but she wiggled out of the leash and was attacked. was advised that citations have been issued; the dog is impounded for the dangerous evaluation. provided the invoice from Valley Animal Hospital in the amount of $819.10

Officer’s Signature:  

Date: 4/19/16

Revised 2016 2.25.16 11
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.

X 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:

On 4/13/16, Kilo was out at large, attacked a black and white poodle. She injured sustained were so severe that the dog had to be euthanized. This is the second incident where Kilo had attacked a dog. The previous incident on 08/03/15 Kilo attacked the Yorkie until it was deceased. The dog is deceased automatically.

OWNER:

ANIMAL NAME: Kilo

ANIMAL ID#: 529399

SEX/M COLORED_fiBREED: 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.
April 2016 Dangerous Dog Comments

Dr. Smith:

DD1&2. These three dogs are in both cases? What happened with the citations to the owners? When is the court appearance?

DD 3. Kilo killed a dog in 8/15. Was a complaint filed and citations issued? If so why was Kilo not declared dangerous at the time and euthanized?

What kind of citations are issued to owners of dangerous dogs? Most of these dogs are dangerous due to lack of training or due to training to produce a dangerous dog. These owners are more at fault than the dogs?

Ms. Emptage:

Why wasn’t the dog Kilo previously declared dangerous? Can the owner(s) be prohibited ordered not to have any dogs for xxx period of time due to the fact they did not take precautions against another dog attack? If Kilo had already been declared dangerous, what penalties are the owners facing?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOLD TYPE ENFORCEMENT</th>
<th>Number on Hold: 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A15-184270</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K16-217610</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A560828 DOG</td>
<td>POMERANIAN/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/10/16</td>
<td>Activity: A15-184270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFISCATE FIELD OWN</td>
<td>D255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORMAL</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennel Comment: 3c3c3c3c3c3c3c</td>
<td>MHENDRII 5/10/16 21:04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/16 ENFORCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/16 21:04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If owner redeems cite for on behalf of #2066; neglect no potable water 6.04.110(B)(2) excessive animal waste 36.183.03 ARS 12210 W Cornell Dr Tucson AZ @ 16:42

| **K16-217611**        |                   |
| A560834 CAT           | SIAMESE/          |
| 5/10/16               | Activity: A15-184270 |
| CONFISCATE FIELD OWN  | RECEIVING R       |
| ILL SEVERE            | MHENDRII 5/10/16 21:05 |
| Kennel Comment: 3c3c3c3c3c3c |                   |
| 05/10/16 ENFORCE      |                   |
| 05/10/16 21:05        |                   |

If owner redeems cite for on behalf of #2066; neglect no potable water 6.04.110(B)(2) excessive animal waste 36.183.03 ARS 12210 W Cornell Dr Tucson AZ @ 16:42

| **K16-217612**        |                   |
| A560833 CAT           | DOMESTIC SH/      |
| 5/10/16               | Activity: A15-184270 |
| CONFISCATE FIELD OWN  | CR026 R           |
| ILL SEVERE            | MHENDRII 5/10/16 21:03 |
| Kennel Comment: 3c3c3c3c3c3c |                   |
| URI at intake         |                   |
| 05/10/16 ENFORCE      |                   |
| 05/10/16 21:03        |                   |

If owner redeems cite for on behalf of; neglect no potable water 6.04.110(B)(2) excessive animal waste 36.183.03 ARS 12210 W Cornell Dr Tucson AZ @ 16:42

| **K16-217613**        |                   |
| A560830 CAT           | DOMESTIC SH/      |
| 5/10/16               | Activity: A15-184270 |
| CONFISCATE FIELD OWN  | I034 R            |
| ILL SEVERE            | MHENDRII 5/10/16 21:03 |
| Kennel Comment: 3c3c3c3c3c3c |                   |
| 05/10/16 ENFORCE      |                   |
| 05/10/16 21:03        |                   |

If owner redeems cite for on behalf of; neglect no potable water 6.04.110(B)(2) excessive animal waste 36.183.03 ARS 12210 W Cornell Dr Tucson AZ @ 16:42

| **K16-217614**        |                   |
| A560831 CAT           | BENGAL/           |
| 5/10/16               | Activity: A15-184270 |
| CONFISCATE FIELD OWN  | CR027 R           |
| ILL SEVERE            | MHENDRII 5/10/16 21:02 |
| Kennel Comment: 3c3c3c3c3c3c |                   |
| URI at intake         |                   |
| 05/10/16 ENFORCE      |                   |
| 05/10/16 21:02        |                   |

If owner redeems cite for on behalf of #2066; neglect no potable water 6.04.110(B)(2) excessive animal waste 36.183.03 ARS 12210 W Cornell Dr Tucson AZ @ 16:42

<p>| <strong>K16-217615</strong>        |                   |
| A560832 CAT           | BENGAL/           |
| 5/12/16               |                   |
| 9:39                  |                   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Breed</th>
<th>Kennel Comment</th>
<th>Activity Code</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/10/16</td>
<td>CONFISCATE FIELD OWN</td>
<td>ILL SEVERE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Activity: A15-184270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/2016</td>
<td>ENFORCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MHENDRII 5/10/16 21:02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If owner redeems cite for on behalf of #2066; neglect no potable water 6.04.110(B)(2) excessive animal waste 36.183.03 ARS 12210 W Cornell Dr Tucson AZ @ 16:42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Breed</th>
<th>Kennel Comment</th>
<th>Activity Code</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K16-217616</td>
<td>A560835 CAT</td>
<td>DOMESTIC MH/</td>
<td></td>
<td>Activity: A15-184270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/10/16</td>
<td>CONFISCATE FIELD OWN</td>
<td>ILL SEVERE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/2016</td>
<td>ENFORCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MHENDRII 5/10/16 21:04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If owner redeems cite for on behalf of #2066; neglect no potable water 6.04.110(B)(2) excessive animal waste 36.183.03 ARS 12210 W Cornell Dr Tucson AZ @ 16:42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Breed</th>
<th>Kennel Comment</th>
<th>Activity Code</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A15-184290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K16-217238</td>
<td>A560382 CAT</td>
<td>DOMESTIC SH/</td>
<td></td>
<td>Activity: A15-184290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6/16</td>
<td>STRAY OTC NORMAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no bite no chip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K16-217241</td>
<td>A560384 CAT</td>
<td>DOMESTIC SH/</td>
<td></td>
<td>Activity: A15-184290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6/16</td>
<td>STRAY OTC NORMAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no bite no chip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K16-217242</td>
<td>A560386 CAT</td>
<td>DOMESTIC SH/</td>
<td></td>
<td>Activity: A15-184290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6/16</td>
<td>STRAY OTC NORMAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no bite no chip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K16-217244</td>
<td>A560387 CAT</td>
<td>DOMESTIC SH/</td>
<td></td>
<td>Activity: A15-184290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6/16</td>
<td>STRAY OTC NORMAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no bite no chip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Breed</th>
<th>Kennel Comment</th>
<th>Activity Code</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A16-190766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K16-214513</td>
<td>A555804 DOG</td>
<td>BELLA</td>
<td>PIT BULL/</td>
<td>Activity: A16-190766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/30/16</td>
<td>CONFISCATE POLICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NORMAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENF HOLD FOR PCAO (( Do not release...2oo2 ))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/30/2016</td>
<td>ENFORCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>akirby 3/30/16 13:48</td>
<td>ENFORCE HOLD FOR PCSO CASE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16-191540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K16-217258</td>
<td>A560408 DOG</td>
<td>CHIHUAHUA SH/</td>
<td></td>
<td>Activity: A16-191540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6/16</td>
<td>CONFISCATE FIELD OWN</td>
<td>NORMAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xdelgad 5/6/16 16:18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05/06/2016 ENFORCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hold for neglect no water, leash law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K16-217260</td>
<td>A560407 DOG</td>
<td>CHIHUAHUA SH/</td>
<td></td>
<td>Activity: A16-191540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/12/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
K16-216475   A559083   DOG   RUNTSTRAFOF PIT BULL/MIX
4/27/16   CONFISCATE FIELD OWN   NORMAL   Activity:A16-192363
Kennel Comment: DD Hold!!

K16-216477   A559086   DOG   POCKETS   PIT BULL/MIX
4/27/16   CONFISCATE FIELD OWN   NORMAL   Activity:A16-192363
Kennel Comment: DD Hold!!

K16-216478   A559087   DOG   MILITIA   PIT BULL/MIX
4/27/16   CONFISCATE FIELD OWN   NORMAL   Activity:A16-192363
Kennel Comment: DD hold!!
R forelimb wound

K16-216479   A559088   DOG   GIZMO   PIT BULL/MIX
4/27/16   CONFISCATE FIELD OWN   NORMAL   Activity:A16-192363
Kennel Comment: DD Hold!!

K16-217516   A560712   DOG   LOLA   TERRIER/MIX
5/10/16   CONFISCATE FIELD OWN   NORMAL   Activity:A16-192425
Kennel Comment: no chip

05/10/2016   ENFORCE   sadkins 5/10/16 9:01
05/10/16 Dog was impounded due to no one home and dog outside in a create with no water and excessive animal waste in create. S.Adkins 1961

K16-217517   A560711   DOG   SARAH   PIT BULL/
5/10/16   CONFISCATE FIELD OWN   NORMAL   Activity:A16-192425
Kennel Comment: no chip

05/10/2016   ENFORCE   sadkins 5/10/16 9:03
05/10/16 Dog was impounded due to no one home and dog outside in a create with no water and excessive animal waste in create. S.Adkins 1961

K16-217518   A560713   DOG   JETHRO   QUEENSLAND HEEL/MIX
5/10/16   CONFISCATE FIELD OWN   NORMAL   Activity:A16-192425
Kennel Comment: no chip

05/10/2016   ENFORCE   sadkins 5/10/16 9:34
05/10/16 Dog was impounded due to no one home and dog outside in a create with no water and excessive animal waste in create. S.Adkins 1961

K16-216811   A559716   DOG   JOHNNY   LABRADOR RETR/MIX
5/2/16   STRAY   NIGHT OWN   INJ SEVERE   Activity:A16-192610
Kennel Comment: 5/2/2016--SEE ACTIVITY MEMO.
3C 3C 3C 3C 3C 3 C 1929

5/12/16 9:39
KENNEL NO
ENFORCE
5/2/2016--NEED TO NOTIFY DOG OWNER OF DOG BEING AT PACC.

0355--CALLED DOG OWNER'S PHONE NUMBER OF
NUMBER IS NOT AVAILABLE.
-PER PHONE SERVICE,

IF OWNER REDEEMS DO A WELFARE PREMISE INSPECTION FOR VET CARE. PER
EMERGENCY VET, DOG W/ BROKEN BONE IN HIND LEG. 1929

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A16-192923</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>K16-217370</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/8/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennel Comment: HAS CHIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C SEE MEMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matted at intake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>985121012901907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/08/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/08/16 - 0925Hrs. If owner attempts to redeem cite owner for abandonment and no water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2060/1961</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **K16-217371** | A560551 | DOG | UNKNOWN | PIT BULL/ |
| 5/8/16 | CONFISCATE FIELD OWN | NORMAL | Activity:A16-192923 |
| Kennel Comment: NO CHIP | |
| 3C SEE MEMO | |
| Collar is in intake bin | |
| D191 | R |
| 05/08/2016 | ENFORCE | AVARGAS 5/8/16 9:28 |
| 05/08/16 - 0925Hrs. If owner attempts to redeem cite owner for abandonment and no water. | |
| -2060/1961 | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A16-193006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>K16-217488</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/9/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennel Comment: no chip. 2021rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C 3C 3C 3C 3C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **K16-217489** | A560687 | DOG | PEANUT | STAFFORDSHIRE/MIX |
| 5/9/16 | CONFISCATE FIELD OWN | NORMAL | Activity:A16-193006 |
| Kennel Comment: no chip. 2021rd | |
| 3C 3C 3C 3C 3C | |
| D179 | R |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A16-193168</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>K16-217688</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/12/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennel Comment: 5/12/2016-SEE ACTIVITY MEMO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C 3C 3C 3C 3C 1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IF OWNER REDEEMS DOG -- HAVE OWNER LOOK AT OTHER PHOTO IN ACTIVITY OF DOG BARKING AND SEE IF THEY OWN DOG. IF SO CITE FOR LEASH LAW FOR 1929 ON 5/12/2016 AT AROUND 0500 IN THE 700 BLOCK N 7TH AVE.

ALSO ADVISE OWNER THAT DOG IN PHOTO BARKING BITE SOMEONE BUT IT DID NOT BREAK THE SKIN. COMPLAINTANT AT THIS TIME DOES NOT WANT CITIES ISSUED BUT ADVISE OF BITING ANIMAL LAW. 1929
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K16-217584</th>
<th>A560944</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>BAT/</th>
<th>EROOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/11/16 WILDLIFE</td>
<td>NORMAL</td>
<td>Activity:A16-193160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennel Comment: 5/11/2016--SEE ACTIVITY MEMO. 1929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

05/12/2016 VET DATTEBEI 5/12/16 2:47
5/11/2016--NEED VET TO DETERMINE IF BAT IS TO BE TESTED FOR RABIES. 1929
PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER
Special Revenue Fund

BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2015/16</th>
<th>FY 2015/16</th>
<th>FY 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td>Requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department's Package A Revenue</td>
<td>6,495,555</td>
<td>7,947,789</td>
<td>6,542,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Department's Package A Expenditures</td>
<td>8,601,390</td>
<td>8,928,389</td>
<td>9,175,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= Net Income from Operations</td>
<td>(2,305,835)</td>
<td>(978,600)</td>
<td>(2,653,044)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ General Fund Support</td>
<td>2,197,545</td>
<td>2,197,545</td>
<td>2,373,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+/- Other Operating Transfers</td>
<td>(19,442)</td>
<td>(19,442)</td>
<td>(19,527)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= Net Fund Impact</td>
<td>(127,732)</td>
<td>1,199,503</td>
<td>(278,866)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Beginning Fund Balance - PACC</td>
<td>316,738</td>
<td>421,908</td>
<td>1,621,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= Ending Fund Balance - PACC</td>
<td>189,006</td>
<td>1,621,411</td>
<td>1,342,523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supplemental Package Request Total 0

ISSUES

- In FY 2013/14, the Board approved an emergency expansion of the shelter facility to enable increased capacity and expanded medical care for sick or injured animals in the shelter. During FY 2015/16, Pima Animal Care Center underwent two major structural changes. Overtime funds were converted to salaries and wages to hire seven additional FTEs to account for this expansion. One Program Coordinator and six Animal Care Technicians were approved to assist with essential services performed both within the shelter and in the medical clinics. Operations were also bifurcated into two separate functions: Internal Operations including shelter, clinic, enforcement, dispatch, and the pet resource center, and External Outreach and Community Engagement which includes adoptions, rescue, foster, volunteers, fundraising, licensing, and business operations. This separation did not lead to additional FTEs.
- PACC's share of the Central Cost Allocation Plan increased from $636,258 in FY 2015/16 to $763,069 in FY 2016/17. The General Fund subsidy was adjusted by 38.63% of the increase, representing the portion of PACC expenses not billed to other jurisdictions. Other adjustments to the subsidy include motor pool, Self Insurance Reserve, benefits, and Information Technology ISF hardware, software, and server/storage.
- FY 2015/16 projected ending cash balance = ($323,358)
  FY 2018/17 projected ending cash balance = ($857,872)
- The department requested 83.0 FTEs in Package A which is a 8.0 FTE increase over FY 2015/16.
- Total requested revenues are $6,542,550 for FY 2016/17 or $46,995 more than FY 2015/16 due primarily to increased donations.
- The department has requested expenditures of $9,175,594, an increase of $374,204 over its FY 2015/16 budget. The increase is due to a number of factors including increased personnel services, veterinary services, and hardware, software, and server/storage costs.
- The department was named as a beneficiary of two trusts in excess of $1.3 million. There are four investments for the use of these funds that commenced in FY 2015/16 and extend into FY 2019/20. Investment #2, building a behavioral rehabilitation program for dogs has created two additional FTEs.
- The department's period 7 projection indicates a negative expenditure variance of $125,000 reflecting the increased costs due to the overtime line item was converted to seven new FTEs for expanded shelter operations. These employees were not hired with the beginning of the fiscal year thus actual overtime pay has occurred and is causing the variance.

SUPPLEMENTALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Package Letter/Name</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>NFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSSWALK - PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER B055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018/16 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>REVENUES</th>
<th>TRANSFERS</th>
<th>FUND IMPACT</th>
<th>FTEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer out to Debt Service</td>
<td>8,631,990</td>
<td>6,495,566</td>
<td>2,197,545</td>
<td>(19,442)</td>
<td>94.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Debt Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,179,103</td>
<td>(127,732)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in charges - x 24.97%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19,442</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Central Overhead - 126,831 x 38.83%</td>
<td>126,831</td>
<td></td>
<td>43,905</td>
<td>(77,938)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIN Decrease 21,720 x 24.97%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,423)</td>
<td>(5,423)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases for Information Technology ISF (hardware, software, server)</td>
<td>104,446</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,448</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits Adjustment - 62,547 x 24.97%</td>
<td>62,547</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,270</td>
<td>(30,879)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Pool - 75,462 x 3.497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19,948</td>
<td>19,948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in municipal billings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48,995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2016/17 Base Budget</th>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>REVENUES</th>
<th>TRANSFERS</th>
<th>FUND IMPACT</th>
<th>FTEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,081,814</td>
<td>6,844,560</td>
<td>2,373,863</td>
<td>(212,976)</td>
<td>84.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in FTEs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Too FTEs Bequests Investment #2</td>
<td>93,780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(93,780)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest revenue budgeted in PACC donations bureau</td>
<td>(2,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Transfer out to Debt Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(19,827)</td>
<td>(19,827)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2016/17 Submitted Requested Budget</th>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>REVENUES</th>
<th>TRANSFERS</th>
<th>FUND IMPACT</th>
<th>FTEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,175,584</td>
<td>6,642,560</td>
<td>2,354,156</td>
<td>(327,883)</td>
<td>93.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2016/17 Recommended Budget</th>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>REVENUES</th>
<th>TRANSFERS</th>
<th>FUND IMPACT</th>
<th>FTEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,175,584</td>
<td>6,642,560</td>
<td>2,354,156</td>
<td>(327,883)</td>
<td>93.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2016/17 Proposed Adopted Budget</th>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>REVENUES</th>
<th>TRANSFERS</th>
<th>FUND IMPACT</th>
<th>FTEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,175,584</td>
<td>6,642,560</td>
<td>2,354,156</td>
<td>(327,883)</td>
<td>93.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2016/17 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>REVENUES</th>
<th>TRANSFERS</th>
<th>FUND IMPACT</th>
<th>FTEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,175,584</td>
<td>6,642,560</td>
<td>2,354,156</td>
<td>(327,883)</td>
<td>93.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

Cost increases by the County - e.g. benefits - increase the GF subsidy by 24.97% which was the FY 15/16 % of subsidized expenditures.
## Five Year Budget History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Expenditures</th>
<th>Total Revenues</th>
<th>Net Deficit</th>
<th>O/T</th>
<th>Net Fund Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budgeted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016/17</td>
<td>9,175,594</td>
<td>6,542,550</td>
<td>(2,633,044)</td>
<td>2,354,156</td>
<td>(278,888)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015/16</td>
<td>8,801,390</td>
<td>6,495,555</td>
<td>(2,305,835)</td>
<td>2,178,103</td>
<td>(127,732)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014/15</td>
<td>8,452,217</td>
<td>6,302,375</td>
<td>(2,149,842)</td>
<td>2,113,786</td>
<td>(36,056)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013/14</td>
<td>7,446,943</td>
<td>5,486,629</td>
<td>(1,960,314)</td>
<td>1,945,741</td>
<td>(14,573)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012/13</td>
<td>5,904,151</td>
<td>4,612,917</td>
<td>(1,291,244)</td>
<td>943,342</td>
<td>(347,902)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011/12</td>
<td>4,924,366</td>
<td>4,476,174</td>
<td>(446,192)</td>
<td>385,727</td>
<td>(60,465)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010/11</td>
<td>4,568,414</td>
<td>4,275,824</td>
<td>(292,590)</td>
<td>251,900</td>
<td>(40,690)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009/10</td>
<td>5,124,007</td>
<td>4,345,145</td>
<td>(778,862)</td>
<td>785,856</td>
<td>6,994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015/16</td>
<td>8,926,389</td>
<td>7,947,789</td>
<td>(978,600)</td>
<td>2,178,103</td>
<td>1,199,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014/15</td>
<td>9,141,696</td>
<td>6,605,658</td>
<td>(2,536,038)</td>
<td>2,116,786</td>
<td>(419,252)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013/14</td>
<td>7,660,406</td>
<td>5,471,599</td>
<td>(2,188,807)</td>
<td>2,065,938</td>
<td>(121,869)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012/13</td>
<td>6,319,953</td>
<td>5,341,826</td>
<td>(978,127)</td>
<td>2,585,299</td>
<td>1,607,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011/12</td>
<td>6,379,334</td>
<td>4,930,956</td>
<td>(1,448,378)</td>
<td>385,727</td>
<td>(1,062,651)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010/11</td>
<td>5,849,329</td>
<td>4,715,123</td>
<td>(1,134,206)</td>
<td>251,900</td>
<td>(882,306)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009/10</td>
<td>5,850,442</td>
<td>4,803,151</td>
<td>(1,047,291)</td>
<td>1,034,171</td>
<td>(13,120)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014/15</td>
<td>(689,479)</td>
<td>303,283</td>
<td>(386,196)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>(383,196)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013/14</td>
<td>(213,463)</td>
<td>(15,030)</td>
<td>(228,493)</td>
<td>121,197</td>
<td>(107,296)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012/13</td>
<td>(415,792)</td>
<td>728,909</td>
<td>313,117</td>
<td>1,641,957</td>
<td>1,955,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011/12</td>
<td>(1,454,968)</td>
<td>452,782</td>
<td>(1,002,186)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1,002,186)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010/11</td>
<td>(1,290,915)</td>
<td>439,259</td>
<td>(841,616)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(841,616)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009/10</td>
<td>(726,435)</td>
<td>458,006</td>
<td>(268,429)</td>
<td>248,315</td>
<td>(20,114)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**
- FY 2015/15 actual is period 7 projected
- FY 2012/13 budgeted is revised to adjust for department overhead charges
### SUMMARY BY OBJECT: EXPENDITURES

**Department Name:** Health  
**Bureau:** Health - Pima Animal Care Center  
**Fund:** Special Revenue - Health Department - PACC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Wages</td>
<td>3,147,927</td>
<td>1,801,101</td>
<td>3,318,034</td>
<td>170,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime</td>
<td>192,379</td>
<td>139,278</td>
<td>50,016</td>
<td>(142,364)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Call Pay</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>5,663</td>
<td></td>
<td>(7,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift Differential</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>5,670</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>(6,800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Help</td>
<td>3,105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3,105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Worked Pay</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>34,807</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>(6,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security &amp; Medicare</td>
<td>241,055</td>
<td>147,712</td>
<td>254,977</td>
<td>13,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Insurance</td>
<td>3,217</td>
<td>2,053</td>
<td>2,566</td>
<td>(621)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Insurance Premiums</td>
<td>606,344</td>
<td>350,392</td>
<td>704,467</td>
<td>96,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers Compensation</td>
<td>48,728</td>
<td>34,836</td>
<td>62,783</td>
<td>3,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Insurance</td>
<td>5,376</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>3,026</td>
<td>(2,350)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Paid Benefit Fees</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Paid Subsidy</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>504</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State Retirement</td>
<td>361,068</td>
<td>228,238</td>
<td>371,325</td>
<td>10,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Insurance Premiums</td>
<td>6,558</td>
<td>3,243</td>
<td>7,213</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdepartment Salaries Charged out/Credit</td>
<td>(44,876)</td>
<td>(333)</td>
<td></td>
<td>44,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdepartment Salaries Charged In/Debit</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>117,580</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdepartment Fringe Charged out/Credit</td>
<td>(13,441)</td>
<td>(128)</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdepartment Fringe Charged In/Debit</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>48,479</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Distribution Fringe Charged out/Credit</td>
<td>(8,689)</td>
<td>(11,333)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(28,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Distribution Fringe Charged In/Debit</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8,319</td>
<td>30,858</td>
<td>20,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Distribution Salaries Charged out/Credit</td>
<td>(38,389)</td>
<td>(39,248)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(50,811)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Distribution Salaries Charged In/Debit</td>
<td>401,400</td>
<td>214,794</td>
<td>430,128</td>
<td>28,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Officials Retirement '2014'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick Payout</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,782</td>
<td>17,700</td>
<td>17,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation Payout</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,476</td>
<td>41,100</td>
<td>41,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Appearance Pay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Allowance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSONNEL SERVICES TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>5,013,894</td>
<td>3,118,377</td>
<td>5,271,954</td>
<td>258,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>18,233</td>
<td>11,113</td>
<td>18,400</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Under $5M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Equipment less than $1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Supplies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs &amp; Pharmaceuticals</td>
<td>203,170</td>
<td>111,648</td>
<td>190,448</td>
<td>(12,722)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical &amp; Lab Supplies</td>
<td>140,425</td>
<td>128,969</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>4,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books, Subscriptions &amp; Videos</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair &amp; Maintenance Supplies</td>
<td>33,714</td>
<td>21,202</td>
<td>31,064</td>
<td>(2,850)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals</td>
<td>3,224</td>
<td>4,412</td>
<td>2,224</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitorial Supplies</td>
<td>87,120</td>
<td>53,355</td>
<td>86,820</td>
<td>(1,600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing, Uniforms, and Safety Apparel</td>
<td>45,350</td>
<td>19,811</td>
<td>39,400</td>
<td>(5,850)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameras, Film &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Operation Supplies</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control Supplies (food &amp; other)</td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td>81,352</td>
<td>226,828</td>
<td>(8,172)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools &amp; Equipment Under $1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers</td>
<td>78,792</td>
<td>39,386</td>
<td>92,904</td>
<td>14,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Legal Expenses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Maintenance and Support</td>
<td>26,871</td>
<td>18,240</td>
<td>26,670</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory &amp; X-ray Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Services</td>
<td>332,563</td>
<td>48,404</td>
<td>264,212</td>
<td>(66,351)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In State Training</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage &amp; Freight</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>61,538</td>
<td>96,944</td>
<td>(3,056)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing &amp; Microfilming</td>
<td>55,175</td>
<td>12,250</td>
<td>52,020</td>
<td>(3,155)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from PB PRDC as of 3/9/2016
### SUMMARY BY OBJECT: EXPENDITURES

**Department Name:** Health  
**Bureau:** Health - Pima Animal Care Center  
**Fund:** Special Revenue - Health Department - PACC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECT NAME</th>
<th>FY 2015/2016</th>
<th>FY 2016/2017</th>
<th>Increase / Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>Actual Thru January</td>
<td>Requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>24,116</td>
<td>10,108</td>
<td>19,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leases &amp; Rental</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leases &amp; Rental - Real Estate &amp; Machinery</td>
<td>18,862</td>
<td>14,905</td>
<td>14,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;M-Machinery &amp; Equipment Services</td>
<td>44,937</td>
<td>13,870</td>
<td>45,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;M Grounds and Landscaping</td>
<td>5,112</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional Services</td>
<td>20,172</td>
<td>48,176</td>
<td>22,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankcard Credit Card Fees and Charges</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>15,992</td>
<td>24,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>19,522</td>
<td>3,078</td>
<td>14,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leases &amp; Rental - Office Machines</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,504</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdepartmental Supplies &amp; Services - Charged</td>
<td>5,388</td>
<td>4,334</td>
<td>5,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In/Debit</td>
<td>44,601</td>
<td>42,539</td>
<td>47,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In/Debit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Administrative Overhead</td>
<td>632,258</td>
<td>371,154</td>
<td>783,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone &amp; Internet</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>32,885</td>
<td>68,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>85,392</td>
<td>225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water &amp; Sewer</td>
<td>38,608</td>
<td>16,552</td>
<td>38,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>18,197</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal and Recycling</td>
<td>4,782</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>4,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mileage Reimbursement</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Pool Charges</td>
<td>273,125</td>
<td>167,904</td>
<td>303,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues and Memberships</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>(800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Miscellaneous Charges</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,101</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments To Agencies</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>286,026</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Liability Insurance Premiums</td>
<td>83,551</td>
<td>48,741</td>
<td>55,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage Insurance Premiums</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Expense - Pooled Investments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,143</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Support Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>51,827</td>
<td>190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>12,075</td>
<td>13,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Hardware - ISF Charges</td>
<td>91,361</td>
<td>53,305</td>
<td>101,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software - ISF Charges</td>
<td>26,574</td>
<td>13,290</td>
<td>33,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Machines &amp; Computers - Non-Capital</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(4,600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Machines &amp; Equipment - Non-Capital</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING EXPENSES TOTAL</td>
<td>3,787,456</td>
<td>1,947,215</td>
<td>3,803,840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** TOTAL: EXPENDITURE OBJECTS ***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2015/2016</th>
<th>FY 2016/2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>Requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,801,380</td>
<td>8,175,594</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from PB PROD as of 3/8/2016
## SUMMARY BY OBJECT: REVENUES

**Department Name:** Health  
**Bureau:** Health - Pima Animal Care Center  
**Fund:** Special Revenue - Health Department - PACC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Revenue</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>2,304</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Revenue Other Operating</td>
<td>4,693,551</td>
<td>2,818,338</td>
<td>4,738,737</td>
<td>46,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Local Governments Other</td>
<td>190,229</td>
<td>290,053</td>
<td>198,108</td>
<td>5,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control Impound Fees</td>
<td>231,867</td>
<td>8,633</td>
<td>232,008</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control Fees for Duplicates</td>
<td>3,501</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>4,265</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control Fees for Transfers</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>(1,418)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control Adoptions</td>
<td>16,711</td>
<td>34,845</td>
<td>16,711</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control Fees</td>
<td>6,942</td>
<td>14,977</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control Owner Pick Up</td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control Vaccinations</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>(180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control Euthanasia</td>
<td>3,870</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>(1,870)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control Microchip Fees</td>
<td>3,634</td>
<td>2,457</td>
<td>8,619</td>
<td>4,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medical Tests</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medical Procedures</td>
<td>9,720</td>
<td>6,828</td>
<td>12,295</td>
<td>2,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License &amp; Permits</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>323,852</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control Citations</td>
<td>5,726</td>
<td>13,789</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control Late Penalties</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>37,553</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Fines</td>
<td>3,140</td>
<td>2,689</td>
<td>5,470</td>
<td>2,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>349,830</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overages &amp; Shortages Operating</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63,643</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Misc. Revenue Operating</td>
<td>95,284</td>
<td>39,589</td>
<td>81,557</td>
<td>(13,707)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF Check Charge Revenue Source</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Fees and Interest Charges on Overdue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL: REVENUE OBJECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2015/2016</th>
<th>FY 2016/2017</th>
<th>Increase / Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,495,555</td>
<td>4,015,046</td>
<td>6,542,550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from PB PROD as of 2/26/2016
Pima Animal Care Center

Requested operating department expenditures, revenues and operating transfers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PACC FUND 2001</th>
<th>FY 15-16 BUDGET</th>
<th>FY 16-17 BUDGET*</th>
<th>PERCENT CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>$8,801,389</td>
<td>$9,175,594</td>
<td>4.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues</td>
<td>$6,495,555</td>
<td>$6,542,550</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Transfers</td>
<td>$2,199,525</td>
<td>$2,373,683</td>
<td>7.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACC FTE</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>93*</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes 2 FTE funded out of Burson/Rasmussen Bequests

PACC increase from FY16 to FY17 of $374,205 due mainly to:

- Increase in Central Overhead $48,995
- Increase for ITD ISF $100,448
- Benefits Increase $13,270
- Motor Pool Increase $18,848
- Burson/Rasmussen $93,780
  (Behavioral Rehabilitation Prog)
Major programs and related services provided by the department:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Programs and Initiatives</th>
<th>Services/Contributions to Economic Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>Enforcement of local animal welfare, safety and rabies control ordinances activity including response to animal bites, free roaming, sick/injured animals, or hoarding cases disproportionately impacts the quality-of-life and property values of low-income communities in our jurisdiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing</td>
<td>This function is critical in decreasing the community risk of rabies, encouraging spay/neuter of pets, and improving our ability to reunite lost pets with their owners. These functions are critical in order to control the costs associated with our PACC operation. Finally we collect licensing revenue on behalf of the partner jurisdictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter/Adoptions</td>
<td>Safely housing and securing stray and unwanted pets is an important cost driver for PACC. These services permit the rapid rehoming of lost pets, promote the long-term placement of other pets with families, as well as increasing vaccination and spay/neuter in Pima County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spay/Neuter</td>
<td>Low-cost spay and neuter services decrease unwanted the animal populations and are a critical to controlling the operational costs for PACC. Such intervention also provides important savings to the individual pet owner increasing disposable income to be used for other purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pima Animal Care Center

Major costs of providing programs and related services by the department:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Mandates</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Revenue (estimate)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>ARS § 11-1006 through ARS § 11-1022</td>
<td>$2,746,851</td>
<td>$1,757,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing</td>
<td>ARS § 11-1006 through ARS § 11-1022</td>
<td>$575,541</td>
<td>$368,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltering/live placement</td>
<td>ARS § 11-1006 through ARS § 11-1022</td>
<td>$2,852,992</td>
<td>$1,825,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spay/Neuter</td>
<td>ARS § 11-1006 through ARS § 11-1022</td>
<td>$1,562,485</td>
<td>$999,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Necessary to coordinate mandated and non-mandated activities</td>
<td>$1,093,862</td>
<td>$699,956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Revenues for programs based on billing for actual services and account for approximately 64% of costs to Tucson, Oro Valley, Marana, Sahuarita, and South Tucson.

PACC Mandates: ARS § 11-1006 through ARS § 11-1022

- The county shall establish civil penalties for violating animal statues and ordinance and conduct hearings
- The county enforcement agent shall enforce provisions, issue citations
- The county enforces that no dogs shall be permitted at large (no strays)
- The county shall impound stray dogs and all impounded cats and dogs shall be given proper and humane care. For animals not reclaimed, the county enforcement agency shall take possession.
- Specified animals shall be confined and quarantined in a county pound. The county enforcement agent shall destroy a vicious animal by order of a justice of the peace or a city magistrate.
- Animals in county pound shall be properly cared for and, when required, humanely destroyed.
- Provisions to be met before dogs and cats can leave county pound: shall not be release unless altered, dogs licensed
Pima Animal Care Center

Significant changes in the requested FY2016/17 budget versus the FY 2015/16 adopted budget:

In 2015, PACC developed a plan to curtail long term overtime expenditures by hiring additional personnel to alleviate staffing shortages. This plan was approved by County administration and implemented, with the effect that overtime was virtually cut in half as of April 2016. This has had a beneficial effect on the overall PACC budget and operations. As of mid-April 2016 PACC was on track to finish the year under budget for the first time in recent history.

Major budget issues the department is facing in FY 2016/17:

Current PACC operations continue to focus on controlling our costs while delivering high-quality humane services to pets and owners in our community. Specifically PACC continues to reduce overtime, decrease contractor costs, streamline current operations, increase philanthropic funding and improve services. An additional operational consideration this year will be the inevitable disruption of services associated with the construction of the voter approved facility while simultaneously continuing to operate at capacity.

We continue to face challenges related to reimbursement from the jurisdictional partners on whose behalf we perform services in Pima County. These challenges are likely to continue.

Any requests for supplemental funding over and above the base budget amount:

No supplemental funding requests were submitted by PACC for FY16/17.
Pima Animal Care Center

Various issues related to FY2016-17 budgets administered by the Department:

Main Operating Budget

PACC requires full staffing in order to meet its statutory and contractual responsibilities. This continues to be a priority in order to avoid expensive overtime pay, improve safety, decrease stress and improve retention of both staff and volunteers.

The current clinical staffing continues to be an important element in our cost containment efforts as it decrease our reliance on outside contractors and vendors of services we are now able to perform in house.

Two years ago PACC hired a Development Director to capitalize on philanthropic opportunities to support PACC’s mission. This has resulted in significant increases in donations and grant funding ($600,000 is the amount budgeted for FY16/17 in donations).

Special Program Budgets

None

Grants Program Budgets

PetSmart Charities $269,000
Burson & Rassmussen Bequests $205,000
Other Grants $8,500

Capital Improvement Program Budgets

None, except for the pending new facility construction which is handled through Facilities.

Internal Service Fund Budgets
Volunteer Application and Volunteer Agreement

We are thrilled you are interested in volunteering at the Pima Animal Care Center. PACC could not thrive without the time and talents that volunteers offer us.

Volunteers work in many areas, including Cat Care, Dog Socialization, Foster Care, and as Groomers, Lobby Greeter, Adoption Counselors, PACC Ambassadors, Clinic Assistants and Office Support. Depending on the needs of PACC, volunteers may be assigned a role at the discretion of the Volunteer Coordinator.

PACC volunteers are held to the highest industry standards. To become a volunteer, the minimum requirements are:

- A six-month commitment as volunteer. Additionally, we also ask that you try to commit to a minimum of six hours per month.
- In the Generations program, youth ages 11 to 15 years old are only allowed to volunteer with a parent or guardian. Youth ages 16 to 18 years old can volunteer on their own.
- Attending the Volunteer Orientation and subsequent animal handling classes (if applicable). Once you have successfully completed the volunteer application and it is approved, we will invite you to an orientation.
- Reading and agreeing to policies, procedures and rules contained below. Failure to abide by these policies, procedures and rules is grounds for disciplinary action, up to and including, dismissal from PACC’s volunteer corps.
**PACC Spay/Neuter Policy:**
To help control the unwanted pet population, PACC will spay/neuter all canines and felines surrendered to our care unless there is a medical reason not to sterilize the animal.

INITIAL HERE to confirm that you understand and accept “PACC Spay/Neuter Policy”: ______________________________

**PACC Euthanasia Policy:** The decision to euthanize an animal is difficult and not made lightly. Pima Animal Care Center accepts all animals from the community. We do not limit the length of time an animal remains in our shelter. All animals in good health and of good temperament are placed up for adoption. We do have a good adoption rate and make every effort within our resources to help as many animals as possible; however, there are certain circumstances when an animal must be euthanized.

INITIAL HERE to confirm that you understand and accept “PACC Euthanasia Policy”: __________

**Professional Expectations**
*As a PACC volunteer, I AGREE TO:*

- Support the mission, vision, goals, efforts and official positions of the Pima Animal Care Center.
- Treat all animals with kindness.
- Promote goodwill by handling my responsibilities and contacts with staff, other volunteers, customers and visitors in a spirit of courtesy and cooperation.
- Observe Pima County Board of Supervisor Policies:
  - D21-2: Prevention of Sexual Harassment
  - D21-3: Prevention of Workplace Harassment
  - D23-1: Preventing, Identifying, and Addressing Workplace Bullying
  - D23-11 Preventing Workplace Violence
- Follow the most current communication plan for reporting concerns with policies, practices or procedures.
- Observe current Social Media Policy
- Observe all policies and directives from Pima County Animal Care Center.

INITIAL HERE to confirm that you understand and accept “Professional Expectations”: ___________
Safety, Security and Confidentiality
As a PACC volunteer, I AGREE TO:

- Report to my volunteer job physically and mentally fit for duty.
- Observe all safety and security rules.
- Report accidents, injuries, fire, theft or other unusual incidents immediately after the occurrence or discovery.
- Refrain from using PACC property, services or supplies for personal reasons unless given prior permission by Volunteer Coordinator or Shelter Manager.
- Deal fairly with all PACC colleagues, co-workers, supervisors, customers, visitors, volunteers, etc., without regard to their gender, race, ethnicity, religion, creed, age, sexual orientation, marital status, national origin, ancestry, citizenship, military status, veteran status, handicap or disability.
- Contact the Volunteer Coordinator or another appropriate supervisor immediately if I feel discriminated against or harassed in connection with my volunteering.
- Hold harmless Pima Animal Care Center, its agents, employees, directors and insurance carriers from any and all claims, damages and judgments which I may have now or in the future against the Pima Animal Care Center in all matters pertaining to my services as an agency volunteer, including, but not limited to, personal injury.

INITIAL HERE to confirm that you understand and accept “PACC Safety, Security and Confidentiality” expectations: ______________

Working with Pima County Inmates
As a PACC volunteer, I AGREE TO:

- Recognize that PACC volunteers and staff work in close proximity to inmates from the Pima County Jail in the day-to-day operation of PACC.
- Understand that under Arizona Revised Statutes inmates have a very different existence and rules of conduct than an ordinary citizen.
- Not engage in conversation or any other type of activity with inmates, other than the courtesy of hello.
- Not give, take or in any manner barter with, inmates, i.e. supply any goods, including food and soft drinks or monies. Said act is unlawful and constitutes a felony for which I can be prosecuted.
- Not handle any mail, notes, packages or verbal messages for any inmate.
- Not photograph an inmate for any reason.
- Not ask inmates to assist me in any way unless in an emergency situation where my personal safety may be in jeopardy.
- Report to PACC staff immediately if an inmate approaches me on any matter other than outlined in this memo.
INITIAL HERE to confirm that you understand and accept “Working with Pima County Inmates” expectations: ______________

Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest
As a PACC volunteer, I AGREE TO:

- Maintain and safeguard the confidentiality of all business, donor, employee, volunteer and animal records, credit and financial information, and/or any information relating to the operation of the agency that is not known or readily available to the general public.
- Abide by PACC Social Media policy.
- Avoid engaging in any conduct that is or could be perceived as a conflict of interest.

INITIAL HERE to confirm that you understand and accept “Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest” expectations: ______________

Community Relations
As a PACC volunteer, I AGREE TO:

- Allow the agency to use and reproduce my name, voice and/or likeness or that of my pet(s) in connection with any advertising, programming and/or promotion of the agency in media as needed.
- Refrain from any political activity while performing responsibilities as a volunteer for Pima Animal Care Center. I will not use any Pima County resources for the purpose of influencing the outcome of an election.

INITIAL HERE to confirm that you understand and accept “Community Relations” expectations: ______________

By initialing all sections, checking the “I agree” button, and submitting this application, I agree to abide by the policies and procedures of the Pima Animal Care Center during my time as a member of the volunteer team, conforming to all rules and regulations commonly applied to employees of the agency, including but not limited to, safety, discrimination, harassment, confidentiality and Position Statements.

I agree that if I do not adhere to any item listed in the agreement it may result in disciplinary action, up to and including dismissal. In most cases, failure to adhere to items listed in the agreement will be addressed in three phases: verbal discussion, written warning and finally, dismissal. In egregious cases of harassment, animal endangerment or violation of social media policy, dismissal may be immediate. This is at the discretion of the PACC administration.
This policy is designed to protect individuals and Pima Animal Care Center, to ensure that references to PACC are factually correct and do not breach confidentiality requirements, and to ensure that all PACC volunteers and staff are treated with respect. Failure to follow this policy will result in disciplinary action, up to and including, dismissal from employment or the volunteer corps.

- “Social media” is defined as websites and applications that enable users to create and share content or to participate in social networking, including but not limited to: Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, Pinterest, Instagram, Snap Chat and Yik Yak. The Pima County Communications Office is responsible for determining whether a website or application qualifies as social media.
- All PACC staff and volunteers must adhere to the procedures and guidelines of County (Administrative Procedure 3-31).
- Unless given authorized by the Director of Community Engagement, PACC staff and volunteers may speak for or collect images on behalf of PACC or to represent that they do in any setting including social media sites.
- PACC staff and volunteers may not share information that has not been publicly released through the official PACC Facebook page, Pima County Website, Volgistics or Foster and Rescue emails. Once information has been shared officially, staff and volunteers are encouraged to share that information.
- A respectful tone is important when referring to past or current PACC staff, volunteers, customers and partners. Derogatory or threatening speech, name calling, etc. will not be tolerated.
- Any communication between employees and/or volunteers that would be considered inappropriate in a workplace (i.e., sexual harassment, intimidation, bullying, etc.) is also prohibited for online communication.
- Social networking contact with youth volunteers is strictly forbidden.
- During a crisis situation, updates will be provided through Pima County’s official communication channels, including PACC official social media. Sharing is encouraged after official announcement is made on Pima County or PACC official FB page.
- PACC reserves the right to remove inappropriate postings on its official social media platforms in conformance with County (AP 3-31).
- PACC does not monitor non-county social media sites. When content in these sites would otherwise violate the standards on County social media and this content is brought to the attention of PACC leadership, we reserve the right to take appropriate follow-up action up to and including the termination of volunteer or employment status.
- Questions regarding social media may be directed to the PACC Director for Community Engagement, Justin Gallick.
Fundraising and social media

We greatly appreciate when you share PACC’s online requests for donations with your friends and family on your personal social networking sites. We ask that you please ask your social media contacts to make gifts directly to PACC or Friends of PACC.

Before launching your campaign, we ask that you please do the following:

• Send a one-paragraph description of your fundraising idea to our Development Office at karen.hollish@pima.gov. This will allow PACC staff to be able to answer any questions from the public that might arise as a result of your fundraiser.
• Include a note at the top of your fundraising page to this effect: “This is a private fundraiser being organized by X, who is a volunteer/staff at Pima Animal Care Center. This is not an official fundraiser for Pima Animal Care Center.”
• Present PACC in the best possible light and refrain from using language such as “death row” or “pound” or “kill.” While we know this language can be an effective fundraising tool for fundraisers that are specific to a particular pet, we feel it also serves to drive away investment in the shelter and makes potential adopters fearful of visiting our campus.

By signing below, I indicate that I understand and accept the Pima Animal Care Center social media policy, including proper process in regard to fundraising and social media:

Signature: ______________________________________________________

Date: __________________________________________________________
General Communication Policy

We want your volunteer experience at Pima Animal Care to be fun and rewarding. PACC takes the input and concerns of our staff and volunteers very seriously. Please come to us with any issue.

We are always open to implementing positive changes, but there are some suggestions we may not be able to integrate into our policies and procedures due to County policy, legal restrictions or budgetary constraints.

We strive to have replies to your concerns within three business days. If you have not received a verbal or written response to your inquiry within that period, please contact Justin Gallick.

- For immediate emergency concerns about animal health and safety, please notify the Shelter Supervisor on Duty. If he/she is unavailable, please contact the Shelter Supervisor or Medical Team.

- To discuss a particular concern about an issue with another staff member or volunteer, please contact the Volunteer Coordinator.

- For other concerns, please refer to the PACC Communication Chart to identify the appropriate contact person.

- Concerns, suggestions and questions about PACC policy and procedures should be emailed to the appropriate contact on PACC Communication Chart. PACC leadership will review the concern, suggestion or question and either contact the submitter directly or refer the individual to the Volunteer Forum.

- Social media communication is regulated by the PACC Social Media policy.

By signing below, I indicate that I have read, understand and accept the Pima Animal Care Center General Communication Policy.

Signature: ____________________________

Date: ________________________________
PACC Email Tree

Shelter pet related questions- corina.rodriguez@pima.gov, Danielle.harris@pima.gov, Daniel.miranda@pima.gov and Jose.chavez@pima.gov

Adoption/off-site adoption questions- Ellie.beaubien@pima.gov, Mark.little@pima.gov and Justin.gallick@pima.gov

Rescue Group and SNA questions- Samantha.nellis@pima.gov and Justin.gallick@pima.gov

Volunteer related questions- Gina.hansen@pima.gov and Justin.Gallick@pima.gov

Foster related questions- Michelle.lindorff@pima.gov and Justin.gallick@pima.gov

Licensing related questions- Jennifer.neustadter@pima.gov

Enforcement related question- debra.tenkate@pima.gov and Niel.knost@pima.gov, adam.ricci@pima.gov and Jose.ocano@pima.gov

To report a needed repair or safety concern – Kino.davis@pima.gov

Fundraising or donor development questions- Karen.Hollish@pima.gov

Medical questions/concerns regarding a pet at PACC- Jennifer.wilcox@pima.gov and Michelle.figueroa@pima.gov

Organizational questions- Justin.gallick@pima.gov and Jose.ocano@pima.gov

Policy concerns and Questions- Jose.ocano@pima.gov, Justin.Gallick@pima.gov and
## Donation Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donation Code</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DONATION</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION ADOP</td>
<td>$364.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION GEN</td>
<td>$13,924.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION OUTR</td>
<td>$53.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION S/N</td>
<td>$14,086.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION SAMS</td>
<td>$3,369.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31,800.41</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation Code</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION</td>
<td>$674.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION ADOP</td>
<td>$14,590.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION ENFORCE 0972</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION GEN</td>
<td>$173,228.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION LIC 0973</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION OUTR</td>
<td>$565.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION S/N</td>
<td>$115,509.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION SAMS</td>
<td>$121,082.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$425,669.80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>