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
   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:
   Pat Jacobs, Tucson Kennel Club
   Sophia Kaluzniacki, DVM, SPCA of AZ, Inc
   Derek Marshall, Public Education
   Helen Mendelsohn, Disabled Community
   Marcy Flanagan, Health Department Deputy Director, Ex-Officio (Health Department Director, Dr. Francisco García served in Ms. Flanagan’s place.)

   - Pledge of Allegiance

2. Adoption of the Minutes

   - Adoption of the May 19, 2016 Meeting Minutes

   Ms. Emptage pointed out the minutes still list her as the Chair, which she no longer is. Mr. Schlueter will correct that.

   The motion was made and seconded (Hubbard/Smith) that the May 19, 2016 meeting minutes be adopted as written, with the aforementioned correction. The motion carried (7-0).

3. Call to the Audience

   There were no speakers from the audience.

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

   All six welfare cases were discussed. Regarding case one, Ms. Schwerin said cruelty laws apply and PACC is not enforcing these laws; Dr. Smith felt the dog should have been impounded since it was found on a tie-out twice; and Ms. Emptage requested a follow-up to see if the dog is again on a tie-out. New Enforcement Manager Adam Ricci acknowledged the points made and said PACC hopefully can work on these types of cases. Ms. Emptage requested a ban on animal ownership for
the owner in welfare case two. Regarding welfare case three, Ms. Schwerin said keeping dogs in crates is extremely cruel and felt the dog should have been bonded. Regarding welfare cases four and five, Ms. Schwerin said keeping dogs on tie-outs is cruel; a dog on a tie-out is in distress; and such dogs should have been bonded. In welfare case six the owner was given 24 hours to get veterinary care. The owner complied and the dog was euthanized.

Mr. Ricci said he has started conversations with the prosecutors to tighten up these welfare cases, but added change is a process; it doesn’t happen immediately. He added that many factors including officers’ judgment calls will still play a part in these cases. The conversation also touched on education and diversion tactics such as education through veterinarians and by targeting high incident neighborhoods.

Dangerous dog case one involved a dog mortally wounded by a neighbor’s dog. Ms. Emptage asked if the owner could be cited for lack of veterinary care for the neighbor’s dog her dog injured. Mr. Ricci leaned toward not being able to charge the neighbor, but said he would look into it. Ms. Hubbard mentioned “Fabian’s Law,” which deals with civil liabilities in dog on dog attacks. She suggested victims be given information on this law.

Regarding dangerous dog case four Ms. Schwerin referred to the right column of the dangerous dog form and said fences have nothing to do with an animal’s behavior. She continued that other than for spaying/neutering an animal the right column deduction points should be eliminated. She added that when a dangerous dog is not declared dangerous, then it is not mandatorily spayed/neutered and could be bred. Mr. Ricci said he has been gathering information regarding the dangerous dog topic and is looking forward to discussing this topic with PACC’s, soon to be hired, behaviorist. He added this is a high volume topic, citing 229 reported animal bites to humans in the month of May.

5. **Old Business**

   - **Shortening of Shelter Animal Lengths of Stay**

     Dr. García said this is an ongoing challenge and assured the Committee this is priority going forward.

   - **Proposed Pima County Animal Care Advisory Committee Management Reports**

     Ms. Hubbard asked about when reports will become available. Dr. García said he wanted information given to the Committee to be actionable and strategic to be able to benefit the most animals possible. He also touched on this topic in his Management Report.

6. **Management Report**

   Dr. García utilized the attached PowerPoint presentation to cover the Management Report and touch on other areas.

   The first bullet of his presentation was a review of achievements, which was a PowerPoint presentation by PACC Operations Manager Jose Ocano, titled A Decade of Progress: Celebrating the Transformation of PACC. (Also included in the record) The presentation detailed the step-by-step progress of PACC from a house and kill shelter with a peak intake of 28,000 animals and a live release rate of only 39 percent, through the strategic decisions, changes and positions hired that
progressed PACC to an intake of 20,000; a live release rate of 90 percent; and a new facility on the way.

Dr. García returned to his presentation and referred to the new Committee going forward as PACCAC 2.0. He said the County Administrator would like the Committee to have more of a strategic focus versus an operational focus. He said staff proposing animal ordinances will be seen as self-serving, while the community or Committee proposing ordinances will be seen as more progressive. He also proposed detailed operations reports produced annually. Going forward the Committee will need to reestablish by-laws and meeting details.

- Building Update

Dr. García said the building is on schedule and keeping it on schedule is a high priority. Phase one is scheduled to be completed by the end of 2017, with phase two to be completed in mid 2018. He added that a major reason the building is on schedule is the flexibility of staff to adjust to the needs of the project.

- Volunteer Program External Assessment

PACC has received a technical assistance grant to evaluate the volunteer program. The assessment covers ten areas and takes six months.

Barking dog informational handouts were provided as requested at a previous meeting.

7. **Donations:** A total of $34,554.17 in donations was received during the month of May.

   There was no discussion on this agenda item.

8. **Complaints and Commendations:** There were no complaints and no commendations received by staff during May.

   Dr. García said PACC recently received positive recognition from Congresswoman McSally.

9. **Call to the Audience**

   There were two speakers from the audience.

   Marcie Velen said she really appreciated Dr. García’s PACCAC 2.0 discussion. She asked for details on the live release numbers, so we can know where PACC needs to improve. She added that the help desk started in 2014 not 2015 as indicated in Mr. Ocano’s presentation.

   Cathy Neuman thanked the Committee for their accomplishments, adding that the positive impact from the Committee has been felt by the volunteers. She also thanked Mr. Neuman for his representation as the volunteer representative on the Committee. She shared Mr. Neuman’s favorite quote, which is from Dr. Regan.
Animals have a life of their own that is of importance to them apart from their utility to us. They are not only in the world, they are aware of it. What happens to them matters to them.

10. Final Observations of the Animal Care Advisory Committee Members and Recognitions

Ms. Schwerin said a State law recently passed, which allows for animal enforcement officers to have access to and use firearms in the field when it is necessary to immediately put an animal out of its misery.

Mr. Neuman thanked the volunteers for their time, money and emotion freely invested in the animals. He also thanked the Committee for their efforts working through long agendas often late into the evening.

11. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:46 pm.
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Call to Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Roll Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Establishment of Quorum and Pledge of Allegiance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Review and Adoption of Minutes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adoption of May 19, 2016 Meeting Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Call to the Audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Welfare and Dangerous Dog Cases from May and Recent Animal Care Center Holds Snapshot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Old Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Shortening of Shelter Animal Lengths of Stay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Proposed Pima County Animal Care Advisory Committee Management Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Management Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Building Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Volunteer Program External Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Donations: A total of $34,554.17 in donations was received during the month of May.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Complaints and Commendations: There were no complaints and no commendations received by staff during May.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Call to the Audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Final Observations of the Animal Care Advisory Committee Members and Recognitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Adjournment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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](http://www.pima.gov/animalcare). The Committee may discuss and take action on any item on the agenda. At the conclusion of an open call to the public Committee members may only respond to criticism made; ask staff to review the matter raised; or ask to include the matter on a future agenda.

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

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-Officio (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
Deputy County Attorney Kreamer: Dangerous Dog Related Enforcement and Policies

Dr. Garcia 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 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. García 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. García 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.


The next meeting will be at the Abrams building.

13. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:32 pm.
### Report Snapshot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date and time reported</td>
<td>06/26/16 18:46 hr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On 06/26/16 at approximately 1846 hours Pima Animal Care (PACC) Officer A. Kirby #2067 arrived at  in reference to a dog on a tie out without access to water. Upon approaching the property I was able to observe a black and white Border Collie mix over the 3 foot fence surrounding the back yard. The dog later Identified as Morena was tied out using a 3-4 foot chain attached by a padlock to an anchor in one side of a concrete pad. There was a very large amount of animal waste surrounding the dog. I observed one stainless steel water bowl upside down with no evidence of water on the ground. I also observed a black rubber type water bowl that was upright but also empty and dry. The area where the dog was tied out had no shelter within 10-20 feet. I knocked on the door and was met by the dog owner advised me of the notice she had received from PACC Officer Hinte #2068 had responded out and witnessed a juvenile resident remove the dog from the tie out at that time. I asked if she noticed the box checked on the notice stating that tie outs are illegal and she stated she did. She stated something to the effect of the dog needs to go pee and can jump the fence, that is why it is tied up. I advised her that a safe alternative to the illegal tie out would be to walk the dog on a leash and she stated that her daughter does but she has classes in the afternoon. I asked how long the dog had been tied up for and she stated, "about 30 minutes." I then asked about the licensing and rabies vaccinations for Morena and she stated they were current. I requested her ID and she provided it. I then returned to the PACC truck and completed a citation for Neglect - Tie Out, Neglect - No water, and Neglect - No shelter. While I was writing the citation removed the dog from the tie out and put it inside the home. I explained to her citation, court date, time, and location, she stated she understood and signed the citation. I provided her copy of the citation and her ID. I then went to take more photographs of the area and after entering the yard where the dog was tied out became defensive and stated that its private property, I explained to her that I was not entering her residence. She then stated something to the effect of "do whatever you need." I photographed the water bowls and chain where Morena was tie out. I advised to remove the chain from the anchor in the ground as she can no longer tie the dog out.

### Officer's Case Report

On 06/06/16 at approximately 1328 hours Pima Animal Care (PACC) Dispatch received a complaint in reference to a dog on a tie out without access to water located at On 05/09/16 at approximately 1206 hours PACC Officer D. Hint #2068 arrived at She knocked on the front door and met with juvenile • He advised that his parents were not home. He admitted that they own a dog who jumps the fence, so she gets tied up when there is no one home. He stated that he was just about to leave so she was currently tie up. Officer Hint prepared a notice for his parents and asked him to remove the dog from the tie out. He agreed to place her inside until his parents can find another solution. She gave him the notice and watched as he removed the dog from the tie out. Officer Hinte reset the call to meet with parents and check that the dog is no longer being kept on a tie-out. On 06/26/16 at approximately 1846 hours 1 Pima Animal Care (PACC) Officer A. Kirby #2067 arrived at in reference to a dog on a tie out without access to water. Upon approaching the property I was able to observe a black and white Border Collie mix over the 3 foot fence surrounding the back yard. The dog later identified as Morena was tied out using a 3-4 foot chain attached by a padlock to an anchor in one side of a concrete pad. There was a very large amount of animal waste surrounding the dog. I observed one stainless steel water bowl upside down with no evidence of water on the ground. I also observed a black rubber type water bowl that was upright but also empty and dry. The area where the dog was tied out had no shelter within 10-20 feet. I knocked on the door and was met by the dog owner advised me of the notice she had received from PACC Officer Hinte #2068 had responded out and witnessed a juvenile resident remove the dog from the tie out at that time. I asked if she noticed the box checked on the notice stating that tie outs are illegal and she stated she did. She stated something to the effect of the dog needs to go pee and can jump the fence, that is why it is tied up. I advised her that a safe alternative to the illegal tie out would be to walk the dog on a leash and she stated that her daughter does but she has classes in the afternoon. I asked how long the dog had been tied up for and she stated, "about 30 minutes." I then asked about the licensing and rabies vaccinations for Morena and she stated they were current. I requested her ID and she provided it. I then returned to the PACC truck and completed a citation for Neglect - Tie Out, Neglect - No water, and Neglect - No shelter. While I was writing the citation removed the dog from the tie out and put it inside the home. I explained to her citation, court date, time, and location, she stated she understood and signed the citation. I provided her copy of the citation and her ID. I then went to take more photographs of the area and after entering the yard where the dog was tied out became defensive and stated that its private property, I explained to her that I was not entering her residence. She then stated something to the effect of "do whatever you need." I photographed the water bowls and chain where Morena was tie out. I advised to remove the chain from the anchor in the ground as she can no longer tie the dog out.

### Summary

Officer Hinte originally spoke with a male juvenile at the residence after receiving a report of a dog on a tie out. The call was later followed up by Officer Kirby who observed the dog on a tie out again. Officer Kirby cited the owner for the following neglect charges: tie out, water and shelter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Member Comments/ Request for Information</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there, or was there, a follow up scheduled?</td>
<td>T. Barrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The individual admitted to receiving a notice that tie outs are illegal and ignored it. Please recheck if possible.</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>Uncomfortable with this case. Dog on tie out twice within one month inspire of information given to the illegal nature of tie outs. If there is a follow-up I bet the dog will be tied out again. If that is the case the dog should be impounded. It is too hot for these animals to be outside for extended periods of time without water or shelter. These owners do not get it. Was this adult disabled that she could not walk the dog?</td>
<td>G. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Tucson Rep.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On 06/16/16 at approximately 13:48 hours brought her elderly Lhasa Apso (or mix thereof) named Maya to Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) at 4000 N Silverbell Rd, and requested that she be humanely euthanized. Stated that Maya was not eating, was losing weight, and whimpering a lot. She told the staff that she has owned Maya for just over a year and that she noticed the dog was sick approximately one month prior to bringing her to PACC. She admitted that Maya has not been seen by a vet in the time she has owned the dog. Also told the kennel staff that she could no longer care for Maya because she had a new baby. On 06/20/16 at approximately 08:50 hours, Investigator Foster #2042, arrived at reference to a previously reported case alleging that the owner of a Lhasa Apso (or mix thereof) known as Maya had neglected to obtain veterinary care necessary to manage her debilitating conditions, maintain her in good health and minimize her suffering. I knocked on the front door and was met by the previous owner of Maya. I stated my name and the reason for my visit and asked if I could see her back yard. She gave me permission to enter her home and I followed her through the home to the back yard. I was able to see and photograph that the yard was mostly free of debris but there was a large number of dead weed-like plants that appeared to have burr or sticker type of seed pods. I asked to see a copy of her log and she agreed and I followed her back through her home to the carport where her log was located. I explained that Pima Animal Care Staff vets requested that a neglect of vet care citation be issued to her. She freely admitted that she has never taken Maya to a vet despite owning the elderly dog for over a year. I explained that Maya will need several teeth removed and that she will most likely lose an eye. In response, she told me that until recently she was paying for waxing, manicures and pedicures, but due to financial difficulties she was unable to enjoy those services. She mentioned that she frequently cut Maya's hair with scissors to save money and still provide some relief to the dog. She was very concerned that she would lose her fingerprint clearance card as a result of receiving citations and told me that she will no longer own pets. She went on to add that "If the dog was my last priority then I probably should not own one." I presented her with her citation and she acknowledged, signed, and accepted her citations. I provided her with her court date, time, and location. I next returned her 10 to her and thanked her for her time and cooperation.

Additional Information from Mr. Ricci's Report:

After Maya was handled via the intake process she was brought to be evaluated by Dr. Karyn Carlson, DVM. Dr. Carlson conducted an evaluation and reported the following conditions of Maya: Severe matting of the coat; Severe dental disease; Underlying dermatitis; Hypochromic, microcytic, nonregenerative anemia- R/O iron deficiency (not provided adequate food) vs chronic disease (E. canis, VF, other). No other markers for VF (hyperglobulinemia) so less likely Monocytosis- R/O chronic
disease (skin vs TF vs VF): Oveitis OS; Corneal ulcer OD; Emaciated- R/0 underlying disease process vs lack of adequate nutrition

Dr. Carlson placed Maya on antibiotics for skin and mouth, scheduled a dental cleaning with likely extractions, recommend OS be enucleated and to recheck weight and PCV in five days. Dr. Carlson also noted that Maya "Ate ravenously when food offered". After Dr. Carlson's evaluation Maya was shaved by a clinic technician.

That on May 18, 2016 I created an Activity Number for an investigation into Maya's condition. I followed up with Dr. Carlson who advised that Maya's condition, in her opinion was from neglect by her owner.

I obtained photographs of Maya taken by Dr. Carlson and Karen Hollish, staff worker at PACC, taken on May 16, 2016 showing the initial condition and the process of shaving Maya.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Member Comments/ Request for Information</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not much to say except this is a terrible owner, but she realized it, only too late for Maya, but thankfully, Dr. Carlson felt she could rehabilitate this dog.</td>
<td>G. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tucson Rep.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
05/10/16 08:12 I, Officer Adkins 1961 arrived at reference to 4 dogs in small cages. I knocked on the front door with no response except for a large breed dog and small breed dog barking from inside the mobile home. I went to the back yard and found 3 dogs in cages with no water and animal waste in the cages, A560711 a young female brindle/white pit bull inside a medium wire crates covered with blankets, a large mirror and a plastic puppy pen around it. There was food and water in the puppy pen but the dog did not have access to it as the dog was locked in the wire crate. When I removed the dog from the crate, it did not have a bottom and there was excessive animal waste that appeared to be old. A560712 an adult female cream/white terrier mix was in a medium sized plastic dog crate with a bowl of dog food and no water. When I removed the dog from the crate there was old animal waste in the crate. AS60713 an adult male tricolor beeler mix was in a large steel cage that was covered with a blue tarp. There was no water with a small amount of animal waste in the cage. Officer Vargas 2060 and Investigator Eck. leburger 1942 had to assist me in removing AS60713 from the cage. I impounded all three dogs for no water and unsanitary living conditions. I scanned the dogs for microchips and did not find any. I posted a notice of impound on the front door.

05/11/16 18:47 Officer Martinez #2067 met with dog owner at Pima Animal Care Center and issued citations 71490 A-E and 71491 A for neglect no water and neglect no shelter(unsanitary shelter) on all three dogs. Signed and received copies of the citations with the court date, time, and location.

Summary

Officer Adkins responded to a residence reference to four dogs outside in crates. Officer Adkins observed three dogs being kept in various types of crates that were found to be without water and having old animal feces in them. The owner was later cited for the following neglect charges: water and shelter.

Committee Member Comments/ Request for Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Member Comments</th>
<th>Request for Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>These dogs were impounded, I hope owner was not allowed to redeem dogs until facility is reevaluated and cleaned up. These are horrible conditions? Please give follow-up on these dogs.</td>
<td>G. Smith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member

T. Barrick
N. Emptage
P. Hubbard
P. Jacobs
S. Kaluzniacki
D. Marshall
H. Mendelsohn
J. Neumann
E. O'Donnell
J. Schwerin

These dogs were impounded, I hope owner was not allowed to redeem dogs until facility is reevaluated and cleaned up. These are horrible conditions? Please give follow-up on these dogs.
05/12/16 11:23 I, Officer Adkins 1961 arrived at a residence in reference to a dog on a tangled tie out with no access to shade or water. I knocked on the door with no response. I observed A560990 a young male sable/white german shepherd on a wire cable tie out attacked to a awning post on the north east side of the porch. The tie out was wrapped around the post several times with about 2 feet of the tie out not tangled up. There was clean water provided in a white bucket which the dog was able to reach. The dog had plenty of shade from the awning but no access to shelter. I impounded the dog and scanned for a microchip in which I did not find one. I posted a notice on the security screen door along with a band out on the animal laws. If owner redeems please cite for dog on tie out and no shelter.

05/12/16 16:32 Officer Martinez #2067 met with the owner at Pima Animal Care Center when she came in to possibly redeem her dog. Officer Martinez issued citation 71492 A-B for no shelter and dog on tie out. Signed and received her copy of citations with the court date, time, and location.

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>Vaccinations? License? Not noted on report.</td>
<td>T. Barrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N. Emptage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P. Hubbard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P. Jacobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. Kaluzniacki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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>Did owner redeem the dog? The form states she came in to possibly redeem dog.</td>
<td>City of Tucson Rep.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

Officer Adkins responded to a residence for a report of a dog on a tangled tie out without access to shade or water. Officer Adkins was able to observe a male German Shepherd on a wire cable style tie out attached to an awning post. After further investigation Officer Adkins impounded the dog. The owner was later cited for the following neglect charges: tie out and shelter.
Officer's Case Report

On 05/01/16 at approximately 1203 hours Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) Dispatch received a call from a complainant who stated that there are 3 dogs kept in 3 different trailers with no ventilation. When the dogs are not kept in the trailer they are kept on a tie out.

On 05/02/16 at approximately 1706 hours PACC Dispatch received call from per caller ID who stated the owner does not live at the listed but frequents the property. She stated none of the trailers have utilities. There is no water, however, she and the neighbors have been feeding and watering the dogs.

On 06/05/16 at approximately 1640 hours I Pima Animal Care (PACC) Officer A. Kirby #2057 responded to the address located at Upon arrival I observed two dogs tied to the fencing with cable tie outs. A gray and white female Pit Bull mix that had access to water and shelter however the black lab mix had no shelter but was provided with clean water in a bucket. I then entered the property through the unlocked gate and I observed a puppy inside a shed on the property with no insulation and the windows were only cracked approximately 1 inch which did not create much airflow. The puppy inside was up against one of the windows panting in an attempt to get the cooler air coming from outside through the small opening in the window. Through the window I observed 3 empty bowls for water. Using a remote thermal temperature device it was determined that the temperature inside the shed was approximately 97 degrees. The ambient air temperature outside per UofA weather reports was 89.8 degrees. I attempted to contact the resident of the property Dara Montgomery with no success. I then impounded the two dogs on the tie outs and the Pima County Sheriff (PCSO) was contacted to assist in making entry into the shed to impound the puppy. A short time later I was met by PCSO Deputy Brady #4751 in reference to PCSO Case #160505270. We made entry into the shed through the unlocked door and impounded a brown and white Pit Bull puppy without incident. Deputies then cleared the scene and I posted a notice of impoundment on the front entry gate to the property.

On 05/07/16 at approximately 12:12 hours Investigator T. Foster #2042 met with Pima Animal Care Center in reference to her three dogs being impounded due to exigent circumstances. She acknowledged, signed, and accepted her citations. Investigator Foster returned her ID and provided her with her court date, time, and location.

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>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Were these dogs returned to this owner? I hope not! The report does not say.

G. Smith
City of Tucson Rep.
On 05/08/16 at 19:49 hrs, Officer Valdez (#2011) arrived at the store and met with the caller who stated a customer found the dog wandering the shopping center and brought it in the store. The small, male, brown, Chihuahua mix appeared to be grossly underweight with a massive tumor on its neck and its nails were abnormally long. While I was documenting the animal with photos a female subject (later identified as •) entered the store stating she was the dog owner and her dog Rocky ran away from her home which was nearby. When I questioned her about the dog’s poor health she stated she had vet care documents at her residence.

Proceeded to the residence of where she produced various outdated vet documentations. One document was dated 06/11/12 from Continental Ranch Pet Clinic and the other was dated 11/29/14 from Southern Arizona Veterinary, which all documents stated tests for Valley Fever and for cancer needed to be performed, but the owner refused. She stated she feels her dog appears fine and does not understand why Rocky needs treatment. She was issued citations for leash law, no rabies vaccination, tag not worn, and neglect for vet care. At the time was also made aware she has 24 hours to obtain vet care for the dog or more citations could be issued. She signed the citations of her own accord, received her copy, her license, and court date/time.

Summary

Officer Valdez responded to a local business after a male Chihuahua was found walking around the parking lot. Upon arrival Officer Valdez observed the small dog to be "grossly" underweight, a large tumor on its neck and long nails. Shortly thereafter an owner located who had the dog had run away from their property. Officer Valdez proceeded to the owner’s residence to verify veterinary care. The owner was unable to provide any current veterinary records for the dog. Officer Valdez then cited the owner for the following charges; leash law, rabies vaccination, tag not worn and neglect (veterinary care).
Officer Hintle originally spoke with a male juvenile at the residence after receiving a report of a dog on a tie out. The call was later followed up by Officer Kirby who observed the dog on a tie out again. Officer Kirby cited the owner for the following neglect charges: tie out, water and shelter.

Report Snapshot

Officer's Case Report

On 06/06/16 at approximately 1328 hours Pima Animal Care (PACC) Dispatch received a complaint in reference to a dog on a tie out without access to water located at
On 06/09/16 at approximately 1206 hours PACC Officer D. Hinte #2063 arrived at
She knocked on the front door and met with juvenile. He advised that his parents were not home. He admitted that they own a dog who jumps the fence, so she gets tied up when there is no one home. He stated that he was just about to leave so she was currently tied up. Officer Hinte prepared a notice for his parents and asked him to remove the dog from the tie out. He agreed to place her inside until his parents can find another solution. She gave him the notice and watched as he removed the dog from the tie out.

On 06/26/16 at approximately 1846 hours 1 Pima Animal Care (PACC) Officer A. Kirby #2067 arrived at in reference to a dog on a tie out without access to water. Upon approaching the property I was able to observe a black and white Border Collie mix over the 3 foot fence surrounding the back yard. The dog later identified as Moreno was tied out using a 3-4 tool chain attached by a padlock to an anchor in one side of a concrete pad. There was a large amount of animal waste surrounding the dog. I observed one stainless steel water bowl upside down with no evidence of water on the ground. I also observed a black rubber type water bowl that was upright but also empty and dry.

The area where the dog was tied out had no shelter within 10-20 feet. I knocked on the door and was met by the dog owner. I advised the owner she had received from PACC Officer Hinte #2068 had responded out and witnessed a juvenile resident remove the dog from the tie out at that time. I asked if she noticed the box checked on the notice stating that tie outs are illegal and she stated that she did. She stated something to the effect of the dog needs to go pee and can jump the fence, that is why it is tied up. I advised her that a safe alternative to the illegal tie out would be to walk the dog on a leash and she stated that her daughter does but she has classes in the afternoon. I asked how long the dog had been tied up for and she stated, "about 30 minutes." I then asked about the licensing and rabies vaccinations for Moreno and she stated they were current. I requested her ID and she provided it. I then returned to the PACC truck and completed a citation for Neglect - Tie Out, Neglect - No water, and Neglect - No shelter. While I was writing the citation, I removed the dog from the tie out and put it inside the home. I explained to her citation, court date, time, and location, she stated she understood and signed the citation. I provided her with her copy of the citation and her ID. I then went to take more photographs of the area and after entering the yard where the dog was tied out, I became defensive and stated that its private property. I explained to her that I was not entering her residence. She then stated something to the effect of "do whatever you need." I photographed the water bowls and chain where Moreno was tied out. I advised her to remove the chain from the anchor in the ground as she can no longer tie the dog out.
Also, being on a chain is in itself extremely cruel, even if there is nothing else wrong.

This fact is reflected in the laws:

Tucson City Code Sec. 9-115: "An animal is deemed to be in distress if it is on a hit-out."

Pima County Code Sec. 6.04.130A4: "An animal is deemed to be in distress and subject to removal and impoundment if it is on a chain."

The paragraph: It is outrageous to leave the dog with these people. They are not only cruel but also repeat offenders. The dog was kept permanently on a very short chain with no water or shelter (shade) in this heat. The permanence was proved by the "very large amount of animal waste surrounding the dog" and the "water bowl upside down with no evidence of water on the ground."

The laws on cruelty apply here: "unnecessary cruelty" and "unnecessary suffering of any kind."
**Report Snapshot**

- **Date:** 06/16/16
- **Time:** 13:45
- **Number of Dogs:** 2
- **Weight:** 75 pounds
- **Temperature:** 98.6°F
- **Condition:** Poor
- **Status:** Lhasa Apso
- **Injury:** None
- **Activity:** Sporting

**Officer's Case Report**

On 06/16/16 at approximately 13:45 hours, brought her elderly Lhasa Apso (or mix thereof) named Maya to Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) at 4000 N Silverbell Rd, and requested that she be humanely euthanized. Stated that Maya was not eating, was losing weight, and whimpering a lot. She told the staff that she has owned Maya for just over a year and that she noticed the dog was sick approximately one month prior to bringing her to PACC. She admitted that Maya has not been seen by a vet in the time she has owned the dog. Also told the kennel staff that she could no longer care for Maya because she had a new baby. On 06/20/16 at approximately 08:50 hours, Investigator Foster #2042, arrived at reference to a previously reported case alleging that the owner of a Lhasa Apso (or mix thereof) known as Maya had neglected to obtain veterinary care necessary to manage her debilitating conditions, maintain her in good health, and minimize her suffering. I knocked on the front door and was met by the previous owner of Maya. I stated my name and the reason for my visit and asked if I could see her back yard, gave permission to enter her home and I followed her through the home to the back yard. I was able to see and photograph that the yard was mostly free of debris but there was a large number of dead weed-like plants that appeared to have burr or sticker type of seed pods. I asked to see a copy of her 10 and she agreed and I followed her back through her home to the carport where her 10 was located. I explained that Pima Animal Care Staff vets requested that a neglect of兽 care citation be issued to her, freely admitted that she has never taken Maya to a vet despite owning the dog for over a year. I explained that she will need several teeth removed and that she will most likely lose an eye. In response, told me that until recently she was paying for waxing, manicures and pedicures, but due to financial difficulties she was unable to enjoy those services. She told me that she tried to obtain grooming services for Maya but every place she called quoted her at least $30.00. She did mention that she frequently cut Maya's hair with scissors to save money and still provide some relief to the dog, was very concerned that she would lose her fingerprint clearance card as a result of receiving citations and told me that she will no longer own pets. She went on to add that "If the dog was my last priority then I probably should not own one." I presented: with her citation and she acknowledged, signed, and accepted her citations. I provided her with her court date, time, and location. I next returned to her 10 to her and thanked her for her time and cooperation.

**Additional Information from Mr. Ricci's Report:**

After Maya was handled via the intake process she was brought to be evaluated by Dr. Karyn Carlson, DVM. Dr. Carlson conducted an evaluation and reported the following conditions of Maya: Severe matting of the coat; Severe dental disease; Underlying dermatitis; Hypochromic, microcytic, nonregenerative anemia; Vitamin D deficiency (not provided adequate food) vs chronic disease (E. canis, VF, other). No other markers for VF (hyperglycemia) so less likely Monocytosis R/t chronic.
disease process vs lack of adequate nutrition
Dr. Carlson placed Maya on antibiotics for skin and mouth, and scheduled a dental cleaning with their orthodontist. Recommended CS be eradicated and to reduce weight and PCV in few days. Dr. Carlson also noted that Maya was anorexic and was advised to eat more. After Dr. Carlson's evaluation, Maya was placed on a diet consisting of low-protein, high-fat food. Dr. Carlson's evaluation showed that Maya's condition has improved since the initial diagnosis by her previous vet. Dr. Carlson recommended that the antibiotics be continued for an additional 2 weeks, to be followed up with Dr. Carlson. Dr. Carlson noted that Maya is improving and that her condition is stable. In conclusion, the team at HCC is following up with Dr. Carlson and have advised that Maya is doing well.
05/10/16 08:12 l, Officer Adkins 1961 arrived at reference to 4 dogs in small cages. I knocked on the front door with no response except for a large breed dog and small breed dog barking from inside the mobile home. I went to the back yard and found 3 dogs in cages with no water and animal waste in the cages, A560711 a young female brindle/white pit bull inside a medium wire crates covered with blankets, a large mirror and a plastic puppy pen around it. There was food and water in the puppy pen but the dog did not have access to it as the dog was locked in the wire crate. When I removed the dog from the crate, it did not have a bottom and there was excessive animal waste that appeared to be old. A560712 an adult female cream/white terrier mix was in a medium sized plastic dog crate with a bowl of dog food and no water. When I removed the dog from the crate there was old animal waste in the crate. A560713 an adult male tricolor beeler mix was in a large steel cage that was covered with a blue tarp. There was no water with a small amount of animal waste in the cage. Officer Vargas 2060 and Investigator Eckelburger 1942 had to assist me in removing A560713 from the cage. I impounded all three dogs for no water and unsanitary living conditions. I scanned the dogs for microchips and did not find any. I posted a notice of impound on the front door.

05/11/16 18:47 Officer Martinez #2067 met with dog owner at Pima Animal Care Center and issued citations 71490 A-E and 71491 A for neglect no water and neglect no shelter (unsanitary shelter) on all three dogs. Signed and received copies of the citations with the court date, time, and location.

---

Keeping dogs in crates is cruel,
but absolutely no response to this was made.
The dogs should have been bonded,
and the owner cited for cruelty.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Snapshot</th>
<th>Officer's Case Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Species</strong></td>
<td>German Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Color</strong></td>
<td>Black and white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Breed</strong></td>
<td>German Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner Name</strong></td>
<td>John Doe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
<td>1234 Main St, Tucson, AZ 85712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact</strong></td>
<td>John Doe, 555-1234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td>05/12/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td>11:23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

05/12/16 11:23, Officer Adkins 1961 arrived at a residence in reference to a dog on a tangled tie out with no access to shade or water. He knocked on the door with no response. He observed a young male black and white German Shepherd on a wire cable tie out attached to an awning post on the north east side of the porch. The tie out was wrapped around the post several times with about 2 feet of the tie out not tangled up. There was clean water provided in a white bucket which the dog was able to reach. The dog had plenty of shade from the awning but no access to shelter. He impounded the dog and scanned for a microchip in which he did not find one. He posted a notice on the security screen door along with a band out on the animal laws. If owner redeems please cite for dog on tie out and no shelter.

05/12/16 16:32 Officer Martinez #2067 met with at Pima Animal Care Center when she came in to possibly redeem her dog. Officer Martinez issued citation 71492 A-B for no shelter and dog on tie out. Signed and received her copy of citations with the court date, time, and location.

---

T. Barrick  
N. Enright  
P. Hubbard  
P. Jacobs  
S. Kalcznacki  
C. Marshall  
H. Mendelson  
J. Neumann  
E. O'Donnell  
J. Schwenk  
C. Smith  
City of Tucson Rep.

See my notes for WC #1

The laws say an animal on a tie-out is in distress, the bond laws should be used.
On 05/01/16 at approximately 12:03 hours Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) Dispatch received a call from a complainant who stated that there are 3 dogs kept in 3 different trailers with no ventilation. When the dogs are not kept in the trailer they are kept on a tie out.

On 05/02/16 at approximately 17:06 hours PACC Dispatch received call from per caller ID who stated the owner does not live at the listed but frequents the property. She stated none of the trailers have utilities. There is no water, however, she and the neighbors have been feeding and watering the dogs.

On 05/05/16 at approximately 16:40 hours Pima Animal Care (PACC) Officer A. Kirby #2057 responded to the address located at Upon arrival I observed two dogs tied to the fencing with cable tie outs. A gray and white female Pit Bull mix that had access to water and shelter however the black lab mix had no shelter but was provided with clean water in a bucket. I then entered the property through the unlocked gate and I observed a puppy inside a shed on the property with no insulation and the windows were only cracked approximately 1 inch which did not create much airflow. The puppy inside was up against one of the windows paning in an attempt to get the cooler air coming from outside through the small opening in the window. Through the window I observed 3 empty bowls for water. Using a remote thermal temperature device it was determined that the temperature inside the shed was approximately 97 degrees. The ambient air temperature outside per UoA weather reports was 89.6 degrees. I attempted to contact the resident of the property.

Dara Montgomery with no success. I then impounded the two dogs on the tie outs and the Pima County Sheriff (PCSO) was contacted to assist in making entry into the shed to impound the puppy. A short time later I was met by PCSO Deputy Brady #4751. In reference to PCSO Case #169052270. We made entry into the shed through the unlocked door and impounded a brown and white Pit Bull puppy without incident. Deputy Brady then cleared the scene and I posted a notice of impoundment on the front entry gate to the property.

On 05/07/16 at approximately 12:12 hours investigator T. Foster #2042 met with Pima Animal Care Center in reference to her three dogs being impounded due to exigent circumstances. acknowledged, signed, and accepted her citations. Investigator Foster returned her ID and provided her with her court date, time, and location.

That Officer Kirby responded to a residence for a report of multiple dogs being kept in trailers without ventilation. Officer Kirby observed two adult dogs on cable tie outs, one had access to shelter and both had clean water. A third dog, a puppy, was located inside a shed with a window opened approximately one inch. Officer Kirby observed the puppy panting up against a window in an attempt to access cooler air. Officer Kirby utilized a thermal temperature device to obtain the interior temperature of 97 degrees. Officer Kirby also obtained the outside ambient temperature being 89.8 degrees from the University of Arizona. Officer Kirby contacted PCSO to assist with entry to the shed. Officer Kirby impounded all three dogs without incident. The owner was later cited for the neglect (shelter).
Once again, tie-outs are cruel — animals suffer when kept on tie-outs — and they are against the law — the owner should have been cited for tie-outs and the bond laws used.

See my notes on #1.
On 05/08/16 at 19:49 hrs, Officer Valdez (#2011) arrived at the and met with the caller who stated a customer found the dog wandering the shopping center and brought it in the store. The small, male, brown, Chihuahua mix appeared to be grossly underweight with a massive tumor on its neck and its nails were abnormally long. While I was documenting the animal with photos a female subject (later identified as * ) entered the store stating she was the dog owner and her dog Rocky ran away from her home which was nearby. When I questioned her about the dog's poor health she stated she had vet care documents at her residence.

Proceeded to the residence of where she produced various outdated vet documentations. One document was dated 06/11/12 from Continental Ranch Pet Clinic and the other was dated 11/29/14 from Southern Arizona Veterinary, which all documents stated tests for Valley Fever and for cancer needed to be performed, but the owner refused, stated she feels her dog appears fine and does not understand why Rocky needs treatment. She was issued citations for leash law, no rabies vaccination, tag not worn, and neglect for vet care. At the time was also made aware she has 24 hours to obtain vet care for the dog or more citations could be issued. Signed the citations of her own accord, received her copy, her license, and court date/time.

Officer Valdez responded to a local business after a male Chihuahua was found walking around the parking lot. Upon arrival Officer Valdez observed the small dog to be "grossly" underweight, a large tumor on its neck and long nails. Shortly thereafter an owner located who had that the dog had run away from their property. Officer Valdez proceeded to the owner's residence to verify veterinary care. The owner was unable to provide any current veterinary records for the dog. Officer Valdez then cited the owner for the following charges: leash law, rabies vaccination, tag not worn and neglect (veterinary care).

Dog in terrible shape

Given 24 hrs to get vet care

Did she do it?
MEMORANDUM

TO: Marcy Flanagan, Deputy Director
FROM: Debra Tenkate, Animal Care Field Supervisor
DATE: June 1, 2016
SUBJECT: Dangerous Dog Cases for May 2016

Tucson:

1. A16-191237 Four dogs named Runtastaford, Pockets, Militia and Gizmo were impounded and declared dangerous by Investigator Eckelburger. The dogs will remain at Pacc during the 30 day compliance period, they will be forfeited and euthanized if the owner fails to come into compliance.

2. A16-192672 A dog named Takoda was impounded and declared dangerous by Investigator Foster. The dog was relinquished by the owner and euthanized at PACC.

3. A16-189926 A dog named Ellie declared vicious by City of Tucson court Judge Berning. Investigator Foster is monitoring compliance.

4. A15-183891 Two dogs named Polomo and Chiquita were declared not dangerous by Investigator Eckelburger.

5. A16-192905 Two dogs named Derf and Lady Bug were impounded and declared dangerous by Investigator Foster. The dog dogs will remain at Pacc during the 30 day compliance period, they will be forfeited and euthanized if the owner fails to come into compliance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE NUMBER</th>
<th>OWNERS LAST NAME</th>
<th>CASE NUMBER</th>
<th>OWNERS LAST NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A16-192673</td>
<td></td>
<td>A16-199926</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16-191937</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF TUCSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

DANGEROUS DOG CASES FOR MAY 2016
MONTHLY INVESTIGATIONS REPORT
PIMA COUNTY ANIMAL CARE CENTER
**INVESTIGATION REPORT**

**Pima County Health Department**

**Pima Animal Services Center**

4000 South Mamita Rd.

Tucson, AZ 85712

**Phone:** (520) 791-6900

**Fax:** (520) 791-6901

---

**SUSPECT**

**NAME:** J. Henderson/1904

**ADDRESS:** A16-191237

**WEIGHT:**

**HEIGHT:**

**EYES:**

**HAIR:**

**DOB:**

---

**LOCATION OF INCIDENT**

**DATE AND TIME OF INCIDENT:**

4/7/15 20:15

---

**VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME:**

**DATE OF BIRTH:**

**RESIDENCE PHONE:**

**BUSINESS PHONE:**

---

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

**DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER:**

---

**ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM:**

**VIOLATION:**

**TREATED BY:**

**DATE GUARANTEED:**

---

**LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS:**

**CLINICS ADDRESS:**

---

**CORE/OCD VIOLATED:**

**PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS:**

---

**ANIMAL ID:**

---

**BREED/DESCRIPTION:**

- **Pit Mix**
- **Runtstaford**
- **Pockets**
- **Militia**
- **Gizmo**

---

**CITATIONS/NUMBERS:**

74000 A,B,C,D,E / 74077 A,B,C,D,E / 76078 A,C

---

**REVIEWED BY:**

**BOND:**

---

**ANIMAL#:**

---

**DATE:**

**TIME:**

---

**WITNESS:**

---

**ADDRESS:**

---

**RESIDENCE PHONE #:**

---

**BUSINESS PHONE #:**

---
INVESTIGATION REPORT

PACC Activity: A16-191237

ACO & Badge J. Henderson/1904

On 04/09/16 at 21:21 hours Officer Valdez #2011 and Officer Baugus #1918 arrived at the residence at 123 Elm St. They met with the calling party who stated he has had an ongoing problem with his neighbor's dog entering his yard by jumping over the fence, or breaking through the wooden slats. He said he talked to the dog owner about the issue with negative results. Due to the issue had reinforced his fence with solid wood sheets believing that would resolve the breaching issue. He stated that on 04/07/16 at approximately 2015 hrs, he came home and found his dog Snickers a 9 year old, male, brown, pit bull mix severely injured from wounds to the throat/neck and head. He proceeded to take Snickers to the vet for the wounds and he ended up passing away from the attack.

He observed that the wood slatted fence in his yard was breached leading into the adjacent yard at 123 Elm St. then went to the residence to confront the neighbor given their history. He spoke with a female resident who admitted her four dogs attacked his dog, and she had them confined in the house. She further told she had to enter his yard to break up the attack and retrieve her dogs. She wishes to have citations issued on his behalf and seeks restitution for the vet costs of $244. After obtaining statement Officer Baugus #1918 and Valdez #2011 went to the residence of the dog owner and found no one at home. They observed wedged between the two fences of the residences were large truck tires which are believed to be the objects the dogs used to boost themselves over the fence. At the time of the visit the dogs were not seen at the residence. A notice was posted on the garage door. Call reset to meet with the attacking dog owner and issue citations.

On 04/27/16 at 09:49 hours I Officer J. Henderson #1904 arrived to and contacted Tucson Police officer Coons #42391 on case #1604270210. Apparently the police were called by resident reference to three of the neighbors dogs getting into her yard again. On 04/07/16 all 4 of the dogs were in her yard and killed her dog Snickers. Pima Animal Care Center had not been able to contact the dog owner and the attacking dogs were being kept in their own yard until today. Prior to my arrival the owner of the loose dogs was aware of the attack on 04/07/16. He freely admitted to his dogs getting into the neighbors yard on the day in question. I explained to him the request for prosecution for the attack incident and the dangerous evaluation process. He stated he was aware of the dangerous dog process. He was cooperative and loaded his dogs in my truck for impound. I was then able to issue to signed and received his court date and time.
DECLARATION OF DANGEROUS / VIOLENT 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, causes injury to a person which results in significant medical intervention/treatment.

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

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

OFFICER COMMENTS:

The dog "Runtstraford" is declared dangerous as a result of attacking and killing a domestic animal while in violation of the leash law.

---

OWNER: ___________________________ ANIMAL NAME: Runtstraford
ADDRESS: _________________________ ANIMAL ID#: A659038
PHONE: ___________________________ SEX: F COLOR: White BREED: Pit x

NOTICE

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

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

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

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

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

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

OFFICER COMMENTS:
The dog "Podrets" is declared dangerous as a result of attacking and killing a domestic animal while in violation of the leash law.

OWNER: ____________________________ ANIMAL NAME: Podrets
ADDRESS: ____________________________ ANIMAL ID#: Ass9086
PHONE: ____________________________ SEX: F COLOR: Black BREED: Pitbull mix

NOTICE

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

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

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

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

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

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

OFFICER COMMENTS:

The dog "Militia" is declared dangerous as a result of attacking and killing a domestic animal while on the leash (law).

-------------------

OWNER:__
ADDRESS:___
PHONE:__

ANIMAL NAME: Militia
ANIMAL ID#: A559087
SEX: F
COLOR: Black
BREED: PitX

NOTICE

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

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

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

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

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

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

OFFICER COMMENTS:

The dog "Gizmo" is declared dangerous as a result of attacking and killing a domestic animal while in violation of the leash law.

OWNER:

ADDRESS:

PHONE 

ANIMAL NAME: Gizmo

ANIMAL ID#: A559088

SEX: M COLOR: Brindle

BREED: Pit Mix

NOTICE

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

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

**Pima County Health Department**

**City:** Tucson  
**State:** AZ  
**Zip:**  
**Residence Phone Number:**  

**Suspect's Address:**

**City:** Tucson  
**State:** AZ  
**Zip:**  
**Business Phone Number:**

**Date and Time of Incident:** 05/02/16 20:00  
**Date and time reported:** 05/02/16 20:22

**NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE):** N/A

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

**Relationship To Victim:**

**Lawful Representative Address:** N/A

**VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE:**

<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>Shepherd mix</td>
<td>Takoda</td>
<td>Red/Sable</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8 yrs</td>
<td>L15-23663</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>A390296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire Terr-x</td>
<td>Timon</td>
<td>White/ black</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10 mos</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Injured</td>
<td>A561880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:**

**ACRO NAME / BASKET #:** T. Foster #2042  
**Activity/Bite Number:** A16-192672

**Bite Welfare:**  
**Dangers:**

**Date of Right:**

**Resident Phone #:**

**Business Phone #:**

**Other:**

**Other Details:**

**Witnesses:**

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

PACC Activity: A16-192672

ACO & Badge T. Foster #2042

On 05/02/16 at approximately 20:22 Pima Animal Care Center received a complaint from a woman who stated that her dog was attacked while being walked on leash that evening. She stated that the attacking dog was being walked off leash at the time of the incident. She reported that her dog was injured badly enough to require emergency veterinary care and that she knows where the attacking dog and it's owner lives.

On 05/16/16 at approximately 19:44 l, investigator Foster #2042 arrived at 320 E. 1st St. I knocked on the front door and was met by . She invited me inside and told me that on 05/02/16 her dog was attacked at approximately 20:00 hours. She said that her boyfriend was standing on the north end of the complex property with her dog Timon's leash wrapped around his leg. She stated that she saw the attacking dog, Takoda, break loose from it's owner and run toward Timon. The boyfriend was able to grab Takoda and restrain it until his owner grabbed him and stated that she had regained control of him. While the boyfriend was restraining Takoda, Timon backed out of his collar and ran for the front door of unit . She said that for some reason Takoda's owner let go of him and he chased and caught Timon. Timon sustained several bite wounds on or around his neck that required emergency vet care.

I was able to take photos of Timon's healing injuries and asked to see her vet bills. I told me that they were in the car and we walked to where she was parked and I photographed her documents. As we spoke Takoda's owner drove into the parking lot in her car and if the car is in the parking lot then she is home. I thanked her for her time and returned to the PACC truck.

As I was preparing to leave a male resident approached me and told me that in addition to previously reported bites, that the dog owner has convinced the parents of two children that were bitten by her dog not to report it. He also told me that the owner was previously evicted from an apartment due to prior human bites. He also told me that the dog owner was putting her dog in the car to "escape" as we spoke. I thanked him and as I was pulling away, the dog owner was pulling out of the parking lot.

I was later able to find two reported bites A14-157199, A16-174110; and one additional Leash Law complaint A16-175684 that involved Takoda.
05/18/16 18:50 I arrived at to meet with the attacking dog's owner. I knocked on the door and was met by a woman who stated her name was . I asked to see her ID and see brought me an AZ ID that was very faded and peeling. I was unable to be 100% certain that the person in the photos was who I was speaking to.

I asked her where was and she told me that was house sitting for a friend in Littletown. I told her that I had info that suggested that whenever the was parked in the parking area that she is home. At that time the in question was parked in parking space .

also informed me that Takoda was with and neither was on the property.

I told her that she is aware of Takoda's aggression and acknowledged that sometimes lets him loose in the common areas. I asked if she knew why and she told me no. I asked her to and she agreed to but seemed to think would not respond.

I called and learned that was not at work and that is still her . I served (as the sole lease holder at apt) with a notice that PACC must conduct a Dangerous Dog Assessment on Takoda. I explained the process and that if , has an acceptable location for temporary confinement I may be able to work with her. I also explained that Takoda may not be moved from Pima County, sold, given away, or disposed of. I thanked for her time and cooperation and left her unit.

05/17/16 18:55 I, Investigator Foster #2042, and Officer A. Kirby #2057 arrived at in reference to a previously reported dog on dog attack. We met with the owner of the alleged attacking dog had compiled and returned her dog Takoda to the address as previously requested. I explained that I was there to issue citations for a leash law and a biting animal citation for the incident that reported took place on 05/02/16 at approximately 20:00 hours. I requested to see a copy of her ID and she provided me with her Arizona Driver's License.

freely acknowledged the incident and told me that on the night it happened, Takoda darted out of the door and she ran after him with a leash. She stated that the dog owner's boyfriend held Takoda until she got to where he was standing and she secured a leash to his collar. I stated that as she was leading him away, Takoda pulled hard on the leash and the snap broke. Takoda ran to apartment and was able to attack Timon on the door step. stated that in the aftermath she paid $100.00 towards the victim dog owner's vet bills. stated that she did not have a receipt for that payment. She also told us that she was told that the initial bill was $1,200.00 and that she felt that the victim dog owner maybe trying to con her into paying more than she was owed.
INVESTIGATION REPORT  
(Continued)

I presented her with her citations and she acknowledged, signed and accepted her copy. I returned her ID to her and provided her with her court date, time, and location.

During my conversation with . I asked her about the previously reported bite cases were Takoda was reported as the biter dog in. She characterized each of the bites as "A scratch." . told me that Takoda only wants to play and that he is not aggressive.

When we first arrived Takoda was on leash with . and was barking and growling at Officer Kirby and I until the owner put him in the apartment in a crate. He continued to bark for the duration of our visit. also told me that she routinely sits on her front porch with Takoda attached to a long cable tie-out. She also told me that Takoda regularly tries to dart past anyone who is opening or closing doors in order to escape the home.

Based on the records that PACC has and in the interest in public safety, I impounded the Takoda for temporary confinement until a Dangerous Dog Evaluation can be completed. was very upset and emotional but remained cooperative when she was told that Takoda would be removed . brought Takoda out of the house and loaded him into a kennel on the PACC truck. I thanked her for her time and cooperation and left the area.

Officer Signature  

Date 5/20/16
CASE NO: Alle-193707
OWNER: 
ANIMAL NAME: Takoda (A390294)

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

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

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

SEVERITY OF INJURY TO ANIMALS:
ATTACK WITH 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 - 6  
INADEQUATE FENCING OR GATES + 5  

OWNER ACCOUNTABILITY / RESPONSIBILITY:
REPAIRED DEFICIENT CONFINEMENT - 3  
ANIMAL IS NEUTERED / SPAVED - 1  
OWNER AWARE OF ANY AGGRESSION + 1  
OWNER FAILED TO REPAIR CONFINEMENT + 6  
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  

Confinement / Fencing:
There is no area of confinement at 1453 N 53rd Ave besides
the interior of the unit. Takoda is being held a Pima Animal
Care Center for temporary confinement until one can be constructed
and approved.

General Comments:
The dog known as Takoda (A390294) scored +36 and
is therefore declared Dangerous.

OFFICER # 2012 T. Foster

TOTAL SCORE: +36

DANGEROUS
NOT DANGEROUS

A SCORE OF TEN POINTS OR HIGHER SHALL BE DEEMED A DANGEROUS ANIMAL
We have determined that your dog displays or has a tendency, disposition, or propensity to injure, bite attack, chase
or charge, OR attempt to injure bite, attack, chase or charge a person or domestic animal in a threatening manner OR
bare its teeth or approach a person or domestic animal in a threatening manner City Code 4-13.1 / County Code 6.04.150.
The owner has ten (10) days in the City, five (5) days (County & other jurisdictions) as to appeal the declaration
dangerous by filing a request for a dangerous dog hearing, providing the dog has not been declared vicious
by a court. The owner may obtain this form at PACC IN PERSON.
INVESTIGATION REPORT

PACC Activity: A16-189926

ACO & Badge X. Delgadillo#2047

On March 15, 2016 at approximately 08:00 hours Officer Tovar #2021, arrived at the

walk at the

e. He met with Tucson Police Officers Packard #100561 and Perkins #50474, Case

#1603150124, who told me that the bite victim had been bit by a dog owned by a lady identified as

stated at 0700 she was

walking with her dog on leash at the

ilk. When she approached the area of

a large long haired black and gray dog, who was off leash, charged her and her dog. She added

that the dog was named "Ellie".

also explained that Tuesday 03/08/15 at approximately 07:15, while walking in the same area, the

same dog charged her dog and bit him on the hind area; the dog was not injured and there was no bite

wound.

stated that last Thursday 03/10/16 the same dog charged her dog but she picked him up before it could get her dog. She asserted that on all three occasions, including this morning, the dog "Ellie" is always off leash.

is requesting Leash Law and Biting Animal for 03/15/16 and for

Tuesday 03/08/16 at 0700-0715 hours.

On March 15, 2016 at approximately 09:57 hours Officer Tovar to:

was advised that the victim alleged that she was bitten by her dog

named Ellie.

stated that she did not believe Ellie bit the victim, she stated that it might

have been Max. I photographed Ellie, a black and gray Queensland Heeler, the dog matches the

description given by the victim. He also photographed Max, a brown and black dog.

said that she does walk her two dogs plus two other dogs she is taking care on leashes but that they got away

from her. She then said that it might have been the victim’s own dog that bit her. I informed her of the

other two incidents reported by the victim regarding Ellie at the

I explained to her that the victim said that last Tuesday 03/08/16 Ellie, who was off leash, charged and bit her dog but that there was

no break in the skin: Thursday 03/10/16 at the same location Ellie charged her dog again. I explained to

that the victim is requesting citations for today’s bite and last weeks attack on her dog.

She was advised that the photo’s will be made available for the victim: If she positively identifies the biter

dog, citations would be issued.

Officer’s Signature:  

Date: 3/28/16

Revised 2002  2.25.16  11
INVESTIGATION REPORT
(Continued)

On March 18, 2016 at approximately 16:56 I, Investigator Delgadillo #2047, arrived to
and met with . I provided her photo's of two dogs on my camera and she
stated that she could not see the pictures clearly. Her and I went to my vehicle so she could view the
pictures on the computer. I showed her the photos and she positively identified, Ellie, the black and
gray Aussie mix. I explained the third party citations to who reaffirmed that citations are
requested.

At approximately 16:30 I arrived to and met with . I
explained the purpose of my visit and she immediately became defensive and stated that her dog
ever bit anyone and that she had a witness. I explained third party citations and requested a rabies
vaccination record for Ellie. She stated that she did not have any available but that she had adopted
her from the Humane Society. I advised her that contact was made with HSSA and no record was
found. She stated that she could not take her dog and she would not sign the citations. I requested
assistance from Tucson Police Department.

came out to my vehicle at approximately 17:05, she provided records from Santa Cruz
Humane Society. The record showed that Ellie was adopted on 11/14/16; I advised her that the rabies
is expired. She then asked me again what she was going to be cited for. I explained she would be
cited for Leash and Biting Animal (attempt) for the incident on 3/8/16; Leash Law and Biting Animal
for the incident on 3/15/16 and for interference with an Officer. She then stated that she would allow
me to take Ellie and brought Ellie to my vehicle; I waived the interference citation.

was cited into Tucson City Court for leash and biting animal. signed her
citations, received a copy and was provided her court date and time.
DECLARATION OF DANGEROUS / VICIOUS ANIMAL

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

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

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

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

OFFICER COMMENTS:

On 05/16/16 The dog known as "Ellie" (A554814) was declared vicious by Tucson City Court Judge.
Hon. T. Berning.

OWNER: ___________________________________________ ANIMAL NAME: Ellie
ADDRESS
PHONE

ANIMAL ID#: A554814
SEX: F  COLOR:  BREED: Aussie-

NOTICE

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

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

**Pima County Health Department**

**Pima Animal Welfare**

**4000 N. Mitzi Place**

**Phone:** (520) 243-2330

**Fax:** (520) 243-2327

**www.pimaanimalcare.org**

---

**SUSPECT**

**ACO NAME / BADGE #** R Tovar 2021

**COMPLAINT NUMBER** A15-183391

---

**ZIP** | **CITY** | **STATE** | **RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER**
---|---|---|---

**SEX** | **WEIGHT** | **HEIGHT** | **RVR** | **HAIR COLOR** | **ORIGIN** | **SSN**
---|---|---|---|---|---|---

---

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

**LOCATION OF INCIDENT**

**DATE AND TIME REPORTED** 12/04/15 / 1155

**DATE AND TIME OCCURRED** 12/04/15 / 1150

**FOOD** | **WATER** | **SHELTER** | **INJURED/ILL VENTILATION** | **ABANDONED** | **TEGOUT** | **BEATEN** | **WASTE** | **OTHER (EXPLAIN)**
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---

**VICTIM/COMPLAINTANT NAME**

**VICTIM'S ADDRESS**

**ZIP** | **CITY** | **STATE**
---|---|---

**REQUEST/WAIVER**

**NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE**

**ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM**

**RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM**

**PHONE NUMBER**

**LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS**

**CLINIC'S ADDRESS**

**3RD PARTY CITATIONS**

**SIGNATURE**

---

**BREED DESCRIPTION**

**VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL**

**ANIMAL'S NAME** | **COLOR** | **SEX** | **AGE** | **TAG NUMBER** | **LICENSE #** | **KL CERTIFICATE #** | **COUNTY** | **ANIMAL ID#**
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---

**Pit Bull** | **VICTIM OWNER** | Nellie | Bro | S | 9M | 257116 | N | A373837

**Boxer** | **VICTIM OWNER** | Palomo | Wh/Blik | M | 3Y | Cited | N | A524809

**Pit Bull** | **VICTIM OWNER** | Chiquita | Blik/WH | F | 1Y | Cited | N | A524808

**Lab X** | **VICTIM OWNER** | Jackie | Bro | F | 2Y | Cited | N | A524807

---

**WITNESS 1**

**DOB** | **ADDRESS** | **RESIDENCE PHONE #** | **BUSINESS PHONE #**
---|---|---|---

**WITNESS 2**

**DOB** | **ADDRESS** | **RESIDENCE PHONE #** | **BUSINESS PHONE #**
---|---|---|---

**WITNESS 3**

**DOB** | **ADDRESS** | **RESIDENCE PHONE #** | **BUSINESS PHONE #**
---|---|---|---

**WITNESS 4**

**DOB** | **ADDRESS** | **RESIDENCE PHONE #** | **BUSINESS PHONE #**
---|---|---|---
INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-183891

ACO name & Badge: Robert Tovar #2021

On December 4, 2015 at 1155 hours the Pima Animal Care Center received a call from Ryan of Southwest Ambulance (Fire Station at 4477 E Benson Highway) who reported that when they were flagged down by a deaf man named, who reported that he was attacked by three unknown dogs. Ryan also reported that he did not see any injuries to and advised that he would stand by with him due to difficulty in communicating with him.

12/04/15 12:24 hours I, Officer Tovar #2021, arrived in the and PCSO Deputy Lopez #6848, Case #151204139. said that this morning he was walking his service dog on when three dogs that were at large charged his dog and began attacking it. He said that he got into the middle of his dog and the three attacking dogs. He stated that he fell down during the incident and he showed me a minor wound to one of his fingers which occurred when he fell. I photographed the wound. said that his dog received a small bite wound to the mouth but was otherwise okay. I saw his dog and did not see any other wounds. I photographed his dog.

stated that a neighbor came out and put the dogs back into the yard and closed the gate that had been open. He asserted that the dogs got out through the open gate. He also said that someone in a truck stopped to help him during the incident. described the three attacking dogs as a white pit bull, a brown pit bull with spots and a brown shaggy dog with long hair. He pointed out a house on where the dogs live. I found the dog owner to live at was still in the area and positively identified the three dogs in the yard as the dogs that attacked him and his dog. He told me that he wanted citations issued to the dog owner as the incident really traumatized him and his dog.
I met with the dog owner, . I explained the reason for my visit. said that as far as she knows she closed the gate when she left the house this morning. I told her that the victim had positively identified her three dogs as the dogs that attacked him and his dog. allowed me to photograph her dogs. I issued her third party citations on behalf of for Leash Law, Biting Animal (Attempt) and Biting Animal (Dog on Dog). I also cited for No License on her three dogs. She signed and received her copy of said citations. I photographed the confinement at 's house and saw that it was satisfactory. I gave her information on how to get her dogs licensed at the Pima Animal Care Center.
PIMA COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT
PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER
4000 N. SILVERBELL RD. TUCSON, AZ 85745
(520) 724-5900 FAX (520) 724-5960
www.pima.gov/animalcare

CASE NO: A16-193565
OWNER: [Redacted]
ANIMAL NAME: Chiquita

EVALUATION CRITERIA
REPORTED BITES:
NON-VIOLATION BITE
VIOLATION BITE

SEVERITY OF INJURY TO HUMANS:
(Check One Factor Only Per Victim)
NO BREAK IN SKIN
BREAK IN SKIN OR BRUISING
MEDICAL CARE (RELEASED)
MULTIPLE BITES-SINGLE INCIDENT
BIT DOWN AND SHOOK VICTIM
MEDICAL CARE (HOSPITALIZATION)

Animal Complaints or Violations:
LEASE LAW CITATIONS
LEASE LAW COMPLAINTS
ATTEMPTED BITE CITATIONS
ANIMAL ATTACK CITATIONS
OTHER CITATIONS / OR COMPLAINTS

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

Confinement / Fencing:
Facing approx 60° East on south, west, and north ends
Facing approx 30° North toward drive way on easterly.
Two double gates + one single gate on east fence (946)

General Comments:
Chiquita scored +3, and is therefore not declared dangerous at this time.

TOTAL SCORE: +3

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

OFFICER # 1942 Eckelbarger

PACC-DD1
CASE NO: A16-193565
OWNER: 
ANIMAL NAME: Fido

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

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

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

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

Confinement / Fencing:
Fencing approx 6 feet tall on south, west, and northwest.
Fencing approx 5.5 feet around south, west, and east.
Gates were single gate on east face.

General Comments:
The dog Fido scored a +7 and is therefore not deemed dangerous.

TOTAL SCORE: +7

OFFICER #: 1942

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

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. Off attempts to injure bite, attack, chase or charge a person or domestic animal in a threatening manner or bare its teeth or approach a person or domestic animal in a threatening manner City Code 4-13 / County Code 8.04.150.
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.
## Investigation Report

**Pima County Health Department**

**Pima Animal Care Center**

**4000 N. Silverbell Rd.**

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

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

### Suspect Information
- **Name:** A. Kirby #2057
- **ID:** A16-192806

### Date and Time of Incident
- **Date:** 08/08/16
- **Time:** 1900 hrs
- **Location:** Marana, AZ

### Victim Information
- **Name:** Dorf
- **Color:** Black/White
- **Age:** Adult
- **License #:** N/A
- **Condition:** Normal

### Additional Information
- **Breed:** Pit Bull Mix
- **Owner:** Yes
- **Board #:** A860443

### Witness Information
- **Witness 1:**
- **Witness 2:**
- **Witness 3:**
- **Witness 4:**

### Other Details
- **Crime:** Violation
- **Site:** Hospitalization
- **Part of Body Bitten:** Multi-Arms/Legs

---

**Date:** 08/08/16

**Time:** 1900 hrs

**City:** Marana, AZ

**State:** AZ

**Zip:** N/A

**Business Phone Number:** N/A

**Social Security Number:** N/A

**Welfare:** No

**Funding:** N/A

**Social Media:**

**Other:** N/A

---

**Other Additional Reports:**

**PCSD 160606272**

**Reviewed By:**

**Date:** 08/19/16

**Time:** 8:21 AM

---

**Citation/Number:** 76514

---

**Breed/Description:** Pit Bull Mix

**Owner:** Yes

**Board #:** A860443

---

**Citation/Number:** 76514

---

**Breed/Description:** Pit Bull Mix

**Owner:** Yes

**Board #:** A860443
INVESTIGATION REPORT

PACC Activity: A16-192905

ACO & Badge A. Kirby #2057

On 05/06/16 at approximately 1857 hours, Pima Animal Care (PACC) Officer A. Kirby #2057 arrived on scene at...met with Pima County Sheriff (PCSD) Deputy Hansen #7726 in reference to PCSD Case# 160506272 where a dog bite had occurred.

Upon arrival, Deputy Hansen advised that they do not have a complete story yet as they were waiting on a deputy to meet with the victim at University Medical Center UMC. There was no one home at the victim's residence during my time on scene. Per Deputy Hansen's conversation with the Avra Valley Fire the dogs came from... Upon my arrival it was noted that someone had come home, placed the dogs inside the residence at... and secured the gate. We waited for a PCSD deputy at UMC to obtain a statement from the bite victim... Deputy Hansen spoke to the deputy at UMC via phone who advised that victim... was checking her mail at the mailboxes across the street in front of the dog owner's residence where the gate was open. The dogs charged out of the open gate and attacked her. She then tried to get the dogs back inside the gate when she realized she was bleeding, she made it back onto the front porch at her residence. A short time later Paramedics with Avra Valley Fire arrived on scene and transported... to UMC Main Campus for treatment.

...told the Deputies there were two dogs, a black and white puppy and a large white dog with black spots.

PCSO Deputies and I then went to... and met with the stepson of the dog owner... when asked if he knew why we were there stated, "probably because his dogs attacked the lady"... then allowed us to enter the residence and view the dogs he owned. Both dogs matched the description of the attacking dogs. I then advised of the quarantine requirements for a dog that bites a person and that I would need to impound the dogs for quarantine.

Loaded the dogs onto the PACC truck. I then completed a PACC quarantine agreement in which... Signed. I provided... with his copy of the quarantine agreement and advised we would be in contact with him or his stepfather in the near future.

Officer's Signature: ___________________________ Date: 05/19/16
INVESTIGATION REPORT  
(Continued)

On 05/11/16 at approximately 1635 hours, I, PACC Officer Kirby #2057 arrived at and met with the bite victim to obtain her statement.

... stated that on 05/06/16 around 6pm she walked to her mail box located on the south side of the street in front of . She stated that when she went to the mail boxes she did not observe any dogs around. As she was going through the mail at the box the black and white puppy and a large dog that was white with black spots charged out through the open gate of . She stated that both dogs then attacked her and bit her several times. . recalls thinking that she can't run away or they will attack worse so she tried to push the dogs back inside the gate. She was able to get the dogs inside the gate and stated that the father later identified as .

that resides at was present after the attack. She stated she asked him to look what his dogs did to her and he responded with "my dogs don't bite." She stated the man then went inside without assisting her. then returned to her property and made it onto her porch. She stated her neighbor came home from work just as she got onto her porch and came to assist her as she was screaming for help. She stated the neighbor came over and called emergency services to help.

then remembers medical staff assisting her and transporting her to the hospital where she was met by her husband and a Pima County Sheriff's deputy. is requested citations be issued for biting animal and leash law. She is also requesting restitution for medical expenses. I advised of the process from this point and that the courts will be in contact with her once the citations are issued. I also advised her of the records request process once the call is completed. We then cleared the scene and photographed the area of property where she was on the porch. We photographed the area of the mail boxes and of the gate where the dogs exited.

We then went to the attacking dog owners address located at and received no answer at the door.

On 05/12/16 at approximately 1320 hours PACC Enforcement Supervisor Tenkate met with the when he came to the Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) to inquire about the 2 impounded dogs that belong to his sons. He stated the following:
* The Pit Bull mix A560443 named Derf belongs to his adult stepson
* The Pit Bull mix A554115 named Lady Bug belongs (licensed) to his adult son III. (because he did not have identification when the dog was being adopted)
* The property were they all reside is owned by his wife. (per Pima County records)

was told about the attack that involved both dogs were involved in that severely injured his neighbor, when she was checking her mail box on 05/06/16. He said he was not aware of this until he got the notice left by the PACC Officer. He would not provide the contact information on either of his sons and left PACC as he felt the questioning required a lawyer to be present.

Before he left PACC he was advised that we (PACC) needed to meet with both of his sons and that the release date for the quarantine is 5/15/16 at 5pm. (at which time the dogs become property of PACC.)
INVESTIGATION REPORT

(Continued)

On 06/12/16 at approximately 1415 hours PACC Supervisor Tenkate received a call from stating he was the owner of A550443 Derf and that his dog did not bite anyone. He said he would be coming to PACC about 4pm to meet with an officer. never arrived at PACC.

On 05/15/17 I came to redeem his dog Derf. PACC Supervisor Konst #2002 met with him and explained the Dangerous Dog requirements to him. Due to time constraints he let him know a investigator would be meeting with him. He can be cited at that time if necessary. He stated he was not home at the time of the incident and that he is only at the house three days a week. He stays in town and goes to school.

On 06/16/16 at approximately 14:00 hours PACC Investigator Foster #2042, and Supervisor Konst #2002 met with and at Plma Animal Care Center in regards to an incident that reportedly took place on 05/06/16 at approximately 18:00 hours where two dogs that belong to the men attacked and caused serious injury to a neighbor.

I stated that he, his wife, and a friend (of ) were at home the day that the attack took place. told us that he was sleeping and his wife saw the victim enter his property through the open gate. He stated that his wife hollered at the neighbor to "leave the dogs alone," and that she also told the neighbor that I would come out and secure the open gate. acknowledged the situation and stated that he could believe that Lady Bug would bite, but had a difficult time believing that Derf would.

He did freely admit that his wife was aware of something going on involving the neighbor, his dogs, and his open gate the day of the attack. He also told us that the victim came to his home and tried to show him her injuries. He stated that the woman asked him to call the police and he refused. He stated that she then told him something to the effect of: I am calling my husband and he will call the police and you will be in big trouble. stated that he told her that she could call who ever she wants and that he did not care.

Investigator Foster explained that both dogs were being automatically declared dangerous and that they would have to remain at PACC until an area of secure confinement is built and approved by the assigned investigator. Investigator Foster issued citations to for leash law violation and biting animal for both Derf and Lady-Bug because he had care and custody of both dogs the day of the incident. She also issued a leash law violation and a biting animal citation to for Lady Bug since he is the legal owner of that dog per Supervisor Tenkate #1911. Both men acknowledged, signed, and accepted their citations. Investigator Foster served both men with Declaration of Dangerous Animal forms for both dogs. She then returned their ID's to them and escorted them out of the building.

The citations to were voided as was in custody of the dogs.

Officer Signature

Date 05/19/16
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DECLARATION OF DANGEROUS / VICIOUS ANIMAL

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

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

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

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

OFFICER COMMENTS:
On 05/04/16 the dog known as "Lady Bug" did attack a human and caused serious injuries that required significant medical treatment.

OWNER: ___________________________ ANIMAL NAME: Lady Bug
ADDRESS: ___________________________ ANIMAL ID#: A554118
PHONE: ___________________________ SEX: F COLOR: BLIND/BROWN
BREED: Pit - Y

NOTICE

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

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

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

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

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

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

OFFICER COMMENTS:

On 05/01/16 The dog known as "Derf" did attack a human and caused serious injuries that required significant medical treatment.

---

OWNER: 
ADDRESS: 
PHONE: 
ANIMAL NAME: Derf
ANIMAL ID#: A566443
SEX: ♂ COLOR: Brown
Breed: Pit X

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.
Animals on Hold Report

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOLD TYPE</th>
<th>ENFORCEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A16-190766</td>
<td>Number on Hold 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**K16-214513**
- **A555804** DOG BELLA PIT BULL/
- **3/30/16** CONFISCATE POLICE NORMAL Activity:A16-190766
- Kennel Comment: ENF HOLD FOR PCAO
  
  (( Do not release...2002 ))
- **D174**

03/30/2016 ENFORCE

03/30/16 13:48 hrs ENFORCEMENT HOLD FOR PCSO CASE.

**A16-192363**

**K16-216475**
- **A559083** DOG RUNTSTRAFORD PIT BULL/MIX
- **4/27/16** CONFISCATE FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A16-192363
- Kennel Comment: DD Hold!!
- **D120**

**K16-216477**
- **A559086** DOG POCKETS PIT BULL/MIX
- **4/27/16** CONFISCATE FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A16-192363
- Kennel Comment: DD Hold!!
- **D120**

**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
- **D116**

**K16-216479**
- **A559088** DOG GIZMO PIT BULL/MIX
- **4/27/16** CONFISCATE FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A16-192363
- Kennel Comment: DD Hold!!
- **D114**

**A16-192905**

**K16-217284**
- **A554115** DOG LADYBUG PIT BULL/MIX
- **5/6/16** QUARANTINE FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A16-192905
- Kennel Comment: DD HOLD!!! see note. 1911
  OWNER WILL REDEEM
- **D108**

**K16-217285**
- **A560443** DOG DERF PIT BULL/
- **5/6/16** QUARANTINE FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A16-192905
- Kennel Comment: DD HOLD!!! see note. 1911
- **D106**

**A16-194250**

**K16-219383**
- **A563160** DOG BENJI TERRIER/MIX
- **6/3/16** STRAY FIELD OWN AGGRESSIVE Activity:A16-194250
- Kennel Comment: 3c3c3c
- **D095**

**A16-194465**

**K16-219469**
- **A197750** DOG MISS TOTO BORDER TERRIER/MIX
- **6/3/16** CONFISCATE HOSPITAL NORMAL Activity:A16-194465
- Kennel Comment: 3c 3c--left notice, from north yard
  Collar is in bin in intake
- **D066**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kennel No</th>
<th>A563261</th>
<th>DOG</th>
<th>LHASA APSO/</th>
<th>Activity: A16-194465</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K16-219470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/3/16</td>
<td>CONFISCATE</td>
<td>HOSPITAL</td>
<td>NORMAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/03/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For owne to be cited for indicated violations/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DWINDAUE 6/3/16 19:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennel Comment:</td>
<td>3c 3c 3c-left notice, from north yard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kennel No</th>
<th>A563262</th>
<th>DOG</th>
<th>SCOT TERRIER/</th>
<th>Activity: A16-194465</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K16-219471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/3/16</td>
<td>CONFISCATE</td>
<td>HOSPITAL</td>
<td>NORMAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/03/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For owne to be cited for indicated violations/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DWINDAUE 6/3/16 19:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennel Comment:</td>
<td>3c 3c 3c-left notice, from south yard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kennel No</th>
<th>A563263</th>
<th>DOG</th>
<th>CHIHUAHUA SH/MIX</th>
<th>Activity: A16-194465</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K16-219472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/3/16</td>
<td>CONFISCATE</td>
<td>HOSPITAL</td>
<td>NORMAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/03/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For owner to be cited for indicated violations/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DWINDAUE 6/3/16 19:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennel Comment:</td>
<td>3c 3c 3c-left notice, from north yard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kennel No</th>
<th>A563264</th>
<th>DOG</th>
<th>JACK PARSON RUSS TER/MIX</th>
<th>Activity: A16-194465</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K16-219473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/3/16</td>
<td>CONFISCATE</td>
<td>HOSPITAL</td>
<td>NORMAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/03/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For owner to be cited for indicated violations/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DWINDAUE 6/3/16 19:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennel Comment:</td>
<td>3c 3c 3c-left notice, from south yard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kennel No</th>
<th>A563265</th>
<th>DOG</th>
<th>CHIHUAHUA SH/</th>
<th>Activity: A16-194465</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K16-219474</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/3/16</td>
<td>CONFISCATE</td>
<td>HOSPITAL</td>
<td>NORMAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/03/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For owner to be cited for indicated violations/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DWINDAUE 6/3/16 19:59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennel Comment:</td>
<td>3c 3c 3c-left notice, from south yard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A16-194553</th>
<th>A563414</th>
<th>DOG</th>
<th>JAZZY PIT BULL/</th>
<th>Activity: A16-194553</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K16-219614</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/5/16</td>
<td>CONFISCATE</td>
<td>FIELD OWN</td>
<td>NORMAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/05/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENFORCEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>t foster 6/5/16 20:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Owner was arrested for providing me (2042) and responding TPD Officers with false information and an alias when receiving PACC citations. Dog was impounded because there was no one at the apartment to care for the dog. The owner told me he was trying to rehome the dog then stated he wished to breed her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am concerned that Jazzy is a theft risk over the fees and possibly being altered. Please use a safe-lock and house in the main floor of the shelter (preferably in biter row) if possible. See activity notes for more info on the owner and circumstances that led to the dog being impounded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A16-194686</th>
<th>A564330</th>
<th>DOG</th>
<th>GERM SHEPHERD/MIX</th>
<th>Activity: A16-194686</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K16-220100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/11/16</td>
<td>CONFISCATE</td>
<td>FIELD OWN</td>
<td>AGGRESSIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please issue 3rd Party Citations for Abandonment

4-3(1)

Tucson City Court

6/11/2016

1637hrs

Owner is Moray Ephraim

Wife is Juanita Ephraim

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kennel No.</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
<th>Pit Bull/Queensland Heel</th>
<th>Field Own</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Activity: A16-194820</th>
<th>Kennel Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A16-194820</td>
<td>6/10/16</td>
<td>A564056</td>
<td>FIELD OWN</td>
<td>NORMAL</td>
<td>A16-194820</td>
<td>no chip 3c3c3c (advisement) TOTAL T4 pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kennel No.</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
<th>Pit Bull/Mix</th>
<th>Field Own</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Activity: A16-194891</th>
<th>Kennel Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A16-194891</td>
<td>6/10/16</td>
<td>A564186</td>
<td>FIELD OWN</td>
<td>NORMAL</td>
<td>A16-194891</td>
<td>no chip 3c3c3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennel No</td>
<td>DOG ID</td>
<td>DOG</td>
<td>BREED</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Confiscation Reason</td>
<td>Kennel Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K16-220018</td>
<td>A564187</td>
<td>DEXTER</td>
<td>PIT BULL/BOXER</td>
<td>A16-194891</td>
<td>6/10/16 20:08 hold for neglect- non potable water, excessive waste, and neglect inadequate shelter</td>
<td>no chip 3c3c3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K16-220254</td>
<td>A523677</td>
<td>MOMMAS</td>
<td>PIT BULL/MIX</td>
<td>A16-194969</td>
<td>6/13/16 20:08 hold for neglect- non potable water, excessive waste, and neglect inadequate shelter</td>
<td>Didn't bite, unable to scan in field <strong>BOND HOLD</strong> Plz do not house in tent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dog is on a BOND hold, please see activity notes for details. May be a theft risk, please house in the a secure area.
This artist’s view shows daily life in the village that was once home to Hohokam farmers along the Santa Cruz River nearly 800 years ago. Families lived in homes built out of local materials where they produced impressive crafts, such as shell jewelry, cotton clothing, and both plain and painted pottery. Fittingly to the current use of this space, dogs were also important companions for the Hohokam.

Pima County has partnered with Desert Archaeology, Inc. on an archaeological excavation to preserve buried evidence of early life in this area, which will be home to the new Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) facility.

Visit PACC’s new facility website for more information:
www.pima.gov/shelterbond
# Donation Activity

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donation Code</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DONATION</td>
<td>$27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION ADOP</td>
<td>$9,603.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION ENFORCE 0972</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION GEN</td>
<td>$18,215.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION OUTR</td>
<td>$39.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION S/N</td>
<td>$11,553.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION SAMS</td>
<td>$15,234.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total**  
$54,671.88
## Donation Activity

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donation Code</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DONATION</td>
<td>$510.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION ADOP</td>
<td>$13,547.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION ENFORCE 0972</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION GEN</td>
<td>$139,493.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION LIC 0973</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION OUTR</td>
<td>$397.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION S/N</td>
<td>$76,612.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATION SAMS</td>
<td>$103,282.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$333,862.78</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Review of PACCAC Achievements
• PACCAC 2.0
• Building Update
• Volunteer Program Assessment
PACCAC 2.0

- Strategic v. operational focus
- Proposed Management Reports—Produced once a year
- Deep dive into operational aspects of PACC
  - Volunteer Program
  - Enforcement
  - Adoption & Rescue Programs
  - Shelter Operations
  - Clinical Program
  - Development
  - Budget
Recommendations

- By-laws
  - Quorum
  - Reports to BOS
- Meeting
  - Frequency
  - Time
  - Location
- Engaging community
New Building Update
Pima Animal Care Center Archaeology and the Hohokam Village of A.D. 1250
Volunteer Program Assessment
A Service Enterprise is an organization that fundamentally leverages volunteers and their skills across all levels of the organization to successfully deliver on its social mission.
Assessment covers 10 crucial steps to a successful volunteer program.
What has happened so far?

- PACC received a grant to participate in the assessment via Best Friends animal Society.
- We are 6 weeks into the 6 months Program assessment.
- Consists of weekly meetings and projects with volunteer management facilitators and other shelters.
- Initial program review by points of light foundation and Beth Steinhorn (facilitator)
- Met with Facilitators to develop long term/ongoing action plan for each of the 10 crucial areas in volunteer management.
Next steps

- Develop “Service enterprise Champion team” consisting of key staff and volunteers.
- Champion team to meet weekly and discuss action plan item implementation strategies.
- Attend group meetings to see how other comparable shelters are handling challenges.
- In another 4 months take another assessment with the goal of improvements made making us eligible to accreditation as a service enterprise.
Thank You PACCAC!
A Decade of Progress: Celebrating the Transformation of PACC!
PACC Facts

- Facility was built in 1969.
- Human population is 1 million.
- Pima County covers 9,400 square miles.
- Shelter has IGAs with five jurisdictions in the county.
- Departments include Shelter, Clinic, Licensing, Enforcement, Dispatch and Administration.
- Annual budget is $8.9 million.
- 91 employees care for 20,000 animals a year.
PACC in 2007

- Intake: Approx. 22,000
  - HSSA was still an open-admission shelter
- Live Release Rate: 39%
- January 2007
- Pit Bull policy change
2008

- Intake: 27,000
  - Recession → Intake spike
- Live Release Rate: 44%
- Treatment technician position created
- The culture starts to shift…
2009

- **Intake:** 28,000
- **Live Release Rate:** 49%
- **Animal Care Advocate**
  - Initiated cultural shift
  - Instituted operational changes
  - Met with resistance
- **Rescue Coordinator**
  - Restructured and legitimized rescue program
  - Numbers grew from 500 to 2,000 in first year
- **SNA Program**
  - Placed trust in our community to rehabilitate these animals
2010

- Intake: 30,000
  - HSSA becomes more stringent on intake policies; we see spike
- Live Release Rate: 47%
- Inmate program
- Treatment of URI
- Start of assembling and maintaining the right team with the right mindset
2011

- Live Release Rate: 55%
- Intake: 28,000
- Sue Sternberg’s Train to Adopt Program initiated
2012

- Live Release Rate: 64%
- Intake: 27,000
- Expanding good programs
- With the guidance of **PACCAC** we increased our rescue program’s partnerships.
  - Not putting limitations on what animals rescues could take
- Holiday walks
  - **PACCAC** support brought hundreds of new supporters to PACC
2013

- Live Release Rate: 76%
- Intake: 24,000
- New positions:
  - Volunteer Coordinator
    - Restructured volunteer program
  - Adoption Coordinator
    - Restructured adoption program
    - Increased offsite adoptions
- Pima Paws for Life contract
  - Select URI dogs able to be treated offsite
2014

- Live Release Rate of 78%
- Intake: 23,600
- Tent constructed
- With the support and on the recommendation of PACCAC we hired
  - Six Animal Care Technicians
  - Shelter Manager
  - Shelter Veterinarian
  - Foster Coordinator
  - Development Director
2014, continued

- With the support/input of PACCAC we increased the funding of our community S/N to $600,000
- Reservations
- Pre-alter model
- Owner euthanasia requests
- ASPCA Challenge
- FIV+ cats placed for adoption
- Community Cat Project with Best Friends and PetSmart Charities
- **PACCAC** leadership was involved in the funding and advocacy of Proposition 415!
2015

- Live Release Rate of 90%!
- Intake ~ 20,000
- Hired Cat Care Leads (2)
- Implemented Help Desk diversion program
- Expanded offsite adoptions to 4 PetSmart locations
- Hired on 2 additional veterinarians and support staff to handle higher level of care in shelter pets
2016

- Barn Cat Program
- Relaunch of Foster Care Program
- Reorganization of leadership to include 2 Division Managers
- Broke ground for new shelter!
The Future Looks Bright for PACC!

- Hold times changed for owned pets to 5 days
- On PACCAC’s recommendation we hired New Enforcement manager/Relaunch of Enforcement Unit
- Launch of Pet Support Center to decrease intake
- Hired a behaviorist on staff to help save more lives

Thank you, PACCAC, for your support!
June 14, 2016

CURRENT RESIDENT
13014 N WHITLOCK CANYON DR
TUCSON, AZ 85755

This office is in receipt of a complaint alleging that your animal is creating excessive noise and disturbing your neighbors. Section 16-31(B3) of the City of Tucson Code and 6.04.160 of the Pima County Animal Code, and Section 6-7-1 of Marana and Section 6.30.010 of Sahuarita Town Codes states:

The following activities are prohibited if they produce clearly audible sound beyond the property line of the property on which they are conducted and they disturb the public peace, quiet or comfort of the neighboring inhabitants.

Owning, possessing, harboring or controlling any animal or bird which frequently or for continuous duration howls, barks, meows, squawks or makes other sounds.

Please note that the Animal Noise Ordinance is a separate ordinance from the standard NOISE Ordinance, which regulates non-animal noise.

Animals make noise for a variety of reasons, including protection of their owner's property, response to new or unusual stimulus or from being left alone. However, animals that make noise routinely, over periods of time, or at disruptive times can create hard feelings between neighbors and cause them undue stress and irritability. The intent of this letter is to notify you of the alleged problem and to offer you the opportunity to take action concerning this matter.

Enclosed is a brochure that contains general information about animal noise and some training tips. The internet also provides a wealth of information regarding dog training, training collars and bark inhibiting devices. You will also find important information, which outlines Pima Animal Care Center's animal noise complaint process. Additional information is available at www.pimaanimalcare.org.

If, after 7 days, the excessive animal noise persists the complainant may move forward with the complaint by pursuing enforcement action as outlined in the enclosed complaint process.

Failure to comply with the above ordinance can result in a civil infraction and court hearing. Minimum fines of fifty dollars ($50.00) per day for each day that the animal continues to make sounds could be assessed against the animal owner.

If after reading the enclosed information you have any questions, please contact me at 724-5910 or by email at civilcomplaints@pima.gov.

Thank You,

Pima Animal Care Center
Enforcement Support Specialist
520-724-5910
PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER
Animal Noise Complaint Process

An animal noise violation is a civil violation.

The following noise complaint enforcement protocol is currently followed. This process is necessary to meet administrative hearing requirements of proof the noise disturbs “the public peace, quiet or comfort of the neighboring inhabitants.”

1. Register a complaint with Pima Animal Care Center
   in Tucson: (520)724-5910 or online at civilcomplaints@pima.gov
   in Ajo: Primary or (520) 387-7502 or Fax: (520)387-7502

2. Letters are sent by Animal Care to complainant and to animal owner which notifies parties of possible problem and asks them to resolve within 7 days. In the case of an anonymous complaint a letter will be sent to the animal owner and no further action is taken.

3. If not resolved, the complainant is instructed to contact the Enforcement Support Specialist at 724-5910 to request further investigation.

4. A noise log can be requested by the complainant and will be sent to the complainant for completion.

   *An owner will be cited to appear before a Judge or Hearing Officer within the appropriate jurisdictional court for a violation of the animal noise law if:

   a. The noise log is returned by the complainant. The complainant must appear at any hearing held and must testify as a result of a citation issued on their behalf.
   b. Complainants may also pursue civil action of their own.

   Fines can range from $50 to $2500 per offense depending on the jurisdiction.

5. Complaints will close after six months.

Pima Animal Care Center
4000 N. Silverbell Rd.
Tucson, AZ 85745
520 724-5900
www.pimaanimalcare.org
Some canine behavior problems, such as house soiling, affect only a dog’s owners. However, problems such as escaping and excessive barking can result in neighborhood disputes and violations of animal control ordinances. Therefore, barking dogs can become “people problems.” If your dog’s barking has created neighborhood tension, it might be a good idea to discuss the problem with your neighbors. It’s perfectly normal and reasonable for dogs to bark from time to time, just as children make noise when they play outside. However, continual barking for long periods of time is a sign that your dog has a problem that needs to be addressed.

The first thing you need to do is determine when and for how long your dog barks, and what’s causing him to bark. You may need to do some detective work to obtain this information, especially if the barking occurs when you’re not home. Ask your neighbors, drive or walk around the block and watch and listen for a while, or start a tape recorder or video camera when you leave for work. Hopefully, you’ll be able to discover which of the common problems discussed below is the cause of your dog’s barking.

**Social Isolation/Frustration/Attention-Seeking**
Your dog may be barking because he’s bored and lonely if:
- He’s left alone for long periods of time without opportunities for interaction with you.
- His environment is relatively barren, without playmates or toys.
- He’s a puppy or adolescent (under three years old) and doesn’t have other outlets for his energy.
- He’s a particularly active type of dog (like the herding or sporting breeds) who needs a “job” to be happy.

**Recommendations:**
Expand your dog’s world and increase his “people time” in the following ways:
- Walk your dog daily - it’s good exercise, both mental and physical.
- Teach your dog to fetch a ball or Frisbee and practice with him as often as possible.
- Teach your dog a few commands and/or tricks and practice them every day for five to ten minutes.
- Take an obedience class with your dog.
- Provide interesting toys to keep your dog busy when you’re not home (Kong-type toys filled with treats or busy-box toys). Rotating the toys makes them seem new and interesting (see our handout: “Dog Toys and How to Use Them!”).
- If your dog is barking to get your attention, make sure he has sufficient time with you on a daily basis (petting, grooming, playing, exercising) so he doesn’t have to resort to misbehaving to get your attention.
- Keep your dog inside when you’re unable to supervise him.
- Let your neighbors know that you’re actively working on the problem.
- Take your dog to work with you every now and then, if possible.
• When you have to leave your dog for extended periods of time, take him to a “doggie day care” or have a friend or neighbor walk and/or play with him.

Territorial/Protective Behavior
Your dog may be barking to guard his territory if:
• The barking occurs in the presence of “intruders,” which may include the mail carrier, children walking to school and other dogs or neighbors in adjacent yards.
• Your dog’s posture while he’s barking appears threatening – tail held high and ears up and forward.
• You’ve encouraged your dog to be responsive to people and noises outside.

Recommendations:
• Teach your dog a “quiet” command. When he begins to bark at a passer-by, allow two or three barks, then say “quiet” and interrupt his barking by shaking a can filled with pennies or squirting water at his mouth with a spray bottle or squirt gun. This will cause him to stop barking momentarily. While he’s quiet, say “good quiet” and pop a tasty treat into his mouth. Remember, the loud noise or squirt isn’t meant to punish him, rather it’s to startle him into being quiet so you can reward him. If your dog is frightened by the noise or squirt bottle, find an alternative method of interrupting his barking (throw a toy or ball toward him).
• Desensitize your dog to the stimulus that triggers the barking. Teach him that the people he views as intruders are actually friends and that good things happen to him when these people are around. Ask someone to walk by your yard, starting far enough away so that your dog isn’t barking, then reward him for quiet behavior as he obeys a “sit” or “down” command. Use a very special food reward such as little pieces of cheese or meat. As the person gradually comes closer, continue to reward his quiet behavior. It may take several sessions before the person can come close without your dog barking. When the person can come very close without your dog barking, have them feed him a treat or throw a toy for him.
• If your dog barks while inside the house when you’re home, call him to you, have him obey a command, such as “sit” or “down,” and reward him with praise and a treat.
• Don’t inadvertently encourage this type of barking by enticing your dog to bark at things he hears or sees outside.
• Have your dog neutered (or spayed if your dog is a female) to decrease territorial behavior.

Fears And Phobias
Your dog’s barking may be a response to something he’s afraid of if:
• The barking occurs when he’s exposed to loud noises, such as thunderstorms firecrackers or construction equipment.
• Your dog’s posture indicates fear – ears back, tail held low.

Recommendations:
• Identify what’s frightening your dog and desensitize him to it (see our handout: “Helping Your Dog Overcome the Fear of Thunder and Other Startling Noises”). You may need professional help with the desensitization process. Check with your veterinarian about anti-anxiety medication while you work on behavior modification.
• Mute noise from outside by leaving your dog in a basement or windowless bathroom and leave on a television, radio or loud fan. Block off your dog’s access to outdoor views that might be causing a fear response, by closing curtains or doors to certain rooms.
The Basics

Rabies Vaccination
Any dog three (3) months or older must be vaccinated against rabies by a licensed veterinarian. This protects your dog and the public from the spread of rabies. Although not a law, it is recommended to have your cat vaccinated against rabies also.

Dog License
Any dog three months or older must have a current Pima County license. The license must be affixed to a collar and should be worn at all times.

Leash Law
Your dog must be kept confined to your home or property, either inside the home or within an enclosed yard or area on your property. When you take your dog outside of its confined area, it must be restrained on a leash no longer than 6 feet in length.

Animal Bites
All animal bites must be reported to Pima Animal Care. All biting animals must be quarantined.

Cruelty
It is illegal to inflict unnecessary cruelty on an animal.

Waste
You must pick up after your dog immediately while on public property. On private property all animal waste must be cleaned up within 24 hours in the city and 72 hours in the county.

Noise
It is illegal to permit an animal to howl, bark, meow or make other sound frequently or for continuous duration.

Welfare

You must provide:
- access to clean water in a clean container at all times. The container must be kept in the shade and be stable enough not to tip over.
- a fresh supply of food for your pet daily. The food must be nutritious and be free of dirt and insects.
- access to clean shelter with a top, a bottom and sides to protect from heat, cold and rain. The shelter must be large enough for the animal to enter, stand, turn around and lie down.
- shade for the animal during daylight hours and in all seasons.
- medical care to your pet for parasites, diseases and injuries to keep your pet healthy and to prevent it from suffering.