Pima County Animal Care Advisory Committee
Minutes
December 18, 2014
3950 S. Country Club Road
Tucson, Arizona 85714

Approved 1-15-15

1. Call to Order

Mr. Neuman called the meeting to order at 5:31 pm

- Attendance

Present:
Tamara Barrick, Foundation for Animals in Risk
Nancy Emptage, Vice-Chair, Animal Welfare Coalition (late)
Pat Hubbard, Humane Society of Southern Arizona
Pat Jacobs, Tucson Kennel Club
Derek Marshall, Public Education
Helen Mendelsohn, Disabled Community
Jack Neuman, Chair, PACC Volunteers
Erin O'Donnell, DVM, Southern AZ Veterinary Medical Association
Jane Schwerin, People for Animals in the Prevention of Cruelty and Neglect
Gail Smith, MD, Board of Health
Kim Janes, Pima Animal Care Center (PACC), Ex-Offico

Absent:
Sophia Kaluzniacki, DVM, ASPCA of AZ, Inc
Angela Spencer, City of Tucson

- Pledge of Allegiance

2. Adoption of the Minutes

- Review of typo correction in September 18, 2014 meeting minutes

The motion was made and seconded (Hubbard/Emptage) that the September 18, 2014 meeting minutes be adopted with the typo corrected as written. The motion carried (10-0).

- Adoption of second draft of October 16, 2014 Meeting Minutes

The motion was made and seconded (Hubbard/Smith) that the second draft of the October 16, 2014 meeting minutes be adopted as written. The motion carried (10-0).

- Adoption of the November 20, 2014 Meeting Minutes

The motion was made and seconded (Mendelsohn/Hubbard) that the November 20, 2014 meeting minutes be adopted as written. The motion carried (10-0)

3. Call to the Audience

There were a number of speakers from the audience at this meeting and many spoke regarding the topic of animal rescue. Four people, Tiffany Rosler, James Dean, Justin Pope and Karen Pope, spoke

at this call to the audience. Other audience member input is recorded under the Old Business, Rescue Program agenda item.

Ms. Rosler provided and read a letter (included) from Maricopa County Animal Care and Control (MCACC), regarding terminating animal pregnancies. Currently, suspected pregnancy is confirmed, if possible, by a veterinarian as soon as possible. If pregnancy is not confirmed, then they proceed as normal based on the animal's health. If an animal is being spayed and is found pregnant, the surgery will continue. If an animal is confirmed as pregnant, then they reach out to rescue partners and ideally a group will take the animal. Ms. Rosler said that Pinal County's practice is similar. Her main point was that Maricopa and Pinal Counties are working with rescue groups to get pregnant animals out to rescue and PACC should do likewise. She added that a year ago this wasn't an issue between PACC and rescues, but now it is.

Mr. Dean said he has been a PACC volunteer since January and he and his wife combined have put in over 1,100 hours. He spoke about a dog, Shorty, with tick fever, by policy only given medication for one month then put on the short term rescue list. The animal was rescued by Tucson Cold Wet Noses, which continued his medication. Mr. Dean said he feels that PACC is playing Russian roulette with the lives of animals and requested PACC reconsider its one month only medication policy. He added that he recently heard some disparaging comments about Dr. Wilcox. He said he has great admiration for Dr. Wilcox and calls her Anne Sullivan because she is a miracle.

Mr. Pope described himself as a numbers guy, someone who works with data daily, and said he was concerned with the data Health Department Director García presented at the last meeting when he referred to the big picture. Mr. Pope provided a handout (included). He pointed out that the Animal Care Center Animal Intakes and Adoptions chart scale does not start at zero making the slope more pronounced. The bars in that chart indicate PACC adoptions total, then PACC special needs adoptions (SNA) stacked on top of the total bar which appears to indicate the SNA are double counted. A second chart from last month indicated 55 rescue partners in 2010 rescuing 2,113 animals for an average of 19. However, mathematically that average should be 38, and math errors continue through that table. His handout provided charts re-presenting the data. He said he has concerns about the validity of the data when there are such errors. Mr. Pope said last month it was emphasized that rescue is down, while SNA is up, which he agreed with for 2012 to 2013, but said both have fallen for 2013 to 2014, with SNAs down about 15 percent. He contended that the data does not support the claim that SNAs are the answer to, or the cause of, the reduced rescue rate. He concluded by saying that life and death decisions should only be made on clear data.

Ms. Pope also referred to comments from Dr. Garcia at the last meeting referring to the big picture and how SNAs are impactful. She agreed SNAs are impactful, but asserted they would not have happened without networking between volunteers and rescues. She contended that volunteers and rescues do look at the big picture; have the same goals as PACC and spend countless hours and days educating the public on vaccination, spay and neuter, and animal behavior and training. Different rescues have different animal interests, and many have complained about the lack of communication from PACC regarding the specific animal types of interest. She asserted that alienating partners is not good for the big picture and that the system is broken. She suggested that more lives could be saved if the Health Department fixed the problem rather than denying it exists.

4. Manager's Report

Kim Janes, Pima Animal Care Center Chief of External Affairs, said the new building timeline includes planning until next summer and the building is expected to be completed by October 2017.

- County Administration Release of County Attorney Legal Opinion Regarding Providing Animal Care Services to Cities and Towns

Mr. Janes said the local cities and towns make up 60 percent of animal care services PACC provides and the municipalities are struggling with the changing service direction. The County Administrator has made clear in the attached correspondence that the County is not changing its direction. The jurisdictions, not the County, are responsible for animal care within their jurisdictions; they have a choice on whether or not to use PACC and discussions are ongoing.

- Replies related to animal welfare questions from the November 20, 2014 meeting

Mr. Janes referred to his December 12, 2014 memorandum with answers to questions asked at the last meeting. The memo also notes that the Animal Defense League of Arizona (ADLA) has responded to the County's notification that it will be removing the ADLA seat from the Committee and wants to retain and fill the seat. In response to a question about a recheck on a dog named Goofy, Mr. Janes said the recheck occurred on December 8, unannounced, and everything looked in order.

There was discussion about case A14-157743 in which a dog was moved to a different location, which keeps PACC from making a recheck. The owner was cited initially and Mr. Janes said if the animal was located in substandard conditions the person with the dog at that time would be cited. Ms. Emptage requested the court be asked to have the owner, when he goes to court, divulge where the animal is. Mr. Janes said such a request could be made; however, this case has probably already gone to court.

- Draft senate bill related to dogs, licensing, vaccination and quarantine

Mr. Janes said the bill doesn't change the licensing or vaccination requirements, but would change a licensing violation from a class two misdemeanor to a petty offense. This keeps a licensing violation from being a criminal offense.

5. Old Business

- Update on July 19, 2014 Motion for Resolution for PACC to Remedy Issues Relating to the Care and Welfare of Pets at PACC – Operations

Mr. Neuman asked for an update on the 22 item resolution. Shelter Manager Jose Ocano said the shelter is still making progress with the County female inmates. He said they are more compassionate, but there is a higher turnover than there was with the State inmates and that creates some training challenges. He said the moving clinic supervisor is expected to be on the floor in mid-February; however, one supervisor is stepping down. The last few weeks the shelter has been focusing on moms and puppies. Mr. Neuman asked if he could meet with Mr. Ocano on the individual issues and there was no objection.

- Vet Holds and Confiscation Holds – Processes, Procedures and Ways to Shorten Length of Hold Time

Mr. Marshall said there is a dog at PACC named Roger, which has been at the center almost a year and lives in Dr. Lilley's office. The dog is not on the holds report and he questioned how Roger can get adopted when volunteers have a difficult time finding him and posed the question, "Where's Roger?" Mr. Janes said he will visit with staff to find out what is going on with Roger and to improve the system. Mr. Neuman pointed out there is no recent memory of Roger being on the holds report and wondered if there are other animals lost in the system.

Ms. Schwerin referred back to her comments on this topic in the November minutes and reiterated that felony cases shouldn't cause animals to be kept longer since there are no laws that require such and since PACC has a fine record of winning cases with testimony and photographs. Mr. Janes said a meeting with the County Attorneys will occur soon to discuss this issue. Mr. Janes briefly touched on that other normal options like foster and adoption are a potential for some hold animals, but in the past law enforcement and attorneys had requested PACC help build the cases through the current hold practices. Mr. Neuman requested that it be noted with the attorneys that fosters are capable of weighing and photographing the animals to help the case.

- County Administrations Response to Committee's Request to Add Additional Field Officers and Shelter Staff

This was only touched on briefly. Mr. Neuman said the response was a polite no, but that his intent is to continue to pursue the issue due to the poor staffing compared to other agencies and due to the number of service calls going unaddressed.

- Rescue Program

Mr. Neuman established he wanted input from rescue partners first, then would give the floor to PACC management, then back to rescues, then back to PACC management. Mr. Jacobs expressed concern that the discussion format was more of a public hearing and should have been advertised as such. His point was discussed to include: a suggestion for a meeting solely on rescue; a point that the Committee is not making any decision on the issue as is implied by the term hearing; a point that the Committee allows individuals who fill out the speaker forms to speak; the point that the rescue topic is on the agenda; and the point that the Committee cannot put out information that is not available, referring to what the individual speakers will say. Rescue partners were allowed to proceed. All speakers from the audience filled out speaker forms.

Kim Brandom said she fosters for in the Arms of Angles. She said in previous years there was good cooperation from PACC regarding communication; however, that cooperation has suffered dramatically in the last one to two years. Rescues take animals off PACC's hands and are a huge resource that is not being fully utilized. Underutilization translates into the use of more tax dollars. Animals fostered through PACC must be tracked by PACC, whereas those through rescues are not. She discussed how the lack of a drainage trench in the tent floor is an example of mismanagement. This poor planning creates poor sanitary conditions and requires more staff time to manage. Ms. Brandom said she has witnessed unbalanced behaviors from animals that have gone through a late term spay abort. She said she has seen animals trying to nurse items such as stuffed animals or socks and cry when doing so; and asserted that there are residual impacts on animals that have gone through

such procedures. Ms. Brandom expressed that, barring medical distress, aborting to help the mother animal's welfare is a broad stretch and not instituting a procedure to work with rescue groups to accommodate pregnant animals is in conflict with the mission of PACC and projects a poor image.

Terri Goddard of Tucson Cold Wet Noses said back in April of last year there was a meeting wherein early networking and pregnant animals were discussed. There were no results from the meeting so in October she put out a list of requests. She said she has seen some improvement in that a weekly list of seniors and once a week list of small dogs is being produced. She is still trying to get animals in distress on a separate list instead of the long list. She said there are ten dogs that need to be out of PACC by December 22 or they will be euthanized. Some of these animals the volunteers identify and put on facebook, but having them on a separate list will bring them to the forefront. She is still waiting for immediate notification on pregnant, possibly pregnant and animals with babies coming into PACC, notification on purebreds and a 72 hour notice before aborting pregnant animals.

Tiffany Rosler with in the Arms of Angels said volunteers do rounds and are assessing medical issues; she would rather see staff do these rounds. There is continual pressure on volunteers to do more and more and when there isn't enough staff to do adoptions the threat is made to close the tent unless volunteers do adoptions. Regarding inmates caring for animals, she said currently there are two moms with puppies and on the last three days when Ms. Rosler was at PACC she saw they had no fresh water and no food not even food bowls, so inmates teaching inmates is not working. She gets her information about pregnant animals and babies from a volunteer website, PACC Pets Need You, not from staff. She said the only reason she knows about the pregnant animals and animals with babies is because she physically goes to PACC and because of information from volunteers, not because of staff. She said that there has been division between rescues, volunteers and staff, but recently volunteers and rescues have come together out of necessity. She gave an example of a September 20 list of pregnant animals and those with babies, which was sent out by the Rescue Coordinator, and itemized how the list helped move various animals out of PACC.

Ms. Emptage asked if Chameleon (PACC's electronic management system) could send out a mass e-mail or text on certain types of animals such as pregnant animals. Mr. Janes answered that staff will be looking at all capacities and possibilities, to include Chameleon, to address issues. Mr. Neuman said there was some discussion on a possibility of some non-staff individuals having limited access to Chameleon.

Dr. Francisco García, Health Department Director, referred to a projected slide and said that without rescues 1,507 animals would have been destroyed last year and acknowledged volunteers and volunteer organizations are a vital part of the solution, but are not the entire solution. In the last four years there has been a tremendous increase in live outcomes from PACC with negligible increases in staff. He stated a goal of stretching limited dollars without over taxing staff, driving volunteers crazy and driving rescues away. He spoke of an aspiration of a real-time-basis view of all animals, something PACC is far from, as a tremendous tool to help place animals and assist our partners. However, at present there are so many animals at PACC that it is extremely difficult to get the right lists to the right people in a timely manner. Additionally management has been meeting with jurisdictional leaders. These jurisdictions accounting for a majority portion of PACC's animals and activities; and these leaders have different priorities and values that also must be taken in consideration. Dr. García said staff has to listen to input from all parties and use their best judgment on what to do.

Other staff responded. Kristin Barney, Chief of Operations, said she agreed with much of what was said; agreed that as was said, the system is broken and that there are strained relationships. She admitted that a fix is not readily apparent and said there are hurt feelings that are hard for many to put aside to go forward. She stressed that staff wants to work with rescues and volunteers because staff and partners want the same objectives, but just don't always agree on how to achieve them. She continued that constructive dialogue is what she wants and posed the question, "How do we get there?" Justin Gallick, Animal Care Advocate, echoed that the system is broken then pointed out that it's the animals that suffer as a result. He added that PACC cannot do what it does without volunteers; acknowledged a current dynamic of volunteers and rescues versus staff; and said many have been "digging in the heels" and that is not solving anything. Dr. García recapitulated that combined efforts have made tremendous advancements for PACC animals; advancements will continually be sought; and then referred the Committee to the provided proposed policy and volunteer agreement.

Comments went back to rescue. Ms. Rosler said that an apology would help bring parties together and said that Mr. Gallick is the only one who ever apologizes. She added that Shelter Manager Ocano has skipped out of meetings and said staff says one thing, then does something else. She referred to a meeting wherein Dr. Wilcox and Mr. Gallick agreed to network pregnant dogs, then said they went back on their word. Robin Noblin with Southern Arizona Beagle Rescue said she has been treated horribly when she has gone to pull animals from PACC; often there is no one to help her; and she would just like to be treated respectfully. Ms. Pope said that when she came to pick up her first pregnant dog from PACC the dog was listed as urgent and needing out of PACC as soon as possible, but she was turned away. She added that sometimes the service at PACC is excellent, but other times she has to wait and wait, and has even spent four hours at PACC trying to get one dog. Tina Roose said she has had to wait at PACC over three hours; that PACC only has one person to help with rescue and adoptions; and said the long waits are very annoying. Terra Hockett said she has been a volunteer at PACC for about nine months and wasn't initially aware of the divide between volunteers and staff, but sees it now. She expressed that Mr. Gallick was being warm earlier in the meeting and was cut off by the big picture numbers; she said rescue people care about saving animals not the big picture; not the image of the shelter; not about defining terms; not about assigning blame; and not about smiling and not being real. She said she didn't need an apology, but vented that she wanted someone to talk to her; "I'm here to help, hear me out." Ms. Goddard said the biggest thing for her is communication; and the current lack of communication is what she sees as the problem. She cited that the Rescue Coordinator was not present at the meeting despite Ms. Goddard's request for the Rescue Coordinator to be there and hear from her partners. Ms. Goddard added that the Rescue Coordinator is improving and needs to hear that, but she needs to be part of the discussion. Ms. Goddard closed with a call to work as a team.

Ms. Mendelsohn posed a question, echoed by Ms. Emptage, about the ability to fast track the process for rescues. Mr. Gallick said there have been streamlining efforts to have most of the paperwork done when things are known in advance, but added there is just the Rescue Coordinator and himself and sometimes just one of the two. He expressed confidence the wait times are in not the two hour range as in the past and said a rescue was just in and out the day of the meeting.

Mr. Neuman said the dialogue was good, but to move forward suggested a separate forum with representatives from PACC management and the Advisory Committee meeting with rescue groups and volunteers. Dr. García acknowledged that conversations have occurred and need to continue, but stressed that not all stories on this topic are bad and successes also need to be acknowledged.

Dr. O'Donnell said she sees a willingness to move forward; talked about the need to forgive and forget to move forward; and volunteered to be part of the forum. She cautioned that we won't all get all we want; there is a need for compromise. She cited the spay abort issue as a hard issue and briefly touched on both sides of the issue and the emotion it evokes. She referred to the passion, love and anger expressed on the issue as evidence that people really care. Mr. Neuman and Ms. Mendelsohn also volunteered to serve on the suggested forum. Ms. Goddard requested Mr. Gallick and the Rescue Coordinator be part of the forum. There was brief discussion that other Committee members could take part as long as a quorum was not reached.

- Criteria required for PACC to Respond and Investigate a Service/Welfare Issue Wherein an Animal is in Distress

There was no discussion on this topic.

6. New Business

- Volunteer Policy and Code of Conduct

The draft policy was provided at the meeting and will be posted on the website. Item to be carried over to the next meeting.

- Possible Ordinance Related to the Sale of Tie Outs

There was no discussion on this topic. Item to be carried over to the next meeting.

7. Animal Welfare and Dangerous Animal Cases for the Month of November and Recent Holds Snapshot

Ms. Schwerin referred to welfare case five, in which there was a pit bull with no shelter, food or water; and multiple citations were issued. She asked why the owner was allowed to redeem the animal. Mr. Janes replied that staff spoke with the owner and felt she would comply and the person who made the complaint said s/he would report any observed neglect going forward. Ms. Schwerin requested Officer Klein (the on-scene officer in this welfare case) come to an Advisory Committee meeting to discuss the decision making process on this specific case and these type of cases in general. Dr. Smith said it is a lot to ask of a citizen to monitor a neighbor's animal welfare issue and asked if complaints like this are followed up on with a surprise visit. Mr. Janes concurred that the citizen monitoring situation is not ideal; said staff would like to follow up on all these, but acknowledged there are a list of complaints that do not get addressed the first time, let alone on a follow up. The Committee briefly touched on this as why they requested and will continue to request additional officers.

8. Donations: A total of 1,034 individuals gave $33,678.20 in donations during the month of November.

Mr. Janes said donations continue to increase, and not just money, but also food and supplies. He said year to date monetary donations exceed $200,000; continued that the Fund Development Manager is doing a great job; and said PACC is currently working on the logistics to receive numerous pallets of dog food from PetSmart Charities. Mr. Neuman had a question about the Sam's fund category on the donations report. Mr. Janes said that fund is for animal medical needs; has been changed on all the

advertising; and will be renamed in the report. Mr. Jacobs added that the Sam this fund is named for was the first veterinarian hired by the University Medical Center and he triaged animals at the Animal Care Center many years ago.

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

   Ms. Schwerin referred to the third complaint, which was a letter that complained of no cooperation from the Adoption Coordinator and the Rescue Coordinator. Mr. Janes said the complaint is an example of why the forum was formed and discussions need to continue.

10. Call to the Audience

    There were no speakers at this call to the audience.

11. Announcements, Schedules and Proposed Agenda Items

    Mr. Janes pointed out two upcoming Pima Alliance for Animal Welfare (PAAW) events, a January 10th cat trapping class and a January 16th PAAW Semi-Annual Community Meeting. Mr. Jacobs made a request for a copy of PACC's policy on tick fever treatment, referring back to Mr. Dean's comments from the audience. Ms. Emptage expanded the request to include the entire medication policy. Mr. Jacobs also requested that members of the public who speak off of a prepared written statement provide copies of the statement to make things easier to understand.

12. Next Meeting – January 15, 2014

    Due to the crowded attendance at the December meeting and interest expressed in the next meeting, Mr. Neuman established that the next meeting will be held at the Abrams building.

13. Adjournment

    The meeting adjourned at 7:56 pm

NOTICE
PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
PIMA COUNTY ANIMAL CARE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

December 18, 2014 – 5:30 p.m.
Herbert K. Abrams Public Health Center
3950 S. Country Club Road
Tucson, Arizona 85714
Room 1108
(520) 724-7729

Functions of the Committee

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

AGENDA	
1.	Call to Order • Roll Call • Establishment of Quorum and Pledge of Allegiance
2.	Review and Adoption of Minutes: • Review of typo correction in September 18, 2014 meeting minutes • Adoption of second draft of October 16, 2014 meeting minutes • Adoption of November 20, 2014 meeting minutes
3.	Call to the Audience
4.	Manager's Report • County administration release of County Attorney legal opinion regarding providing animal care services to cities and towns • Replies related to animal welfare questions from the November 20, 2014 meeting • Draft senate bill related to dogs, licensing, vaccination and quarantine
5.	Old Business • Update on July 19, 2014 Motion for resolution for PACC to remedy issues relating to the care and welfare of pets at PACC - Operations (Chair Neuman/PACC Management Team) • Vet holds and confiscation holds – processes, procedures and ways to shorten length of hold time (Chair Neuman/PACC Management Team) • County Administration response to the committee's request to add additional field officers and shelter staff (Chair Neuman/Mr. Janes) • Rescue program (Chair Neuman/PACC Management Team) • Criteria required for PACC to respond and investigate a service/welfare issue wherein an animal is in distress (Ms. Emptage)
6.	New Business • Volunteer policy and code of conduct (Chair Neuman/PACC Management Team) • Possible ordinance related to the sale of tie outs (Ms. Emptage)
7.	Animal Welfare and Dangerous Animal Cases for the Month of November and Recent Holds Snapshot

	Welfare		Dangerous Dogs	
	A14-160091	A14-160168	A14-159061	
	A14-159954	A14-159856	A14-160530	
	A14-159157	A14-157606		
	A14-159999	A14-160704		
	A14-159416	A14-160679		

8.	Donations: A total of 1034 individuals gave $33,678.20 in donations during the month of November.
9.	Complaints and Commendations: There were three complaints and no commendations received by staff during November.
10.	Call to the Audience
11.	Announcements, Schedules and Proposed Agenda Items
12.	Next Meeting – January 15, 2015
13.	Adjournment

Copies of this agenda are available upon request at the Pima County Health Department, 3950 S. Country Club Road, by calling 243-7729 or at www.pima.gov/animalcare. The Committee may discuss and take action on any item on the agenda. At the conclusion of an open call to the public Committee members may only respond to criticism made; ask staff to review the matter raised; or ask to include the matter on a future agenda.

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

said the current situation of a crowded shelter, which is stressful for animals, and the lack of counselors and staff requires balance in the interpretation of suitable home, but continued that there will be times when PACC will say no when necessary. Ms. Beaubien said to become an Adoption Counselor volunteers go through two hours of training then shadow an experienced Adoption Counselor for 16 hours. Ms. Beaubien said about once or twice a week prospective adopters are referred to her and those cases are usually a breakdown in communication where she ends up saying yes approximately nine out of ten times, but she does say no about once or twice a month. Dr. Kaluzniacki characterized that low denial rate as disturbing. Dr. O'Donnell pointed out that prospective adopters often have to wait for help. Mr. Gallick indicated that staff members are often pulled to help at intake and that during the week there are less volunteers available. He added that the first couple of hours in the morning are the busiest on the floor and in intake. Ms. Barney said staff is looking at a tiered volunteer system with training and incentives to help volunteers develop and advance. In response to a question Ms. Beaubien said if someone has a felony conviction it will show up the database and the individual will be denied an adoption. Also multiple minor infractions and animal returns are grounds for denial. There was concern voiced about misdemeanor violations not just felonies. There was also concern about offsite adoption events. Ms. Beaubien acknowledged there is no computer offsite, but said if they are uncomfortable with someone they call PACC for the computer check. Ms. Beaubien said that in five years she has only encountered one convicted individual trying to adopt. Ms. Schwerin said she caught the end of a television add offering discounted adoptions for university students; said that is a terrible idea; and said university students are well known poor animal owners who often abandon pets at the end of the school year or end of college and typically have little money for veterinary expenses. Mr. Janes acknowledged that there was such an offer for one day, but said it will not happen again.

- Committee's Report to the Board of Supervisors

There was no discussion in this item.

- Draft Letter Requesting the Health Department Hire More Enforcement Staff

Dr. Smith provided a draft letter she and Dr. O'Donnell generated requesting four more Field Officers. In response to a question Mr. Janes indicated the original request for these officers was sent up the chain of command in approximately May. There was discussion that the shelter was also clearly under staffed, as indicated at the last Committee meeting, and on whether to add a request for more shelter staff to the letter or send it as is and address shelter staff separately going forward. Mr. Neuman took a vote between those two courses of action and the majority (6-4) voted to send the letter as is and address shelter staff separately. Mr. Neuman and Dr. Smith agreed to craft a letter regarding shelter staffing.

1. New Business

- Rescue Program - Procedures, Criteria, Follow-Up, Inspections, Reporting

Mr. Gallick said once an evaluation places a pet on a special needs / rescue list, if an adopter / rescuer comes in they start with the regular questionnaire, then proceed with going over the special needs of the animal, then they go over the guidelines, waiver, commitment to veterinary care and provide paperwork for the outside veterinarian to fill out and send back. Rescue organizations also have to provide proof of sterilizations. Also with rescue groups, under the new law staff goes out and meets

DRAFT

Pima County Animal Care Advisory Committee
Minutes
October 16, 2014
4000 N. Silverbell Rd.
Tucson, Arizona 85745

2nd Draft

1. Call to Order

Mr. Emptage called the meeting to order at 5:31 pm

- Attendance

Present:
Nancy Emptage, Vice-Chair, Animal Welfare Coalition
Pat Hubbard, Humane Society of Southern Arizona
Pat Jacobs, Tucson Kennel Club
Derek Marshall, Public Education
Helen Mendelsohn, Disabled Community
Jane Schwerin, People for Animals in the Prevention of Cruelty and Neglect
Gail Smith, MD, Board of Health
Kim Janes, Pima Animal Care Center, Ex-Offico

Absent:
Tamara Barrick, Foundation for Animals in Risk
Sophia Kaluzniacki, DVM, ASPCA of AZ, Inc
Jack Neuman, Chair, PACC Volunteers
Erin O'Donnell, DVM, Southern AZ Veterinary Medical Association
Angela Spencer, City of Tucson

- Pledge of Allegiance

2. Adoption of the Minutes

- Adoption of the September 18, 2014 Meeting Minutes

Ms. Emptage pointed out one typo. The motion was made and seconded (Hubbard/Smith) that the September 18, 2014 meeting minutes be adopted as written, with typo corrected. The motion carried (6-0).

3. Call to the Audience

Kim Silver addressed the Committee regarding the relationship between the Pima Animal Care Center and rescue organizations. Per No Kill Pima County, the 2012 rescue rate was 12 percent of PACC animals, but currently the rate is down to nine percent. PACC's animal numbers are at an all-time high. With increased medical care and a budding foster program PACC staff implies that rescue numbers should be declining. Ms. Silver disagrees and thinks rescue numbers should be increasing. She expressed that PACC should provide job descriptions, as were requested more than once, for positions such as Live Release Manager and Rescue Coordinator, which imply certain functions to the public. She asserted that the current Rescue Coordinator's functions are drastically different that the former's.

Ms. Silver said feedback from rescue partners Tucson Cold Wet Noses (TCWN) and In the Arms of Angels (AOA) indicates the consensus among rescue partners is that it is difficult to work with PACC and receive accurate information regarding PACC animals. The previous Rescue Coordinator sent out categorized e-mails about certain types of shelter animals such as seniors, pregnant dogs or small special needs dogs. She also sent out information on animals not faring well. Her e-mails were very helpful. Recently TCWN and AOA recommended these types of categorized e-mails recommence and that efforts be made to rebuild relationships with rescue organizations. Their suggestions have reportedly been met with a tremendous amount of resistance from PACC's Live Release Manager.

Ms. Silver expressed concern that PACC does not follow through with commitments to stakeholders. Meetings and discussions are held and agreements are made, but PACC does not keep their agreements. She cited an agreement back in April for pregnant dogs to be placed on a 72-hour rescue list before they would be spay aborted; this agreement has not been followed. She added that AOA possibly will no longer be pulling animals from PACC. She reported significant resistance in the rescue community to work with PACC and said that some rescuers are now pulling animals from other shelters outside of Pima County because they are easier to work with.

Ms. Silver relayed the following list of requests from rescues regarding what they are asking from PACC.

1. Weekly list of seniors at PACC
2. Weekly list of small dogs at PACC
3. Weekly notification of animals in distress
4. 72-hour notice before aborting pregnant dogs
5. Immediate notification of a pregnant, possibly pregnant or mom with babies entering PACC

Ms. Silver also expressed concern about rescue alter certificates and the risk of rescues adopting out unaltered animals.

4. <u>Manager's Report</u>

Kim Janes, Pima Animal Care Center Chief of External Affairs, reported that the trend of fewer intakes continues and more animals are being released alive. The rescue numbers are down compared to last year, but adoptions and to a lesser degree returns to owners are higher than last year.

During discussion Mr. Janes said the County Administrator has adopted a no euthanasia policy by which no adoptable, rehabilitatable or treatable animal is put down; and referred to the Asilomar Accords as a source for this policy and its terminology. Ms. Schwerin asserted that there are more adoptable animals than suitable homes; cautioned against adopting animals out to cruel owners / poor homes; referred to a packet welfare case wherein animals adopted from PACC were emaciated; and said an animal is better off dead than being in a home where it is badly mistreated. Ms. Hubbard added that she has recently spoken to four of the five Board of Supervisors members regarding the PACC bond proposal and was encouraged to hear two of them interject that we can't keep killing animals. Mr. Janes said the Center is using due diligence to make every effort to place animals in suitable homes. Yes there are challenges and returns, but PACC's live release rate has gone from approximately 40 percent to over 80 percent and we cannot go back to a euthanizing policy.

DRAFT

- Community Cat Project

The City of Tucson very recently voted to amend their code to allow for the Community Cat Project to move forward in the City. There are ongoing financial discussions with the cities and towns; however, the County is committed to proceeding with this project. Also PACC is continually seeking grants, donations and funding avenues to fund this project and other PACC objectives.

- Bond Educational Opportunities

Mr. Janes provided two County Animal Care Center bond information sheets and reported that he has been a speaker at bond educational opportunities, including with a Green Valley / Sahuarita council and the Oro Valley Chamber of Commerce.

5. Old Business

- Update on July 19, 2014 Motion for Resolution for PACC to Remedy Issues Relating to the Care and Welfare of Pets at PACC - Operations

This item was deferred to next month's agenda.

- Vet Holds and Confiscation Holds – Processes, Procedures and Ways to Shorten Length of Hold Time (Chair Neuman/PACC Management Team)

Mr. Janes pointed out there were no veterinary holds in the report only enforcement holds. In response to a question, Dr. Bonnie Lilley, Chief of Veterinarian Services, discussed factors influencing the length of a hold. Felonies take more time than misdemeanors; and some health conditions take longer than others. An animal with low weight might not take a long time to recover; in contrast, mange can take one to two months to treat. Dr. Lilley talked about how if an animal improves dramatically at PACC, which she described as a minimum standard of care, then a court can say that the owner was negligent. She described an example where before and after photos resulted in a guilty verdict against a pet owner.

- Post Adoption Medical Care (Chair Neuman/Ms. Emptage)

Ms. Emptage receives numerous calls from pet owners who say they cannot afford veterinary care. She suggested that some individuals hear about a free veterinary visit and think it means free veterinary care, which is not the case. She voiced that being able to obtain medications from PACC at cost or elsewhere at a discount would be helpful. She emphasized that adopters need to be educated on risks and responsibilities of pet ownership going forward. Ms. Hubbard said the Humane Society was told they could not have their veterinarian see pets they adopted out because they are not licensed as a full service public veterinary clinic. Pet insurance, possibly covered for two weeks by PACC, was touched on as an avenue to pursue, but Mr. Janes said pet insurance does not cover pre-existing conditions.

DRAFT

6. New Business

- The dates/name/location of organizations the Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) has visited both announced and unannounced to verify accordance with the ordinance passed on August 5, 2014 regarding animals received from PACC.

Animal Care Advocate Justin Gallick said since the code change PACC Staff has visited six rescue foster locations. Five passed and one, Siberian Husky Rescue, failed; and PACC is no longer working with them. The five visited that passed are Big Heads Bigger Hearts, Hope Animal Shelter, Sol Dog Rescue, Pima Paws for Life and Cold Wet Noses. Poor cleanliness was the reason for the one fail. Discussion brought out that, due to lack of resources, PACC is currently only planning to visit one foster per rescue.

7. Animal Welfare, Dangerous Animal Cases and Holds for the Month of August

Ms. Schwerin cited welfare case 2, in which an owner was cited for tie-out, no water, no license and no rabies vaccination, as an example of a poor owner getting her dog back. In response to a question, Dr. Lilley confirmed that law requires the rabies vaccine be given by a veterinarian, not an owner. Ms. Schwerin referred to welfare case 1, in which an owner was cited for tie-outs, no shelter, no water, no license and no vaccination, as an example of an owner she doubts would ever become a good owner. Mr. Jacobs requested information on authority to confiscate and not return an animal. Mr. Janes discussed judgment calls based on physical conditions, the condition of the animal(s) and interactions with owners and said the code says the officer "may" confiscate. Ms. Schwerin said Pima County Code 6.04.130: Authority to remove and impound, and 6.04.140: Procedures to remove or forfeit animals; notice; order to show cause hearing; appeal are the applicable County codes and the city has similar codes. Ms. Schwerin cited welfare case 5, in which two dogs were found to be emaciated, as an example of animals adopted out of PACC into a home that was not a suitable home.

8. Donations: A total of 1,269 individuals gave a total of $44,365.53 in donations during the month of September.

There was no discussion on this item.

9. Complaints and Commendations There were four complaints and one commendation, plus a fifth complaint that eventually became a second commendation, received by staff during September.

There was no discussion on this item.

10. Call to the Audience

Tiffany Rosler addressed the Committee regarding PACC interactions with rescue partners. Recently Ms. Rosler was notified by a volunteer, at 9:11 pm, about a pregnant Chihuahua. Ms. Rosler was at PACC at 8:00 am the next morning and had the dog out by 10:29 am. She said this is an example of how quickly rescue personnel can act when given proper information and said the rescue was a result of a volunteer's communication, not the Rescue Coordinator's. She said the nightly rescue list has numerous errors and one recently almost cost a dog being adopted. The dog was pregnant and was spay aborted. An individual seeking to adopt this dog ~~rescue partner~~ was turned away twice because

DRAFT

Chameleon was not update and still listed the dog as pregnant. Ms. Rosler also requested name tags for staff and said name tags will promote staff accountability.

11. Announcements, Schedules and Proposed Agenda Items

Mr. Jacobs requested the rescue / PACC relationship concerns brought up by both speakers from the audience be added to the next agenda. His request included copies of the narrative Ms. Silver read from.

Mr. Janes announced that PACC's accomplishments in the ASPCA Challenge over the summer resulted in PACC receiving a check for $5,000.

Mr. Gallick said PACC received an $8,000 grant to facilitate tent events at four different PetSmarts and will be bringing adoptable dogs to these local PetSmarts over the next two days.

12. Next Meeting – November 20, 2014

There was no discussion on this item.

13. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:52 pm

DRAFT

Pima County Animal Care Advisory Committee
Minutes
November 20, 2014
4000 N. Silverbell Rd.
Tucson, Arizona 85745

Draft

1. Call to Order

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

- Attendance

Present:
Tamara Barrick, Foundation for Animals in Risk
Nancy Emptage, Vice-Chair, Animal Welfare Coalition (late)
Pat Hubbard, Humane Society of Southern Arizona
Pat Jacobs, Tucson Kennel Club
Sophia Kaluzniacki, DVM, ASPCA of AZ, Inc
Derek Marshall, Public Education
Helen Mendelsohn, Disabled Community
Jack Neuman, Chair, PACC Volunteers
Erin O'Donnell, DVM, Southern AZ Veterinary Medical Association
Jane Schwerin, People for Animals in the Prevention of Cruelty and Neglect
Gail Smith, MD, Board of Health
Kim Janes, Pima Animal Care Center (PACC), Ex-Offico

Absent:
Angela Spencer, City of Tucson

- Pledge of Allegiance

2. Adoption of the Minutes

- Adoption of the October 16, 2014 Meeting Minutes

Ms. Schwerin pointed out the October 16, 2014 minutes refer to a typo in the September 18, 2014 minutes being corrected and requested to see the correction. Correction detail will be provided for the next meeting. Ms. Schwerin referred to Item 7 of the October 16, 2014 minutes and requested her citing of code authority to confiscate animals, in response to a question from Mr. Jacobs, be included in the minutes.

The motion was made and seconded (Hubbard/Kaluzniacki) that the October 16, 2014 meeting minutes be adopted as written with the addition requested by Ms. Schwerin. The motion carried (10-0).

3. Call to the Audience

There were three speakers at this call to the audience: Mariana Parker, Tiffany Rosler and Terri Goddard.

Ms. Parker, a volunteer at PACC, first thanked Mr. Ocano for his efforts in getting a large number of confiscated cats spayed and neutered and many placed in homes. Ms. Parker said many rescue

organizations are not happy with PACC. They are not being notified properly. If a pregnant dog comes in In the Arms of Angels wants to be notified and would be happy to take it, given a 72 hour notice. There are seven dogs on the urgent list, but there are empty kennels in the tent. Ms. Parker questioned why dogs have to die when there are empty kennels.

Ms. Rosler said she was misquoted in the October minutes; it was a member of the public trying to adopt who was turned away twice because the dog that was still listed as pregnant, not a rescue partner as the draft minutes stated.

Ms. Rosler then read a letter from Heather Binnie, who is a volunteer at PACC and who has attended a number of PACC meetings focused on reducing euthanasia. The letter was about a white pitbull she observed barking in the kennel on November 5th. Ms. Binnie stopped to talk to the dog, but it didn't stop barking or even look at her. There was a tag that said the dog was named Odie and was deaf. Ms. Binnie thought the dog was probably also blind. She carefully touched Odie and she stopped barking. When she stopped touching her Odie started barking again. Odie needed human contact. Odie came in on the 2nd and was evaluated on the 5th. Ms. Binnie briefly discussed the dog's evaluation with Simmone. Ms. Binnie put a through-the-fence picture of Odie on Facebook and started networking on Odie's behalf. She received lots of interest and Ms. Binnie went to get a better picture of Odie on the 6th, but couldn't find her and was told she was probably getting spayed. The next day Ms. Binnie went back to PACC to get the better picture and Michelle informed her Odie was put down. Michelle said Odie was stressed and would not stop barking. Ms. Binnie asked Michelle about the dog being deaf and blind. Michelle said there was no indication Odie was blind. Ms. Binnie told Michelle that Odie had been networked on Facebook and that this is not going to look good. Michelle said to avoid this, do not pre-network animals that have not been evaluated, but Ms. Binnie said she discussed the evaluation with Simmone. Michelle said not to network animals that have not been approved by her or Justin and that the evaluation staff doesn't decide whether an animal lives or dies. Odie's owner had died and the next of kin could not keep her. Ms. Binnie was in shock and called Terri Goddard of Cold Wet Noses, who spoke with Michelle, who reportedly admitted that Odie was blind. Saving Odie could have garnered praise and support for PACC. Ms. Binnie has attended focus groups on how to save more dogs. Hours are spent in these meetings, but nothing has come from all the input. How hard would it have been to make a few phone calls for a blind and deaf dog?

Ms. Goddard, from Tucson Cold Wet Nose, said she has been rescuing from PACC for nine years. There have been a lot of disappointments lately and Ms. Goddard said she had e-mailed PACC rescue staff five "preventable points" which she believes can save animal lives at PACC. The e-mail was sent over five weeks ago. The five points are requests for: a once a week list of seniors; a once a week list of small special needs dogs; a heads up on dogs in distress at least once a week; 72 hour notice before aborting dogs or cats and immediate notification on possibly pregnant, pregnant and mothers with babies; and when a purebred animal comes into PACC that information gets to the rescue coordinator / rescue staff so they can contact purebred rescue organizations. Since the e-mail was sent, November 12 was the first time any of these requested changes were implemented, and the immediate notifications on possibly pregnant, pregnant and animals with babies still haven't been implemented, nor have the purebred notifications. Ms. Goddard vented frustration regarding these changes taking so long. She said in April 2013 a meeting was held wherein it was agreed upon that there would be immediate notice on possibly pregnant, pregnant and animals with babies and a 72 hour window before pregnant mothers' babies are aborted. Once an agreement was made it should have been adhered to. A new early networking of high risk animals has been implemented; however,

they are placed on a lengthy daily list. Ms. Goddard appreciates the daily list, but feels animals at high risk for euthanasia should be on a separate e-mailed list. She also said she has experienced resistance to change in dealing with PACC rescue staff.

4. Manager's Report

Kim Janes, Pima Animal Care Center Chief of External Affairs, reported that Proposition 415 to build a modern animal shelter passed at the recent election. He pointed out a September 23, 2014 *Pima Animal Care Center Cost to Municipalities* memorandum from County Administrator Huckelberry in the Committee's packet as a reference for Mr. Huckelberry using the term "policy of non-euthanasia" as was mentioned at the last Committee meeting. Also included in the packet was a sample of Mr. Huckelberry's November 4, 2014 *Board of Supervisors Communication Regarding Pima Animal Care Center Financing and Legal Opinion Regarding County Obligations* letter to the local cities and towns and a copy of Mr. Huckelberry's November 18 *County Obligation for Animal Care Services Inside Cities and Towns* Board of Supervisors Memorandum, wherein Mr. Huckelberry recommended the Board waive privilege regarding the County Attorney's legal opinion regarding County obligations for provision of animal care services inside cities and towns. Mr. Janes reported privilege was waived on November 18 and he would forward the opinion to the Committee. On November 14 County staff met with city and town representatives regarding funding and support and there is a bit of disagreement on what the municipalities are willing and able to fund; these discussions will continue.

Mr. Neuman asked about, on the October monthly report, why the year-to-date euthanasia "other" number was up compared to last year's; and Mr. Janes replied that the number includes DOAs picked up which is the primary reason for the increase. Mr. Neuman also asked about the decrease in enforcement responses; and Mr. Janes replied the decrease has to do with the nature of calls and staff vacancies, which were held up recently due to an automated management system switch over. Mr. Neuman referred to correspondence from Mr. Huckelberry regarding the Committee's request for more staffing, wherein Mr. Huckelberry tied staffing to fiscal support from municipalities; and Mr. Neuman asked if this translate into a similar dynamic with other departments where staffing is tied to funding from cities and towns. Mr. Janes pointed out that discussions with the municipalities are in early stages and then discussed that PACC is largely unique in that services are tied to governmental agreements, in contrast to most other programs that are not because the authorities and/or responsibilities are codified as assigned solely to the County.

5. Old Business

- Update on July 19, 2014 Motion for Resolution for PACC to Remedy Issues Relating to the Care and Welfare of Pets at PACC – Operations

Mr. Neuman referred to the original motion and past discussion on how staffing was cited as the reason why the 22 items haven't been accomplished. He said there is frustration among the volunteers and pointed out that the adoption program is mostly comprised of volunteers. He added that the volunteer influence is high because they are doing most of the work; and one way for staff to have more control is to not have volunteers so entrenched, doing almost everything.

Mr. Neuman asked Shelter Manager Jose Ocano for an update on progress on the 22 item resolution. Mr. Ocano said staffing hasn't changed, but there have been a number of positive changes. The shelter has transitioned from State inmates to female County inmates for sanitation. The new inmate

DRAFT

workers have better attention to detail and are more compassionate. The shelter is cleaner than it has been for years. The County inmates are supervised and trained by a Senior Corrections Custodian. With the State inmates the shelter supervisors were constantly pulled away to train or direct inmates. This news dynamic requires less involvement by shelter supervisors, who are therefore freed up to perform their duties. Mr. Ocano said he now also supervises the clinic and the clinic supervisor is being moved to the shelter. There was a meeting with volunteers on kennel cards, and a new system has just been implemented. He said PACC still has more animals than can be cared for and things still get missed, but things are improving. Kristin Barney, Chief of Operations, added that the clinic supervisor change is an example of staff looking for ways to restructure to be more efficient. She added that things don't typically change immediately, but that is not because management doesn't care; it just takes time to get better which is what everyone wants. Mr. Neuman acknowledged that PACC is definitely short staffed compared to other similarly situated operations.

- Vet Holds and Confiscation Holds – Processes, Procedures and Ways to Shorten Length of Hold Time (Chair Neuman/PACC Management Team)

Ms. Schwerin referred to discussion on this topic during the last Committee meeting wherein Dr. Lilley said felony cases take longer. Ms. Schwerin contended this shouldn't be the case; there are no laws requiring such; and asserted that these animals coming from an abusive situation then ending up in a lengthy hold amounts to double suffering. Mr. Janes replied that animals in felony cases generally have more severe issues which take longer to recover from and it takes longer to build the case. He added that forensically there are issues such as the chain of evidence and credibility of evidence that are better served by keeping the animal at PACC. Ms. Schwerin said she admires PACC's record on court cases and added that the courts trust what PACC officers say and the details they record, so it isn't necessary to keep the animals physically at PACC.

Mr. Neuman said he didn't understand much of why animals are on the holds report. Mr. Janes spent time breaking down what all the numbers mean and some of the sequences of events related to holds. Many of the holds are on animals with enforcement issues being held for the mandatory three to seven days depending on whether or not it is owned. If an owner does not come forth during the mandatory hold time, then the animal is released for adoption. One of the challenges in understanding the report is that the report is just a snapshot of holds when the report was run and does not include what happened since; then once the hold is resolved it is dropped from the report and the Committee doesn't see the outcome. Mr. Janes explained the two vet holds. One was a cat that died and the hold should have been deleted then, and the other is a dead skunk and PACC is waiting on results from a rabies test. In response to a question Mr. Janes indicated that the owner, in a mass impound case on the report, served with a bond on November 13 has until November 23 to pay the bond. Mr. Janes acknowledged that the Committee's interest in the holds has caused staff to look more closely at processes and things are being attended to more closely. In response to a question Mr. Neuman acknowledged the current hold list is noticeably smaller than those in the past.

Ms. Schwerin revisited her concern about animals being held in felony cases and said that officers' testimonies and pictures do a good job in court. Mr. Janes said there is great benefit in showing what it takes to rehabilitate an animal and the current practice was requested by attorneys. However, staff will visit with our attorneys regarding Ms. Schwerin's concerns. Mr. Neuman suggested foster especially in cases where the evidence is the weight of the animal. Mr. Jacobs said if a judge orders PACC to keep an animal, then there is no choice; and if a prosecutor requests such, then in his opinion we should do as requested. Ms. Hubbard said when the detectives say hang onto an animal then her

organization does so; but added that they do have some special fosters who are familiar with special expectations such as bringing the animal to court. There were questions and concerns about the length of time an animal is held in these cases and comments on delays that drag these cases out. Mr. Neuman requested this item be on next month's agenda.

- Committee's Request to Add Additional Field Officers and Shelter Staff

This item was touched on briefly under the Manager's Report, item 4.

6. New Business

- Rescue Program

Ms. Hubbard related an incident that happened about eight years ago wherein the Sheriff's Department, PACC and the Humane Society of Southern Arizona collaborated on a horrible hording case involving over 800 dogs. Most of the dogs were females and most of them were pregnant or lactating. In response to this case veterinary collaborators worked tirelessly to get the pregnant dogs spayed before they could have puppies. Ms. Hubbard stated that she cannot understand why PACC allows pregnant dogs to go out to foster, saying, "Your job is prevention." Ms. Schwerin said she agreed completely. Kristin Barney, Chief of Operations, said there has been considerable discussion on this topic over the past six weeks or so; acknowledged it is tough topic; and acknowledged that many shelters feel the way Ms. Hubbard feels. Ms. Hubbard stressed it's not a feeling; it's a job; it's prevention. Ms. Barney said staff would be open to listen to the Committee's input and is moving toward a decision. Ms. Hubbard said, "There is no decision to make; your job is prevention; your job is to keep these animals from being born." She acknowledged that groups want to save lives, but added that they don't have 24,000 animals to manage every year. Dr. Kaluzniacki added that in her work with the Animal League of Green Valley her policy is to immediately spay any pregnant dog. If the puppies are viable, then fine, if not, then she is in agreement with Ms. Hubbard. Dr. Smith asked how close to term puppies are viable. Dr. Kaluzniacki said pregnancies are about nine weeks and puppies can survive at about eight weeks.

Mr. Ocano interjected that he sometimes goes against his professional opinion to appease rescues and volunteers. Ms. Barney said PACC is trying to be respectful with valuable rescue partners and volunteers, but has recently received a threatening e-mail and has been called names and cursed at for decisions PACC is attempting to make. She requested that a Code of Conduct Agreement be put on next month's agenda; acknowledged that communications have broken down; and said she wants to establish respectful communications from all sides.

Dr. Francisco García, Health Department Director, said there is a struggle to balance input from volunteers, rescue groups, the Advisory Committee and other stakeholders and what limits should be in place needs to be enshrined in policy. Dr. García provided a handout at the meeting and referred to the "big picture." The handout included charts and figures showing since year 2010/2011 adoptions have increased 57 percent and special needs adoptions have increased by 109 percent. The role of rescue has evolved over the same time period. The total number of animals rescued has gone down, but the number of rescue partners working with PACC has increased. Individual rescue groups make decisions on their priorities and what animals they can take and network. Dr. García said that as policy evolves some things will have to be off the table and the pregnant pets issue is likely to be one of those items. There have been struggles with Chameleon (PACC's electronic management system)

and IT to try to give rescues access to information so they can find out what animals are available, within a well-defined set of policies and procedures. He stressed the main priorities as decreasing intake and increasing adoptions. Dr. García has attended meetings facilitated by No Kill Pima County in which a number of ideas were exchanged. Staff now needs to decide what ideas are feasible and impactful for PACC. There was discussion on whom, including PACC staff and/or the Committee, should take what actions to establish a policy. Dr. García said staff has a draft; has been getting stakeholder input; and will have the draft ready for the next meeting.

Ms. Schwerin replied to Dr. García's comment about decreasing intake and increasing adoptions. She said one way intakes are being decreased is by leaving animals with abusive owners and referred to welfare cases in the packet. She indicated a count of 52 citations issued for the ten Committee packet cases, but most of the animals were allowed to remain with the owners. Regarding increasing adoptions, she said new adopters are not screened well enough to ensure animals go to a suitable home and cited a packet welfare case that was an animal acquired from PACC. She recommended massive spay and neutering, specifically requiring all pit bulls be spayed and neutered, and more broadly, that laws require all dogs and cats be spayed and neutered.

The motion was made and seconded (Jacobs/Kaluzniacki) that the rescue discussion be tabled until the next meeting. The motion carried (11-0).

After the vote Mr. Neuman stated that people can send him opinions on the current topic for inclusion in the next meeting's packet.

- Criteria required for PACC to Respond and Investigate a Service/Welfare Issue Wherein an Animal is in Distress

Ms. Emptage related an experience wherein a dog with rectal bleeding was at a veterinary facility and the veterinarian recommended euthanasia. The owner had no money and wanted to take the dog home to say good-by, but the animal was clearly in distress. Ms. Emptage offered to be present for the euthanasia, but the owner said they could handle it without her. Ms. Emptage offered to have the animal cremated at a pet cemetery and the owner agreed. Ms. Emptage filed a report with PACC. The next day she found out the dog was taken home and the owner had given a false address. Per Mr. Janes, PACC staff had followed up with the clinic, but spoke to someone other than the treating veterinarian, who inaccurately indicated that the situation was not very bad. The point of the discussion was, what can be done when someone sees an animal in distress? Mr. Janes indicated that anyone can call in to report an animal in distress and PACC will investigate; he added that getting the information to the supervisor is the best course of action. PACC enforcement is still investigating the case discussed, but does not have an address. In response to questions, Enforcement Supervisor Jose Chavez said that applicable neglect citations would be issued to the animal's owner regardless of where the animal ends up, and that a search warrant could be sought to help bring the dog forward.

7. <u>Animal Welfare and Dangerous Animal Cases for the Month of October and Recent Holds Snapshot</u>

Ms. Schwerin referred to welfare case three, in which there were ten citations for ten animals without water and the owner relinquished all but two of the animals. She asked why the owner was allowed to keep the two and if they were spayed and/or neutered. Mr. Janes said that the owner showed some responsibility and appeared to have too many animals for him to handle so he kept just the two. Mr. Janes also said he would check to confirm on the spay/neuter question. Ms. Schwerin asked about

DRAFT

whether or not redeemed animals are spayed and neutered; and Mr. Janes replied that owners are given an option to redeem their animal intact, but they pay much higher fees. Mr. Neuman said the Committee had in the past recommended that all animals that end up at PACC be spayed or neutered. Mr. Janes acknowledged that direction was recommended, but said it requires an ordinance that he and Ms. Schwerin have been working on. Ms. Schwerin said they hope to have the ordinance done by the end of the year. On welfare case five, which involved three dogs and a duck; two animals were euthanized and two were adopted, Ms. Schwerin asked which animals were adopted. Mr. Janes will check. In welfare case seven a dog was found dead; it was tied out in the sun as punishment. Ms. Schwerin asked why this wasn't a felony case. Mr. Janes said that if it is not a felony now, that option is still open and the County Attorney can take that route. Mr. Neuman questioned why the second dog, Goofy, was left with the owner; and Ms. Emptage contended that the owner in this case should not be allowed to own animals for as long as is legally permitted. Mr. Janes said he would discuss the ownership ban recommendation with the prosecuting attorney and he would have someone check on the second dog. Ms. Schwerin pointed out that the dog in welfare case eight, which was on a tie out and jumped the fence, was adopted from PACC. Ms. Barrick added that tie outs are an on-going problem, are illegal, and there needs to be some type of education. Ms. Emptage pointed out that it is not illegal to sell tie outs, but she hoped to gain some leverage to influence stores to not sell tie outs or at least post information that they are illegal. Mr. Marshall said he had talked to the General Manager of Petco about tie outs and was told they would not change their displays. Ms. Emptage requested an agenda item for next month regarding an ordinance requiring posted signage about tie outs being illegal. Ms. Schwerin referred to welfare case ten as an example of how well the officers document a terrible situation. She asked about the follow up welfare check and Mr. Janes said it was conducted unannounced and the owner was found to be in compliance. Ms. Schwerin asked about how many welfare cases there are and how the ten given to the Committee are selected. Mr. Janes said there were 2,404 enforcement calls last month, but those include waste and noise complaints. Enforcement selects ten cases they feel are representative of what they see in the field.

8. Donations: A total of 1,263 individuals gave $39,086.28 in donations during the month of October.

   Mr. Neuman commented that the donations now are far beyond the few thousands PACC was receiving a few years ago.

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

   There was no discussion on this item.

10. Call to the Audience

    There were three speakers at this call to the audience: Karen Pope, Tiffany Rosler and Terri Goddard.

    Ms. Pope said she has been a foster with In the Arms of Angels for the last year and a half. Her family takes pregnant moms from PACC one at a time. Mother and puppies are all spayed or neutered and vaccinated, and then the animals are adopted out by the rescue organization through a strong application process. They only place dogs as indoor pets. Ms. Pope said she agrees that spay abort is better than having puppies born at PACC, but through a home environment healthy spayed and neutered puppies are able to go to households that could have purchased unaltered, unvaccinated pets

DRAFT

from breeders with hundreds of dogs. She said they are asking for 72 hours noticed to give these dogs a chance. So far her family has helped five mothers and 48 puppies and kittens.

Ms. Rosler said she agreed with Ms. Pope. She didn't feel PACC was a safe environment for puppies, but fosters with one mother per home are safe. Ms. Rosler related that she adopted a puppy from PACC in 2009 and it died a month later of distemper. She said she got into rescue specifically to help pregnant animals so someone like her, who doesn't want to purchase from a breeder or puppy mill, has the option to adopt a rescue puppy.

Ms. Goddard said she was responding to Dr. García saying rescue is down. She said, in her opinion, rescue is down because of the attitude of, and lack of communication from, the Rescue Coordinator. Ms. Goddard said she used to only rescue from PACC, but now rescues from Pinal County, Maricopa County and Wilcox because they communicate and go the extra mile. She added that she believes special needs adoptions are up because of efforts by the volunteers and rescues, not rescue staff.

11. Announcements, Schedules and Proposed Agenda Items

Mr. Janes announced that PACC's holiday dog walk is on, beginning at 8:30 on Thanksgiving Day.

There were a number of proposed agenda items requested throughout the meeting.

12. Next Meeting – December 18, 2014

Due to the crowded attendance at the November meeting and interest expressed in the December meeting, the motion was made and seconded (Emptage/Marshall) that the December meeting be held at the Abrams building. The motion carried (11-0).

13. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:06 pm

DRAFT









Original charts provided by Pima County Health Department, 11/20/2014.

Additional charts prepared by Justin Pope from PCHD data.

PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 2014 OPERATIONAL REPORT

	THIS MONTH			THIS YEAR TO DATE			LAST YEAR TO DATE			YEAR TO YEAR	
	TUCSON	COUNTY	TOTAL	TUCSON	COUNTY	TOTAL	TUCSON	COUNTY	TOTAL	DELTA	%+/-
SHELTER OPERATIONS											
ALL ANIMALS HANDLED											
DOGS	647	544	1,191	3,473	3,134	6,607	3,511	2,879	6,390		
CATS	301	245	546	1,658	1,237	2,895	2,259	1,400	3,659		
OTHERS	17	49	66	151	281	432	141	295	436		
TOTAL ANIMALS HANDLED	965	838	1,803	5,282	4,652	9,934	5,911	4,574	10,485	-551	-5%
Live Animals Handled	850	742	1,592	4,372	3,964	8,336	5,190	4,025	9,215	-879	-10%
IMPOUNDED ANIMALS											
ADOPTED											
DOGS	221	209	430	1,293	1,257	2,550	1,101	888	1,989		
CATS	127	141	268	767	676	1,443	493	409	902		
OTHER	0	3	3	2	11	13	18	12	30		
TOTAL ADOPTED	348	353	701	2,062	1,944	4,006	1,612	1,309	2,921	1085	37%
RETURNED TO OWNER											
DOGS	80	37	117	423	309	732	373	285	658		
CATS	4	0	4	19	29	48	20	28	48		
OTHER	0	2	2	0	7	7	3	11	14		
TOTAL RETURNED	84	39	123	442	345	787	396	324	720	67	9%
RESCUED											
DOGS	114	94	208	467	487	954	559	606	1,165		
CATS	67	42	109	309	244	553	587	390	977		
OTHER	0	8	8	9	31	40	13	27	40		
TOTAL RESCUED	181	144	325	785	762	1,547	1,159	1,023	2,182	-635	-29%
***TOTAL LIVE RELEASES**	613	536	1,149	3,289	3,051	6,340	3,167	2,656	5,823	517	9%
****TOTAL LIVE RELEASE RATE**	80%	80%	80%	82%	83%	82%			73%		
EUTHANIZED											
DOGS	140	143	283	789	699	1,488	951	797	1,748		
CATS	38	21	59	194	133	327	859	488	1,347		
OTHER	5	4	9	41	53	94	23	48	71		
TOTAL EUTHANIZED	183	168	351	1,024	885	1,909	1833	1333	3166	-1257	-40%
(-)Owner Requsted Euthanasia	29	37	66	288	266	554			1035		
Adjusted Total Euthanasia	154	131	285	736	619	1,355			2,131		
***EUTHANASIA RATE	20%	20%	20%	18%	17%	18%			27%		
OTHER	145	116	261	1,195	893	2,088	842	641	1,483	605	41%
ENFORCEMENT OPERATIONS											
Welfare Responses	183	115	298	973	471	1444	1025	477	1502	-58	-4%
ENFORCEMENT CALLS FOR SERVICE	1,341	925	2,266	7,077	4,396	11,473	7,571	4,966	12,537	-1,064	-8%
LICENSING OPERATIONS											
ALTERED	2,740	4,086	6,826	16,435	19,544	35,979	16,981	21,333	38,314		
UNALTERED	141	231	372	963	1,160	2,123	1,191	1,659	2,850		
OTHER	71	81	152	318	443	761	376	498	874		
TOTAL SOLD	2,952	4,398	7,350	17,716	21,147	38,863	18,548	23,490	42,038	-3,175	-8%

*Total Live Releases(TLR)=Total Adopted+Total Returned+Total Rescued
**Live Release Rate=TLR/(TLR+Adjusted Total Euthanasia)
***Euthanasia Rate=(Adjusted Total Euthanasia)/(TLR+Adjusted Total Euthanasia)

PIMA COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT
PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER
4000 N. SILVERBELL RD ● TUCSON, AZ 85745
(520) 243-5900 FAX (520) 243-5960
www.pimaanimalcare.org

MEMORANDUM

TO: **Chair and Members, Pima Animal Care Center Advisory Committee**

FROM: **Kim Janes, Executive Secretary**

DATE: **December 12, 2014**

RE: **December 2014 Manager's Report**

The following report is provided for your information.

During the February 20, 2014 Advisory Committee Meeting, the Committee requested an update on the following welfare cases:

- Case # A14-156877. Staff was asked if the two pets redeemed by the owner were altered upon redemption. The two adult male pit bull mixed breed dogs, Blue and Buddy, were neutered prior to the owner redeeming them.

- Case # A14-152716. Staff was asked the outcome of the two remaining pets. The duck was transferred to a foul rescue who works with 4H to rehome and care for chickens. The female Queensland heeler mix was altered and adopted on October 21, 2014.

- Case #A14-157743. Staff committed to complete a recheck on the pet. The owner has moved as reported. Staff continues to attempt to contact the owner for the new address.

- Case# A14-157854. The Committee advised staff to request at the owner's hearing that the owner be banned from owning any pets for as long as possible. Also, staff was asked to conduct a follow up welfare check on the remaining dog, Goofy. This recheck is pending.

On December 9, 2014, the Animal Defense League of Arizona (ADLA) replied to the notice the County would be removing ADLA's seat from the Committee. The representative requested ADLA retain and be allowed to fill that seat. As you may recall, the last action by the Committee was to remove the seat. Unless otherwise directed by the Committee, staff will advise ADLA of this action and then initiate the ordinance change necessary to make the change effective.

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

C.H. HUCKELBERRY
County Administrator

November 18, 2014

Martha Durkin, Interim City Manager
City of Tucson
P. O. Box 27210
Tucson, Arizona 85726-7210

Re: **Pima County Attorney's Legal Opinion Regarding Pima Animal Care Center Obligations**

Dear Ms. Durkin:

As indicated in my November 4, 2014 letter, the County Attorney's Opinion regarding County obligations related to animal care would be released provided the Board of Supervisors waived the Attorney/Client Privilege. Today, in public session, the Board waived the Attorney/Client Privilege.

Therefore, I am enclosing a copy of the Legal Opinion regarding the County's financial obligations to provide animal care services inside cities, towns and municipalities. As you can see, the County has no obligation. The services we provide are based on the consent of the jurisdiction through an intergovernmental agreement. The policy regarding how the County operates and conducts animal care services is under the purview of the Board of Supervisors and based on recommendations from the Animal Care Advisory Committee.

I know that you have met with Deputy County Administrator Jan Lesher to discuss these matters and how best to obtain city, town and municipal input for conducting animal care services throughout Pima County. We have adopted an appropriate modern animal care service model and will not be altering that model; however, we value your input and suggestions on how these services can be provided to your community.

I encourage you to continue to provide suggestions to Ms. Lesher. We will continue to provide these services if desired by your community, and we look forward to continuing dialog with you.

Sincerely,

C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator

CHH/anc

Attachment

c: Jan Lesher, Deputy County Administrator for Medical and Health Services
Dr. Francisco Garcia, Director, Health Department
Kristen Barney, Internal Operations Manager, Pima Animal Care Center
Kim Janes, External Operations Manager, Pima Animal Care Center

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

C.H. HUCKELBERRY
County Administrator

November 4, 2014

Martha Durkin, Interim City Manager
City of Tucson
P. O. Box 27210
Tucson, Arizona 85726-7210

Re: **Board of Supervisors Communication Regarding Pima Animal Care Center Financing and the Legal Opinion Regarding County Obligations**

Dear Ms. Durkin:

I will be asking the Board of Supervisors to waive Attorney/Client Privilege so the Legal Opinion of the County Attorney can be released to the public. If the Board waives the privilege on November 18, 2014, I will immediately provide you with a copy of the opinion for your information.

In addition, I understand Deputy County Administrator Jan Lesher and Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) staff will meet with you to discuss budget and finance issues as they relates to supporting the PACC facility and program in Pima County. We will be directing our information and correspondence to your attention to avoid potential lapses in communication.

Sincerely,

C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator

CHH/anc

c: Jan Lesher, Deputy County Administrator for Medical and Health Services
Dr. Francisco Garcia, Director, Health Department
Kim Janes, External Operations Manager, Pima Animal Care Center

ATTORNEY/CLIENT PRIVILEGED
MEMORANDUM

Pima County Attorney's Office
Civil Division
32 North Stone Ave, Suite 2100
Phone 520.740.5750 Fax 520.620.6556

This is a privileged attorney-client communication and should not be disclosed to persons other than Pima County officials and employees involved in the matter that is the subject of the communication. The privilege is held by Pima County and can be waived only by an official action of the Board of Supervisors.

To: C.H. Huckelberry, County Administrator

From: Paula J. Perrera, Deputy Pima County Attorney PJP

Date: September 29, 2014

Subject: Termination of City of Tucson Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) for PACC services

Q: What is the correct procedure to terminate the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) between Pima County and the City of Tucson for the provision of animal care services?

A: Paragraph 14 of the IGA states "Either party may terminate this Agreement by giving written notice to the other party by not less than six (6) months prior to the termination date." Accordingly, if the Board of Supervisors decides to terminate the IGA they could then authorize the Chair or a designee to send written notice of termination to the City of Tucson.

Q: Which services is the County required to provide inside the City of Tucson if the IGA is terminated?

A: None. A.R.S. Ch.7 Art. 6 authorizes the County Board of Supervisors to perform many functions including the designation of a county enforcement agent who is responsible for enforcement of the provisions of Art. 6. Among the powers granted to the Board of Supervisors are the ability, but not the obligation, to establish a county pound, contract with cities and towns for enforcement of their ordinances, perform licensing and rabies control functions, as well as the impoundment of stray animals and management of biting animals and aggressive dogs. However, A.R.S. §11-1018 B provides that the provisions of Art. 6 do not apply to counties "which regulate the running at large of dogs in the unincorporated areas of the county by ordinance provided that such ordinance is equal to or more stringent than the provisions of this article." Section 6.04.030 of the Pima County Code regulates the running at large of dogs in unincorporated Pima County and is at least equal to the provisions of Art. 6. Therefore Pima

County is relieved from any of the functions or duties otherwise required by Art. 6. See Op.Atty.Gen. No. I84-078. Further, because Chapter 6.04 of the Pima County Code regarding Animal Control is only applicable to unincorporated Pima County the County doesn't possess independent authority to perform those functions in incorporated areas of the County.

PJP/blp

cc: Christopher Straub, Chief Civil Deputy
Jan Lesher, Deputy County Administrator – Med. & Health

Maricopa County Information Sheet: Animal Care & Control

The attached bill draft separates the requirement to vaccinate against rabies from the requirement to license a dog, lowers the penalty for licensure violations and provides flexibility when determining a quarantine location.

Provisions:

Licensure

- Requires a distinct tag number, rather than a license number and year of expiration, and a county contact telephone number to be provided on county issued dog tags.
- Eliminates the requirement for county enforcement agents to provide written notice of a licensure violation within 15 days.
- Reduces the penalty for non-compliance of the licensure statutes from a class 2 misdemeanor to a petty offense.

Vaccination

- Requires all dogs three months of age or over to be vaccinated against rabies by a veterinarian licensed to practice in a jurisdiction of the United States and makes conforming changes.
- Eliminates the requirement that dogs must be vaccinated against rabies before a license is issued.
- Allows owners and veterinarians to submit vaccination information via an online website maintained by the county and updates information that must be provided.
- Specifies that any person who knowingly fails to vaccinate a dog is guilty of a class 2 misdemeanor.

Quarantine Locations

- Updates the manner and facilities that a county enforcement agent may quarantine a dog or cat that bites a person, regardless of whether or not the animal has been vaccinated, to include the home of the owner or a boarding facility.
- Allows a dog used by a law enforcement agency or a search and rescue dog that bites a person under proper supervision while performing the duties it was trained to do, to be placed in a working quarantine if they have a current rabies vaccination. Requires the county enforcement agent to determine the manner of confinement and quarantine if a bite occurs while a law enforcement dog or a search and rescue dog is not under proper supervision or not performing the duties it was trained for.

Contact Information:

Maricopa County
Government Relations
602.506.2798

Dr. Rodrigo Silva
Assistant County Manager
602.506.8515

12/4/2014

DRAFT

Rough Draft
December 04, 2014 12:46 PM
Folder 414, Drafter LIZ DUNFEE

REFERENCE TITLE: dogs; licensing; vaccination; quarantine

State of Arizona
Senate
Fifty-second Legislature
First Regular Session
2015

S. B. _____

Introduced by _____

AN ACT

AMENDING SECTIONS 11-1008, 11-1010 AND 11-1014, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES; RELATING TO ANIMAL CONTROL.

(TEXT OF BILL BEGINS ON NEXT PAGE)

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona:

Section 1. Section 11-1008, Arizona Revised Statutes, is amended to read:

11-1008. License fees for dogs; issuance of dog tags; exception; violation; classification

A. The board of supervisors of each county may set a license fee that shall be paid for each dog three months of age or over that is kept, harbored or maintained within the boundaries of the state for at least thirty consecutive days of each calendar year. License fees shall become payable at the discretion of the board of supervisors of each county. ~~The licensing period shall not exceed the period of time for revaccination as designated by the state veterinarian.~~ License fees shall be paid within ninety days to the board of supervisors. A penalty fee of two dollars shall be paid if the license application is made less than one year subsequent to the date on which the dog is required to be licensed under this article. If the license application is made one year or later from the date on which the dog is required to be licensed, an additional penalty fee of ten dollars shall be paid for each subsequent year up to a maximum of twenty-two dollars. This penalty shall not be assessed against applicants who provide adequate proof that the dog to be licensed has been in their possession in ~~Arizona~~ THIS STATE FOR less than thirty consecutive days.

B. If the board of supervisors adopts a license fee, the board shall provide durable dog tags. Each dog licensed under the terms of this article shall receive, at the time of licensing, ~~such~~ a tag on which shall be inscribed the name of the county, ~~the number of the license and the year in which it expires~~ A DISTINCT TAG NUMBER ASSIGNED TO THE DOG, A COUNTY CONTACT TELEPHONE NUMBER AND ANY OTHER INFORMATION REQUIRED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. The tag shall be attached to a collar or harness that shall be worn by the dog at all times, except as otherwise provided in this article. Whenever a dog tag is lost, a ~~duplicate~~ REPLACEMENT tag shall be issued on application by the owner and payment of a fee established by the board of supervisors.

C. The board of supervisors may set license fees that are lower for dogs permanently incapable of procreation. An applicant for a license for a dog claimed to be incapable of procreation shall provide adequate proof satisfactory to the COUNTY enforcement agent that ~~such~~ THE dog has been surgically altered to be permanently incapable of procreation.

D. All fees and penalties shall be deposited in the rabies control fund pursuant to section 11-1011.

E. Any person who knowingly fails ~~within fifteen days after written notification from the county enforcement agent~~ to obtain a license for a dog required to be licensed, counterfeits an official dog tag, removes ~~such~~ A tag from any dog for the purpose of intentional and malicious mischief or places a dog tag ~~upon~~ ON a dog unless the tag was issued for that particular dog is guilty of a ~~class 2 misdemeanor~~ PETTY OFFENSE.

F. Notwithstanding subsection A of this section, the board of supervisors of each county may not charge an individual who has a disability and who uses a service animal as defined in section 11-1024 or an individual who uses a search ~~or~~ AND rescue dog a license fee for that dog. An applicant for a license for a:

1. Search ~~or~~ AND rescue dog shall provide adequate proof satisfactory to the COUNTY enforcement agent that the dog is a search ~~or~~ AND rescue dog.

2. Service animal shall sign a written statement that the dog is a service animal as defined in section 11-1024. A person who makes a false statement pursuant to this paragraph is guilty of a petty offense~~,~~ and IS SUBJECT TO a fine that ~~shall~~ DOES not exceed fifty dollars. The statement to be signed shall be substantially in the following form:

> By signing this document, I declare that the dog to be licensed is a service animal as defined in section 11-1024, Arizona Revised Statutes, and I understand that a person who makes a false statement pursuant to section 11-1008, Arizona Revised Statutes, is guilty of a petty offense~~,~~ and is subject to a fine that does not exceed fifty dollars.

Sec. 2. Section 11-1010, Arizona Revised Statutes, is amended to read:

11-1010. Anti-rabies vaccination; violation; classification

A. ALL DOGS THREE MONTHS OF AGE OR OVER SHALL BE VACCINATED AGAINST RABIES BY A VETERINARIAN WHO IS LICENSED TO PRACTICE IN A JURISDICTION OF THE UNITED STATES. ~~Before a license is issued for any dog,~~ The owner or a veterinarian must present a paper or electronic copy or ~~telefacsimile~~ FAX of the vaccination certificate signed by a veterinarian OR SUBMIT INFORMATION ONLINE THROUGH A WEBSITE MAINTAINED BY THE COUNTY stating the owner's name, TELEPHONE NUMBER and address, ~~and giving~~ the dog's description, THE date of vaccination, THE manufacturer and serial number of the vaccine used, THE NAME AND CONTACT INFORMATION OF THE VETERINARIAN WHO ADMINISTERED THE VACCINATION and THE date revaccination is due. A duplicate of each rabies vaccination certificate issued shall be transmitted to the county enforcement agent within two weeks of the date the dog was vaccinated. ~~No dog shall be licensed unless it is vaccinated in accordance with the provisions of this article and the regulations promulgated pursuant to this article.~~

~~B. A dog vaccinated in any other state prior to entry into Arizona may be licensed in Arizona provided that, at the time of licensing, the owner of the dog presents a vaccination certificate, signed by a veterinarian licensed to practice in that state or a veterinarian employed by a governmental agency in that state, stating the owner's name and address, and giving the dog's description, date of vaccination and type, manufacturer and serial number of the vaccine used. The vaccination must be in conformity with the provisions of this article and the regulations promulgated pursuant to this article.~~

~~C.~~ B. The county enforcement agent shall make provisions for vaccination clinics as deemed necessary. The vaccination shall be performed ~~by a veterinarian~~ PURSUANT TO TITLE 32, CHAPTER 21, ARTICLE 3.

C. ANY PERSON WHO KNOWINGLY FAILS TO VACCINATE A DOG IS GUILTY OF A CLASS 2 MISDEMEANOR.

Sec. 3. Section 11-1014, Arizona Revised Statutes, is amended to read:

11-1014. Biting animals; reporting; handling and destruction; exception

A. ~~An unvaccinated~~ A dog or cat that bites any person shall be confined and quarantined in a MANNER AND FACILITY PRESCRIBED BY THE COUNTY ENFORCEMENT AGENT. THE COUNTY ENFORCEMENT AGENT MAY REQUIRE THE ANIMAL TO BE CONFINED AT THE HOME OF THE OWNER, county pound or, on request of and at the expense of the owner, at a veterinary hospital OR IN A BOARDING FACILITY for a period of ~~not less than~~ AT LEAST ten days. The quarantine period shall start on the day of the bite incident. If the day of the bite is not known, the quarantine period shall start on the first day of impoundment. ~~A dog properly vaccinated pursuant to this article that bites any person may be confined and quarantined at the home of the owner or wherever the dog is harbored and maintained with the consent of and in a manner prescribed by the county enforcement agent.~~

B. A dog or cat that is impounded as the result of biting any person shall not be released from the pound to its owner unless one of the following applies:

1. The dog has a current dog license pursuant to section 11-1008 at the time the dog entered the pound.

2. The dog or cat has been previously spayed or neutered before impound or has been spayed or neutered and implanted with a microchip before release from the pound.

3. There is no veterinary facility capable of performing surgical sterilization within a twenty mile radius of the pound.

4. A veterinarian determines that a medical contraindication for surgery exists that reasonably requires postponement of the surgery until the surgery can be performed in a safe and humane manner.

5. The bite occurred in the premises of the owner and the victim is a member of the same household.

6. The owner pays a fifty dollar recovery fee, in addition to any fees or costs otherwise required pursuant to this article.

C. Any domestic animal, other than a dog, a cat or a caged or pet rodent or rabbit, that bites any person shall be confined and quarantined in a county pound or, on the request and at the expense of the owner, at a veterinary hospital for a period of ~~not less than~~ AT LEAST fourteen days. Livestock shall be confined and quarantined for the fourteen-day period in a manner regulated by the Arizona department of agriculture. Caged or pet rodents or rabbits shall not be quarantined or laboratory tested.

D. With the exception of a wild rodent or rabbit, any wild animal that bites any person or directly exposes any person to its saliva may be killed and submitted to the county enforcement agent or the agent's deputies for transport to an appropriate diagnostic laboratory. A wild rodent or rabbit

may be submitted for laboratory testing if the animal has bitten a person and either the animal's health or behavior indicates that the animal may have rabies or the bite occurred in an area that contains a rabies epizootic, as determined by the department of health services.

E. If an animal bites any person, the incident shall be reported to the county enforcement agent immediately by any person having direct knowledge.

F. The county enforcement agent may destroy any animal confined and quarantined pursuant to this section before the termination of the minimum confinement period for laboratory examination for rabies if:

1. The animal shows clear clinical signs of rabies.

2. The animal's owner consents to its destruction.

G. Any animal subject to licensing under this article found without a tag identifying its owner shall be deemed unowned.

H. The county enforcement agent shall destroy a vicious animal by order of a justice of the peace or a city magistrate. A justice of the peace or city magistrate may issue an order to destroy a vicious animal after notice to the owner, if any, and the person who was bitten, and a hearing. The justice of the peace or city magistrate may impose additional procedures and processes to protect all parties in the interest of justice, and any decision by the justice of the peace or magistrate may be appealed to the superior court.

I. The owner of a vicious animal shall be responsible for any fees incurred by the COUNTY enforcement agent for the impounding, sheltering and disposing of the vicious animal.

J. ~~This section does not apply to~~ A dog that is used by any federal, state, county, city or town law enforcement agency OR A SEARCH AND RESCUE DOG WHOSE OWNER HAS PROVIDED ADEQUATE PROOF TO THE COUNTY ENFORCEMENT AGENT THAT THE DOG IS A SEARCH AND RESCUE DOG PURSUANT TO SECTION 11-1008, SUBSECTION F and that bites any person ~~if the bite occurs~~ while the dog is under proper law enforcement OR SEARCH AND RESCUE supervision and the care of a licensed veterinarian~~, except that~~ SHALL BE PLACED UNDER A WORKING QUARANTINE IF THE DOG HAS A CURRENT ANTI-RABIES VACCINATION PURSUANT TO SECTION 11-1010. The law enforcement agency OR SEARCH AND RESCUE ORGANIZATION shall notify the county enforcement agent if the dog exhibits any abnormal behavior, ~~and~~ make the dog available for examination at any reasonable time AND IMMEDIATELY CONFINE AND QUARANTINE THE DOG UNTIL A HEALTH ASSESSMENT IS MADE BY A LICENSED VETERINARIAN. IF THE BITE OCCURRED WHILE THE DOG WAS NOT UNDER PROPER LAW ENFORCEMENT OR SEARCH AND RESCUE SUPERVISION OR WHILE THE DOG WAS NOT PERFORMING THE DUTIES IT WAS TRAINED FOR, THE LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY OR SEARCH AND RESCUE ORGANIZATION SHALL NOTIFY THE COUNTY ENFORCEMENT AGENT, AND THE COUNTY ENFORCEMENT AGENT SHALL DETERMINE THE MANNER OF CONFINEMENT AND QUARANTINE FOR THE DOG.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE

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

C.H. HUCKELBERRY
County Administrator

October 23, 2014

Jack Neuman, Chairman
Pima County Animal Care Advisory Committee
4000 N. Silverbell Road
Tucson, Arizona 85745

Re: **Your September 26, 2014 Letter Regarding Four Additional Field Officers to be Included in the Fiscal Year 2015/16 Budget**

Dear Mr. Neuman:

I appreciate the request and the justification provided by the Animal Care Advisory Committee (ACAC) for additional field officers. I value the opinion and recommendations of the ACAC.

As you know, over the last several years, the County has made significant investments to alter the outcomes of animals that enter the Pima Animal Care Center. Unfortunately, these programs have recently come under criticism by our jurisdictional partners due to increased costs. It is my opinion, and continues to be my recommendation to the Board of Supervisors, that all of these costs are fully justified and are necessary to support our transition from a euthanasia shelter to one that promotes adoption. The County will not retreat from this operational model; however, the concerns raised by municipalities regarding costs do require that we take your request to the various jurisdictions to determine if they are willing to pay their fair and appropriate share of the cost to provide four additional field officers.

We clearly understand the statistics in this matter and understand the municipalities will be the primary beneficiary of additional field officers, but they will also have to pay a proportional share of the cost. Hopefully, their response will be a positive one. However, given the concerns they have raised regarding operating a more humane shelter, I cannot be assured of such an outcome.

I greatly appreciate the efforts of the ACAC. Your guidance has been instrumental in our transition of care for the homeless animals within this community.

Sincerely,

C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator

CHH/anc

Enclosure

c: The Honorable Chair and Members, Pima County Board of Supervisors
Jan Lesher, Deputy County Administrator for Medical and Health Services
Dr. Francisco Garcia, Director, Health Department
Kim Janes, Manager, Pima Animal Care Center
Jose Ocaño, Shelter Manager, Pima Animal Care Center

PIMA COUNTY ANIMAL CARE CENTER ADVISORY COMMITTEE
4000 N. SILVERBELL RD TUCSON, AZ 85745
(520) 243-5909 FAX (520) 243-5954
www.pimaanimalcare.org

September 26, 2014

The Honorable Chair and Members
Pima County Board of Supervisors
130 W. Congress, Eleventh Floor
Tucson, Arizona 85701

Dear Chair and Members:

The Pima County Animal Care Advisory Committee strongly urges the Board of Health and Board of Supervisors to support the Pima Animal Care Center's request for four additional Field Officers.

As you know, from the Six City & County review, our organization is severely understaffed and over-utilized. Our Field Officers cover the second largest physical area of the six communities reviewed at 9200 Square Miles. The largest in size is Maricopa County at 9224 square miles. Pima County only has 25 field officers to serve this large area, compared to the 30 Field Officers in Maricopa County. The Pima County Field Officers responded to 29,079 calls with the 25 Field Officers, while the Maricopa County 30 Field Officers respond to only 21,368 calls.

Our Officers respond to all calls ranging from nuisance calls, animal waste calls, strays, wildlife issues, welfare and neglect issues and animal bites. The other respondents answer a variety of calls but delegate many of these calls to other agencies.

There are several examples of the disparity in responsibilities and manpower of the Pima County Field officers compared to those of the other locations in the study. First, Maricopa & Clark Counties refer wildlife issues to their State's Game and Fish departments, while San Antonio refers these calls to Texas Wildlife and Fish. Pima County Field Officers answer wild animal calls. Further, Welfare and Neglect cases are referred to Law Enforcement in Maricopa County, and their Field Officers are only called if animals need to be transported to the Humane Society for sheltering. Pima County Field Officers handle the welfare and neglect calls, only calling law enforcement when back up is needed. Finally, Animal Waste issues are handled by zoning departments in Maricopa County as well as in San Antonio and Austin, Texas. These issues are also handled by our understaffed field officers in Pima County.

At this time the citizens of Pima county are considering a 22 million dollar Bond to rebuild the Pima Animal Care Center. Unfortunately many people in the county do not understand how hard the staff at PACC work. Unless they come to the Center, they do not see the hard working staff who are trying to save and rehabilitate

as many animals as possible, to then adopt them into good homes. The most publicly visible representatives of Pima County's efforts on the behalf of pets are the Field Officers on the street. These officers often times come to community events to educate the public on the services that PACC provides for the county, in addition to all the other service calls they make. But with only 25 Officers available, dispatch must tell many callers that they will have to wait, or that the officer cannot attend the issue at this time, but will come as soon as possible. Our Field Officers would be able to better serve the community, and demonstrate to the public the progress that Pima County has made with regard to animal welfare, if there were more of them. As it is now, our Officers are spread too thin and stretched to the breaking point. They need help and we urge you to approve the funds for the four extra officers we need.

Sincerely,



Jack Neuman
Chairman
Pima County Animal Care Advisory Committee

cc: President and Members, Pima County Board of Health
C.H. Huckelberry, Pima County Administrator
Jan Lesher, Deputy Pima County Administrator, Medical and Health Services
Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Director, Pima County Health Department

PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JUNE 2014 OPERATIONAL REPORT

	THIS MONTH			THIS YEAR TO DATE			LAST YEAR TO DATE			YEAR TO YEAR	
	TUCSON	COUNTY	TOTAL	TUCSON	COUNTY	TOTAL	TUCSON	COUNTY	TOTAL	DELTA	%+/-
SHELTER OPERATIONS											
ALL ANIMALS HANDLED											
DOGS	736	589	1,325	8,220	7,314	15,534	8,586	7,816	16,402		
CATS	457	277	734	4,923	3,128	8,051	5,963	3,456	9,419		
OTHERS	43	32	75	308	439	747	243	529	772		
TOTAL ANIMALS HANDLED	1,236	898	2,134	13,451	10,881	24,332	14,792	11,801	26,593	-2261	-9%
Live Animals Handled	1,128	837	1,965	11,998	9,813	21,811	13,160	10,484	23,644	-1833	-8%
IMPOUNDED ANIMALS											
ADOPTED											
DOGS	292	277	569	2,883	2,582	5,465	2,387	2,271	4,658		
CATS	202	92	294	1,243	905	2,148	872	617	1,489		
OTHER	9	0	9	43	14	57	30	3	33		
TOTAL ADOPTED	503	369	872	4,169	3,501	7,670	3,289	2,891	6,180	1490	24%
RETURNED TO OWNER											
DOGS	75	46	121	880	665	1,545	960	847	1,807		
CATS	6	2	8	73	61	134	93	69	162		
OTHER	0	0	0	7	13	20	4	9	13		
TOTAL RETURNED	81	48	129	960	739	1,699	1,057	925	1,982	-283	-14%
RESCUED											
DOGS	67	54	121	1,171	1,360	2,531	1,338	1,165	2,503		
CATS	65	40	105	1,072	665	1,737	1,110	577	1,687		
OTHER	1	3	4	67	48	115	9	43	52		
TOTAL RESCUED	133	97	230	2,310	2,073	4,383	2,457	1,785	4,242	141	3%
***TOTAL LIVE RELEASES**	717	514	1,231	7,439	6,313	13,752	6,803	5,601	12,404	1348	11%
****TOTAL LIVE RELEASE RATE**			80%			76%			64%		
EUTHANIZED											
DOGS	137	119	256	1,915	1,724	3,639	2,783	2,503	5,286		
CATS	106	71	177	1,532	1,009	2,541	2,909	1,774	4,683		
OTHER	3	7	10	37	78	115	54	84	138		
TOTAL EUTHANIZED	246	197	443	3,484	2,811	6,295	5,746	4,361	10,107	-3812	-38%
(-)Owner Requsted Euthanasia			142			2,047			3,084		
Adjusted Total Euthanasia			301			4,248			7,023		
***EUTHANASIA RATE			20%			24%			36%		
OTHER	384	275	659	1,720	1,260	2,980	1,840	1,488	3,328	-348	-10%
ENFORCEMENT OPERATIONS											
Welfare Responses	268	114	382	2552	1170	3722	3173	1514	4687	-965	-21%
ENFORCEMENT CALLS FOR SERVICE	1,410	844	2,254	17,853	11,075	28,928	19,438	12,300	31,738	-2,810	-9%
LICENSING OPERATIONS											
ALTERED	3,856	4,296	8,152	43,226	54,787	98,013	44,072	57,294	101,366		
UNALTERED	264	305	569	2,947	3,882	6,829	3,387	4,496	7,883		
OTHER	89	93	182	860	1,169	2,029	1,099	1,333	2,432		
TOTAL SOLD	4,209	4,694	8,903	47,033	59,838	106,871	48,558	63,123	111,681	-4,810	-4%

*Total Live Releases(TLR)=Total Adopted+Total Returned+Total Rescued
**Live Release Rate=TLR/(TLR+Adjusted Total Euthanasia)
***Euthanasia Rate=(Adjusted Total Euthanasia)/(TLR+Adjusted Total Euthanasia)

December 17, 2014

Terri Goddard
Tucson Cold Wet Noses

Dear Ms. Goddard,

Maricopa County Animal Care and Control (MCACC) is in the process of reassessing our policy/practice of terminating the pregnancy and spaying of all pregnant animals. Through the efforts of our partners, we identified that the termination of late term pregnancies are those that members of our partner organizations and the public find most troubling. In an effort to meet the expectations of our customers, we have suspended our policy/practice.

Through some trial and error, we have found a temporary practice that is working for all involved at this point in time. I'll share what we are doing now in hopes that you'll find it helpful.

- Suspected pregnancy is noted in the animal's record and requested verified by MCACC Veterinarians at the earliest possible time
    - Vet Check entered
    - Vet examines the dog
    - Vet can visibly confirm (or not) if the animal is pregnant
    - Vet memo's the results of his/her exam
- If unable to confirm pregnancy through exam, then proceed as normal based upon overall health and behavioral assessment of the animal
    - If animal is being spayed and found pregnant after surgery begins; surgery will proceed
- If pregnancy is confirmed, then proceed with pleas to New Hope Partners
    - Alternative Placement sends out three email pleas, three days in a row
        - Ideally, a group will take the pregnant animal
        - If there is no response to our pleas to New Hope the animal, then we will proceed with the best outcome we can make for each animal with the approval of our Director

We have found that by working with our New Hope Partners and accommodating the requests to not terminate pregnancies has led to all of us working together better and everyone being cognizant of the enormity of the dilemma of so many pregnant animals.

Thank you very much for your work with MCACC to save more lives!

Samantha Spinelle
Alternative Placement Supervisor
Maricopa County Animal Care & Control
2500 South 27th Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85009
Office: 602-506-8995
Cell: 602-526-0320
FAX: 602-506-2739
sspinelle@mail.maricopa.gov
pets.maricopa.gov

ATTACHMENT A



Pima Animal Care Center Animal Intakes, Adoptions & Rescue Partnerships

- Rescue Pulls from PACC
- PACC Special Needs Adoptions
- PACC Adoptions Total

PACC has increased overall adoptions by 57% and special needs adoptions by 109%

*Note: data is based on an analysis between November 1, 2013 through October 31, 2014 for purposes of this graphic and special study – not Pima County Fiscal Year

Pima Animal Care Center Rescue Group Partnerships



Pima Animal Care Center
Partnership Agreement

Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) serves a community of nearly 1 million residents and is committed to saving as many lives as possible. PACC has made significant progress toward this goal, as exemplified by PACC's live release rate which has doubled, rising from 38% in 2008 to 76% in 2014. This progress is due to the passion and dedication of PACC staff, rescue partners, volunteers, and committed citizens. PACC is responsible for the health and safety of the residents of Pima County as well as the health and safety of the pets within our care. The work PACC and its partners do is important and it is emotional. Difficult decisions are made each day at PACC, and will need to be made as we continue to improve. Mutually respectful partnerships will be the key to providing the best possible outcomes for all of the people and pets in our community.

PACC staff and rescue partners agree:

- To respect, support and promote the activities of the other PACC partners and the programs of PACC
- To make no inflammatory public statements about PACC, staff and programs, volunteers and PACC rescue partners
- To engage in respectful interaction and dialogue both in person and through electronic communication
- To bring complaints or disputes to the attention of _____
- To allow representatives of PACC access to adoption and spay/neuter records when requested
- To allow representatives of PACC access to facilities housing animals, including unannounced visits
- To comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws governing nonprofit organizations including but not limited to those governing maintenance of its status as a 501©(3) organization, partisan political activity, lobbying, charitable solicitations and fundraising
- To comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and ordinances governing animal welfare
- PACC and stakeholders will continue to support and promote each other even in the instance that there is an irresolvable disagreement on policy or practice. The overarching goals of the organizations and the promotion of animal welfare take precedence over individual opinions or decisions and should not be compromised in the event of disagreements.

Either party reserves the right to dissolve any partnership if, in its sole discretion, it determines that the partner is not fulfilling the obligations as set forth in this agreement, or is otherwise engaged in conduct detrimental to the accomplishment of PACC's mission.

Pima Animal Care Center Advisory Committee
Request for Documentation and Protocol Change in regards to PACC Rescue Partners
Prepared for PACCAC Meeting 12.18.2014

PACC Rescue Protocol Change:

- Implementation of auto-generated lists populated with available animals by breed, age and type specifications.
- Changed the methodology of notifications for short-term rescues, sending out the list at a consistent time to help PACC rescue partners facilitate, network and find foster homes…
- Increased communication among PACC staff and leadership to advise methodology to increase communication with rescue partners.

Documentation

- The PACCAC rescue documentation request has been fulfilled through analysis of a multi-year collaboration with rescue partners and current PACC statistics, including annual animal intakes, special needs adoptions and rescue collaborators.

Next Steps:

- We are creating a singular email address for rescue and foster, respectively, to ensure that all communication from our rescue and foster partners goes to a singular email address and can be accessed by staff on duty. This will help expedite rescue and foster placements and minimize lapse in communication.
- PACC leadership has drafted a partnership agreement that will help keep all stakeholders focused on mutual goals and objectives.
- PACC leadership has drafted an alteration policy for pets leaving PACC either to potential adopters or rescue groups.

-

Pima County Health Department

PROGRAM POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Subject:	Pre-Alter	PPP NO. PACC-AD-00X
Approved by Chief of Operations:		Approval Date:

A. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

This Operating Policy and Procedure (OPP) establishes Pima Animal Care Center's (PACC) guidelines to increase adoptions by ensuring pets leave the premises altered and on the same day as adoption.

B. DEFINITIONS

1. **Evaluation Team:** Animal Care Technicians specially trained and assigned to assess pets prior to placement.

2. **Hold Time:** The period of time mandated to hold onto a stray pet prior to making available for adoption.

3. **Pre-Alter:** is defined as performing a spay or neuter procedure on a pet prior to that pet being made available.

4. **Shelter Team:** Supervisors and Animal Care Technicians assigned to work in the shelter.

5. **Spay/Neuter Team:** Animal Care Technicians assigned to work in the spay/neuter clinic.

C. POLICY

PACC will pre-alter pets to make the adoption process easier and more efficient for adopters.

All pets will be altered prior to final placement to adopter or rescue partner unless determined to be ineligible for surgery by a Pima Animal Care Center Veterinarian.

All pets two (2) months of age or later and/or a healthy body weight as determined by the veterinarian will be altered prior to final placement to adopter or rescue partner. PACC's goal is to perform fifty (50) surgeries per day.

D. PROCEDURE

1. Pet Evaluation:

    a. After pets have completed their hold time and become property of Pima County, the Evaluation Team will:

DRAFT

i. Select and prioritize the pet for pre-alter;

ii. Fill out a surgery card and staple it to the kennel; and

iii. Add the pet's animal ID number, name and Kennel number to the pre-alter list.

2. Spay/Neuter:

a. The Spay/Neuter Team will:

i. Use the Pre-alter list to identify and retrieve pets and bring them to the clinic for surgery;

ii. Evaluate/examine pets for surgery.

(1) Pets that are found not suitable for surgery, as determined by PACC Veterinarian, will be placed on the secondary evaluation list with veterinarian's note as to why the pet is not suitable for surgery and returned to the shelter.

iii. Email the Shelter supervisors/lead staff with the number of post-surgery kennels needed;

iv. Alter pets and provide recovery care in the clinic;

v. Return altered pets to the designated kennels in the shelter; and

vi. Prepare and hang up new kennel cards with the updated kennel number and reproductive status.

3. Shelter:

a. The Shelter Team will:

i. Reply to the Spay/Neuter's email with the reserved kennel numbers;

ii. Prepare post-surgery kennels; and

iii. Place "Pre-Alter" signs holding the kennels for those pets.

DRAFT

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

MEMORANDUM

TO: **Kim Janes, Chief of External Affairs**

FROM: **Jose Chavez, Enforcement Operations Manager**

DATE: **12-4-14**

SUBJECT: **Welfare report for November 2014**

---

1. A14-160091 No animal was impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. This complaint is closed.

2. A14-159954 One animal was impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at PACC. The animal was redeemed. This complaint is closed.

3. A14-159157 One sick animal was turned in to PACC for euthanasia by the owner. A Field Supervisor reviewed the circumstances and initiated an animal neglect case. An Officer met with the owner at their residence reviewed the animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited. The animal was euthanized. This case is closed.

4. A14-159999 One animal was impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at PACC. The owner did not redeem the dog, the dog was placed for adoption and was adopted. This complaint is closed.

5. A14-159416 One animal was impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at PACC. The animal was redeemed. This complaint is closed.

6. A14-160168 No animals were impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. This complaint is closed.

7. A14-159856 79 animals were impounded all were relinquished to PACC with the exception of 7 that were placed on bond. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. The bond was not posted for the 7 animals and were automatically forfeited to PACC. 63 animals were adopted and the remaining animals are pending an outcome. This complaint is closed.

8. A14-157606 No animals were impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner. No neglect violations were found closed complaint unfounded.

9. A14-160704 No animals were impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner. No neglect violations were found closed complaint unfounded.

10. A14-160679 No animals were impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner. No neglect violations were found closed compliant unfounded.

WC 1

INVESTIGATION REPORT

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

SUSPECT				ACO X. Delgadillo #2047	COMPLAINT NUMBER A14-160091
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS				BITE ☐ WELFARE ☒ DANGEROUS ☐ OTHER ☒	
ZIP 85706	CITY Tucson	STATE AZ	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER	CODE IF OTHER :4-3(2) E(2), 4-81, 4-76	
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS				CI ☐ CO ☒ OTHER ☐	
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER	DRIVERS LICENSE	

SEX	WEIGHT	HEIGHT	EYES	HAIR COLOR	ORIGIN	DOB	SSN
F	240	5'6"	Br	Br			

DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES ☒ NO ☐	LOCATION OF INCIDENT	DATE AND TIME REPORTED 11/14/14 / 14:16	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 11/14/14 / 14:41

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

☐ I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case	VICTIM/COMPLAINTANT NAME Officer X. Delgadillo	D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	BUSINESS PHONE NO. 520-243-5900*3
☐ I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.	VICTIM'S ADDRESS 4000 N. Silverbell RD	ZIP 85745	CITY Tucson	STATE AZ
☐ REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B0 and § 8-286 (B)	VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS	ZIP	CITY	STATE

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)	DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES ☐ NO ☒	RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES ☐ NO ☒	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # ☐ SO ☐ TPD ☐ TFD ☐ OTHER:	FOLLOW UP REQUEST ☐ SO ☐ TPD ☐ OTHER:

☐ ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM	☐ VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY:	TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED	PACC ☐ VET ☐ HOME ☐
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM	☐ NON-VIOLATION	PART OF BODY BITTEN:			RELEASE DATE:	
PHONE NUMBER	VET CLINIC		PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES ☐ NO ☐		FTQ ☐ UTQ ☐
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS	CLINIC'S ADDRESS		QUARANTINE 10 ☐ 15 ☐ 45 ☐ 180 ☐		☐ FRA HEAD#	
	3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES ☐ NO ☒	CITING ACO X. Delgadillo #2047	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES ☐ NO ☐	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS	
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE	CODE/ORD VIOLATED :4-3(2) E(2), 4-81, 4-76,				REVIEWED BY 2002 KOMST 11/14	
	CITATIONS/NUMBERS 73571				BOND YES ☐ NO ☐	

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
Bull Terrier Mix	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐	Jasper	Black/White	M						501722
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									

WITNESS 1	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 2	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 3	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 4	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #

NC 1

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-160091

ACO name & Badge:X. Delgadillo

I,Officer Delgadillo, responded to reference a dog on a tie-out. When I approached the residence I observed a small white and black terrier mix tied to a chair. The chair was turned upside down and the dog was tied to the chair with a lead leash approximately 5 feet long. The dog did not have any shelter or water present and there was animal waste in the area the dog had to move around in.

I knocked on the door and I spoke with She stated that the dog belongs to her grandson (juvenile) and that his mother was the owner of the dog. I asked if she was present and she stated that she was not. I asked her if resided at the residence or was house sitting. She stated that was the owner of the residence. I then advised her that the dog on a tie-out is illegal and she responded that the dog is usually left outside for an hour or two. I advised her that the dog on a tie-out was illegal. I asked her if the dog was licensed and had rabies and stated that she believed so but did not have any documents.

Ms. was cited into Tucson City Court for neglect, tie-out; no rabies vaccine and no license. Ms. Selis was advised of the 15 day limit as well. Ms. Selis signed and received a copy of her citations; also was provided her court date and time.

Officer's Signature: **Date:** 11/15/14

WC 2

INVESTIGATION REPORT

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

SUSPECT					ACO NAME / BADGE # Robert Tovar 2021 M Eckelbarger 1942	COMPLAINT NUMBER A14-159954	
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS					BITE ☐ WELFARE ☒ DANGEROUS ☐ OTHER ☐		
ZIP 85713	CITY Tucson	STATE AZ	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER		CODE IF OTHER :		
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS N/A					CI ☒ CO ☐ OTHER ☐		
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER		DRIVERS LICENSE /		
SEX	WEIGHT 165	HEIGHT 5'06"	EYES Grn	HAIR COLOR Br	ORIGIN	DOB	SSN

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

LOCATION OF INCIDENT

DATE AND TIME REPORTED 11/12/14 / 1614

DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 11/14/14 / 0900

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

☐ I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case

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

☐ REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B0 and § 8-286 (B)

VICTIM/COMPLAINTANT NAME Mike Eckelbarger	D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	BUSINESS PHONE NO. 520-724-5900		
VICTIM'S ADDRESS		ZIP	CITY	STATE	
VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS 4000 N Silverbell		ZIP 85745	CITY Tucson	STATE AZ	

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)

DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES ☐ NO ☐	RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES ☐ NO ☐	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # ☐ SO ☐ TPD ☐ TFD ☐ OTHER:	FOLLOW UP REQUEST ☐ SO ☐ TPD ☐ OTHER:

☐ ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

PHONE NUMBER

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

☐ VIOLATION ☐ NON-VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY: PART OF BODY BITTEN:	TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED / RELEASE DATE:	PACC ☐ VET ☐ HOME ☐
VET CLINIC		PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES ☐ NO ☐		FTQ ☐ UTQ ☐
CLINIC'S ADDRESS		QUARANTINE 10 ☐ 15 ☐ 45 ☐ 180 ☐	☐ FRA HEAD#		
3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES ☐ NO ☒	CITING ACO Robert Tovar #2021	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES ☐ NO ☒	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS	
CODE/ORD VIOLATED 4-3(2)(E)(2)				REVIEWED BY	
CITATIONS/NUMBERS 73626				BOND YES ☐ NO ☐	

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
Bruss Griffon mix	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Fluffy	Wh	M	A				N	A501641
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									

WITNESS 1	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE # / BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 2	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE # / BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 3	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE # / BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 4	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE # / BUSINESS PHONE #

WC 2

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-159954

ACO name & Badge: Robert Tovar #2021

On November 14, 2014 at 0900 hours. Investigator Eckelbarger (1942) responded to . He reported that he did not receive an answer at the door. Investigator Eckelbarger said that he observed a small white dog on a tie-out approximately 15 feet long, with one end connected to the dog's collar and the other attached to the front steps. He stated that the dog had food, water, and shade. Investigator Eckelbarger said that he impounded the dog and posted a notice of impoundment on front door. He reported that he took photographs of the property and the dog on a tie-out.

On November 14, 2014 at 15:41 hours I, Officer Tovar #2021, spoke with Ms. when she came in to the Pima Animal Care Center to redeem her dog Fluffy. She explained that the dog was given to them a week ago and initially they kept the dog inside the house, however, they put him outside as their youngest son was afraid of the dog. She said that she tied the dog to the stairwell as they do not have a fence around the yard. Ms. said that her husband is going to buy the supplies to put up fence this weekend. She added that they are going to have Fluffy neutered and will pick him up on Monday. I cited Ms. for Neglect-Tie Out on behalf of Investigator Eckelbarger #1942. Ms. signed and received her copy of said citation. I also gave her a copy of the Tucson and Pima County Animal Laws.

Officer's Signature: Robert Tovar #2021 **Date:** 11-15-14

WC 3

INVESTIGATION REPORT

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

SUSPECT						ACO NAME / BADGE # C. Meek 2015	COMPLAINT NUMBER A14-159157
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS						BITE ☐ WELFARE ☐ DANGEROUS ☐ OTHER ☒	
ZIP 85742	CITY AZ	STATE TUC	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER			CODE IF OTHER: Vet Care	
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS						CI ☐ CO ☒ OTHER ☐	
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER			DRIVERS LICENSE	
SEX	WEIGHT 140	HEIGHT 5'05	EYES HAZ	HAIR COLOR BR	ORIGIN	DOB	SSN

DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES ☐ NO ☒	LOCATION OF INCIDENT 4000 N. Silverbell Rd	DATE AND TIME REPORTED 11/01/14 / 1106	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 11/01/14 / 1106

FOOD ☐ WATER ☐ SHELTER ☐ INJURED/ILL ☐ VENTILATION ☐ ABANDONED ☐ TIEOUT ☐ BEATEN ☐ WASTE ☐ OTHER (EXPLAIN) ☒ vet care

☐ I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case	VICTIM/COMPLAINTANT NAME Officer C. Meek		RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	BUSINESS PHONE NO. 520-243-5900	
☐ I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.	VICTIM'S ADDRESS		ZIP	CITY	STATE
☐ REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B0 and § 8-286 (B)	VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS 4000 N. Silverbell Rd		ZIP 85745	CITY TUC	STATE AZ
NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)	DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES ☐ NO ☒	RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES ☐ NO ☒	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # ☐ SO ☐ TPD ☐ TFD ☐ OTHER:	FOLLOW UP REQUEST ☐ SO ☐ TPD ☐ OTHER:

☐ ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM	☐ VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY:	TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED	PACC ☐ VET ☐ HOME ☐
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM	☐ NON-VIOLATION	PART OF BODY BITTEN:			RELEASE DATE:	
PHONE NUMBER	VET CLINIC		PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES ☐ NO ☐		FTQ ☐ UTQ ☐
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS	CLINIC'S ADDRESS		QUARANTINE 10 ☐ 15 ☐ 45 ☐ 180 ☐		☐ FRA HEAD#	
	3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES ☐ NO ☒	CITING ACO C. Meek 2015	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES ☐ NO ☒	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS	
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE	CODE/ORD VIOLATED 6.04.110(A), 6.04.110(B)(4)				REVIEWED BY 2002 KONST 11/22	
	CITATIONS/NUMBERS 72410				BOND YES ☐ NO ☐	

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
Q. Heeler-X	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Newman	WHT/Tan		13Y				PTS	A500260
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									

WITNESS 1	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE # / BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 2	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE # / BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 3	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE # / BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 4	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE # / BUSINESS PHONE #

WC 3

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-159157

ACO name & Badge: C. Meek 2015

On 11.01.14 Supervisor Konst badge number 2002 was called to the animal receiving area to investigate a possible neglect case. Upon arrival at the intake area Supervisor Konst observed a brown and white dog with what appeared to be an infected tumor or possible snake bite. The kennel technician stated the dog was brought in by a Mrs. . She stated to the technician that the dog has had a tumor for 11 years and her husband Chris would not let her have the dog put to sleep. The tumor recently broke open and became infected; so she brought the dog in to be euthanized. Then Mrs. left before Supervisor Konst arrived. An investigation of neglect complaint was set up and photographs were taken by Supervisor Konst.

On 11/15/14 at 1028 hours I Officer Meek badge number 2015 responded to in reference to a neglect complaint. I arrived at the address and rang the doorbell but received no answer. I posted a notice requesting contact from the dog owners.

On 11/17/14 I Officer Meek badge number 2015 responded to follow up a neglect vet care complaint.

I arrived at the address and was able to meet with the dog owner Mr. and Mrs. . I was advised by Mr. that the dog named Newman was brought in to Pima Animal Care Center to be humanely euthanized.

I advised Mr. that concerns were raised by the attending shelter staff to Newman's condition when presented for euthanasia. Mr. stated he understood. Mr. advised me that Newman had a skin deficiency that caused him to grow the cist. Mr. equated Newman's condition to having an extremely large pimple. Mr. did advise me that Newman was seen at Acoma vet clinic as a puppy and as an adult he was seen at Ina road. Pet Hospital. Mr. did advise me that Newman had an issue in the past with his skin. Mr. advised me that the cist was removed previously. Mr. advised me that Newman was still active and eating well up until he brought him into Pima Animal Care Center.

I asked Mr. when the last time Newman was into the vet for his skin condition. Mr. advised me that it had been several years since he was seen. I advised Mr. that based on the information he provided I would have to issue citations. Mr. and Mrs. stated they understood and Mrs. provided me with her Arizona Drivers License. I issued Mrs. a total of two citations which included neglect no vet care and cruelty. I advised Mr. that with the citations she would need to appear in court

WC 3

and I provided her with the date. Mrs. stated she understood and signed her copy of the citations.

Officer's Signature:

Date: 11/22/14

WC 4

INVESTIGATION REPORT

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

SUSPECT					ACO NAME / BADGE # D.Robledo #1990 N.Konst #2002	COMPLAINT NUMBER A14-159999	
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS					BITE ☐ WELFARE ☒ DANGEROUS ☐ OTHER ☐		
ZIP 85714	CITY Tuc	STATE Az	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER		CODE IF OTHER :		
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS n/a					CI ☒ CO ☐ OTHER ☐		
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER		DRIVERS LICENSE		
SEX	WEIGHT 200	HEIGHT 5'-9"	EYES Blk	HAIR COLOR Bk	ORIGIN	DOB	SSN n/a

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

LOCATION OF INCIDENT	DATE AND TIME REPORTED 11/13/14 / 1225	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 11/13/14 / 1230	
FOOD ☐ WATER ☐ SHELTER ☐ INJURED/ILL ☐ VENTILATION ☐ ABANDONED ☐ TIEOUT ☒ BEATEN ☐ WASTE ☐ OTHER (EXPLAIN) ☐			

☐ I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case

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

☐ REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B0 and § 8-286 (B)

VICTIM/COMPLAINTANT NAME D.Robledo #1990	D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	BUSINESS PHONE NO. 724-5900
VICTIM'S ADDRESS	ZIP	CITY	STATE
VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS 4000 N. Silverbell Rd.	ZIP 85745	CITY Tuc	STATE Az

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)

DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES ☐ NO ☒	RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES ☐ NO ☒	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # 14-11130223 ☐ SO ☒ TPD ☐ TFD ☐ OTHER:	FOLLOW UP REQUEST ☐ SO ☐ TPD ☐ OTHER:

☐ ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

PHONE NUMBER

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

☐ VIOLATION ☐ NON-VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY: PART OF BODY BITTEN:	TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED RELEASE DATE:	PACC ☐ VET ☐ HOME ☐
VET CLINIC		PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES ☐ NO ☐		FTQ ☐ UTQ ☐
CLINIC'S ADDRESS		QUARANTINE 10 ☐ 15 ☐ 45 ☐ 180 ☐		☐ FRA HEAD#	
3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES ☐ NO ☒	CITING ACO N.Konst #2002	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES ☐ NO ☐	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS	
CODE/ORD VIOLATED 4-3(2)(E)(2)				REVIEWED BY 11-19-14 DTK1911	
CITATIONS/NUMBERS 72923				BOND YES ☐ NO ☐	

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
pitbull	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Kilo	Blue	M	Ad				ok	A501569
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									

WITNESS 1	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE # / BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 2	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE # / BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 3	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE # / BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 4	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE # / BUSINESS PHONE #

WC 4

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-159999

ACO name & Badge: Daniel Robledo #1990

On November 13, 2014, 1230 hours, I Officer Robledo #1990, responded to an emergency call with Tucson Police Department. I met with Officer Gonzalez #42127 Case # 14-11130223. He explained and pointed out a pitbull on a chain tie-out at the address of We both took photographs of the dog. The dog is healthy, had water, shade, and shelter present. The dog had a chain tie-out about 6-7 feet long, attached from its chain collar to the ground. At this home, we met with Graciela Luque who lives here. She stated that her boyfriend owns the home and dog. She has been in this country for 10 days and presented me a Mexico driver's license. She stated that her boyfriend has lived here all his life. She gave me the information on her boyfriend She stated that her boyfriend ties up the dog because they are fixing their front gate. I placed the dog in my truck and gave her a notice of impound to give to him.

On November 15, 2014 at 1100 hours, Supervisor Konst #2002 met with the dog owner at the Pima County Animal Care Center. Mr. came to the shelter to redeem his dog. Supervisor Konst explained to Mr. the reason for the impoundment. Supervisor Konst explained and issued the citation for the tie out to Mr. . Mr. stated he understood his 12/01/14 court date signed and received his copy of the citation.

Officer's Signature: #1990 **Date:** 11-19-14

WC 5

INVESTIGATION REPORT

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

SUSPECT						ACO NAME / BADGE # Klein 1926	COMPLAINT NUMBER A14-159416
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS						BITE ☐ WELFARE ☒ DANGEROUS ☐ OTHER ☐	
ZIP 85714	CITY Tucson	STATE Az	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER			CODE IF OTHER :	
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS Unknown						CI ☒ CO ☐ OTHER ☐	
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER			DRIVERS LICENSE	
SEX	WEIGHT 117	HEIGHT 5'5	EYES Bro	HAIR COLOR Blk	ORIGIN	DOB	SSN Unknown

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

LOCATION OF INCIDENT | DATE AND TIME REPORTED 11-5-14 / 1110 | DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 11-21-14 / 1544

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

☐ I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case

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

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

VICTIM/COMPLAINTANT NAME E.Klein Badge 1926	D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	BUSINESS PHONE NO. 520-724-5900		
VICTIM'S ADDRESS		ZIP	CITY	STATE	
VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS 4000 N Silverbell Rd		ZIP 85745	CITY Tucson	STATE Az	

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)

DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES ☐ NO ☒	RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES ☐ NO ☒	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # ☐ SO ☐ TPD ☐ TFD ☐ OTHER:	FOLLOW UP REQUEST ☐ SO ☐ TPD ☐ OTHER:

☐ ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

PHONE NUMBER

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

☐ VIOLATION ☐ NON-VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY: PART OF BODY BITTEN:	TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED RELEASE DATE:	PACC ☐ VET ☐ HOME ☐
VET CLINIC		PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES ☐ NO ☐		FTQ ☐ UTQ ☐
CLINIC'S ADDRESS		QUARANTINE 10 ☐ 15 ☐ 45 ☐ 180 ☐		☐ FRA HEAD#	
3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES ☐ NO ☒	CITING ACO Konst 2002	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES ☐ NO ☒	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS	

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

CODE/ORD VIOLATED 4-3(2)(E)(2), 4-3(2)(C) 4-3(2)(B) 4-76,4-81	REVIEWED BY 2002 KONST 11/25/14
CITATIONS/NUMBERS 72925A,B,C,D,E	BOND YES ☐ NO ☐

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
Pitbull	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Isenberg	Tan/Wht	M	1Y		Cited	Cited	Ok	A502379
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									

WITNESS 1 M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 2 M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 3 M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 4 M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #

WC 5

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-159416

ACO name & Badge:Klein 1926

On November 5,2014 the Pima County Animal Care Center (PACC) dispatch department received an complaint stating there was a dog on a tie out at

On November 13, 2014 it was noted that another complaint was made about the same dog. The caller stated the dog has been tied up for 3 weeks.

Another entry was made on November 17, 2014 reporting that the dog was still on the tie out and it can be seen while driving by the residence.

On November 21, 2014 at1643 hours, I, Investigator Klein badge 1926 arrived at . and observed an adult male tan and white pit bull with a cable tie out connected to a his red harness. He was very friendly and would run to greet me until the cable ran out. He would be pulled so hard by the motion that he would be yanked back ward and would land on his back. He could get under a truck the was next to his cable tie out but had no shelter to protect him from cold, wind, rain or heat. I saw one empty metal bowl nearby and a plastic bucket with some dirty water and a shoe inside of it. He had no potable water or food available. The property had no fencing.

I knocked at the back door and received no response. I knocked at the front of the house and again, no response.

I impounded the dog, took several photos and left a notice of impound connected to the cable tie out.

I placed a hold on his kennel card and requested that if his owners come to redeem him citations be issued for the following at 11-21-14 1643 hours:
No license 4-81
No Rabies Vaccination 4-76
Neglect Tie Out 4-3 (2)(E)(2)
Neglect Shelter 4-3 (2)(C)
Neglect Water 4-3 (2)(B)
Neglect Food 4-3 (2)(A)

WC 5

I also requested that a premise inspection form be filled out ordering confinement and that a follow up inspection be scheduled.

On November 22, 2014 Supervisor Konst met with at the Pima County Animal Care Center. came in to PACC to redeem her dog Isenberg. Supervisor Konst explained to her why the dog was impounded and that the dog was found in violation of numerous City of Tucson animal laws. Supervisor Konst explained and issued citation 72925 to her for the violations found on November 21, 2014.

E.Klein Badge 1926

Officer's Signature: E.Klein E.Klein

Date: 11-22-14

WC 6

INVESTIGATION REPORT

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

SUSPECT					ACO NAME / BADGE # A. Kirby #2057	COMPLAINT NUMBER A14-160168	
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS					BITE ☐ WELFARE ☒ DANGEROUS ☐ OTHER ☒		
ZIP 97002	CITY Aurora	STATE OR	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER		CODE IF OTHER : Leash Law		
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS					CI ☐ CO ☒ OTHER ☐		
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER		DRIVERS LICENSE		
SEX	WEIGHT 135	HEIGHT 5'04"	EYES UNK	HAIR COLOR Red	ORIGIN	DOB	SSN

DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES ☐ NO ☒	LOCATION OF INCIDENT	DATE AND TIME REPORTED 11/16/14 / 12:29 hrs	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 11/16/14 / 14:39 hrs
	FOOD ☐ WATER ☐ SHELTER ☐ INJURED/ILL ☐ VENTILATION ☐ ABANDONED ☐ TIEOUT ☒ BEATEN ☐ WASTE ☐ OTHER (EXPLAIN) ☐		

☐ I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case	VICTIM/COMPLAINTANT NAME PACC Officer A. Kirby #2057	D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO. 520-724-5900 Ext. 3	BUSINESS PHONE NO.
☐ I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.	VICTIM'S ADDRESS	ZIP	CITY	STATE
☐ REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B0 and § 8-286 (B)	VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS 4000 N. Silverbell Rd.	ZIP 85745	CITY Tucson	STATE AZ

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)	DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES ☐ NO ☒	RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES ☐ NO ☒	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # 141116127 ☒ SO ☐ TPD ☐ TFD ☐ OTHER:
				FOLLOW UP REQUEST ☐ SO ☐ TPD ☐ OTHER:

☐ ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM	☐ VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY:	TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED	PACC ☐ VET ☐ HOME ☐
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM	☐ NON-VIOLATION	PART OF BODY BITTEN:			RELEASE DATE:	
PHONE NUMBER	VET CLINIC		PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES ☐ NO ☐		FTQ ☐ UTQ ☐

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS	CLINIC'S ADDRESS		QUARANTINE 10 ☐ 15 ☐ 45 ☐ 180 ☐	☐ FRA HEAD#	
	3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES ☐ NO ☒	CITING ACO A. Kirby #2057	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES ☐ NO ☒	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE	CODE/ORD VIOLATED 6.04.110(B)(5), 6.04.070, 6.04.030, 11-1010(A)				REVIEWED BY 11-18-14 DTK 1911
	CITATIONS/NUMBERS 73611				BOND YES ☐ NO ☒

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE		LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
Husky Mix	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Barret	White/Brown	M	A				N	A501948
Shepherd Mix	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	LeeLuo	Black/Tan	F	A				N	A501949
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									

WITNESS 1	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 2	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 3	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 4	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #

WC 6

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-160168

ACO name & Badge: A. Kirby #2057

On November 16. 2014 at approximately 1439 hrs I Officer Kirby #2057 arrived at and met with the complainant Ms. stated that shortly before she called, the dogs from the unit behind her address had attempted to attack her pigs but were unsuccessful in doing so. Mrs. said that she would just like the owners advised of the laws at this time. Upon attempting to make contact with the female later identified as , Mrs. became aggressively hostile and stated that "it was the county there are no laws, get the hell off the property." I then backed off the property and had Pima Animal Care dispatch contact Pima County Sherriffs Office (PCSO) for assistance. While exiting the property to wait the arrival of PCSO I observed a white/brown Husky mix tied out with a cable to the back porch stair rails. Upon arrival of PCSO we were able to make more civil contact with Mrs. who advised that where they were from in Oregon, animal control had no authority, and there are no laws regarding dogs on private property as an explanation for her actions. I explained that the dogs were actually in a common area of a rental property and were not confined as the front of the property was open and there was no fence dividing the two rental properties. I also explained that in Pima County tie outs are illegal and dangerous to the dog. I issued Mrs. citations for neglect – tie out, no license, and no rabies vaccinations for Barret, the white and brown Husky mix, and, leash law, and no license for Leeluo, the black and tan Shepherd mix that was at large on the property at that time. I explained to Mrs. her court date, time, and location she stated she understood and signed the citation.

Officer's Signature: **Date:** 11/16/14

WC 7

INVESTIGATION REPORT

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

SUSPECT						ACO NAME / BADGE # Klein 1926		COMPLAINT NUMBER A14-159856
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS						BITE ☐ WELFARE ☒ DANGEROUS ☐ OTHER ☐		
ZIP 85756	CITY Tucson	STATE Az	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER			CODE IF OTHER :		
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS Unemployed						CI ☐ CO ☒ OTHER ☐		
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER			DRIVERS LICENSE		
SEX	WEIGHT 300	HEIGHT 6'1	EYES Br	HAIR COLOR Br	ORIGIN	DOB 7-12-57	SSN	

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

LOCATION OF INCIDENT	DATE AND TIME REPORTED	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED
5576 E Hermans Rd Unit #2	11-11-14 / 1601	11-11-14 / 1700

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

☐ I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case

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

☐ REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B0 and § 8-286 (B)

VICTIM/COMPLAINTANT NAME	D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	BUSINESS PHONE NO.
E.Klein Badge #1926			724-5900

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

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)

DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED	RESTITUTION REQUESTED	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # 141111141	FOLLOW UP REQUEST
YES ☐ NO ☒	YES ☐ NO ☒		☒ SO ☐ TPD ☐ TFD ☐ OTHER:	☐ SO ☐ TPD ☐ OTHER:

☐ ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

PHONE NUMBER

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

☐ VIOLATION / ☐ NON-VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY: / PART OF BODY BITTEN:	TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED / RELEASE DATE:	PACC ☐ VET ☐ HOME ☐
VET CLINIC		PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES ☐ NO ☐		FTQ ☐ UTQ ☐
CLINIC'S ADDRESS		QUARANTINE 10 ☐ 15 ☐ 45 ☐ 180 ☐		☐ FRA HEAD#	
3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES ☐ NO ☒	CITING ACO Klein 1926	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES ☐ NO ☒	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS	
CODE/ORD VIOLATED 6.04.110(B)(4), 6.04.110(B)(3),36.183.03 ARS				REVIEWED BY 11-12-14 DTK 1911	
CITATIONS/NUMBERS 73701 through 73740				BOND YES ☐ NO ☐	

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
79 cats- see kennel cards	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									

WITNESS 1 PCSO Deputy Figueroa Badge 3254	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS 1750 E Benson Hwy	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE # 520-351-4900
WITNESS 2 PCSO Deputy Barnes Badge 1250	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS 1750 E Benson Hwy	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE # 520-351-4900
WITNESS 3 PCSO Berlin Belin Badge 1076	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS 1750 E Benson Hwy	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE # 520-351-4900
WITNESS 4 PACC Officer Kirby Badge 2057	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS 4000 N Silverbell Rd	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE # 520-724-5900

NC 7

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-159856

ACO name & Badge: Klein, Badge # 1926

On November 11, 2014 at 1602 hours the Pima County Animal Care Center (PACC) dispatch department received a call from Pima County Sheriff Department (PCSO) Deputy Figueroa Badge 3254 stating they had responded to a home at that was infested with approximately 40 unhealthy cats. Deputy Figueroa stated they were living in bad conditions with excessive waste throughout the home.

On November 11, 2014 at approximately 1700 hours I, PACC Investigator Klein Badge 1926 arrived at 5576 E. Hermans Rd and met with Pima County Sheriff Department (PCSO) Deputy Figueroa badge 3254 and Deputy Barnes badge 1250 (PCSO case 141111141) who explained they responded regarding a physical altercation between the property owner and the renter.

I and (520-) reside at (the back unit) and own the property. They rent out to and (520- Mr. has been trying to conduct an inspection of the mobile home at unit #2 because of the foul smell coming from the home. Mr. was conducting the inspection today when a physical altercation took place.

When the Deputies saw the condition inside of unit #2 they called the PACC and Child Protective Services. They explained that they counted over 40 cats inside of the home. They stated feces are everywhere and some of the cats are sick.

As I exited my vehicle I could smell a very strong odor of cat urine. When we walked toward the mobile home the smell became stronger. I could not see inside of the home as all of the windows were covered with blankets and sheets.

I first spoke with who was sitting in his vehicle that was parked in front of unit #2. I asked Mr. how many cats they had inside of the home and he stated about 25.

WC 7

Mr. I said some of them have become sick and they have owned some for over 10 years. Mr. said he understands that PACC will be taking the cats but Ms. is very attached to them and will want to keep some. Mr. said she was already trying to find people to take the cats.

I then went inside of the home with Deputy Barnes and met Ms. . Once inside of the house my eyes and nose began to burn from the extremely strong smell of cat urine. I saw that there was no furniture inside of the house. There were new and old feces through out the house. The floors, walls and sideboards are all stained from the animal waste. As we walked through the house with Ms. n I felt my feet slipping on the saturated floor. I saw only two litter boxes in the house. Both were completely full and overflowing. I did see fresh water in several pans and dishes. I saw one large open bag of dry cat food on the floor.

Deputy Barnes counted 40 cats in the main room of the house. I saw cats of all sizes and ages. They all appeared to be of adequate body weight. Their fur looked ok. Several of the cats had eye discharge, some had eyes that were very swollen and crusted shut. I heard several sneezing. One of the kittens had a bowel movement while standing next to me and it was loose diarrhea.

I asked Ms. how many cats they have and she said she did not know. I asked if they have a veterinarian. She said they use Ina Road vet services. I asked the name of their doctor and she said she did not know. I asked when she last went there and she said it must be at least 2 years ago. Deputy Barnes asked if she had any dead cats inside of the house. The juvenile named with Mr. said one of the cats had a litter of 3 stillborns about 3 days ago but they already disposed of them.

I then asked Ms. to show us the rest of the rooms. Ms. stated the bedrooms are all furnished and that is where they live. She said the cats have taken over the rest of the house so they all stay in there own bedrooms.

I did not find any cats in the 2 bedrooms where the 2 juvenile boys stay. The front bedroom had at least 7 cats in it. Some ran out when the door was opened. The floors were covered in trash, old food, dirty clothes and animal waste. The bathroom was full of waste, mold and mildew. There was a padlock on a door. After much discussion Ms. stated she had put the cat known as Cubby in the closet because she is her favorite cat and she did not want me to take her away. She opened the door and I saw a 5 month old female orange and white DSH lying on a pile of clothes. She appeared to be of adequate weight. A second cat came running out of the closet and ran into the main part of the house. Ms. said she did not know which cat that was. I then asked Ms. to step outside to talk to me because I was having a very difficult time breathing inside of this house.

I explained to Ms. and Mr. that I will be submitting the photographs and my report for review. I told them that PACC will return to impound all of the cats as the living conditions of the home are unacceptable, unsanitary and not habitable for them and their cats. I also explained that all of the cats need medical care that has not been provided

WC 7

Ms. said she knows the cats need to be removed. She said she wants PACC to take most of them but she would like to keep HBK, Poo, Puss and Cubby. I asked if any of them are altered. She stated they are all boys except for Cubby and said she will get them taken care of.

I told her I will advise my supervisors of her request and that it is unlikely due to the condition of the home and the neglect of providing vet care. I thanked her for her cooperation and told her they need to start cleaning the house and litter boxes immediately. Their cooperation will be taken into consideration. Ms. asked that we call to let her know when PACC will be returning so she can help with the impound so the cats don't get too stressed out. She said she can be reached at 520- .

The Deputies and I then went to unit #1 where I spoke with and . They stated they have been renting to this family for about 2 years and only recently noticed the smell coming from the house. They will be applying for an emergency eviction tomorrow. The stated PACC can call them and they will allow full access to the home at anytime. Mrs. can be reached at 520- . I provided this case number and asked them to call if they have any problems.

On November 13, 2014 at 0734 hours I, PACC Investigator Klein Badge 1926, PACC Officer Kirby Badge 2057, PACC Investigator Carver Badge 1901, PACC dispatch employee Lee Harrington and Pima County Chief Veterinarian Dr. Bonnie Lilley arrived at We met with PCSO Deputy Belin Badge 1076 who responded to our request for assistance under PCSO case number 141113034.

We spoke with and and explained that we were prepared to impound the cats today. They allowed us into the home. Dr. Lilley and I both took additional photographs of the cats and the condition of the home. The home and the cats were still in the same condition as I had observed on November 11, 2014. I asked if any of the cats have been taken to a veterinarian and they stated no. Ms. and her juvenile son stayed inside of the home and helped us impound all of the cats.

We impounded 72 cats from the home. Each cat was processed individually. Each cat was photographed and given its own identification number. I asked Ms. and if all of these cats are the same cats that were here on November 11, 2014. They stated yes, all of the cats were here.

Ms. stated she had cleaned her room and bathroom where she kept 7 of the cats. She stated she wanted to keep those cats. I entered her bedroom and bathroom and found that there was still an excessive amount of waste. Some of the cats in this room also had crusted eyes and eye discharge.

I explained to Mr. and Ms. that all of the cats would be removed from the home today. I explained that I could place the cats they wanted returned to them on a Bond form which would allow them 10 days to pay the Bond amount required to PACC. If they were able to do that they could then have a hearing and ask a judge to return the animals to them.

WC 7

Mr. stated he will take full responsibility for the conditions of the home and the care of the cats. He stated he will accept the Bond and citations. Mr. then provided his Arizona drivers license as identification.

The 7 cats were then removed from Ms. room. Those cats were photographed and given individual identification numbers.

While preparing the Bond form in my vehicle I was approached by two people who stated they were here about the children living in the home. They asked about the conditions inside. I explained what I observed. They stated they were going to be removing the one teenager that was present today and that they would be going to the school were the second teenager was and picking him up as well.

I completed the Bond form and included Jack A501551, Poo A501552,Pumkin A501554, Puss A 501556, HBK A501557, Cubby A501558 and Mousy A 501560. I explained to Mr. Harden that he would be required to pay the Bond amount of $2450.00 within 10 calendar days. I then provided him with his signed copy of the Bond.

Mr. signed the release of ownership form which stated he is the owner of all of the animals removed from and he relinquished ownership of all animals except Jack, Poo, Pumkin, Puss, HBK, Cubby and Mousy to PACC.

I then issued the citations to Mr. . I explained that the citations that were being issued to him are for the neglect vet care and neglect shelter for each of the 79 cats that were impounded. He was also issued a citation for excessive animal waste inside of the home. Mr. Harden signed each citation. I provided him with a copy of each and explained the court appearance.

Deputy Belin left as we did. We returned to the Animal Care Center where all of the cats were processed and placed in the clinic.

On November 14, 2014 I called Ina Road Pet Clinic and spoke to , the receptionist. I explained that I was conducting an investigation. I asked if Mr. or Ms. were clients. stated they brought in a cat named HBK who had blood in his urine on February 14, 2012. They did not find any stones or crystals in the urine and prescribed a Hills Prescription SO diet to help with a urinary tract infection. They did not return for the follow up exam and have not brought any other animals to the clinic.

** Please note, none of the cats were micro chipped or altered at the time of impound. The kennel cards included with this report have been adjusted to show the cats that were altered and micro chipped after being impounded and brought to PACC. All of the cats that were impounded will be treated, altered and micro chipped. E. Klein Badge #1926

WC 8

Activity Report

Activity Number:	Activity Type:	Activity Date:	Priority:	Total Animals:	Animal Type:
A14-157606-1	INV/NEGLI	10/11/14 10:33 AM	2	1	DOG

Activity Address:
: TENNESSEE ST , TUCSON

Geo Code: 4T

Jurisdiction: TUC

Activity Comment:
4700 S SHORT TIE-OUT, NO WATER. NOT IN DISTRESS.

Caller Information: P352552
TONY , (520)
HATFIELD ST , TUCSON AZ 85706

Owner Information: P355389
JIMMY , (520) 3
: TENNESSEE ST
TUCSON AZ 857

Officer:	Call Taker:	Result Codes:
P999942 ECKELBARGER	BMEHREN	2 CITE 1 COMP

Dispatch Date:	Working Date:	Complete Date:	Response Time:
11/14/14 06:27 AM	11/14/14 08:20 AM	11/14/14 08:47 AM	33D 21:47

Memo:

10/09/2014 NOTE
10/09/14 15:02

SHORT TIE-OUT, NO WATER. NOT IN DISTRESS.

11/14/2014 ACTIVITY
11-14-14 0820 hours. I Investigator Eckelbarger (1942) responded to Tennessee St where I met with dog owner, Jimmy : (DOB), who stated he has owned his husky "Sheila" for appx 4 months and his Chihuahua "Daisy" for almost 10 years. He also had a 2 month old shep x puppy. All dogs in backyard, all dogs appeared in ok condition. Dogs had access to shade, shelter, water, and food. I observed no sign of tieout.

I then checked for license information and found none. I then cited Mr. for no license on both Daisy and Sheila under City jurisdiction. Mr. . signed and received his copy of the citations. Closing complaint at this time. 1942 Eckelbarger

Print Date: 12/12/2014

WC 8

Activity Report

Activity Number:	Activity Type:	Activity Date:	Priority:	Total Animals:	Animal Type:
A14-157606-1	INV/NEGLI	10/11/14 10:33 AM	2	1	DOG

Photos: NONE TAKEN

WC 9

Activity Report

Activity Number:	Activity Type:	Activity Date:	Priority:	Total Animals:	Animal Type:
A14-160704-1	INV/NEGLI	11/24/14 06:54 PM	2	1	DOG

Activity Address:
; ROSE PL , TUCSON

Geo Code: 3T

Jurisdiction: TUC

Activity Comment:
7300E; SEE MEMO

Caller Information:
,
,

Owner Information: P343168
TIFFANY , (520)
ROSE PL
TUCSON AZ 857.

Officer:	Call Taker:	Result Codes:
P999942 ECKELBARGER	DANNABLE	3 CITE 1 EDUC 1 COMP

Dispatch Date:	Working Date:	Complete Date:	Response Time:
11/29/14 06:37 AM	11/29/14 11:49 AM	11/29/14 12:15 PM	4D 16:55

Memo:

11/24/2014 NOTE
11/24/14 18:59 I 2045 RECEIVED A COMPLAINT CONCERNING THE POODLE/MIX DOG AT THIS ADDRESS. THE DOG GETS LEFT FOR SEVERAL DAYS AT A TIME WITHOUT APPARENT CARE. DCA2045

11/29/2014 ACTIVITY
11-29-14 1140 hours I Investigator Eckelbarger (1942) responded to Rose Pl where I met with dog owner, Tiffany (DOB who showed me her three dogs, "Gizmo" Baxter, and Blue. All dogs appeared in ok condition and had all adequate welfare requirements. Stated they never abandon the dogs. Stated the small white poodle mix gets out loose from the yard sometimes.

I then checked for license information on the dogs found none. I then cited Ms. for no license on all three dogs under City jurisdiction. Closing complaint at this time. 1942 Eckelbarger

Print Date: 12/12/2014

WC9

Activity Report

Activity Number:	Activity Type:	Activity Date:	Priority:	Total Animals:	Animal Type:
A14-160704-1	INV/NEGLI	11/24/14 06:54 PM	2	1	DOG

Photos: NONE TAKEN

WC 10

Activity Report

Activity Number:	Activity Type:	Activity Date:	Priority:	Total Animals:	Animal Type:
A14-160679-1	INV/NEGLI	11/24/14 02:24 PM	2	2	DOG

Activity Address:
PARK AVE , TUCSON

Geo Code: 4T

Jurisdiction: TUC

Activity Comment:
1000E NO SHELTER, NO WATER, NO FOOD, SKINNY, ONE IS MATTED

Caller Information:
,
,

Owner Information: P356507
SALLY
PARK AVE
TUCSON AZ 857

Officer:	Call Taker:	Result Codes:
P999942 ECKELBARGER	LHARRING	4 CITE 1 EDUC 1 COMP

Dispatch Date:	Working Date:	Complete Date:	Response Time:
11/30/14 02:32 PM	11/30/14 03:51 PM	11/30/14 04:19 PM	6D 01:27

Memo:

11/30/2014 ACTIVITY

11-30-14 1550 hours. I Investigator Eckelbarger (1942) responded to Park Ave where I met with dog owner, Sally (DOB), who showed me her poodle "Whitey" and Chihuahua "Obama" in the backyard. Both dogs appeared normal body condition. The poodle was a little matted so I advised owner to get groomed. Both dogs had food, water, shade, and shelter (dog house and open shed).

I then checked for license and vaccination information. Ms. stated she never got the vacciantions for either dog. I then cited Ms. for no license and no rabies vaccination on both Obama and Whitey under City jurisdiction. Ms. signed and received her copies of the citations. Closing complaint at this time. 1942 Eckelbarger

Print Date: 12/12/2014

WC 10

Activity Report

Activity Number:	Activity Type:	Activity Date:	Priority:	Total Animals:	Animal Type:
A14-160679-1	INV/NEGLI	11/24/14 02:24 PM	2	2	DOG

Photos: NONE TAKEN

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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Kim Janes, Chief of External Operations

FROM: Neil Konst, Animal Care Field Supervisor

DATE: 12/02/14

RE: Dangerous Dog Cases for November 2014

Pima County:

1. A14-159061---Thomas Cyr; dog named Gabe was declared not dangerous by Investigator Klein.

City of Tucson:

2. A14-160530---Rudy Romero; dogs named Dallas and Luna were declared dangerous by Investigator Carver who is monitoring compliance. Both dogs are currently being held at PACC until compliance is met.

PIMA COUNTY ANIMAL CARE CENTER
MONTHLY INVESTIGATIONS REPORT
DANGEROUS DOG CASES FOR NOVEMBER 2014

Pima

CASE NUMBER	OWNER'S LAST NAME	NUMBER OF ANIMALS ASSESSED	NUMBER OF ANIMALS DECLARED DANGEROUS	NUMBER OF ANIMALS DECLARED NOT DANGEROUS	NUMBER OF ANIMALS IMPOUNDED	NUMBER OF ANIMALS RELINQUISHED	NUMBER OF ANIMALS PTS	HEARING Y/N	UPHELD	NOT UPHELD
A14-159061	Cyr	1	0	1	0	0	0	N		

Tucson

CASE NUMBER	OWNER'S LAST NAME	NUMBER OF ANIMALS ASSESSED	NUMBER OF ANIMALS DECLARED DANGEROUS	NUMBER OF ANIMALS DECLARED NOT DANGEROUS	NUMBER OF ANIMALS IMPOUNDED	NUMBER OF ANIMALS RELINQUISHED	NUMBER OF ANIMALS PTS	HEARING Y/N	UPHELD	NOT UPHELD
A14-160530	Romero	2	2	0	2	0	0	n		

002

INVESTIGATION REPORT

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

SUSPECT						ACO NAME / BADGE # T. Haynes #2032	COMPLAINT NUMBER A14-159323
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS						BITE ☒ WELFARE ☐ DANGEROUS ☐ OTHER ☐	
ZIP	CITY Tucson	STATE AZ	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER			CODE IF OTHER :	
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS N/A						CI ☒ CO ☐ OTHER ☐	
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER			DRIVERS LICENSE	
SEX	WEIGHT	HEIGHT	EYES	HAIR COLOR	ORIGIN 1	DOB	SSN Not Given

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

☒ I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case

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

☐ REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B0 and § 8-286 (B)

LOCATION OF INCIDENT	DATE AND TIME REPORTED 11/04/14 / 0942 hrs	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 11/04/14 / 0942 hrs	

FOOD ☐ WATER ☐ SHELTER ☐ INJURED/ILL ☐ VENTILATION ☐ ABANDONED ☐ TIEOUT ☐ BEATEN ☐ WASTE ☐ OTHER (EXPLAIN) ☒ Bite/Leash Law

VICTIM/COMPLAINTANT NAME	D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	BUSINESS PHONE NO.
VICTIM'S ADDRESS	ZIP	CITY Tucson	STATE AZ
VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS N/A	ZIP	CITY	STATE

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)

DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES ☐ NO ☒	RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES ☒ NO ☐	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # 1411040166 ☐ SO ☒ TPD ☐ TFD ☐ OTHER:	FOLLOW UP REQUEST ☐ SO ☐ TPD ☐ OTHER:

☐ ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

PHONE NUMBER

☒ VIOLATION ☐ NON-VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY: 3-Medium	TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED 11/04/14	PACC ☒ VET ☐ HOME ☐
	PART OF BODY BITTEN: Arm/Leg			RELEASE DATE: 11/13/14	
VET CLINIC		PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES ☒ NO ☐		FTQ ☐ UTQ ☐

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

CLINIC'S ADDRESS		QUARANTINE 10 ☒ 15 ☐ 45 ☐ 180 ☐		☐ FRA HEAD#
3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES ☒ NO ☐	CITING ACO Sup. N. Konst #2002	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES ☐ NO ☒	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS A14-152975
CODE/ORD VIOLATED 4-97, 4-7(2)(B)				REVIEWED BY 2002 KONST 11/19
CITATIONS/NUMBERS 72921, 72922				BOND YES ☐ NO ☐

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
Aussie mix	VICTIM ☒ OWNER ☐	Bella	Tricolor	F	8Y				Inj	
Pit Bull	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Dallas	Blu/W	M	1Y				N	
Pit Bull	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Luna	Blu/W	F	2Y				N	
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									

WITNESS 1	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE # / BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 2	M ☐ F ☒	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE # / BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 3	M ☒ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE # / BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 4	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE # / BUSINESS PHONE #

DD2

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-159323

ACO name & Badge: T. Haynes #2032

On November 04, 2014 at approximately 1002 hours I, Officer T. Haynes #2032, arrived at and was met by Tucson Police Officer Mah #49532. She advised me that the Tucson Fire Department firefighters had the two attacking (biting) dogs contained. I observed four firefighters coming towards me with a medium, blue/white, male Pit Bull and a medium, blue/white, female Pit Bull on makeshift leashes. Both dogs were very people friendly and I was able to pet them and handle them without any issues. Both dogs were scanned for microchips and none were detected. Both dogs were impounded without incident for the mandatory 10 day quarantine.

I then met with the first of three bite victims, she said that at approximately 0945 hrs, as she was returning from taking a friend to class, she observed a woman's dog being attacked by the two Pit Bulls that she had observed running through the neighborhood earlier. , said that as she was picking up the dog that was being attacked, the attacking dogs jumped up on her biting her on the right upper arm and left side of the neck. She was uncertain to which dog bit her. She was not sure if she was going to obtain medical care at this time. I provided her with a bite case number. She stated that she did not want to pursue prosecution at this time.

Then I met with the second bite victim, he stated that he walked out of his house at and observed a woman walking her dog and her dog being attacked by the two Pit Bulls. He said that he went to help get the Pit Bulls off of the victim dog and the victim dog over the fence at when he was bitten on the left pinky, ring, ~~and~~ middle fingers and the right forearm by the male Pit Bull. was unsure if he was going to obtain further medical treatment. I provided him with a bite case number. He stated that he did not want to pursue prosecution at this time.

I was finally able to meet with the third bite victim and victim dog owner, She stated that at approximately 0945 hrs, she was taking her dog, Bella, an 8 year old, medium, tricolor, long haired, spayed Aussie Shepherd, for a walk down , when the female Pit Bull came out from in between two house and started attacking her. said that a

DD 2

neighbor came out and kicked the Pit away stopping the first attack. She said that she then crossed the street to get away from the dog and that's when Bella was attacked the second time by the male Pit Bull and then the female Pit Bull. I said that it was at this point when the two other bite victims and additional people intervened to get Bella away from the attack. received bites to her left hand and forearm and to her right leg, above her knee. She is not sure which dog bit her.

I was able to do a quick once over of Bella. She was standing and bearing weight well on all four legs. She did have some palpable swelling in the right front and rear legs and they were tender to the touch. I did not detect any gushing wounds and had trace amount of blood on my hands after the quick once over. I asked if she wanted citations issued to the Pit Bull owner and she was undecided at this time and will contact PACC later. I provided her with the activity number only as she wanted to get Bella to a vet to have her injuries assessed.

Witnesses advised that they believed the dogs reside at and possibly belong to TPD attempted to contact him at the residence and by phone with negative results. I posted a notice at the padlocked front gate advising the residents of that the dogs had been impounded and that they can call or come to PACC for information and redemption.

On November 04, 2014, Supervisor Konst #2002, spoke with dog owner, , at the licensing counter at Pima Animal Care Center concerning the events and quarantine.

On November 05, 2014 at approximately 0652 hours I was contacted by third bite victim and victim dog owner, via email. She advised that Bella had sustained significant injuries and was going to need extensive veterinary care. She advised that she would like to pursue prosecution for the animal attack and human bite. is also seeking restitution for her and Bella's medical expenses.

On November 14, 2014 at approximately 1700 hours Supervisor Konst #2002 met with at Pima Animal Care Center. stated he was the owner of the two Pit Bulls that were involved in the incident on November 4, 2014. Supervisor Konst issued third party citations #72921 and 72922 to Mr. Romero for biting animal on both dogs for the attack on Bella, biting animal on both dogs for the attack on , and leash law citations on both dogs for being at large.
Citations, court date, time and location were explained to acknowledged, signed and received a copy of the citations

Officer's Signature: JHaynes 2032 Date: 11-19-14

DD 2

PIMA COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT
PIMA ANIMAL CONTROL CENTER
4000 N. SILVERBELL RD. TUCSON, AZ 85745

www.found-pets.org/pacc.html

7245900 x3

COMPLAINT # 14 160530
OFFICER # CARVER 1401
DATE: 11-25-14

ORDER OF COMPLIANCE - DANGEROUS / VICIOUS ANIMAL

OWNER: _____
ADDRESS: _____
PHONE: _____

ANIMAL NAME: LUNA
BREED: Pit Bull
SEX: F COLOR: Blu/Wht

THE ABOVE LISTED ANIMAL HAS BEEN DECLARED TO BE A DANGEROUS ANIMAL PURSUANT TO CITY CODE/COUNTY ORDINANCE. THE OWNER(S) OF THE ANIMAL SHALL COMPLY WITH THE FOLLOWING ITEMS WITHIN THIRTY (30) DAYS OF THE ABOVE DATE.

CONFINEMENT ____ Construct A Completely Covered Kennel run.
____ Construct A fence which is (6) feet in height. The top (1) one foot of the fence shall incline inward at a (45) degree angle. The material used in the construction of the fence or kennel run MUST be strong enough to prevent the animal from EVER ESCAPING. The bottom of the fence or kennel run MUST be of concrete, cement or asphalt or MUST be constructed with footing of such material. All entry gates must be kept padlocked except for entry or exit.

[redacted] Owner Initials Compliance checked and Approved by : _____ On _____

MUZZLE The animal is to be kept MUZZLED and LEASHED and under the control of an adult when outside the confinement area.

[redacted] Owner Initials Compliance checked and Approved by : _____ On _____

SIGNS Dangerous Animal signs received: (circle the amount) 1 (2) 3 4 Signs to be posted on all entrances to the confinement area. Report all loss of signs to Pima Animal Control Center Immediately . Failure to report losses will result in a Violation of the Order Of Compliance and will result in the issuance of criminal citations.

[redacted] Owner Initials Compliance checked and Approved by : _____ On _____
[redacted] Owner Initials Received by : _____ Date : _____

INSURANCE Obtain and maintain liability insurance in the amount of $50,000 at all times.VICIOUS amount is $250,000. Proof of this insurance is to be provided to Pima Animal Control.

[redacted] Owner Initials Compliance checked and Approved by : _____ On _____

TATTOO Have Animal Tattooed on inside left thigh, with a number assigned by Animal Control.
Tattoo # PAC 14-63 Microchip # 982000363493938

[redacted] Owner Initials Compliance checked and Approved by : _____ On _____

SPAY / NEUTER Have animal spayed or neutered and provide proof to Pima Animal Control

[redacted] Owner Initials Compliance checked and Approved by : _____ On _____

IMMEDIATE TEMPORARY CONFINEMENT REQUIREMENTS:

Owner of an animal declared Dangerous shall not sell, give away, abandon or otherwise dispose of the animal without notifying Pima Animal Control in writing in advance. If the animal dies, Animal Control must verify identity before the owner disposes of the animal.

[redacted] Animal MUST remain at Pima County Animal Control for temporary confinement
_____ Other temporary confinement or address: _____

I acknowledge receipt of this order and my right to appeal within 5 days of this notice.

OWNER [redacted] DATE: 11/25/14 OFFICER: CARVER DATE: 11/25/14

Pacc-DD2

DO 2

PIMA COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT
PIMA ANIMAL CONTROL CENTER
4000 N. SILVERBELL RD. TUCSON, AZ 85745

COMPLAINT # 14 160530
OFFICER # CARVER 1901
DATE: 11-25-14

7245900 x 3

www.found-pets.org/pacc.html

ORDER OF COMPLIANCE - DANGEROUS / VICIOUS ANIMAL

OWNER: _
ADDRESS: _
PHONE: _

ANIMAL NAME: DALLAS
BREED: Pit Bull
SEX: M COLOR: Blu/Wht

THE ABOVE LISTED ANIMAL HAS BEEN DECLARED TO BE A DANGEROUS ANIMAL PURSUANT TO CITY CODE/COUNTY ORDINANCE. THE OWNER(S) OF THE ANIMAL SHALL COMPLY WITH THE FOLLOWING ITEMS WITHIN THIRTY (30) DAYS OF THE ABOVE DATE.

CONFINEMENT ___ Construct A Completely Covered Kennel run.
___ Construct A fence which is (6) feet in height. The top (1) one foot of the fence shall incline inward at a (45) degree angle. The material used in the construction of the fence or kennel run MUST be strong enough to prevent the animal from EVER ESCAPING. The bottom of the fence or kennel run MUST be of concrete, cement or asphalt or MUST be constructed with footing of such material. All entry gates must be kept padlocked except for entry or exit.

[redacted] Owner Initials Compliance checked and Approved by : _____ On _____

MUZZLE The animal is to be kept MUZZLED and LEASHED and under the control of an adult when outside the confinement area.

[redacted] Owner Initials Compliance checked and Approved by : _____ On _____

SIGNS Dangerous Animal signs received: (circle the amount) 1 (2) 3 4 Signs to be posted on all entrances to the confinement area. Report all loss of signs to Pima Animal Control Center Immediately . Failure to report losses will result in a Violation of the Order Of Compliance and will result in the issuance of criminal citations.

[redacted] Owner Initials Compliance checked and Approved by : _____ On _____
[redacted] Owner Initials Received by : _____ Date : _____

INSURANCE Obtain and maintain liability insurance in the amount of $50,000 at all times.VICIOUS amount is $250,000. Proof of this insurance is to be provided to Pima Animal Control.

[redacted] Owner Initials Compliance checked and Approved by : _____ On _____

TATTOO Have Animal Tattooed on inside left thigh, with a number assigned by Animal Control.

Tattoo # PAC 14-62 Microchip # 982000363494041

[redacted] Owner Initials Compliance checked and Approved by : _____ On _____

SPAY / NEUTER Have animal spayed or neutered and provide proof to Pima Animal Control

[redacted] Owner Initials Compliance checked and Approved by : _____ On _____

IMMEDIATE TEMPORARY CONFINEMENT REQUIREMENTS:

Owner of an animal declared Dangerous shall not sell, give away, abandon or otherwise dispose of the animal without notifying Pima Animal Control in writing in advance. If the animal dies, Animal Control must verify identity before the owner disposes of the animal.

[redacted] Animal MUST remain at Pima County Animal Control for temporary confinement
_____ Other temporary confinement or address: _____

I acknowledge receipt of this order and my right to appeal within 5 days of this notice.

OWNER: [redacted] DATE: 11/25/14 OFFICER: CARVER DATE: 11/25/14

Pacc-DD2

DD1

INVESTIGATION REPORT

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

SUSPECT		ACO NAME / BADGE # T. Foster2042	ACTIVITY/BITE NUMBER A14-152031
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS		BITE ☒ WELFARE ☐ DANGEROUS ☐ OTHER ☐	
CITY Tucson	STATE Az / ZIP / RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER		
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS UNK		CI ☐ CO ☐ OTHER ☐	
CITY N/A	STATE N/A / ZIP N/A / BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER N/A	DRIVERS LICENSE	
SEX / WEIGHT / HEIGHT / EYES / HAIR / ORIGIN		DOB / SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER	

DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES ☒ NO ☐	LOCATION OF INCIDENT	DATE AND TIME OF INCIDENT 07/21/14 05:50	DATE AND TIME REPORTED 07/21/14 07:14
	FOOD ☐ WATER ☐ SHELTER ☐ VENTILATION ☐ ABANDONED ☐ TIEDUT ☐ BEATEN ☐ WASTE ☐ INJ / ILL ☐ OTHER (EXPLAIN) ☐		
☐ I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case	VICTIM/COMPLAINTANT NAME	DATE OF BIRTH	RESIDENCE PHONE 520-577-3925 / BUSINESS PHONE Unk
☐ I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.		CITY Tucson	STATE Az / ZIP
☐ REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B0 and § 9-286 (B)	VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS Unk	CITY N/A	STATE N/A / ZIP N/A
NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)	DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES ☐ NO ☒ / RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES ☒ NO ☐ / DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # ☐ SHERIFF DEPT ☐ TUCSON POLICE ☐ FIRE ☐ OTHER:	FOLLOW UP REQUEST ☐ SO ☐ TPD ☐ OTHER:
☐ ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM	☒ VIOLATION ☐ NON-VIOLATION / BITE SEVERITY: 3-Med / PART OF BODY BITTEN: Thigh	TREATED BY Urgent Care / PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED 07/21/14 / RELEASE DATE: / PACC ☐ VET ☐ HOME ☒
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM / PHONE NUMBER	VET CLINIC	PHONE NUMBER / OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES ☒ NO ☐	FTQ ☐ UTQ ☐
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS	CLINIC'S ADDRESS	QUARANTINE (DAYS) 10 ☐ 15 ☐ 45 ☐ 180 ☐	☐ FRA HEAD#
	3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES ☒ NO ☐ / CITING ACO 2042	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES ☐ NO ☒ / PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE	CODE/ORD VIOLATED 6.04.120(B)(2); 6.04.070; 6.04.030		REVIEWED BY 7/24/14 KONST 2002
	CITATIONS/NUMBERS #72745 (A, B, C)		BOND YES ☐ NO ☒

BREED/DESCRIPTION		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	LICENSE #	CONDITION	ANIMAL ID#
R. Ridgeback	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Gabe	Red	M	6Yr	L11-052398	N	A139973
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐							
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐							
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐							
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐							
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐							
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐							

WITNESS 1	M ☐ F ☒	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE # / BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 2	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE # / BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 3	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE # / BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 4	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE # / BUSINESS PHONE #

DD 1

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-152031

ACO Name & Badge: T. Foster 2042

07/21/14 16:49 I, Officer Foster 2042 arrived at in reference to Activity number A14-152031 to meet with the victim, . I knocked on the front door and was met by . I stated the reason for my visit and asked if she had time for me to obtain a bite statement from her. invited me inside her home and stated that on 07/21/14 at approximately 05:50 am she and a neighbor, were walking north bound, in front of when they observed and his adult son walking their two dogs southbound towards them. stated that it is fairly common knowledge in the neighborhood that Rhodesian Ridgeback "Gabe" is aggressive and as such she and her companion moved to the side of the road to allow the men and their dogs to pass. was walking Gabe with the leash tied around his waist and his adult son was walking the other dog "Luke". As the men were passing where and were standing, Gabe was able to pull r over to was and bit her on her upper right thigh. stated that asked her if he (Gabe) hurt her. stated that she responded that "No" she was not okay and that she was bleeding. stated that on hearing that struck Gabe as punishment. stated that she left the area and sought medical treatment. I then asked for the address and phone number for her witness. provided me with that information as requested. I then asked if I could photograph her injuries, she gave permission and I took said photos. I then asked if she is requesting citations for the bite incident. stated that yes she is requesting third party citations be issued on her behalf. I then thanked , for her time and cooperation and left her residence. I then drove the Pima Animal Care truck to the dog owner's residence.

At approx 17:20 I arrived at and knocked on the front door. I was met by the adult son of the dog owner. The young man called to his father invited me inside the residence and I stated the reason for my visit. stated that he believed that Gabe had only scratched the woman. I responded that our agency had reason to believe that Gabe left actual bite wounds on her person. I then stated that Pima Animal Care records reflect that Gabe is current on his Rabies vaccination and therefore qualifies for a Home Quarantine. However, Pima Animal Care records also showed that Gabe's license expired in 2011. I then explained the terms of the home quarantine agreement and informed Mr. that the victim has requested that I issue him citations for biting animal and leash law. was unhappy about his neighbor's decision but was very cooperative and friendly. I then requested to see a copy of his license. gave me a copy of his driver's license and returned to the Pima Animal Care truck to prepare the citations for biting animal, leash law, no license, and the quarantine agreement. When I returned to the house acknowledged, signed, and accepted his copies of the citations and the quarantine agreement. I then returned his license to him and provided him with his court date, time, and location. I then thanked for his time and cooperation and left his residence. 2042

Officer's Signature: T. Foster **Date:** 7/24/14

DD 1

PIMA COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT
PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER
4000 N. SILVERBELL RD. TUCSON, AZ 85745
~~(520) 743-7550~~ FAX ~~(520) 743-9581~~
www.pimaanimalcare.org 724-5900

CASE NO: A14. 590161
OWNER:
ANIMAL NAME: GABE 139973

ADDRESS:
SEX: M BREED: R. RIDGEBACK
COLOR: RED DATE: 11-7-14

EVALUATION CRITERIA

REPORTED BITES:

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

SEVERITY OF INJURY TO HUMANS:
(Check One Factor Only Per Victim)

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

Animal Complaints or Violations:

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

SEVERITY OF INJURY TO ANIMALS:

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

CONFINEMENT MEASURES: (Check one factor only)
(Primary Method of Confinement at the time of the incident)

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

NOT CONTROLLED ON LEASH

OWNER ACCOUNTABILITY / RESPONSIBILITY:

REPAIRED DEFICIENT CONFINEMENT	- 3	-3
ANIMAL IS NEUTERED / SPAYED	- 1	-1
OWNER AWARE OF ANY AGGRESSION	+ 1	
OWNER FAILED TO REPAIR CONFINEMENT	+ 5	
CURRENTLY LICENSED LIC # 052398	- 1	-1
NO CURRENT LICENSE	+ 1	
NO CURRENT RABIES VACCINATION	+ 1	

NEIGHBOR COMMENTS (Scored by Majority Opinion):
(Two or More Neighbors Interviewed)

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

DOGS BEHAVIOR: (If Observed by Officer)

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

Confinement / Fencing:

PROPERTY IS CONFINED BY A PRIVACY WALL AND SECURE GATES. GABE IS NO LONGER TAKEN FOR WALKS. HE NOW HAS A HARNESS AND GENTLE LEAD THAT WILL BE USED IF HE IS TAKEN OUT.

General Comments:

I FOUND NO HISTORY OF COMPLAINTS OR VIOLATIONS. I FOUND NO ONE WHO HAS EVER WITNESSED GABE DISPLAY ANY TYPE OF AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR. GABE IS NOT DEEMED DANGEROUS AT THIS TIME.

E. KLEIN

OFFICER # 1926

TOTAL SCORE: +3

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

_____ DANGEROUS
X NOT DANGEROUS

We have determined that your dog displays or has a tendency, disposition, or propensity to injure, bite attack, chase or charge, OR attempt to injure ,bite, attack, chase or charge a person or domestic animal in a threating manner OR bare its teeth or approach a person or domestic animal in a threating 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**.

PACC-DD1

Pima Animal Care Center
Animals on Hold Report

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

kennel no

HOLD TYPE ENFORCEMEN

Number on Hold **6**

A12-102940

K14-176847 A247678 DOG SATIVA ROTTWEILER/

11/6/14 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN AGGRESSIVE Activity:A12-102940 **D055** R

Kennel Comment: chip 494D4C3F3D
DO NOT RELEASE!
Bond hold.1926 SAFE LOCK

11/17/2014 DTENKATI 11/17/14 13:35

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

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

11/06/2014 ENFORCE EKLEIN 11/6/14 20:29

11-6-14, Do not release Sativa. Owner must meet with enforcement.1926

11/10/2014 ENFORCE JCHAVEZ 11/10/14 10:14

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

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

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

12/11/2014 ENFORCE JCHAVEZ 12/11/14 10:35

12-4-14 The bond was paid on 11-26-14. The dog will be held further until the Order to Show Cause hearing is set up and conducted. 1914

A14-160905

K14-177394 A502999 DOG BRONSON PIT BULL/

11/28/14 QUARANTINEFIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A14-160905 **DR004** R

Kennel Comment: 3c3c3c3c3
dd hold. read memo

11/28/2014 ENFORCE EKLEIN 11/28/14 19:15

11-28-14,bronson is to be held for quarantine and a dd assessment. owner was not home at time of impound and still needs to be cited. when owner comes to pacc he must meet with enforcement.1926

12/11/2014 ENFORCE JCHAVEZ 12/11/14 10:42

12-11-14
The dog is under a dangerous dog evaluation and placed on hold due to confinement issues and the severity of the incident. 1914

A14-161335

kennel no

K14-178825 A503567 DOG OSOITO PIT BULL/MIX

12/4/14 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A14-161335 **DR015**

Kennel Comment: HOLD FOR BOND/ DD Evaluation. R

A14-161569

K14-178042 A503831 DOG LABRADOR RETR/MIX

12/8/14 CONFISCATE FIELD NORMAL Activity:A14-161569 **D016**

Kennel Comment: nhb. no chip. 3c3c3c3c3c3c3c3c3c3c3c3c3c3c.... R

A14-161691

K14-178288 A504153 DOG PIT BULL/

12/11/14 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN AGGRESSIVE Activity:A14-161691 **U011**

Kennel Comment: scan no chip
3c3c3c3c R

12/11/2014 ENFORCE KWALTON 12/11/14 18:38

12-11-14 Upon arrival to this abandoned call, the 24 hour notice was still on the front door dated 12-10-14. The dog was still in the back yard with no food or shelter, but did have water. The water container was covered with green algae , but the water was clear. There was a small plastic container with water under the window, in full sun. There were many empty bowls in the yard, but no food. The dog was scared and aggressive and ran to the side of the house where it was caught and impounded. I took photos of the bowls in the yard and scanned the dog, no chip was found.
A neighbor advised me that there were 2 dogs originally, but when the workers came over to change the locks the gate was left open a little and the dog got out. She described the dog as a pit bull mix, white with black spots, and hyper. The dog has not been seen since. I left notice of impound on the door.
If the owner tries to redeem, I am requesting citations to be issued for abandonment, no shelter, no food.
1925

A14-161758

K14-178211 A504060 DOG PIT BULL/MIX

12/10/14 STRAY FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A14-161758 **D017**

Kennel Comment: no bite/ no chip R

12/10/2014 ENFORCE KWALTON 12/10/14 18:46

12/10/14 17:52hrs Arrived at location and observed the front gate to be wide open with small pitbull mix puppy running at large. Upon speaking to the neighbor, we learned the house is a duplex and while one side of the house is empty, the other side is lived in by the owner. The neighbor was unsure of whether the dog belonged to the home owner or previous tenants that recently vacated the property. We did observe a dog house and a bucket of water which was approximately 1/2 full and a little dirty, at the back of the property. Due to dog being at large we did impound him. Left a notice stating reason for impoundment and requested contact to clarify complaint on abandonment.

1925/2068

kennel no

HOLD TYPE VET Number on Hold **1**

A14-161425

[redacted] A503663 DOG PIT BULL/MIX

12/5/14 STRAY NIGHT NORMAL Activity:A14-161425 **D074** R

Kennel Comment: didnt bite, no chip found
3C3C3C3C

12/11/2014 VET ASANCHE 12/11/14 12:25

SWOLLEN RIGHT SIDE OF FACE: POSSIBLE BITE WOUNDS= ABCESS

DRAIN PLACED- REMOVE DRAIN AND VET HOLD TO 12/16/14

2000

Donation Activity

Period: 11-01-14 To: 11-30-14

Donation Code	Amount
DONATION	$110.00
DONATION ADOP	$334.00
DONATION GEN	$19,589.20
DONATION OUTR	$31.00
DONATION S/N	$11,193.00
DONATION SAMS	$2,141.00
DONATION SHEL 0974	$280.00
Grand Total	$33,678.20

Donation Activity

Period: 07-01-14 To: 11-30-14

Donation Code	Amount
DONATION	$125.00
DONATION ADOP	$2,380.86
DONATION GEN	$98,848.26
DONATION OUTR	$3,389.00
DONATION S/N	$64,152.26
DONATION SAMS	$12,201.50
DONATION SHEL 0974	$20,585.00
Grand Total	$201,681.88

Complaints and Commendations for the Month of November 2014

11-12-14 complaint came through District 3 Supervisor's Office
Complaint
Ongoing problem with stray dog in the neighborhood
Course/Action
A trap was set and the dog was captured on 11-30-14

11-20-14 complaint came through District 5 Supervisor's Office
Complaint
Neighbor's pit bull jumps the gate; reported to PACC, but PACC hasn't been able to come out yet
Course/Action
Contact made, owner said he was in the process of adding to the gate to prevent the dog escaping confinement. Recheck confirmed boards were added to the gate. Owner received citation for no license.

11-26-14 complaint letter sent through an Advisory Committee member
Complaint
Negative encounter with Rescue Coordinator and Adoption Coordinator regarding urgent list dog
Course/Action
Addressed with staff

Michael Schlueter

From: Jose Chavez
Sent: Thursday, November 13, 2014 11:29 AM
To: District3
Cc: Kiki Navarro; Anissa Ramirez; Michael Schlueter; Kristin Barney; Kim Janes
Subject: RE: Supervisor Sharon Bronson feedback form 2014-11-12 04:17 PM Submission Notification

---

From: Kim Janes
Sent: Wednesday, November 12, 2014 5:01 PM
To: District3
Cc: Kiki Navarro; Anissa Ramirez; Jose Chavez; Michael Schlueter
Subject: RE: Supervisor Sharon Bronson feedback form 2014-11-12 04:17 PM Submission Notification

Of course Ms. Cabrera.

Respectfully,

Kim

PIMA COUNTY
ANIMAL CARE

From: Jennifer Cabrera **On Behalf Of** District3
Sent: Wednesday, November 12, 2014 4:21 PM
To: Kim Janes
Cc: Kiki Navarro; Anissa Ramirez
Subject: FW: Supervisor Sharon Bronson feedback form 2014-11-12 04:17 PM Submission Notification

Good Afternoon Kim,

Please see the constituent email below.
Can you have staff contact Mr. Alvarez and let us know the outcome?

Thank you,

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

From: notification@pima.gov [mailto:notification@pima.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, November 12, 2014 4:18 PM

To: District3
Subject: Supervisor Sharon Bronson feedback form 2014-11-12 04:17 PM Submission Notification

Supervisor Sharon Bronson feedback form 2014-11-12 04:17 PM was submitted by Guest on 11/12/2014 4:17:53 PM (GMT-07:00) US/Arizona

Name	Value
First Name	
Last Name	
Email	
Phone	
Address	
City	
State	
Zipcode	
District_of_Concern	Supervisor District 2 - Ramon Valadez,Supervisor District 3 - Sharon Bronson,Supervisor District 5 - Richard Elias
Department_of_concern	Animal Care Center
Subject_or_Nature_of_Concern	non-responsiveness from Pima County animal control staff
Comments	Hello, I am sending this email due to unresponsiveness by Animal control center. I have called three times regarding a stray dog in the neighborhood that may be a danger to young children. My neighbor who has the same concerns has called several different times as well. This issue has been going on for over two months now and I have been calling since October. The dog has even dug under the neighbor's fence to get into the yard where small children play. Many young children walk through the area on their way home from Miller Elementary and when the neighbor and I have approached the dog, he has growled and barked at us. I consider this dog a nuisance and a danger. I have called twice to the animal control center and left messages for two different supervisors, neither of which has returned my call. I am concerned that neither of them has been professional nor courteous enough to return my calls. I am requesting that an inquiry be made as to what action has been taken or if any action has indeed been taken. My wife and I are here most of the day and neither of us have even seen a animal control vehicle in the neighborhood. I can be reached at and would be happy to show any representative where the dog hangs out.
Would_like_a_response	Yes
Referred_Page	https://webcms.pima.gov/cms/One.aspx?portalId=169&pageId=8164

Thank you, Pima County, Arizona

Michael Schlueter

From: Kim Janes
Sent: Thursday, November 20, 2014 3:25 PM
To: Keith Bagwell
Cc: Laura.Dent@tucsonaz.gov; Jose Chavez; Michael Schlueter
Subject: RE: Animal Care inquiry

From: Keith Bagwell
Sent: Thursday, November 20, 2014 3:10 PM
To: Kim Janes
Cc: Laura.Dent@tucsonaz.gov
Subject: FW: Animal Care inquiry

Kim,

Please let us know when the Animal Care folks get to investigating this situation and let us know the outcome.

Thank you,

Keith Bagwell, Richard Elías' office, 4-8723

From: Laura Dent [mailto:Laura.Dent@tucsonaz.gov]
Sent: Thursday, November 20, 2014 2:02 PM
To
Cc: Keith Bagwell
Subject: Animal Care inquiry

Animal Care is actually managed by Pima County, they can be reached at 520-243-5900.

You can also contact your elected representative at the county, Supervisor Richard Elias, for help if approaching Animal Care directly does not work. We work with his staff often on multi-jurisdictional issues. I have CC'd his staffer Keith Bagwell here for your convenience. It sounds like your complaint is in queue, so Keith may be able to find out how things are going.

best,
Laura

Laura Dent, MPA
Chief of Staff
Council Member Regina Romero
City of Tucson - Ward 1
940 W. Alameda
520.837.4264
http://government.tucsonaz.gov/ward-1

>>: 11/19/2014 1:31 PM >>>

Hi Laura,

You have helped us in the past to find contacts in the city that we could talk to about a public housing property that has been causing problems for us for some time. You had given me Mr. Elias's email and I have had several contacts with him. I would like to contact him about another problem that is happening at that house. It seems that the neighbors pit bull has learned to jump the gate anytime someone is in the alley. I was unable to get out of my gate in the back yard on Friday because of the dog blocking my way. I called animal control on Friday and placed a report. When I called today they said my report was on a priority list but they have not been able to get out to that property yet. Another neighbor told me that he has stopped walking his dog down the alley because of this situation. I was hoping that Mr Elias might give us some guidance on what to do next. I drove down the alley several times this weekend and saw the dog jump the gate and follow my car.

I am out of town and can not find Mr Elisa's contact information. Would you pass this on to me?

You may send this email to anyone you think might be of help to us. My understanding is that my neighbor is no longer employed by the Housing Department in the city but I am still uncomfortable calling that department directly. This is a very frustrating situation for all of us.

Take care,

Sent from my iPad

To all concerned,

I am writing to express my concern with a few things about PACC. Specifically, I wanted to share my experience with the adoption process. In searching Craigslist, I came upon several urgent messages, saying that six dogs were going to be dead by Sunday the 9th at PACC unless they were adopted. This prompted my wife and me to want to act. We are new to the Tucson area and had very little knowledge of how to go about this.

Due to having two special case dogs already, we didn't consider any of the dogs as described to be a good fit for fostering at our house, but nonetheless wanted to help. We arrived at PACC on Saturday the 8th. My wife went in to speak with Michelle Lindorff, the Rescue Coordinator, with basically a blank check offer to provide the financials to take care of those dogs still on the urgent list until they can find homes.

Michelle said to my wife "we don't do that", waving her away dismissively with her hand. My wife tried to press her further about it, specifically Buster, hoping to get at least something to work with, but Michelle only listed Buster's negative traits, specifically that he fears kennel environments and doesn't like people before saying "maybe you can pay to board him" before dismissing her. Board a dog that you just said didn't like these types of environments?

It's my understanding that the title of Rescue Coordinator implies the coordination of rescues. One would think the urgent dogs would be of greatest concern to someone in this position. This Rescue Coordinator not only refused a significant sum of money, without even a second thought, but also failed to provide even one single resource, one single rescue group to try to do something for these dogs. In short, the Rescue Coordinator didn't even attempt to coordinate, and, frankly, didn't even seem to care. I understand if the money can't be used in the exact way we want it, but to not even attempt to channel what should be a wonderfully surprising potential resource is beyond pathetic.

After this, we had to ask volunteers to find out where Buster was and made our way to the Pecan Festival. We got there and I asked after Buster, asking if he was the one on the "Euth list", having seen that on the Craiglist ad. Instead of selling us on the virtues of this dog, Ellie Beaubien, the Adoption Coordinator, instead decided to try to argue with me about the proper wording, saying that PACC doesn't have a "euth list", it has a "urgently in need of adoption" list. This was the first of three times Ellie provoked me over wording issues. During our time there, not once did she attempt to make the dog seem appealing, only listing his perceived negative traits. Not once did I see her actively engage anybody who walked up to look at the dogs. Someone in this position should be selling, should be excited, should be actively engaging people, rather than only focusing their attention on sitting and arguing.

Thankfully for Buster, Kim Silver was there and relieved our fears about how he would fit in with our other dogs. She was the only one we encountered who actually had anything positive to say about Buster. So much so, that we ended up adopting him. The only one who bothered to try to do right by this dog isn't even an employee. The two employees we encountered did more to try to shoo people away than actually make the effort to get a dog on the urgent list adopted.

This is a big problem for PACC. You have two people, in pivotal positions, who either don't care, are too lazy, or not competent enough for the positions given to them. You need people in these positions who are professional, passionate, mature, and willing to go the extra mile for these animals. People who take the initiative, people who are positive. People who are going to make the effort to actually analyze these dogs, to get the best information on them possible. Buster is nothing like he was described. These two individuals are completely unfit for the positions and are really doing PACC and the community a disservice.

Thank you for your time in reading this. My goal here is to help you by providing my experience. With the new money coming in, it's my hope that you can get the right personnel in place to make sure as many animals can be adopted as possible. If any of you wish to speak to me about this, you can reach me at or at I would be happy to speak anytime about this letter.

Thank you,