

1. Call to Order

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

- Attendance

Present:

Nancy Emptage, Vice-Chair, Animal Welfare Coalition

Pat Hubbard, Humane Society of Southern Arizona

Derek Marshall, Public Education

Helen Mendelsohn, Disabled Community

Jack Neuman, Chair, PACC Volunteers

Jane Schwerin, People for Animals in the Prevention of Cruelty and Neglect

Gail Smith, MD, Board of Health

Kim Janes, Pima Animal Care Center (PACC), Ex-Officio

Absent:

Tamara Barrick, Foundation for Animals in Risk

Pat Jacobs, Tucson Kennel Club

Sophia Kaluzniacki, DVM, SPCA of AZ, Inc

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 December 18, 2014 Meeting Minutes

The motion was made and seconded (Mendelsohn/Hubbard) that the December 18, 2014 meeting minutes be adopted as written. The motion carried (7-0)

3. Call to the Audience

There were four speakers from the audience, Justin Pope, Marcie Velen, Lea Ann Kelly and Kim Brandom.

Mr. Pope referred to the second bullet of the Partnership Agreement provided in the packet and on the agenda, about making no inflammatory public statements about PACC, staff and programs, volunteers and PACC rescue partners. He questioned who all this was to apply to, individuals who sign the agreement, organizations, individuals associated with organizations; does it only apply to one's professional life or does it also include personal life? Secondly he questioned what is inflammatory, and reported Webster's defines it as causing anger, which he characterized as pretty broad. He suggested that saying animals are at risk of euthanasia or objecting to the Partnership Agreement could be perceived by some as inflammatory. Thirdly he asserted that the agreement is rather one-sided.

Ms. Velen said she felt most of the Partnership Agreement bullet points apply to what is expected of partners and very few apply to what is expected from PACC. She called for working on a mutual agreement that included what rescue partners wanted and concurred with the comment about the agreement being one-sided.

Ms. Kelly said she agreed with Ms. Velen's comments then went on to say 501(c)(3)s are targeted and discriminated against in the agreement. Both 501(c)(3)s and non 501(c)(3)s pull from PACC and the agreement has special rules just for the 501(c)(3)s, but those rules should be enforced by the IRS not PACC. She continued that PACC wants access to adoption and sterilization records; and while she has no problem with sterilization records, she does have a problem with adoption records; feels that is an invasion of privacy and that PACC should trust the rescues to do their job to find good homes for rescued animals. She also said she had other issues that can't be addressed at the meeting and provided a handout (included in the record).

Ms. Brandom said she agreed the term inflammatory was too broad; the wording in the Partnership Agreement needs to be tightened up; and there needs to be clarification on who to bring complaints and disputes to. She went on to say there are fairly detailed reports on donations, but not on how those donations are spent, which she would like to see.

#### 4. Management Report

There was no discussion on this item.

#### 5. Old Business

- Volunteer Policy and Partnership Agreement

Dr. Smith said she didn't understand why rescues wouldn't want to share information; if someone gets an animal directly from PACC, then PACC knows where it went, so why is it a problem if it went out via a rescue? Ms. Mendelsohn pointed out that an individual could obtain several animals by going to different non-profits and each non-profit wouldn't see the person is getting a high number of animals. Also the agencies wouldn't know if PACC has record of the person being an animal abuser. Ms. Emptage pointed out that PACC is accountable for placement of the animals; the law requires PACC know where the animals go; and the law requires dogs be licensed, which would also give PACC the owner's information, so it should not be an issue. Ms. Schwerin agreed that it was the law and added that the law requires PACC to verify a number of things about the organization, which the rescue organization must agree to in writing. Mr. Neuman also agreed with the legal obligations stated.

Mr. Neuman expressed that some stipulations in the agreement seem to contradict first amendment rights, but said PACC has the right to sever relations with entities that sidetrack from PACC's mission. He said he typically stays off Facebook, but has sometimes seen a thread of negative communication. Dr. Smith suggested rather than banning negative communication, provide a person or structure to address problems, adding that Facebook rants make people less likely to want to deal with PACC which makes overcrowding worse. Ms. Emptage said it comes down to the third bullet, being respectful, and added that negative communications get magnified and taint the public. She relayed there are negative perceptions of PACC that currently just aren't true, adding that the Committee will listen and if people don't want to come in person, then they can send them a letter.

Mr. Neuman said volunteer interaction with the Volunteer Coordinator has gone down and the volunteers see him less, but suggested more Volunteer Coordinator availability could be part of the solution. Ms. Mendelsohn suggested more than one person to go to. Mr. Neuman pointed out that at some point PACC management makes a decision on an issue and that decision stands. It was discussed that concerns voiced are part of the record and the Committee can act or advise as they see fit. Mr. Marshall said most PACC related Facebook posts are emotional responses to some recent event. He suggested such postings are cathartic for the volunteer and can lead to commiseration and eventually positive outcomes.

Dr. Francisco García, Health Department Director, said the agreement is a starting point and part of the process is to get feedback as expressed. He said staff will work on the language. As a result of recent input, the Rescue Coordinator will be meeting with rescue organizations to improve communication. The partnership agreement is not intended to infringe on free speech rights, but rather to promote respectful communication as opposed to comments that border on an attack on an individual or organization. Staff stressed that PACC could not do what it does without volunteers and other partners and that the agreement is an attempt to try to work together not a way to get rid of volunteers. Dr. García cited the Humane Society as an example of an organization using volunteers in a focused manner to provide exemplary service.

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

Jessica Gray, a volunteer with People for Animals in the Prevention of Cruelty and Neglect (PFA), spoke about two extreme cases of neglect. After she spoke she provided the document she read off of. The first case involved an unvaccinated, unlicensed pitbull mix named Chewy. The dog was originally injured on or around November 10<sup>th</sup> when it suffered a severed Achilles tendon and lacerated his leg to the bone. The owner took Chewy to Southern Arizona Vet Services and was referred to Ms. Emptage in her capacity as a counselor for PFA. Euthanasia was recommended. Instead the owner took Chewy home and provided no further medical care until he contacted Ms. Gray nearly a month later. The owner failed to get Chewy to two separate appointments, so Ms. Gray gave Chewy and his owner a ride to VCA Animal Medical Center. When Chewy got to the truck there was an overwhelming odor of decomposition. At VCA the veterinarian had to soak the bandage off of Chewy's leg. The owner made it clear he was homeless and jobless. Only euthanasia was offered. The owner began yelling and announced his intentions to further deprive Chewy of veterinary care. The veterinarian wrapped Chewy's leg and changed her story from what was earlier discussed with Ms. Gray. Ms. Gray then called PACC. Animal Care Enforcement Operations Manager Jose Chavez spoke with the veterinarian and the owner was allowed to keep Chewy. Later in the week PACC staff responded to where the owner was living, PFA was contacted and Ms. Gray provided transportation to Valley Animal Hospital where the veterinarian offered amputation or euthanasia as the only reasonable options. PFA would not authorize amputation due to their policy against it and the owner's track record of providing no aftercare. The owner intended to again leave with Chewy, so Ms. Gray again called PACC. Mr. Chavez said a private donor would pay for the amputation and there would be follow up to ensure Chewy would not suffer any further. Currently there is no record of further PACC or veterinarian contact; Chewy's condition is unknown and the owner has not responded to attempts to contact him.

The other case involved a mixed breed female dog which was reported to Ms. Gray by her owner, on December 23<sup>rd</sup>, to have been severely injured (broken shoulder and leg and likely internal injuries) in

March and that the owner has not provided any medical care. The owner continued that last week the dog was attacked by cattle and was screaming in pain, which Ms. Gray could hear in the background. Ms. Gray sent them to VCA and authorized only pain medication to relieve the animal's suffering while the situation was investigated. She also made VCA aware she was contacting PACC. Ms. Gray notified Field Supervisor Konst of the animal's medical situation and the owners various animal related violations. Mr. Konst spoke to the veterinarian who was consenting to allow the dog to go home until after Christmas, so that children wouldn't lose their dog at Christmas.

In light of the two aforementioned cases, Ms. Gray asked if efforts to be a no kill county were interfering with enforcement's ability to seize and relieve the suffering of severely injured and neglected animals, or if it is simply not PACC's goal to enforce the laws and ordinances as written? She said there have been numerous cases wherein PACC and law enforcement have demonstrated unwillingness to enforce animal welfare codes. She continued that numerous other agencies have adopted no kill models where no kill did not translate into being overcrowded and ineffective, nor force suffering into the field. She called for dialogue on the lack of enforcement and the ability of PACC field officers, especially supervisors, to override veterinarians in cases of previous neglect. She cited that the laws are clear and strong, just not enforced, and as a result animals are allowed to suffer tremendously.

Ms. Hubbard said she believes there is a state law requiring veterinarians to report animal cruelty and there appears to be a problem with veterinarians. Ms. Gray strongly agreed and said there is a board of veterinary ethics and she is in the process of writing them on this topic. Ms. Emptage said the pitbull owner wanted PFA to pay for the amputation and when he was told PFA was only offering euthanasia he told Ms. Emptage she was wasting his time. Ms. Emptage said some veterinarians don't want to make a stand and it's hard for PACC to go against what a veterinarian says. Ms. Hubbard said there are some veterinarians who automatically call PACC when an owner takes an animal home against medical advice (AMA). Ms. Emptage added there have been instances when veterinarians give an animal pain medication and then don't say or document an AMA because there is no suffering at that time, which sends the problem away and they avoid any controversy, but they know the owner doesn't have money and the relief will only be temporary.

PACC Field Supervisor Tenkate, in response to a question, said there are times when owners are allowed to relinquish an animal to PACC in lieu of citations, but depending on the severity of the violations citations can still be issued when an animal is relinquished. Sometimes the decision to issue citations comes after examinations by our veterinarian. Regarding Chewy, staff was shown a form regarding another vet clinic visit, but when the owner brought Chewy in the clinic refused to do anything due to lack of payment. Ms. Emptage contended that PACC should ask about owners' ability to pay and in the case of Chewy should have known the owner could not pay since PFA was involved. Ms. Tenkate said procedurally field officers don't question people about their financial situation. Ms. Gray also indicated she informed Mr. Chavez of Chewy's owner's lack of means to treat. Ms. Schwerin commented that veterinarians are often wrong and why not take action and get another veterinarian to testify? Mr. Janes commented that it is a balancing act and there are no absolutes. Mr. Neuman asked if PFA had contracts with the veterinary clinics involved in the aforementioned cases. Ms. Schwerin said her organization has "broken up" with VCA except for euthanasia. Mr. Neuman suggested a meeting be set up with enforcement and animal assistance agencies like PFA to work through how to best handle situations like those discussed. Dr. García was supportive of suggestion. In response to a question, Mr. Janes indicated that paying the bill isn't the same as being the client / animal owner.

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

Mr. Neuman said he was combining the discussion under this bullet with the New Business Jurisdiction IGA Discussion since they are closely related. He asked Deputy County Administrator for Medical and Health Services Jan Leshar to explain the current County and municipality dynamic which ties these issues together.

Ms. Leshar provided the following information. The County is only legally obligated to provide animal care services in unincorporated Pima County; services within the municipalities are provided through intergovernmental agreements (IGAs) with the County. Additionally animal care spending has increased, including roughly \$1.2 million a couple of years ago. PACC's spending increases hit the cities and towns in the middle of a budget cycle, which is not something they like, and County Administration agrees that isn't the way things should be done. Through the IGA the city of Tucson pays roughly \$3 million for their portion of the services PACC provides. There has been ongoing dialogue between County and municipality management concerning animal care services and costs. Two guiding principles were established going into these discussions. First, the decision making authority regarding animal care services legally rests with the Board of Supervisors and cannot be taken away; and secondly, the County will not step back from the quality of care. In general the jurisdictions feel the County is spending too much on animal care. They have questioned why PACC deals with cats, since it's not legally mandated, and have suggested a maximum animal retention of three days. The Board of Supervisors is the only legal body currently directly involved in animal care. Therefore they hear from constituents, but the local municipalities typically do not get input on animal related issues and don't perceive animal care needs. The jurisdictions know the budget is tight and put people before pets. It has come to the point where the IGAs might not be renewed. However, the lack of an IGA, probably won't keep PACC from getting animals from any given municipality. How do we handle that; turn away animals from non-IGA jurisdictions; charge a fee? Local animal advocacy entities are telling the County to spend more, while the cities and towns are saying cut PACC's spending. The Committee's request for more field officers was shared with the jurisdictions because the costs impact their budgets. How do we get the community engaged in letting the municipalities know what the animal care issues are and how important these issues are to them? For example, representatives from large jurisdictions have told Ms. Leshar that we don't have feral cats. They don't hear about the needs and issues, so the issues don't shape their budgets.

Mr. Neuman spoke about meeting with jurisdiction officials and pointed out that many of the PACC volunteers live in the various municipalities. He added that city managers and finance managers aren't elected and would probably be less influenced by constituents. Dr. Smith suggested participating in city council meetings. The possibility of the Committee sending letters to city and town officials was also touched on. Ms. Leshar pointed out the recent drastic increase in charitable contributions to PACC and how much of this increase is tied to PACC's improved service model. Organizations give in connection to policies and programs they agree with; and these funds offset costs, to include costs to the jurisdictions. A regression in service philosophy will result in these funds not being available. Mr. Neuman asserted that having to charge individuals or having to turn animals away will unravel all the progress made in recent years. He said he was composing a letter to the volunteers. The Committee discussed obtaining information, through staff, on the jurisdictions and their meetings, and then possibly holding another meeting to discuss actions once the information has been gathered.

Eventually, a motion was made and seconded (Emptage/Smith) that the Committee hold a meeting prior to the next regular meeting to address how the Committee wants to approach animal care communications with the local municipalities. The motion carried (7-0).

6. New Business

- Jurisdiction IGA Discussion and County Obligation for Animal Care Services Inside Cities and Towns

See discussion at previous bullet.

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

Ms. Schwerin referred to welfare case two, in which there were four dogs left outside in the rain all day. Documentation stated that proof of shelter was provided; however, she questioned the validity of the proof of shelter. She said people like this owner do not reform and the owner should not be allowed to redeem the animals.

Ms. Schwerin referred to welfare case three as a terrible case involving multiple violations. A motion was made and seconded (Emptage/Marshall) that the Committee recommend to the court that it ban the owner in this case from animal ownership. The motion carried (7-0).

Ms. Emptage referred to welfare case five in which three dogs were on tie outs and the report states the owner gave reason to believe he would place the dogs back on tie outs. She said it is likely the dogs went back on tie outs. However, as reported by Mr. Janes, a subsequent recheck found the dogs were not on tie outs.

Ms. Schwerin referred to welfare case four in which a dog was on a tie out tangled around a tree and the owner received several citations. She asked why the owner was allowed to keep the dog. Mr. Janes said staff could revisit the case to see why the officer made that decision.

Ms. Emptage referred to welfare case six, another dog on a tie out, which was also on a tie out when rechecked. She asked where the dog is now. Mr. Janes said that was a good question and indicated Supervisor Tenkate was taking notes.

Ms. Emptage referred to welfare case ten as a horrible case. The case included three dogs on tie outs and one emaciated boxer which had to be euthanized. The owner signed a release of ownership for all the dogs. The Committee discussed wanted severe action taken against the owner. Supervisor Tenkate added that the owner is now on PACC's no adoption list; there was no history of violations at his address and the maximum legal ban on animal ownership is three years.

The motion was made and seconded (Emptage/Smith) that the County Attorney and Judge in this case be made aware of a recommendation from the Committee for the owner to receive the maximum fines and animal ownership ban. The motion carried (7-0). During discussion Ms. Schwerin referred to a proposed ordinance she has been working on. She said the current cruelty and neglect law calls for fines from \$100 to \$2,500, up to six months in jail, and up to three years of probation. Her proposed addition included a violator not being allowed to own or harbor animals for up to 5 years, or longer, or ever.

Ms. Schwerin requested staff provide her with the court dates associated with welfare cases two, three, four, five and ten.

To make better use of staff time at the meetings, a motion was made and seconded (Hubbard/Smith) to move the Welfare Cases and Dangerous Dogs agenda items sooner in the agenda going forward. The motion carried (6-0).

8. Donations: A total of 1,821 individuals gave \$114,509.68 in donations during the month of December.

Mr. Neuman characterized December's donations total as unprecedented. Ms. Hubbard asked if these donations are from individuals or organizations, to which Mr. Janes replied they are all monetary donations from all sources, to include \$29,000 from PetSmart Charities. He said there have been a number of special appeals generated by PACC's Fund Development Manager, who is doing a fantastic job. Mr. Janes added that most donation funds go for spay/neuter and medical expenses, although some funds are specifically designated where they are to be used and that is how those dollars are allocated.

9. Complaints and Commendations: There were three complaints and one commendation received by staff during December.

There was no discussion on the documentation provided. Ms. Emptage wanted to commend staff for the on-line licensing feature which she said was very easy to use. Mr. Neuman complemented the Adoption Coordinator for being out on the floor assisting and for turning down a would-be adopter who was of concern.

10. Call to the Audience

There were no speakers at this call to the audience.

11. Announcements, Schedules and Proposed Agenda Items

Ms. Hubbard said the Humane Society has a grant to provide free spay/neuter and vaccinations for puppies in zip code 85705.

Mr. Janes said the Pima Alliance for Animal Welfare (PAAW) will have a meeting tomorrow morning at 8:00 in the exact same room the Committee meeting was in..

Ms. Emptage said she has been in discussions regarding service and emotional therapy dogs and if anyone has any input they can send it to her.

12. Next Meeting – February 19, 2015

Mr. Neuman established that the next meeting will be held at the Abrams building.

13. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:53 pm



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

January 15, 2015 – 5:30 p.m.  
Herbert K. Abrams Public Health Center  
3950 S. Country Club Road  
Tucson, Arizona 85714  
Room 1108  
(520) 724-7729

**AMENDED**

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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roll Call</li> <li>• Establishment of Quorum and Pledge of Allegiance</li> </ul>			
2.	Review and Adoption of Minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adoption of December 18, 2014 meeting minutes</li> </ul>			
3.	Call to the Audience			
4.	Management Report			
5.	Old Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Volunteer policy and Partnership Agreement (Chair Neuman/PACC Management Team)</li> <li>• General Criteria required for PACC to respond and investigate a service/welfare issue wherein an animal is in distress (Ms. Schwerin/ Ms. Emptage/Ms. Jessica Gray/PACC Enforcement Management)</li> <li>• County Administration response to the Committee's request to add additional field officers and shelter staff (Chair Neuman/Mr. Janes)</li> </ul>			
6.	New Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jurisdiction IGA Discussion and County Obligation for Animal Care Services Inside Cities and Towns (Chair Neuman/Mr. Janes)</li> </ul>			
7.	Animal Welfare and Dangerous Animal Cases for the Month of December and Recent Holds Snapshot			
	Welfare		Dangerous Dogs	
	A14-162943	A14-157273	A14-160803	A14-162288
	A14-162549	A14-160633	A14-161172	A14-161700
	A14-159915	A14-162650	A14-162079	
	A14-126693	A14-162744	A14-161922	
	A14-161212	A14-151102	A14-162284	
8.	Donations: A total of 1,821 individuals gave \$114,509.68 in donations during the month of December.			
9.	Complaints and Commendations: There were three complaints and one commendation received by staff during December.			
10.	Call to the Audience			
11.	Announcements, Schedules and Proposed Agenda Items			
12.	Next Meeting – February 19, 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](http://www.pima.gov/animalcare). The Committee may discuss and take action on any item on the agenda. At the conclusion of an open call to the public Committee members may only respond to criticism made; ask staff to review the matter raised; or ask to include the matter on a future agenda.

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

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

**Draft**

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-Officio

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 10<sup>th</sup> cat trapping class and a January 16<sup>th</sup> 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

PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DECEMBER 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	%+/-
<b>SHELTER OPERATIONS</b>											
ALL ANIMALS HANDLED											
DOGS	684	551	1,235	4,150	3,672	7,822	4,093	3,498	7,591		
CATS	291	177	468	1,926	1,393	3,319	2,551	1,586	4,137		
OTHERS	23	37	60	174	318	492	174	300	474		
<b>TOTAL ANIMALS HANDLED</b>	<b>998</b>	<b>765</b>	<b>1,763</b>	<b>6,250</b>	<b>5,383</b>	<b>11,633</b>	<b>6,818</b>	<b>5,384</b>	<b>12,202</b>	<b>-569</b>	<b>-5%</b>
Live Animals Handled	871	652	1,523	5,213	4,582	9,795	5,997	4,748	10,745	-950	-9%
<b>IMPOUNDED ANIMALS</b>											
<b>ADOPTED</b>											
DOGS	244	212	456	1,544	1,474	3,018	1,362	1,133	2,495		
CATS	150	98	248	933	775	1,708	613	486	1,099		
OTHER	3	1	4	5	12	17	20	12	32		
<b>TOTAL ADOPTED</b>	<b>397</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>708</b>	<b>2,482</b>	<b>2,261</b>	<b>4,743</b>	<b>1,995</b>	<b>1,631</b>	<b>3,626</b>	<b>1117</b>	<b>31%</b>
<b>RETURNED TO OWNER</b>											
DOGS	93	58	151	516	368	884	436	337	773		
CATS	4	3	7	23	32	55	26	31	57		
OTHER	12	0	12	12	7	19	3	11	14		
<b>TOTAL RETURNED</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>551</b>	<b>407</b>	<b>958</b>	<b>465</b>	<b>379</b>	<b>844</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>RESCUED</b>											
DOGS	102	121	223	570	609	1,179	648	736	1,384		
CATS	65	50	115	379	296	675	650	442	1,092		
OTHER	2	1	3	11	32	43	36	27	63		
<b>TOTAL RESCUED</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>341</b>	<b>960</b>	<b>937</b>	<b>1,897</b>	<b>1,334</b>	<b>1,205</b>	<b>2,539</b>	<b>-642</b>	<b>-25%</b>
<b>*TOTAL LIVE RELEASES</b>	<b>675</b>	<b>544</b>	<b>1,219</b>	<b>3,993</b>	<b>3,605</b>	<b>7,598</b>	<b>3,794</b>	<b>3,215</b>	<b>7,009</b>	<b>589</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>**TOTAL LIVE RELEASE RATE</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>82%</b>			<b>75%</b>		
<b>EUTHANIZED</b>											
DOGS	171	138	309	960	840	1,800	1,086	966	2,052		
CATS	21	34	55	217	166	383	931	530	1,461		
OTHER	1	2	3	42	55	97	25	50	75		
<b>TOTAL EUTHANIZED</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>367</b>	<b>1,219</b>	<b>1,061</b>	<b>2,280</b>	<b>2042</b>	<b>1546</b>	<b>3588</b>	<b>-1308</b>	<b>-36%</b>
(-)Owner Requested Euthanasia	46	61	107	340	326	666			1190		
Adjusted Total Euthanasia	147	113	260	879	735	1,614			2,398		
<b>***EUTHANASIA RATE</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>18%</b>			<b>25%</b>		
OTHER	162	132	294	1,356	1,025	2,381	957	737	1,694	687	41%
<b>ENFORCEMENT OPERATIONS</b>											
Welfare Responses	200	99	299	1170	568	1738	1252	554	1806	-68	-4%
<b>ENFORCEMENT CALLS FOR SERVICE</b>	<b>1,336</b>	<b>950</b>	<b>2,286</b>	<b>8,406</b>	<b>5,346</b>	<b>13,752</b>	<b>8,907</b>	<b>5,795</b>	<b>14,702</b>	<b>-950</b>	<b>-6%</b>
<b>LICENSING OPERATIONS</b>											
ALTERED	2,944	4,457	7,401	19,379	24,001	43,380	20,187	25,494	45,681		
UNALTERED	167	243	410	1,130	1,403	2,533	1,397	1,938	3,335		
OTHER	59	74	133	377	517	894	424	582	1,006		
<b>TOTAL SOLD</b>	<b>3,170</b>	<b>4,774</b>	<b>7,944</b>	<b>20,886</b>	<b>25,921</b>	<b>46,807</b>	<b>22,008</b>	<b>28,014</b>	<b>50,022</b>	<b>-3,215</b>	<b>-6%</b>

\*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

## PROGRAM POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

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

### 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:

- 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.

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 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.





## 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.

Mr. Neuman

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

October 23, 2014

Page 2

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 Leshner, 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](http://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

The Honorable Chair and Members  
Pima County Board of Supervisors  
September 26, 2014  
Page 2 of 2

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 Leshner, 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

SHELTER OPERATIONS	THIS MONTH			THIS YEAR TO DATE			LAST YEAR TO DATE			YEAR TO YEAR DELTA % +/-
	TUCSON	COUNTY	TOTAL	TUCSON	COUNTY	TOTAL	TUCSON	COUNTY	TOTAL	
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%
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%			78%			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 Requested 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	2562	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	284	305	589	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)



---

# MEMORANDUM

---

Date: September 23, 2014

To: Jan Leshner  
Deputy County Administrator  
for Medical and Health Services

From: C.H. Huckelberry  
County Administrator

Dr. Francisco Garcia, Director  
Health Department

Re: **Pima Animal Care Center Cost to Municipalities**

As you know, based on Board of Supervisors and staff leadership, the County has invested a significant amount of new resources in the Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) to make it a more humane facility, reversing the euthanasia rate within two to three years. This is a result of the investments the Board has been willing to make. I firmly believe our investments have been well made and that our policy of non-euthanasia is the best and most humane response to this issue.

Recently, some jurisdictions have voiced concerns over their share of these increased costs. These increased costs are primarily driven by the County's decision to pursue a non-euthanasia policy for the care of animals. Our decision will remain unchanged and we will continue to incur these costs over and above what has previously been spent by the County on animal care functions.

Municipalities should be given the opportunity to choose a less costly option; therefore, please develop a euthanasia option for municipalities. Such a policy would mean that animals taken or received from a certain municipal jurisdiction would be euthanized at the earliest possible time pursuant to the existing County policy and state law regarding such. This would allow certain costs to be reduced for municipalities for the provision of animal care services. While this is not a policy I would recommend for the County, it should be an option available to municipalities. When you have the basic outline of such a policy, please ask the Animal Care Advisory Committee to review it before we ask the Board of Supervisors for direction.

Choosing a euthanasia policy would allow the municipality to avoid the spay/neuter fees embedded in our operating costs. In addition, kennel space requirements would be reduced, as would medical care expenses, thereby reducing their costs. If the municipality chooses this option, I would ask they train one or more of their staff in euthanasia practices, as I do

Ms. Jan Leshar and Dr. Francisco Garcia  
**Re: Pima Animal Care Center Cost to Municipalities**  
September 23, 2014  
Page 2

not desire to place on our staff the increased emotional burden of carrying out additional euthanasia.

Finally, municipalities do have the option to operate their own independent animal care facilities. We would certainly assist any jurisdiction that would want to be responsible for its own animal care services.

CHH/anc

c: The Honorable Chair and Members, Pima County Board of Supervisors



## 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 Leshar 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "C.H. Huckelberry", is written over a large, sweeping flourish that extends to the right and then curves back down to the left, ending under the signature text.

C.H. Huckelberry  
County Administrator

CHH/anc

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



---

# Board of Supervisors Memorandum

---

November 18, 2014

## County Obligation for Animal Care Services Inside Cities and Towns

### Introduction

Pima County provides animal care services to incorporated cities and towns through intergovernmental agreements (IGAs). The County operates the Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) and is the management entity responsible for developing policy and procedures regarding animal care services. The extent to which they are provided and the level of service and all operational aspects of providing animal care services are decided by the County. For your information, attached is a copy of the present IGA with the City of Tucson.

### Concerns Over Increased Costs

As you know, cities and towns, including the City of Tucson, have expressed concern over the increased animal care costs being incurred by the jurisdictions. These increased costs are in direct response to a changing management philosophy of how the animal care facility is operated. We have successfully transitioned from a euthanasia model to one of adoption. A few years ago, only 1 in 4 animals going into the PACC was ever adopted. Today, this number is 4 out of 5. This change in operational philosophy, generally demanded by the community at large and supported by the Animal Care Advisory Committee and all animal welfare groups, has resulted in increased costs, primarily in the following areas:

### Personnel and Increased Staffing

A number of new personnel have been hired, and these positions all relate to the adoption model. An additional veterinarian has been employed, as has a development director who has dramatically increased donations to PACC; and a number of personnel were added to kennel management due to the increasing number of animals housed each day at the facility. It has grown on average from 700 a few years ago to over 900 today.

### Increased Kennel Space, Including Utility Costs

As the Board knows, a temporary solution to the severe overcrowding in the existing kennels was implemented using a tent. This tent provided sufficient additional kennel capacity to facilitate the adoption model; but in implementing the tent, a total of \$445,600 of capital cost has been incurred to date. An additional \$29,400 in capital funds will be allocated to remaining and related issues such as drainage and electrical requirements. In addition, the tent has a much higher operating cost per kennel based on utilities needed to heat and cool the facility. The tent is approximately 7,200 square feet and costs approximately \$8,000 per year more for costs associated with operations and maintenance than kennel space in the existing facility. In addition, the tent costs \$38,232 annually to heat, cool and clean (water).

### Spay and Neuter Program

The only long-term viable solution to pet overpopulation is an effective spay/neuter program advanced through community education and sufficient funding to carry out the program. Prior to 2008, there were few funds dedicated to spay and neuter. In 2004, the Board designated \$20,000 from the Contingency Fund for spay/neuter and did so again in 2006. In 2008, the County budgeted \$100,000; in 2009 increased it to \$200,000; and in 2010 increased it to \$220,000 per year. This year, funding was increased to \$600,000.

Recognizing the significant importance of spay/neuter programs, the County increased licensing fees from \$12 to \$15 in 2009 and dedicated the increased revenue to a spay/neuter program. This increased our spay/neuter investment from \$100,000 to \$200,000. The County, believing other jurisdictions would also see the benefit of the long-term investment in spay/neuter, asked other jurisdictions to make similar contributions. The only jurisdiction that did so was the Town of Oro Valley. Recognizing that voluntary contributions by jurisdictions would not increase spay/neuter funding, I directed that this cost be embedded as an operational cost of PACC. Hence, it would then be apportioned back to each jurisdiction in proportion to their use of animal care services.

Investing now in spay and neuter programs will, in the relative short term of 5 to 10 years, significantly reduce pet overpopulation, as well as reduce the annual operating and maintenance expenses of the animal care function operated regionally by Pima County on behalf of the County and the cities and towns within the County.

Benefits of the spay/neuter program are obvious when looking at annual intake statistics. Attachment 1 shows that during the last few years, when the program funding was increased, annual intakes decreased from 29,516 in 2010 to 24,332 in 2013.

### Legal Obligations of the County to Provide Animal Care Services Inside Cities, Towns and Municipalities

A question was raised by the City of Tucson regarding the County's obligations inside cities and towns, specifically regarding the public health and welfare functions of animal care. Meaning, if the County has statutory obligations inside cities and towns, some costs would be borne by the County as overall operating expenses rather than those expenses being apportioned to the City of Tucson.

To determine this responsibility, I asked the County Attorney to provide a written legal opinion; this opinion is dated September 29, 2014. In order to release this opinion to the public, I will be asking the Board of Supervisors to waive attorney/client privilege so that all parties are aware of the conclusions in this legal opinion regarding the County's obligations to provide animal care services inside cities, towns and municipalities.

Timely Notice to Municipalities, Cities and Towns of Pending Increases in Animal Care Costs

Much has been said about the County's notice of the increasing cost of animal care services due to our transition to an adoption animal care model. The County's correspondence and interaction with municipalities and jurisdictions regarding these costs is extensive and has occurred continuously. They have occurred primarily between the staffs involved in these matters, with limited information directed to Managers or Mayors and Councils. With regard to the City of Tucson, a total of 7 communications were provided to various staff regarding these cost increases. In fact, the City has, on at least two occasions, discussed the increasing cost of spay/neuter services at the Mayor and Council level.

Concerned over these rising increases, the Marana Town Manager called for a special meeting and invited other city and town managers to the meeting. Unfortunately, other than the Marana Town Manager and staff, only the Oro Valley Town Manager attended the meeting. Staff presented the cost information again and made a PowerPoint Presentation that thoroughly identified the costs and their allocation. Notice by the County of these increased costs has obviously been provided to the jurisdictions.

Recommendation

I recommend the Board of Supervisors:

1. Waive privilege regarding the County Attorney's September 29, 2014 Legal Opinion regarding the obligations of the County inside cities, towns and municipalities for the provision of animal care services.
2. Direct staff to continue to negotiate with all cities and towns to reach intergovernmental agreements that fund the increasing cost of animal care services by December 31, 2014.

Respectfully submitted,



C.H. Huckelberry  
County Administrator

CHH/mjk – October 31, 2014

Attachment

c: Jan Leshar, Deputy County Administrator for Medical and Health Services  
Dr. Francisco Garcia, Director, Health Department

## ATTACHMENT 1

Fiscal Year	2013/14	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	*2009/10	**2008/09	2007/08
County Community Spay/ Neuter Support	\$220,000	\$220,000	\$220,000	\$220,000	\$220,000	\$200,000	\$100,000
Intakes	24,332	26,593	28,193	29,516	27,641	27,243	21,446
Euthanasia Rate Percentage	24	36	45	53	51	56	61
Average Number of Pets per Day**	877	761	795	771	735	----	----
Live Releases	13,752	12,404	11,345	10,542	8,918	10,161	8,163
*County increased licensing fees by \$3 and applied increase to spay neuter support.							
**Humane Society of Southern Arizona implemented a drop-off fee, which may have contributed to a significant increase in PACC intake numbers.							
Note: The average number of pets per day was not recorded prior to mid 2008/09.							



## DEPARTMENT

## PIMA COUNTY HEALTH

**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 Operations**

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

**DATE: 1-5-14**

**SUBJECT: Welfare report for December 2014**

- 
1. A14-162943 No animal was impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. A recheck was completed and found the dog was removed from the property. This complaint is closed.
  2. A14-162549 Three animals were impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. The owner provided proof of shelter and the animals were redeemed. This complaint is closed.
  3. A14-159915 One animal was impounded. Staff reviewed the animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited the owner's at the residence at a later time. The animal was not redeemed and was euthanized due to its aggression. This case is closed.
  4. A14-162293 No animal was impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. This complaint is closed.
  5. A14-161212 No animal was impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. A recheck was completed and found in compliance. This case is closed.
  6. A14-157273 No animals were impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. A recheck was completed and found in compliance. This complaint is closed.
  7. A14-160633 No animals were impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. A recheck was completed and found in compliance. This complaint is closed.
  8. A14-162650 No animal was impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner. No neglect violations were found closed complaint unfounded.
  9. A14-162744 One animal was impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at PACC. The dog was redeemed. This complaint is closed.
  10. A14-151102 Eight animals were impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at PACC. The owner relinquished all the animals. The mom dog with 4 pups were sent to rescue. One dog had to be euthanized due to the severity of the illness and the others are on a medical evaluation hold.

w/c 1

<b>INVESTIGATION REPORT</b>		SUSPECT				ACO NAME / BADGE #		COMPLAINT NUMBER	
Pima County Health Department Pima Animal Care Center 4000 N. Campbell Rd. Tucson, Arizona 85719 Phone: (520) 243-5960 Fax: (520) 243-5960 www.pimaanimalcare.org		SUSPECT'S ADDRESS				Downing#1923		A14-162943	
BITE <input type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>		ZIP		CITY		STATE		RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER	
CODE IF OTHER :		857		Tucson		Az.			
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS		None		CI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CO <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>		DRIVERS LICENSE			
ZIP		CITY		STATE		BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER			
SEX		WEIGHT		HEIGHT		EYES		HAIR COLOR	
		165		6' 3		Haz.		Brn.	
ORIGIN		DOB		SSN					
DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		LOCATION OF INCIDENT				DATE AND TIME REPORTED		DATE AND TIME OCCURRED	
						12-31-14 / 1427		12-31-14 / 1523	
FOOD <input type="checkbox"/> WATER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SHELTER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> INJURED/ILL <input type="checkbox"/> VENTILATION <input type="checkbox"/>		ABANDONED <input type="checkbox"/> TIEOUT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BEATEN <input type="checkbox"/> WASTE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (EXPLAIN) <input type="checkbox"/>							
<input type="checkbox"/> I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case		VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME				DOB		RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	
<input type="checkbox"/> I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.		Officer Downing #1923				NA		NA	
<input type="checkbox"/> REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B) and § 8-286 (B)		VICTIM'S ADDRESS				ZIP		CITY	
		NA							
NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)		DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED		RESTITUTION REQUESTED		DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER		OTHER AGENCY CASE #	
		YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				<input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> TFD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:	
<input type="checkbox"/> ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION		BITE SEVERITY:		TREATED BY		PHONE NUMBER	
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM		<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION		PART OF BODY BITTEN:				DATE QUARANTINED	
PHONE NUMBER								PACC <input type="checkbox"/>	
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS		CLINIC'S ADDRESS		QUARANTINE		10 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>		FRA HEAD# <input type="checkbox"/>	
								VET <input type="checkbox"/>	
								HOME <input type="checkbox"/>	
								RELEASE DATE:	
								OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	
								FTQ <input type="checkbox"/>	
								UTQ <input type="checkbox"/>	
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE		3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				CITING ACO Downing#1923		PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
		CODE/ORD VIOLATED						PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	
		4-3 (2) (e) (2) 4-3 (2) (c) 4-3 (2) (B)						OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS	
		CITATIONS/NUMBERS						REVIEWED BY 2002	
		73591 A,B,C						Konst 1/4/15	
								BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL</b>		<b>ANIMAL'S NAME</b>		<b>COLOR</b>		<b>SEX</b>		<b>AGE</b>	
Pit Bull		Benzio		Red		M		1 y	
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/>									
OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/>									
OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/>									
OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/>									
OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/>									
OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
WITNESS 1		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>		DOB		ADDRESS		RESIDENCE PHONE #	
WITNESS 2		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>		DOB		ADDRESS		RESIDENCE PHONE #	
WITNESS 3		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>		DOB		ADDRESS		RESIDENCE PHONE #	
WITNESS 4		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>		DOB		ADDRESS		RESIDENCE PHONE #	

N/C 1

## INVESTIGATION REPORT



**Activity Number: A14-162943**

**ACO name & Badge: Downing #1923**

---

On December 31, 2014, I arrived at [redacted] St. in response to a call about a dog on a tie-out. Upon arrival, I received no response from anyone. I went around to the back yard and observed a red male, Pit Bull that was tangled around a tree by a kennel chain. The dog had no water and no shelter. I took a photo and impounded the dog. As I was about to clear the scene a man showed up and claimed he lived there and gave me the dogs name and his name. I explained why I removed the dog and explained the laws. I returned the dog to him and issued the appropriate citations to him.

He said he just moved here from out of state. He had to tie the dog out because it was getting out of the yard.

**Officer's Signature:**


*[Handwritten Signature]* #1923

**Date:** 1-2-2015

W/c 2

<b>INVESTIGATION REPORT</b>		SUSPECT				ACO NAME / BADGE # <b>D.Hinte 2068</b>		COMPLAINT NUMBER <b>A14-162549</b>									
Pima County Health Department Pima Animal Care Center 4000 N. Silverbell Rd. Tucson, Arizona 85714 Phone: (520) 243-5960 Fax: (520) 243-5960 www.pimaanimalcare.org		SUSPECT'S ADDRESS 1				BITE <input type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>											
ZIP <b>857</b> CITY <b>Tucson</b> STATE <b>AZ</b> RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER		SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS				CODE IF OTHER :											
ZIP CITY STATE BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER		CI <input type="checkbox"/> CO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>				DRIVERS LICENSE											
SFX	WEIGHT <b>185</b>	HEIGHT <b>5'6"</b>	EYES <b>BRO</b>	HAIR COLOR <b>BLK</b>	ORIGIN	DOB	SSN										
DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					LOCATION OF INCIDENT		DATE AND TIME REPORTED <b>12/24/14 / 1529</b>		DATE AND TIME OCCURRED <b>12/31/14 / 2005</b>								
FOOD <input type="checkbox"/> WATER <input type="checkbox"/> SHELTER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> INJURED/ILL <input type="checkbox"/> VENTILATION <input type="checkbox"/> ABANDONED <input type="checkbox"/> TIEOUT <input type="checkbox"/> BEATEN <input type="checkbox"/> WASTE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (EXPLAIN)																	
<input type="checkbox"/> I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case		VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME <b>Officer D.Hinte #2068</b>				D.O.B <b>09/10/1993</b>		RESIDENCE PHONE NO.		BUSINESS PHONE NO. <b>520-724-5900</b>							
<input type="checkbox"/> I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case		VICTIM'S ADDRESS <b>4000 N. Silverbell Rd.</b>				ZIP <b>85745</b>		CITY <b>Tucson</b>		STATE <b>AZ</b>							
<input type="checkbox"/> REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B) and § 8-286 (B)		VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS <b>Pima Animal Care Center</b>				ZIP		CITY		STATE							
NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)		DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER		OTHER AGENCY CASE # <b>141231230</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> TFD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:		FOLLOW UP REQUEST <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:							
<input type="checkbox"/> ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM		<input type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION		BITE SEVERITY:		TREATED BY		PHONE NUMBER		DATE QUARANTINED							
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM		<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION		PART OF BODY BITTEN:		PHONE NUMBER		OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		PACC <input type="checkbox"/> VET <input type="checkbox"/> HOME <input type="checkbox"/>							
PHONE NUMBER		VET CLINIC				PHONE NUMBER		OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		FTQ <input type="checkbox"/> UTQ <input type="checkbox"/>							
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS		CLINIC'S ADDRESS				QUARANTINE 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>		FRA HEAD#									
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE		3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		CITING ACO		PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER		OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS							
CODE/ORD VIOLATED <b>6.04.110(B)(3);6.04.070;11-1010(A) ARS</b>		CITATIONS/NUMBERS <b>73951 A-E; 73952 A-E; 73953 A-B</b>				REVIEWED BY		BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>									
BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME		COLOR		SEX		AGE		LICENSE #		VX CERTIFICATE #		COND		ANIMAL ID#	
Rottweiler		VICTIM <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<b>Balko</b>		<b>Blk/tan</b>		<b>M</b>		<b>1.5 yr</b>		<b>CITED</b>		<b>CITED</b>		<b>N A456789</b>	
Miniature Pinscher		VICTIM <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<b>Sadie</b>		<b>Blk/tan</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>4 yr</b>		<b>CITED</b>		<b>CITED</b>		<b>N A456790</b>	
Miniature Pinscher		VICTIM <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<b>Tootsie</b>		<b>Blk/tan</b>		<b>F</b>		<b>2 yr</b>		<b>CITED</b>		<b>CITED</b>		<b>N A398186</b>	
Yorkshire Terrier		VICTIM <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<b>Shortie</b>		<b>Tricolor</b>		<b>M</b>		<b>1 yr</b>		<b>CITED</b>		<b>CITED</b>		<b>N A505971</b>	
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>																	
WITNESS 1 <b>Vivian Nguyen</b>		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		DOB		ADDRESS <b>1080 W. Sea Urchin St.</b>		RESIDENCE PHONE # <b>520-780-7005</b>		BUSINESS PHONE #							
WITNESS 2 <b>Deputy S. Mcleod #5882</b>		M <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>		DOB		ADDRESS <b>1750 E. Benson Highway</b>		RESIDENCE PHONE # <b>520-351-4600</b>		BUSINESS PHONE #							
WITNESS 3 <b>Chris Disanto</b>		M <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>		DOB		ADDRESS <b>1087 W. Sea Lion Dr.</b>		RESIDENCE PHONE # <b>520-225-9145</b>		BUSINESS PHONE #							
WITNESS 4 <b>Brandy Hilton</b>		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		DOB		ADDRESS <b>2400 W. Las Lomitas</b>		RESIDENCE PHONE # <b>520-225-9145</b>		BUSINESS PHONE #							

W/c 2



## INVESTIGATION REPORT

**Activity Number: A14-162549**

**ACO name & Badge: D.Hinte 2068**

---

On December 24, 2014 at 3:29 PM, Vivian Nguyen P358278 called Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) dispatch to report four dogs that are always left outside with no shelter at [redacted] Dr.

On December 31, 2014 at 6:24 PM, PACC dispatch received a call from Pima County Sheriff's Department (PCSO) requesting assistance regarding four dogs with no shelter at the same address as reported by Ms. Nguyen. A previous activity, A14-161624, from Deputy Hensen #7725 regarding a barking dog and welfare complaint at [redacted] Dr. was received on December 8, 2014, but was not responded to. This activity was closed on December 31, 2014 by D. Atteberry #1929 as a duplicate of A14-162549.

On December 31, 2014 at 6:44 PM, Officer Rademaker #2019 and I, Officer Hinte #2068, arrived at [redacted] and met with PCSO Deputy S. Mcleod #5882 who provided us with his case number of 141231230. Deputy Mcleod stated that there were four dogs in the backyard with inadequate shelter. We observed two Miniature Pinschers, one Yorkshire Terrier, and one Rottweiler in the backyard. The entire yard was visible from vantage points on both sides of the house. No shelter was available. It was raining, and had been all day, with freezing temperatures and snow forecast. At this time, we spoke with the neighbor [redacted] who resides at [redacted] Dr, phone number 520-[redacted] Mr. [redacted] stated that the residents of [redacted] Dr. had just moved in around December 1st, and since then have left their dogs outside with no shelter everyday. all day and night. We also spoke to [redacted], who resides at [redacted], but is a frequent visitor of Mr. [redacted] house. She corroborated Mr. [redacted] statement that she has never seen the dogs inside or with any shelter available.

We decided to impound the dogs for neglect, no shelter. PCSO cut the padlock on the gate and we entered the yard and impounded three of the dogs, however, one of the Miniature Pinschers escaped into the neighborhood and was still at large when we eventually cleared the scene. Prior to leaving the scene, the owner of the dogs, [redacted] returned home. We determined that none of the dogs were current on their license and vaccinations. Mr. [redacted] stated that his dogs are always outside. We explained

W/c 2

the ordinances he was in violation of and informed him that we would be issuing citations and impounding the dogs until adequate shelter can be provided for them. We also informed him that an officer would be out to check the shelter before the dogs would be released to him. Mr. : received citations for 4x neglect no shelter, 4x no license, and 4x no rabies vaccination in the County. We explained his court date, time and location, he stated he understood. He signed and received his copy of the citations.

Officer's Signature: *D. Hina*

Date: *1/02/15*

W/c 3

**INVESTIGATION REPORT**

Pima County Health Department  
 Pima Animal Care Center  
 4000 N Silverbell Rd  
 Tucson, Arizona 85711  
 Phone: (520) 243-5960  
 Fax: (520) 243-5960  
 www.pimaanimalcare.org



SUSPECT	ACO NAME / BADGE # <b>J RADEMAKER 2019</b>	COMPLAINT NUMBER <b>A14-159915</b>
---------	---	---------------------------------------

SUSPECT'S ADDRESS

ZIP <b>857</b>	CITY <b>TUCSON</b>	STATE <b>AZ</b>	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER <b>520-</b>
-------------------	-----------------------	--------------------	---------------------------------------

BITE  WELFARE  DANGEROUS  OTHER

CODE IF OTHER :

SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS  
**DESERT HORIZONS 326 S WILMOT**

CI  CO  OTHER

ZIP	CITY <b>TUCSON</b>	STATE <b>AZ</b>	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER <b>520-615-2255</b>
-----	-----------------------	--------------------	--

DRIVERS LICENSE

SEX	WEIGHT <b>135</b>	HEIGHT <b>5'1"</b>	EYES <b>HAZ</b>	HAIR COLOR <b>BR</b>	ORIGIN	DOB	SSN
-----	----------------------	-----------------------	--------------------	-------------------------	--------	-----	-----

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

LOCATION OF INCIDENT	DATE AND TIME REPORTED <b>11/12/14 / 1005</b>	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED <b>11/13/14 / 0844</b>
----------------------	--	--

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

I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case

VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME <b>OFFICER J RADEMAKER 2019</b>	D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	BUSINESS PHONE NO. <b>724-5900</b>
--	-------	---------------------	---------------------------------------

I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.

VICTIM'S ADDRESS	ZIP	CITY	STATE
------------------	-----	------	-------

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

VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS <b>PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER 4000 N SILVERBELL RD</b>	ZIP <b>85745</b>	CITY <b>TUCSON</b>	STATE <b>AZ</b>
--	---------------------	-----------------------	--------------------

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)

DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> TFD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:	FOLLOW UP REQUEST <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:
--	---	-----------------------	---	--

ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

<input type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY:	TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED	PACC <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION		PART OF BODY BITTEN:		RELEASE DATE:	VET <input type="checkbox"/>

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

VET CLINIC	PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	FTQ <input type="checkbox"/>	UTQ <input type="checkbox"/>
------------	--------------	---	------------------------------	------------------------------

PHONE NUMBER

CLINIC'S ADDRESS	QUARANTINE 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> FRA HEAD#
3 <sup>RD</sup> PARTY CITATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CITING ACO	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
		PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER
		OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

CODE/ORD VIOLATED <b>4-3(2)(B); 4-3(2)(C); 4-3(2)(E); 4-3(2)(E)(2)</b>	REVIEWED BY
CITATIONS/NUMBERS <b>73663A-D</b>	BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL	ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
BOXER X VICTIM <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	BOO	TAN	M	2		CURRENT	CURRENT	D	A481439
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									

WITNESS 1	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 2	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 3	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 4	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #

W/C 3

## INVESTIGATION REPORT

**Activity Number: A14-159915**

**ACO name & Badge: J RADEMAKER #2019**

---

On November 13, 2014 at 08:44AM I, Officer Rademaker #2019, went to [redacted] Blvd in response to a complaint that a dog at that address was illegally tied out on a short tieout and did not have access to water. There was no dog in the front yard and I received no response to my knocks at the front door. When I knocked I heard a dog in the side yard on the North side of the house. I was easily able to see over the fence that a large male tan and white boxer/pitbull mix dog was tied to the fence with a very short tieout (approximately 4 feet). The tieout consisted of an approximately 3 foot length of plastic covered chain and approximately 1 foot of doubled over nylon leash. There was a dog carrier crate behind the dog but he would not have been able to access it because of the length of the tieout. I saw a black pot that at that time I could not determine if it held water or not.

I entered the side yard and determined that the black pot had held water but no more than a 1/10" was there then. I had to cut the leash part of the tieout in order to free and impound the dog. The dog was wearing a PACC license [redacted] which is registered as Boo [redacted], a tan 2 year old boxer belonging to [redacted] of [redacted]. The license is current. I posted a notice of impound and a law brochure on the front door.

I posted instructions that if the owner should attempt to redeem the dog she should receive citations for neglect, tie out; neglect, no water; neglect, lack of exercise space and neglect, no shelter. The owner did not attempt to redeem that dog and Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) evaluated the dog as not adoptable. The dog was euthanized.

On December 21, 2014 at 12:17PM I met with registered owner [redacted] who stated that she was out of town from 10/15/14 - 12/17/14 and that her grandmother, [redacted] was taking care of the dog Boo for her. She said [redacted] Golf Links and Kolb. PACC records show her at [redacted] and map confirms [redacted] doesn't exist, would be in DMAFB. I reset the call for citations to be issued to caretaker [redacted]

W/c 3

On December 21, 2014 at 3:32PM Officer Tovar #2021 arrived at [redacted]. He spoke with Ms. [redacted] and explained the reason for his visit. Ms. [redacted] told him that she took care of her daughter-in-law, [redacted]'s, dog Boo at her own house as her daughter-in-law said that she did not have anywhere to keep the dog. Ms. [redacted] then told me that she gave her daughter-in-law a kennel in which to keep the dog and that her daughter-in-law then took the dog to her house on Sparkman. Ms. [redacted] told Officer Tovar that she never went to the house on Sparkman to take care of Boo. She added that had she been asked to take care of Boo she would have kept him at her house. She also said that she was not aware that her daughter-in-law had ever gone out of town. Ms. [redacted] said that she could not remember the exact date that she returned Boo to her daughter-in-law but that it was three to six weeks prior to the dog being confiscated. Officer Tovar reset the call to meet with Ms. [redacted].

On December 20, 2014 at 6:57PM Officer Hinte #2068 and I, Officer Rademaker #2019, went to [redacted] and met with [redacted]. I explained to her that her grandmother Arleen Boykin had disputed the story she had told me about the care of the dog Boo. I told Ms. [redacted] that, as the registered owner of the dog Boo and the resident of the location where I had impounded the dog, she was responsible for the dog and would be cited for the violations I observed on 11/13/14 at 08:44AM.

I issued her citations for violations of Tucson City Code for neglect, no water; neglect, no shelter; neglect, lack of exercise space and neglect, tie out. I explained court and she said she understood. I gave her a law brochure

Officer's Signature:

  
2019

Date:

12/30/14

W/C 4

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



SUSPECT		ACO NAME / BADGE # <b>A. Kirby #2057</b>		COMPLAINT NUMBER <b>A14-162293</b>				
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS		BITE <input type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>						
ZIP <b>857</b>	CITY <b>Tucson</b>	STATE <b>AZ</b>	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER <b>4</b>					
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS <b>673 W. Raven Dr.</b>		CI <input type="checkbox"/> CO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>						
ZIP <b>85286</b>	CITY <b>Chandler</b>	STATE <b>AZ</b>	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER					
SFX	WEIGHT <b>153</b>	HEIGHT <b>5'9"</b>	EYES <b>BRO</b>	HAIR COLOR <b>BRO</b>	ORIGIN			
DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		LOCATION OF INCIDENT		DATE AND TIME REPORTED <b>12/19/14 / 1658 hrs</b>	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED <b>12/19/14 / 1720 hrs</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case		FOOD <input type="checkbox"/> WATER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SHELTER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> INJURED/ILL <input type="checkbox"/> VENTILATION <input type="checkbox"/>		ABANDONED <input type="checkbox"/> TIEOUT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BEATEN <input type="checkbox"/> WASTE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (EXPLAIN)				
<input type="checkbox"/> I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.		VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME <b>PACC Officer A. Kirby #2057</b>		D.O.B	BUSINESS PHONE NO. <b>520-724-5900</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B) and § 8-286 (B)		VICTIM'S ADDRESS		ZIP	CITY			
NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)		DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> TFD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:			
<input type="checkbox"/> ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM		<input type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION		BITE SEVERITY:	TREATED BY			
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM		<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION		PART OF BODY BITTEN:	PHONE NUMBER			
PHONE NUMBER		VET CLINIC		PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>			
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS		CLINIC'S ADDRESS		QUARANTINE 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>	FRA HEAD#			
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE		3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		CITING ACO <b>A. Kirby #2057</b>	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>			
CODE/ORD VIOLATED <b>6.04.110(B)(5), 6.04.110 (B)(2), 6.04.110 (B)(3)</b>		CITATIONS/NUMBERS <b>73461</b>		PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS			
BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		REVIEWED BY <b>12-22-14 DTK 1911</b>						
BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL	ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
<b>Alaskan Husky</b>	<b>Denver</b>	<b>White / Black</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>A504989</b>
VICTIM OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>								
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								
WITNESS 1	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS		RESIDENCE PHONE #		BUSINESS PHONE #	
WITNESS 2	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS		RESIDENCE PHONE #		BUSINESS PHONE #	
WITNESS 3	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS		RESIDENCE PHONE #		BUSINESS PHONE #	
WITNESS 4	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS		RESIDENCE PHONE #		BUSINESS PHONE #	

W/C 4



## INVESTIGATION REPORT

**Activity Number: A14-162293**

**ACO name & Badge: A. Kirby #2057**

---

On December 19, 2014 at approximately 1720 hrs I Officer Kirby #2057 responded to [redacted] Dr., in reference to a dog on a tangled tie out. Upon arrival I could hear a large breed dog yelp in the back yard at which time, I was able to observe the dog over the back wall on the tangled tie out.

I then entered the yard through the unlocked gate on the side of the house, and I observed a white/black husky that was on a tie out and tangled around a tree, without access to water or shelter. I then removed the dog from the tie out and found a Petsmart identification tag on its collar which identified the dog as Denver and contained two phone numbers. [redacted] and [redacted]. Dispatch was able to make contact with the dog's owner via phone using the numbers provided.

A short time later the dogs owner Mr. [redacted] arrived. I advised Mr. [redacted] as to why I was there and asked if he had current proof of rabies vaccinations and licensing, he stated he did not as they had recently moved from Chandler approximately 1 week before. I advised he had 30 days from the date he arrived in Pima County to obtain a license for the dog.

I issued citations to Mr. [redacted] for Neglect - Tie Out, Neglect - No Water, and Neglect - No Shelter. Mr. [redacted] was explained his court date, time, and location, stated he understood and signed the citation.

Officer's Signature:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "A. Kirby", written over a horizontal line.

Date:

12/19/14

W/c 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 # <b>A. Kirby # 2057</b>		COMPLAINT NUMBER <b>A14-161212</b>	
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS				BITE <input type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>			
ZIP <b>8571</b>	CITY <b>Tucson</b>	STATE <b>AZ</b>	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER				
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS <b>NOT GIVEN</b>				CODE IF OTHER :			
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER		DRIVERS LICENSE		
SEX	WEIGHT <b>185</b>	HEIGHT <b>5' 11"</b>	EYES <b>GRN</b>	HAIR COLOR <b>BRO</b>	ORIGIN	DOB	SSN

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

LOCATION OF INCIDENT	DATE AND TIME REPORTED <b>12/03/14 / 0909 hrs</b>	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED <b>12/13/14 / 11:00 hrs</b>
----------------------	--	---

FOOD <input type="checkbox"/>	WATER <input type="checkbox"/>	SHELTER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	INJURED/ILL <input type="checkbox"/>	VENTILATION <input type="checkbox"/>	ABANDONED <input type="checkbox"/>	TIEOUT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	BEATEN <input type="checkbox"/>	WASTE <input type="checkbox"/>	OTHER (EXPLAIN)
VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME <b>PACC Officer A. Kirby #2057</b>				D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.		BUSINESS PHONE NO. <b>520-724-5900</b>		

<input type="checkbox"/> I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case	VICTIM'S ADDRESS <b>4000 N. Silverbell Rd.,</b>	ZIP <b>85745</b>	CITY <b>Tucson</b>	STATE <b>AZ</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.	VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS	ZIP	CITY	STATE
<input type="checkbox"/> REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B) and § 8-286 (B)	NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)			

DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # <b>141213103</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> TFD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:	FOLLOW UP REQUEST <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:
--	---	-----------------------	---	--

<input type="checkbox"/> ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM	<input type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY:	TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED	PACC <input type="checkbox"/>
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM	<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION	PART OF BODY BITTEN:			RELEASE DATE:	VET <input type="checkbox"/>
PHONE NUMBER	VET CLINIC		PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		HOME <input type="checkbox"/>
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS	CLINIC'S ADDRESS		QUARANTINE 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/> FRA HEAD#	FTQ <input type="checkbox"/>

3 <sup>RD</sup> PARTY CITATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CITING ACO <b>A. Kirby #2057</b>	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS
--	-------------------------------------	---	----------------------	--------------------------

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE	CODE/ORD VIOLATED <b>6.04.110 (B)(5), 6.04.110 (B)(3), 6.04.070, 11-1010(A)</b>	REVIEWED BY <b>2002</b> <b>KONST 12/16</b>
	CITATIONS/NUMBERS <b>73458, 73458, 73460</b>	BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL	ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
Husky/Mix VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Princess	White	F	A			N	A504468
Husky VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kodiak	White/Gray	M	A			N	A504469
German Shepherd VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lilith	Black/Tan	F	A			N	A504470
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								

WITNESS 1	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 2	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 3	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 4	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #

W/C 5



## INVESTIGATION REPORT

**Activity Number: A14-161212**

**ACO name & Badge: A. Kirby #2057**

---

On 12/13/14 at approximately 1100 hrs I Officer Kirby 2057 arrived at St. in response to a report of 3 large breed dogs that were tied up in the front yard. Upon arrival I located a white Husky/ Mix, a white/grey Husky/ Mix, and a black/tan German Shepherd that were all tied out without access to adequate shelter. I observed clean water for each of the dogs. I photographed each dog as well as surrounding areas of the yard to show the living conditions of the dogs at the time of my arrival.

I then attempted to make contact with the dog owner by entering the yard through the unlocked gate and knocking on the sliding glass front door. I was then met by who claimed to be the owner of the dogs, when I asked Mr. why the dogs were tied up he stated "for your protection". I observed no signs of aggression from any of the dogs. As the conversation continued Mr. became more and more hostile to the point of which he stated he better just not speak to me before he loses his temper and does something, in the interest of safety I requested the assistance of PCSO.

PCSO Deputy Serrano Badge# 6875 (PCSO Case# 141213103) arrived and assisted in keeping the peace with Mr. as I completed the investigation and paperwork. I asked Mr. for proof of rabies vaccinations as well as about a current dog license. Mr. stated he does not have any documentation for the animals here in Pima County because it is all from Idaho. I then asked Mr. how long the dogs have been in Pima County and he stated about 1 year. I then advised him that the licensing and rabies vaccinations must be current in Pima County if the dogs resides in the county for more than 30 days, to which Mr. stated was not true since he was not claiming residency in this state.

I issued citations for Neglect- Tie Out, Neglect - No Shelter, No License, and No Rabies Vaccinations for each of the 3 dogs. I explained to Mr. his citations, Court Date, Time, and location, he stated he understood and signed the citations. I then removed the tie outs from the property as they were evidence in the case, and Mr. gave reason to believe that he would place the dogs back on the tie outs upon me leaving the property.

**Officer's Signature:**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "A. Kirby", written over a horizontal line.

**Date:** 12/13/14

W/C 6

<b>INVESTIGATION REPORT</b>		SUSPECT				ACO NAME / BADGE # <b>1942 Eckelbarger</b>		COMPLAINT NUMBER <b>A14-157273</b>			
Pima County Health Department Pima Animal Care Center 4000 N. Silverbell Rd Tucson, Arizona 85719 Phone: (520) 243-5960 Fax: (520) 243-5960 www.pimaanimalcare.org		SUSPECT'S ADDRESS				BITE <input type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>					
		ZIP <b>857</b>	CITY <b>Tucson</b>	STATE <b>AZ</b>	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER				CODE IF OTHER :		
		SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS				CI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CO <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>					
		ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER				DRIVERS LICENSE		
		SEX	WEIGHT <b>200</b>	HEIGHT <b>6-2</b>	EYES <b>Blk</b>	HAIR COLOR <b>BK</b>	ORIGIN	DOB	SSN		
DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		LOCATION OF INCIDENT			DATE AND TIME REPORTED <b>10-5-14 / 0631</b>		DATE AND TIME OCCURRED <b>12-5-14 / 1010</b>				
		FOOD <input type="checkbox"/> WATER <input type="checkbox"/> SHELTER <input type="checkbox"/>		INJURED/ILL VENTILATION <input type="checkbox"/>		ABANDONED <input type="checkbox"/> TIEOUT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		BEATEN <input type="checkbox"/> WASTE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (EXPLAIN) <input type="checkbox"/>			
<input type="checkbox"/> I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case		VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME <b>1942 Eckelbarger</b>			D.O.B		RESIDENCE PHONE NO.		BUSINESS PHONE NO. <b>724-5992</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/> I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.		VICTIM'S ADDRESS				ZIP	CITY	STATE			
<input type="checkbox"/> REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B) and § 8-286 (B)		VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS <b>4000 N. Silverbell Rd</b>				ZIP <b>85719</b>	CITY <b>Tucson</b>	STATE <b>AZ</b>			
NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)		DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER		OTHER AGENCY CASE # <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> TFD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:			
								FOLLOW UP REQUEST <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:			
<input type="checkbox"/> ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM		<input type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION		BITE SEVERITY:		TREATED BY		PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED		
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM		<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION		PART OF BODY BITTEN:					RELEASE DATE:		
PHONE NUMBER		VET CLINIC				PHONE NUMBER		OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>			
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS		CLINIC'S ADDRESS				QUARANTINE 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>		FRA HEAD#			
		3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		CITING ACO <b>1942 Eckelbarger</b>		PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER			
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE		CODE/ORD VIOLATED <b>4-3 (2)(E)(2)</b>						OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS			
		CITATIONS/NUMBERS <b>73788 (A)</b>						REVIEWED BY <b>KONST 12/6</b>			
								BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME		COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
Pit-bull		Princess		Blue	F	9mo		L14-238715	Current	Ok	A502318
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>											
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>											
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>											
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>											
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>											
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>											
WITNESS 1		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS			RESIDENCE PHONE #		BUSINESS PHONE #		
WITNESS 2		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS			RESIDENCE PHONE #		BUSINESS PHONE #		
WITNESS 3		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS			RESIDENCE PHONE #		BUSINESS PHONE #		
WITNESS 4		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS			RESIDENCE PHONE #		BUSINESS PHONE #		

W/C 6



## INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-157273

ACO name & Badge: 1942 Eckelbarger

---

On 11-21-14 at 1130 hours, I Investigator Eckelbarger (1942) responded to [redacted] where I met with dog owner, [redacted] ( [redacted] who showed me his 8 month old pit-bull mix "Princess" in the backyard. Princess was on a chain tie-out with access to shade and shelter. She appeared in ok condition. Mr. [redacted] stated he has had princess for 4 months and he chained the dog up because she will chew things in the yard. He stated he found someone to take the dog and dog will be gone by 12-1-14.

I had the owner take the dog off of the chain and put her indoors. I then checked for license and rabies vaccinations on the dog and found that Mr. [redacted] had not gotten either for the dog. I then cited Mr. [redacted] for no license and no rabies vaccination under City jurisdiction. Mr. [redacted] signed and received his copies of the citations. I advised him on the animal welfare requirements for dogs in Pima County. I also advised him I would reset the call for a recheck after 12-1-14.

On 12-5-14 at 1010 hours I responded back to [redacted] where I received no answer at the door. I went around to the backyard and could see "Princess" was still on a chain tie-out in the same spot in the backyard. I observed the dog on the tie-out through the cracks in the fence. I then took photographs of the dog on the tie-out and the yard. The dog was on a tie-out with only enough slack for the dog to peek half of her body out from under the shelter provided. There was a pan of water provided for the dog. I was unsure if the dog would have access to the water though due to the length of the tie-out. I then called the dog owner, received no answer, left a message advising we are impounding the dog from the tie-out. I then impounded Princess and posted a notice of impoundment on the front door.

The dog owner, [redacted], later called in response to the notice of impoundment.

At 1234 hours I responded back to the dog owner's address at [redacted] where I met with [redacted]. I then cited Mr. [redacted] for neglect-tieout under City jurisdiction. Mr. [redacted] signed the citation by signing "refused to sign". I then gave him the copy of the signed citation.

W/C 6

I then returned Princess back to Mr. . I advised Mr. that I would be resetting the call to recheck his property again for tieout in the future. I reiterated that tie-outs are illegal. Mr. was very argumentative so I repeated the tie-out law to him.

Officer's Signature:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'E. J.' followed by '1942.' The signature is written in a cursive, somewhat stylized font.

Date: 12-5-14

W/C 7


**INVESTIGATION REPORT**

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



SUSPECT		ACO NAME / BADGE # <b>1942 Eckelbarger</b>		COMPLAINT NUMBER <b>A14-160633</b>	
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS		BITE <input type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>			
ZIP <b>857</b>	CITY <b>Tucson</b>	STATE <b>AZ</b>	RESIDENTIAL PHONE NUMBER		
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS		CODE IF OTHER:			
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER		CI <input type="checkbox"/> CO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>
SEX	WEIGHT <b>135</b>	HEIGHT <b>5-4</b>	EYES <b>Haz</b>	HAIR COLOR <b>Br</b>	ORIGIN
LOCATION OF INCIDENT		DATE AND TIME REPORTED <b>11-23-14 / 2012</b>		DATE AND TIME OCCURRED <b>12-1-14 / 1510</b>	
FOOD <input type="checkbox"/> WATER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SHELTER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> INJURED/ILL <input type="checkbox"/> VENTILATION <input type="checkbox"/>		ABANDONED <input type="checkbox"/> TIEOUT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BEATEN <input type="checkbox"/> WASTE <input type="checkbox"/>		OTHER (EXPLAIN) <input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/> I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case		VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME <b>1942 Eckelbarger</b>		D.O.B	BUSINESS PHONE NO. <b>724-5992</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.		VICTIM'S ADDRESS		ZIP	CITY <b>Tucson</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B) and § 8-286 (B)		VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS <b>4000 N. Silverbell Rd</b>		ZIP <b>85745</b>	STATE <b>AZ</b>
NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)		DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> TFD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:
<input type="checkbox"/> ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM		<input type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION		TREATED BY	
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM		<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION		PHONE NUMBER	
PHONE NUMBER		BITE SEVERITY:		DATE QUARANTINED	
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS		PART OF BODY BITTEN:		RELEASE DATE:	
CLINIC'S ADDRESS		VET CLINIC		OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		CITING ACO <b>1942 Eckelbarger</b>		PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE		CODE/ORD VIOLATED <b>6.04.110 (B)(5), 6.04.110 (B)(2), 6.04.110 (B)(3), 6.04.070, 11-1010 (A)ARS</b>		PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	
CITATIONS/NUMBERS <b>73784 (A-D), 73785 (A-E)</b>		OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS		OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS	
BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		REVIEWED BY <i>12-2-14</i> <i>DTK 1911</i>			
BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE
Poodle mix		Sonny	White	M	4yr
Pit-bull		JJ	White/Black	F	5yr
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>					
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>					
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>					
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>					
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>					
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>					
WITNESS 1		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #
WITNESS 2		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #
WITNESS 3		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #
WITNESS 4		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #

W/C 7



## INVESTIGATION REPORT

**Activity Number: A14-160633**

**ACO name & Badge: 1942 Eckelbarger**

---

On 12-1-14 at 1510 hours, I Investigator Eckelbarger (1942) responded to [redacted] where I received no answer at door. I observed a white poodle mix on a tie-out in the backyard. The poodle appeared matted and had no access to water. The tie-out got tangled around some childrens toys in the yard at one point while I was on scene. The poodle also had no access to shelter. I also observed a white and black female pit-bull in a small pen in the backyard. The pit-bull was on a tie-out approximately 10 feet long. The pit-bull also got tangled while I was on scene as she had tried to get out through a small hole at the bottom of the pen. The pit-bull also had no access to water as both buckets were dry. The pit-bull had a dog house for shelter.

I then took photographs of the yard and the dogs. I provided water for both dogs and they immediately drank the water. I then impounded both dogs and posted a notice of impoundment on the front door.

A neighbor advised the owners are [redacted] and [redacted] (DOB: [redacted]). I attempted to contact the owners, received no answer, and left a message advising them to call the Pima Animal Care Center.

At 1700 hours I returned back to the dog owner's address at [redacted] after we were contacted by the dog owner. I met with [redacted] (DOB: [redacted]) who stated she had just got home from work. She stated that "JJ" can dig out and jump over the pen fencing so they put her on the tie-out. I then cited Ms. [redacted] for neglect-tieout, neglect-no water, no license, and no rabies vaccination on "JJ" and for neglect-tieout, neglect-no water, neglect-no shelter, no license, and no rabies vaccination on "Sonny" under County jurisdiction. Ms. [redacted] signed and received her copies of the citations. She stated she had given the rabies vaccinations herself from the feed store. I advised a licensed veterinarian has to give the vaccines by law. I advised I would reset the call to make sure dogs are no longer on the tie-out and that both dogs have access to water and shelter. I then returned both dogs to the owner who put the dogs inside the house.

Officer's Signature:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "T. D. 1942", written over a horizontal line.

Date: 12-1-14

W/C 8

# Activity Report

<u>Activity Number:</u> A14-162650-1	<u>Activity Type:</u> INV/NEGLI	<u>Activity Date:</u> 12/26/14 05:29 PM	<u>Priority:</u> 2	<u>Total Animals:</u> 1	<u>Animal Type:</u> DOG
---	------------------------------------	--	-----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

<u>Activity Address:</u> TUCSON	<u>Geo Code:</u> 2T	<u>Jurisdiction:</u> TUC
------------------------------------	------------------------	-----------------------------

Activity Comment:  
2400N; 10-17 STATES THE DOG OUT IN COLD, NO SHELTER

<u>Caller Information:</u> ,	<u>Owner Information:</u> P285942 (520) TUCSON AZ 857
---------------------------------	---

<u>Officer:</u> P999066 HENDRICKSON	<u>Call Taker:</u> DANNABLE	<u>Result Codes:</u> 1 MC 1 UNFND 2 CITE 1 COMP
--	--------------------------------	--

<u>Dispatch Date:</u> 12/28/14 01:53 PM	<u>Working Date:</u> 12/28/14 04:36 PM	<u>Complete Date:</u> 12/28/14 05:53 PM	<u>Response Time:</u> 1D 23:07
--	---	--	-----------------------------------

**Memo:**

12/28/2014 NOTE  
 12/28/14 17:00 I Officer Hendrickson #2066 and Officer Henderson arrive at [redacted] in response to a dog reported with no shelter. We made contact with the owner [redacted] had a boxter/ pit mix named Dojo that appeared in good health. We went over a premis inspection form and [redacted] had sutable water, food,no animal waste and the dogs shelter was located under his back porch inside a open storage closet. [redacted] did not have a current license and vaccination,citations were given. 2066

12/28/2014 NOTE  
 12/28/14 17:00 I Officer Hendrickson #2066 and Officer Henderson arrive at [redacted] in response to a dog reported with no shelter. We made contact with the owner [redacted] had a boxter/ pit mix named Dojo. We went over a premis inspection form and [redacted] had sutable water and food and the dogs shelter was located under his back porch inside a open storage closet. [redacted] did not have a current license and vaccination,citations were given. 2066

W/C 8

# Activity Report

---

<u>Activity Number:</u>	<u>Activity Type:</u>	<u>Activity Date:</u>	<u>Priority:</u>	<u>Total Animals:</u>	<u>Animal Type:</u>
A14-162650-1	INV/NEGLI	12/26/14 05:29 PM	2	1	DOG

---

Photos: NO PHOTOGRAPHS TAKEN.

W/C 9

**INVESTIGATION REPORT**

Pima County Health Department  
 Pima Animal Care Center  
 4000 N. Silverbell Rd  
 Tucson, Arizona 85711  
 Phone: (520) 243-5960  
 Fax: (520) 243-5960  
 www.pimaanimalcare.org



SUSPECT				ACO X. Delgadillo #2047 S. Adkins#1961		COMPLAINT NUMBER <b>A14-162744</b>	
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS							
ZIP	CITY	STATE	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER				
857	Tucson	AZ	520-				
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS							
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER				
SEX	WEIGHT	HEIGHT	EYES	HAIR COLOR	ORIGIN	DOB	SSN
	250	5'5"	Br	Br			

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

LOCATION OF INCIDENT				DATE AND TIME REPORTED <b>12/28/14 17:23</b>		DATE AND TIME OCCURRED <b>12/28/14 / 17:45</b>			
FOOD	WATER	SHELTER	INJURED/ILL	VENTILATION	ABANDONED	TIEOUT	BEATEN	WASTE	OTHER (EXPLAIN)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case  
 I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.  
 REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-1405 (B) and § 8-286 (B)

VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME <b>Officer X. Delgadillo</b>	D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	BUSINESS PHONE NO. <b>520-724-5900*3</b>
VICTIM'S ADDRESS <b>4000 N. Silverbell RD</b>	ZIP <b>85745</b>	CITY <b>Tucson</b>	STATE <b>AZ</b>
VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS	ZIP	CITY	STATE

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE IF APPLICABLE)

DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> TFD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:	FOLLOW UP REQUEST <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:
---	--	-----------------------	---	--

ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

<input type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY:	TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED	PACC <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION	PART OF BODY BITTEN:			RELEASE DATE:	VET <input type="checkbox"/>
					HOME <input type="checkbox"/>

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM  
  
PHONE NUMBER

VET CLINIC	PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	FTQ <input type="checkbox"/>	UTQ <input type="checkbox"/>
------------	--------------	---	------------------------------	------------------------------

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

CLINIC'S ADDRESS	QUARANTINE 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> FRA HEAD#
3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CITING ACO X. Delgadillo #2047	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS
	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

CODE/DRD VIOLATED <b>4-3(2) E(2), 4-3-(2) (B)</b>	REVIEWED BY <b>KONST 1/6/15</b>
CITATIONS/NUMBERS <b>73681</b>	BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL	ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
<b>husky Mix</b>	<b>Zeus</b>	<b>Black/White</b>	<b>M</b>						<b>505713</b>
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									

VITNESS 1	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
VITNESS 2	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
VITNESS 3	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
VITNESS 4	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #

W/c 9



## INVESTIGATION REPORT

**Activity Number: A14-162744**

**ACO name & Badge: X. Delgadillo**

On December 28, 2014 at 17:45, Officer Adkins #1961, arrived to Vista reference a dog on a tie-out who had jumped the fence and is fighting with a stray pit bull. When Officer Adkins arrived she observed an adult male black/white husky on a cable tie out with access to shelter. Officer Adkins knocked on the door with no response. Officer Adkins noticed there were several bowls near the tree where the dog was tied too, but all bowls were empty. Officer Adkins impounded the dog for being on a tie out and left a notice on the security screen door. Officer Adkins scanned the dog for a microchip and found 95600009324483 which was not listed in chameleon.

On January 2, 2015, Dog owner came to Pima Animal Care Center to redeem his dog. I, Officer Delgadillo, issued citations to the dog owner for neglect, tie-out and neglect, no water. Mr. signed his citations and received a copy. Mr. was advised of his court date and time.

**Officer's Signature:**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "X. Delgadillo", written over a horizontal line.

**Date:**

1/6/15

W/C 10

**INVESTIGATION REPORT**

Pima County Health Department  
 Pima Animal Care Center  
 4000 N. Oracle Rd  
 Tucson, Arizona 85710  
 Phone: (520) 243-5960  
 Fax: (520) 243-5960  
 www.pimaanimalcare.org



SUSPECT		ACO NAME / BADGE # <b>X. Delgadillo #2047</b>		COMPLAINT NUMBER <b>A14-151102</b>	
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS <b>10440 S. Epperson lane</b>		BITE <input type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
ZIP <b>85</b>	CITY <b>Tucson</b>	STATE <b>AZ</b>	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER <b>520-</b>		
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS		CODE IF OTHER : <b>6.4.110(B) (4), 6.4.110 (B)(2), 6.4.110 (B)(1), 6.4.110(B)(3), 6.4.110(B)(5)</b>			
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS		CI <input type="checkbox"/> CO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>			
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER		DRIVERS LICENSE
SFX	WEIGHT <b>180</b>	HEIGHT <b>5'5"</b>	EYES <b>Bro</b>	HAIR COLOR <b>BR</b>	ORIGIN
LOCATION OF INCIDENT		DATE AND TIME REPORTED <b>07/08/14 / 1030</b>		DATE AND TIME OCCURRED <b>12/30/14 / 1646</b>	
FOOD <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WATER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SHELTER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> INJURED/ILL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> VENTILATION <input type="checkbox"/> ABANDONED <input type="checkbox"/> TIEOUT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BEATEN <input type="checkbox"/> WASTE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (EXPLAIN) <input type="checkbox"/>					
<input type="checkbox"/> I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case		VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME		D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.
<input type="checkbox"/> I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.		VICTIM'S ADDRESS		ZIP	CITY STATE
<input type="checkbox"/> REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B) and § 8-286 (B)		VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS		ZIP	CITY STATE
NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)		DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> TFD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:
<input type="checkbox"/> ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM		<input type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION		BITE SEVERITY:	TREATED BY
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM		<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION		PART OF BODY BITTEN:	PHONE NUMBER
PHONE NUMBER		VET CLINIC		OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	DATE QUARANTINED
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS		CLINIC'S ADDRESS		QUARANTINE 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>	RELEASE DATE:
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE		3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PACC <input type="checkbox"/> VET <input type="checkbox"/> HOME <input type="checkbox"/>
CODE/DRD VIOLATED <b>6.4.110(B) (4), 6.4.110 (B)(2), 6.4.110 (B)(1), 6.4.110(B)(3), 6.4.110(B)(5)</b>		CITING ACO		PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS
CITATIONS/NUMBERS <b>73033, 73034, 73035, 73036</b>		REVIEWED BY		BOND YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	
BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<b>Brownie</b>	<b>Brown</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>adult</b>
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<b>Wedo</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>adult</b>
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<b>Chicarone</b>	<b>Cream</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>adult</b>
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<b>Loca</b>	<b>Brown/White</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>adult</b>
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<b>Puppy#1</b>	<b>White/Black</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>Pup</b>
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<b>Puppy#2</b>	<b>White/Black</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>Pup</b>
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<b>Puppy#3</b>	<b>Brown/Black/Wh</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>Pup</b>
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<b>Puppy#4</b>	<b>Brown/Black/Wh</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>Pup</b>
WITNESS 1		M <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	
WITNESS 2		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	
				RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
				RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #

W/c 10



## INVESTIGATION REPORT

**Activity Number: A14-151102**

**ACO name & Badge: X. Delgadillo #2047**

---

**On December 30, 2014 at approximately 16:46, I Officer Delgadillo #2047 arrived to location of \_\_\_\_\_ reference neglect, dogs on a tie-out. When I arrived, the vehicle drive through gates were padlocked, no response to honking the vehicle horn. I tapped on the fence with my baton to see if any dogs would come to the gate and none were seen at that time.**

**I then drove to the side of the residence and I observed three dogs on a tie-out, a white boxer; brown and white boxer; and a cream colored Chihuahua. As I was photographing the dogs on a tie-out, I observed a severely emaciated male brown boxer. This dog was not on a tie-out and was attempting to stand but kept falling down. As I observed the brown Boxer, it was not attempting to walk but was dragging itself from under the trailer to the front of the residence. The dog was struggling to pull itself to the front of the residence and would stop and lay down in exhaustion; after he had only moved a few paces. Then the dog would start again, pulling itself, until it reached a piece of carpet by the front of the residence. The dog did not have sufficient shelter, as the only area he could go to is under the trailer. The trailer did not have skirting all the way around to protect the dog from the weather elements. The dog would not have been able to go into any of the dog houses on the property as the other dogs were tied them and if he could; the dog houses were not able to occupy more than one dog.**

**I called Supervisor Tenkate and described the situation and permission was granted to cut the locks and confiscate the dogs. I called Pima County Sheriff to respond. Officer Walsh arrived and I cut the lock from the side walk through gate. A male cream/white Chihuahua was tied to a tree and had no water or food; a male white boxer was tied to a stake on the side of the dog house but had no food or water; the brown and white female boxer was tied to a stake on the side of its house with no food and a pot of water. The water was not potable and appeared in green color. The brown and white boxer had four puppies, approximately one week old, in the dog house it was tied to. The dogs were impounded and a notice was placed on the vehicle drive through gate. I contacted our on-site treatment personnel and advised of the condition of the male brown boxer. Treatment advised to bring the dog to our on-site clinic. When I arrived, the dog was taken to the clinic where it was weighed at 38 lbs.**

W/C 10

01/15

On December 31, 2014, the dog owner, \_\_\_\_\_ came to Pima Animal Care Center to redeem his dogs. Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ was not interested in redeeming Brownie(A505892), the severely emaciated Boxer or Wedo(A505881) the white boxer. Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ was only interested in Loca(A505890) the brown and white boxer with the four puppies and Chicarone(A505891), the cream/white Chihuahua. While interviewing Mr. \_\_\_\_\_

I asked him why he had not sought vet care for Brownie. Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ stated that Brownie had been thin before and seemed to recover. I then stated to Mr. \_\_\_\_\_, "the dog was ill before and the dog was not taken to a veterinarian to seek treatment?" Mr. Noriega replied yes. I advised Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ that the dogs he wants to redeem are bonded and would require payment in the amount of \$4650.00, of which \$1025.00 for Loca, \$650.00 for each puppy and \$650.00 for Chicarone. Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ chose not to redeem any of the any animals and signed a release of ownership form. Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ was cited into Pima County Justice Court for the following charges:

Brownie(A505882), Neglect, No vet care; no water; insufficient shelter, no food(nutritional).

Wedo(A505881), Neglect, tie-out; no food and no water.


Chicarone(A505891), Neglect, tie-out; no food and no water.

Loca(A505890), Neglect, tie-out; no food and no water.

Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ signed his citations and received a copy. Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ was advised of his court date and time. I advised him if he could not make the scheduled date, it would be his responsibly to contact the court and make arrangements. Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ stated that he understood.

On January 2, 2015, Brownie(A505882) was euthanized due to severity of the suspected illness and was taken to Arizona State Diagnostics Lab for a necropsy.

Officer's Signature:



Date:

1/6/15



**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:** 12/31/14  
**RE:** Dangerous Dog Cases for December 2014

---

### Pima County:

1. A14-160803 Steven Prather; dog named Gracie, was declared Not Dangerous by Investigator Carver.
2. A14-161172 Steven Boggs; dog named King was declared Dangerous by Investigator Carver who is monitoring compliance.

### City of Tucson:

3. A14-162079 Robert Jaxel; dog named Lexi was declared Vicious in Tucson City Court by Judge Klotz. Investigator Klein is monitoring compliance.
4. A14-161922 Sabrina Rinquist; dog named Shiloh was declared Vicious in Tucson City Court by Judge Chayet. Investigator Carver is monitoring compliance
5. A14-162284 Cereriano Fernandez; dog named Chulo was declared Vicious in Tucson City Court by Judge Berning. Chulo was signed over to PACC for euthanasia.
6. A14-162288 Lorena Verdugo; dog named Sweet Pea was declared Vicious in Tucson City Court by Judge Cranshaw. Investigator Eckelbarger is monitoring compliance.
7. A14-161700 Andrew Tellez; dog named Bronson was declared Dangerous by Investigator Klein who is monitoring compliance.

D 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

CASE NO: 14160803  
OWNER: ROSALIND PRATHER  
ANIMAL NAME: GRACIE

ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_  
SEX: F BREED: Pit Bull  
COLOR: BRN/Wht DATE: 12/10/14

**EVALUATION CRITERIA**

**REPORTED BITES:**

NON-VIOLATION BITE + 3 \_\_\_\_\_  
VIOLATION-BITE + 6     /    

**SEVERITY OF INJURY TO HUMANS:**

(Check One Factor Only Per Victim)

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

**Animal Complaints or Violations:**

LEASH LAW CITATIONS + 2 +2  
LEASH LAW COMPLAINTS + 1 \_\_\_\_\_  
ATTEMPTED BITE CITATIONS + 2 \_\_\_\_\_  
ANIMAL ATTACK CITATIONS + 3 +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 +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

**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 # 14-107481 - 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 \_\_\_\_\_  
ANIMAL NOT OBSERVED AGGRESSIVE - 3 -3  
ANIMAL OBSERVED AT LARGE <5X/YR + 1 +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:**

6 foot Block + Chain link with SECURE GATE

**General Comments:**

RECORDS SHOW NO PRIOR INCIDENTS. NEIGHBORS REPORT NO ISSUES. THE DOG WAS CALM & FRIENDLY DURING ASSESSMENT. THE DOG GRACIE IS DECLARED NOT DANGEROUS AT THIS TIME. JC

OFFICER # CARVER / 901

TOTAL SCORE: +5

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

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

DD 1

STATE OF ARIZONA VS. PRATHER, ROSALIND JANAE	TRAFFIC & CRIMINAL MINUTE ENTRY ORDER AND JUDGMENT	CASE NO. CR14-112147-AM <input type="checkbox"/> JUVENILE <input type="checkbox"/> ACCOUNT IN COLLECTION
--	--	--

PRESENT:  Defense Attorney  County Attorney LOCINER  
 Interpreter  Defendant  Victim  Parent  Officer  Other

Statute Number	Description	Plea	Finding by the Court	Dismiss with with/out prejudice	Fine/Civil Sanction	Amount with proof
6.04 (B3)	DOG AT LARGE		G		450 <del>248.00</del>	Suspend 450
6.04 (2) B2	VIOLENT ANIMAL BITING		G		458.00	with proof 458.00

YOUR NEXT COURT DATE IS: Date 2, 13, 15 Time 2:30 AM/PM TOTAL \$ 300

- Case Management Conference
- Status/Review Hearing
- Change of Plea
- Evidentiary Hearing/Oral Argument
- Bench Trial
- Sentencing
- Contempt/Compliance Hearing
- Restitution Hearing
- Telephone Hearing. Call (520) 724-3505
- Affirm Pending Court Dates
- Vacate Pending Court Dates
- Other

DIVERSION OPTION:  Pima County Attorney Diversion Program  U of A Diversion Program (Dean of Students Office)  
 Report to the specified program within 3 days. For dismissal complete and show proof by \_\_\_\_\_.

DEFENDANT IS:  
 Placed on  Unsupervised probation for \_\_\_\_\_ months.  Supervised probation for \_\_\_\_\_ months; probation fees of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ per month.  
 Committed to Pima County Jail for \_\_\_\_\_ days. Suspend \_\_\_\_\_ days on completion of conditions of probation. (Serve \_\_\_\_\_ days).  
 Credit \_\_\_\_\_ days for time served.

DEFENDANT IS ORDERED TO SHOW:  
 Valid driver's license by \_\_\_\_\_  Defensive driving school by \_\_\_\_\_  
 Current registration by \_\_\_\_\_  Alcohol/drug evaluation by \_\_\_\_\_  
 Current insurance due 30 days from today.  \_\_\_\_\_ hours of Alcohol/drug education by \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ hours of Community Restitution by \_\_\_\_\_  Other DANGEROUS PIC RESTRICTION by

DEFENDANT IS ORDERED TO PAY: Total \$ 1913.33. Pay \$ 150 per month beginning 1/1/15.  
 Pay in full today  Plea incorporated  
 Fine \$ 300  Attorney Fees \$ \_\_\_\_\_  Warrant fee(s) \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 Suspend \$ \_\_\_\_\_  \$20.00 Time Payment Fee  \$15.00 Drug Offense Fee  
 Restitution \$ 1593.33  \$18.50 Automation (only Title 28 cases)

(NOTE: Failure to pay may result in collection costs and suspension of your driver's license)

Issue Warrant  Set Bond \$ \_\_\_\_\_  Warrant Remains Active  Quash Warrant  
 Bond is hereby:  Exonerated \$ \_\_\_\_\_  Converted \$ \_\_\_\_\_  Assigned to \_\_\_\_\_  Forfeited \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 Set Aside Default  Lift Suspension  Vacate Fines/Cost Recovery Fee  Remove from Collections

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Release Agreement Statement: I promise to comply with my release conditions, including the standard conditions listed on the back of this form. I understand I have the right to be present at my trial and other proceedings in my case, and that if I fail to appear, the trial or proceedings may be held without me, any bond posted may be forfeited and a warrant may be issued for my arrest. I promise to notify the court immediately, in writing, of any change in my current address.  
 Statement of Understanding: I hereby acknowledge receipt of a copy of the foregoing order. I understand that if I violate any of these orders, the Court may issue a warrant for my arrest and order me to jail pending further proceedings. If I have been placed on probation, the Court may revoke and terminate my probation and impose sentence in accordance with the law. I promise to notify the court immediately, in writing, of any change in my current address.

DEFENDANT'S ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_  
 TELEPHONE: \_\_\_\_\_ DEFENDANT'S SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: 1/25/15 JUDGE: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Pro Tem  Hearing Officer

DD1


**INVESTIGATION REPORT**

Pima County Health Department  
 Pima Animal Care Center  
 4000 N. Campbell Rd.  
 Tucson, Arizona 85711  
 Phone: (520) 243-5960  
 Fax: (520) 243-5960  
 www.pimaanimalcare.org



SUSPECT <b>Rosalind Prather</b>		ACO NAME / BADGE # <b>C. Meek 2015</b>		COMPLAINT NUMBER <b>A14-146013</b>	
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS		BITE <input type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
ZIP	CITY	STATE	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER		
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS		CODE IF OTHER: <b>6.04.120(B)(2)</b>			
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER		DRIVERS LICENSE
SEX	WEIGHT	HEIGHT	EYES	HAIR COLOR	ORIGIN
DOB		SSN			
DATE AND TIME REPORTED <b>04/21/14 / 1827</b>		DATE AND TIME OCCURRED <b>04/21/14 / 1800</b>			
FOOD <input type="checkbox"/> WATER <input type="checkbox"/> SHELTER <input type="checkbox"/> INJURED/ILL <input type="checkbox"/> VENTILATION <input type="checkbox"/> ABANDONED <input type="checkbox"/> TIEOUT <input type="checkbox"/> BEATEN <input type="checkbox"/> WASTE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (EXPLAIN) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> leash law					
VICTIM / CONTACT NAME		RESIDENCE PHONE NO.		BUSINESS PHONE NO.	
VICTIM'S ADDRESS		ZIP	CITY	STATE	
VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS		ZIP	CITY	STATE	
NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)		DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> TFD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:
ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM		VIOLATION <input type="checkbox"/>		FOLLOW UP REQUEST <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:	
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM		BITE SEVERITY:		TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER
PHONE NUMBER		PART OF BODY BITTEN:		DATE QUARANTINED	PACC <input type="checkbox"/> VET <input type="checkbox"/> HOME <input type="checkbox"/>
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS		VET CLINIC		PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
CLINIC'S ADDRESS		QUARANTINE 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>		FRA HEAD# <input type="checkbox"/>	
3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		CITING ACO <b>J. Carver 1901</b>		PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE		CODE/ORD VIOLATED <b>72977</b>		OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS	
CITATIONS/NUMBERS <b>6.040.030, 6.04.120(B)(2)</b>		REVIEWED BY <b>6/19/14</b> <b>S. J. 1994</b>		BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	
BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE
Pit Bull		Pit Bull-X	Brn/Wht	F	5Y
VICTIM OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>		GRACIE			
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>					
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>					
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>					
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>					
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>					
VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>					
WITNESS 1		M <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	
WITNESS 2		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	
WITNESS 3		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	
WITNESS 4		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	
RESIDENCE PHONE #		BUSINESS PHONE #		RESIDENCE PHONE #	
520-591-9214				RESIDENCE PHONE #	
				RESIDENCE PHONE #	
				RESIDENCE PHONE #	
				BUSINESS PHONE #	
				52	

DD 1 0 0



## INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-1416013

ACO name & Badge: C. Meek 2015

On 04/21/2014 at 1827 hours Pima Animal Care Center received a call from a [redacted] advised the dispatcher that she was walking her dog on the 4000 block of [redacted] stated that when she got to the driveway of [redacted] a Pit Bull type dog of medium size ran up to her and attacked her Binchon named Kodi. [redacted] advised the dispatcher that she was on the way to the Vet Specialty on River Road. [redacted] advised the dispatcher that the attacking dog was in the driveway when she left to take her dog to the veterinarian.

On 04/21/14 at 2019 hours I Officer Meek badge number 2015 responded to [redacted] in reference to a leash law dog on dog attack complaint. The address I responded to initially was the dog attacking dog owners.

I arrived at the address and was able to meet with the supposed attacking dog owner [redacted]. I advised Mr. [redacted] of the alleged complaint. I asked Mr. [redacted] if he had a brown and white Pit Bull mix or similar type dog. Mr. [redacted] advised me he did own a dog fitting that description. I asked Mr. Prather if I could see the dog and Mr. [redacted] then presented me with a five year old female Pit Bull named Gracie. Gracie was inside the residence when I arrived. At that point I was joined by Ms. [redacted], I advised Ms. [redacted] of the complaint as well as the alleged attack. Both Mr. and Ms. [redacted] emphatically denied that Gracie attacked another dog and were just as steadfast that she was inside the residence at the time of the attack (approximately 1800).

I asked the [redacted] if it were possible that Gracie was able to slip through the gate as it was open when I arrived. I was advised by Ms. [redacted] that it was only opened a short time before my arrival and Gracie was indoors when it was opened. I asked the [redacted] if I could photograph Gracie to show the complainant and they both agreed and Gracie was photographed for the report. Ms. [redacted] advised me that she thought the mobile home behind her residence also had a brown and white Pit Bull type dog. I advised Ms. [redacted] that I would make an attempt to see if there is a dog fitting the description given at that residence when I finished meeting with them. After finishing up with the [redacted] I did walk the fence line behind their residence and I did not observe any dogs in the yard of the described mobile home and due to the degree of darkness it made it extremely difficult to see anything.

I advised the [redacted] that I would be meeting with the victim dog owner in an effort to ensure that the right dog was found and the wrong dog was not

P D I

held accountable and that I would be back in touch with them after meeting with the victim dog owner. I provided my name, badge number, as well as complaint number. The [redacted] asked that when I return to the residence to please come before 1900 hours as they have a small child the goes to be fairly early. The [redacted] again advised me that Gracie was indoors at the time of the attack and that she could not have been involved in the incident.

I left the residence and then was able to meet with a neighbor residing at [redacted]. I met with Mr. [redacted]. Mr. [redacted] advised me that he did not witness the actual attack but did hear the commotion outdoors and the victim dog squealing like a "rabbit" and went out to investigate. Mr. [redacted] advised me that when he got outdoors the attack was over and the victim dog owner was carrying the dog away and it appeared as though there was blood on her shirt. Mr. [redacted] advised me that the attacking dog was still loose and that he was able to see the dog and described it as a tan and white Pit Bull type dog. Mr. [redacted] said the dog barked at him but he was behind the wall at his residence and never had physical contact with the dog. I showed Mr. [redacted] the photograph of Gracie. Mr. [redacted] identified Gracie as the dog he saw immediately after the incident with the victim dog. I asked Mr. [redacted] if he would be willing to testify as to what he saw and Mr. [redacted] advised me that he would be willing to testify. I gathered Mr. [redacted] information.

I then proceeded to the address of [redacted] the residence of the victim dog owner. I knocked at the door and was able to meet with a house guest Ms. [redacted]. Ms. [redacted] advised me that the dog owner Ms. [redacted] was currently at the vet with the victim dog. Ms. [redacted] advised me that the dog, a Binchon Frise, was getting ready for X-rays and would potentially be at the vet for quite some time. I provided Ms. [redacted] with my name, badge number, and case number and asked that she have Ms. [redacted] call Pima Animal Care Center with her availability for a meeting.

Between the dates of 04/24/14 and 04/28/14 Pima Animal Care Center received calls from both the victim dog owner Ms. [redacted] and the attacking dog owner Mr. [redacted] and his spouse Ms. [redacted]. Ms. [redacted] called to advise the dispatch department she would be out of town. The [redacted] called the dispatch department to advise that their dog was not involved with the attack and to be transferred to a supervisor.

On 04/28/14 at 1834 hours I Officer Meek badge number 2015 responded to [redacted] to follow up on a leash law complaint and to meet with the complainant and victim dog.

I arrived at the address and was able to meet with Ms. [redacted] the victim dog owner. I asked Ms. [redacted] to recount what happened on the evening of 04/21. Ms. [redacted] went on to advise me that she went out for a walk with her dog, a Binchon Frisea named Kodi. Ms. [redacted] went on to advise me that while walking in the cul-de-sac of the 4000 block of east [redacted] she and Kodi were attacked by a tan and white Pit Bull. Ms. [redacted] went on to describe the dog as well as she could recollect advising me that the dog was wearing a pink or red collar. Ms. [redacted] advised me that she was more interested in protecting her dog and was attempting to pick up Kodi during the attack. Ms. [redacted] advised me that she was not bitten during the attack. Ms. [redacted] then presented me with her dog Kodi which was resting in a wire crate.

I asked Ms. [redacted] about Kodi's vet care and how much cost she has

DD 1

incurred substantial costs as a result and presented me with a bill from Mesquite Valley Animal the was just over 1500 dollars. Ms. [redacted] went on to advise me that there would also be continuing care required for Kodi. Ms. [redacted] advised me that Kodi suffered a punctured lung, broken ribs, torn muscles, and puncture wounds from the attack. I advised Ms. [redacted] that I did photograph the dog that was described in the complaint and that I would like her to identify the dog before I met with the owners again. I presented Ms. [redacted] with the photograph of the [redacted] dog named Gracie. Ms. [redacted] positively identified Grace as the dog that attack Kodi.

I then asked Ms. [redacted] if she would like citations issued to the dog owner's for the event of 04/21. Initially Ms. [redacted] advised me that she would like citations issued to the Prathers. Ms. [redacted] then began to ask me about the judicial process. I advised Ms. [redacted] that the [redacted] are emphatic that their dog was not the dog that attacked Kodi. This news was troubling to Ms. [redacted] that the [redacted] were adamant that the attacking dog was not theirs. Ms. [redacted] then asked if I could meet with the [redacted] and explain that Grace was identified as the attacking dog and ask that they pay her current vet bill and the care as a result of the attack. Ms. [redacted] advised me that if the [redacted] took responsibility for the attack she would forgo issuing citations. I advised Ms. [redacted] that I would be more than happy to meet with the [redacted] and explain my findings. Ms. [redacted] then asked that I return to her residence after meeting with the [redacted]

I then made my way to [redacted] meet with Mr. and Ms. [redacted] I initially had the dispatch department make contact per their request. I explained to both Mr. and Ms. [redacted] that Grace was identified as the dog that attacked Ms. [redacted] dog Kodi. Upon my initial meeting was the [redacted] they both were still emphatic about Grace not being the dog that was out on 04/21. I advised both the [redacted] that there was a witness to the event and that Ms. [redacted] was willing to work with them on the vet bills she incurred.

I advised the [redacted] that Ms. [redacted] was willing to work with them in regards to payment. I advised the [redacted] if they would like to speak with Ms. [redacted] and attempt to work the problem out as neighbors I would make sure Ms. [redacted] would be comfortable with her telephone number being given out. I made contact with the dispatch department to make contact with Ms. [redacted] Ms. [redacted] advised the dispatcher that she was fine with me giving her telephone number. I then provided [redacted] with Ms. [redacted] telephone number. I advised the [redacted] that if they were unable to work out an arrangement with Ms. [redacted] that I would have to return to issue citations. Both Mr. and Ms. [redacted] stated they understood and would make contact with Ms. [redacted] and work the issue out.

I then returned to Ms. Collett's residence to advise her of my meeting with the [redacted]. I advised Ms. [redacted] that I provided the [redacted] with her telephone number and to expect a call from them. I then advised Ms. [redacted] that if they were unable to come to an arrangement with regards to Kodi's bills to please call Pima Animal Care Center and I would then issue the citations she requested.

Between the dates of 04/28/14 and 05/10/14 Pima Animal Care center received contact both from Ms. [redacted] and the [redacted] regarding the complaint. The [redacted] made contact with Pima Animal Care Center to again advise that their dog was not involved in the attack. Ms. [redacted] stated that she obtained video of the attacking dog which she stated resided at an [redacted]

DDI

to advise that she spoke with the \_\_\_\_\_ and their conversation was not fruitful and she would like citations issued to them for the attack on Kodi.

On 05/20/14 at 0828 hours I Officer Meek badge number 2015 responded to \_\_\_\_\_ to follow up on a leash law complaint. I asked the dispatch department to make contact with the \_\_\_\_\_ per their request. I was advised that contact was made with Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ and that he gave an availability of two hours daily between 1700 and 1900 hours to meet.

On 05/26/14 at 1904 hours Officer Foster badge number 2042 responded to \_\_\_\_\_ to follow up on a leash law complaint. Officer Foster stated that she made contact with the dispatch department to have them make contact with the \_\_\_\_\_. Officer Foster stated that the dispatcher advised her that there were no answers at any of the telephone number they provided.

Officer Foster stated she arrived at the \_\_\_\_\_ and found the gate to be shut. Officer Foster stated a notice was posted on the gate requesting contact.

Officer Foster stated she then made contact with Ms. \_\_\_\_\_ at her residence. Officer Foster stated that she was able to pick up an invoice for Kodi's care along with a type letter from the \_\_\_\_\_. The letter from the \_\_\_\_\_ denied their dog was involved with the attack but did offer Ms. \_\_\_\_\_ a settlement amount in the sum of \$800 dollars for her costs. During Officer Foster's meeting with Ms. \_\_\_\_\_ it was brought up that Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ currently is employed by \_\_\_\_\_ and that contact may be made with him at his place of employment if a meeting was unsuccessful at his residence.

On 06/12/14 at 0839 hours I Officer Meek 2015 responded to \_\_\_\_\_ to follow up on a leash law complaint. I arrived at the address and found the front gate to be shut. I asked the dispatch department to make contact with the Prathers. I was advised that no contact was made with either Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ or Ms. \_\_\_\_\_. I posted a notice on the front gate advising the \_\_\_\_\_ if contact was not made with Pima Animal Care Center within twenty four (24) hours I would attempt contact at their places of employment.

On 09/14/14 at 0832 hour Pima Animal Care Center received a call from Ms. \_\_\_\_\_ the victim dog owner in the complaint. Ms. \_\_\_\_\_ called to inquire the status of the complaint and asked whether she needed to hire an attorney.

On 06/14/14 at 1008 hours Pima Animal Care Center dispatch department attempted to contact the \_\_\_\_\_ with no success and indicated a message was left. An alternate telephone number was used and contact was made with \_\_\_\_\_ r. The dispatcher advised Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ that an Officer was in the area and wanted to meet with him. Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ advised the dispatcher that it was not a convenient time.

On 06/14/14 at 1730 hours Investigator Carver badge number 1901 responded to \_\_\_\_\_ in an attempt to make contact with the \_\_\_\_\_. Investigator Carver stated he arrived at the dog owners residence and observed a vehicle pulling into the driveway. Investigator Carver observed a young woman walking out and yelled "NO" and the gate was shut. Investigator Carver also indicated that the male driver of the vehicle stated "I'm just here for the party, you know Father's Day." Investigator Carver again had the dispatch department attempt contact with the Prathers and was advised no one was home. Investigator Carver stated he posted a notice on the front gate requesting contact and advising the Prathers the complaint would not be closed until they met with an Officer.

DD1

residence. Ms. [redacted] advised Investigator Carver that after her meeting with Officer Foster on 05/26/14 Mr. [redacted] came to her residence approximately ten (10) minutes after she left. Ms. [redacted] advised Investigator that Mr. [redacted] still was adamant that his dog was not involved with the attack on Kodi. Ms. [redacted] went on to advise Investigator that Mr. [redacted] again offered her \$800 dollars to settle the matter. Investigator Carver indicated in his notes that Mr. [redacted] must have been home at the time of Officer Foster's arrival when he said he was not. Investigator Carver recommended contacting Mr. [redacted] supervisor in an effort to get the complaint resolved.

On 06/15/14 at 1655 hours Investigator Klein badge number 1926 made contact with Mr. [redacted] via telephone on line number 5928 which is also recorded. Investigator Klein stated she would be able to meet with Mr. [redacted] this evening (06/14) to resolve the complaint. Investigator Klein stated that Mr. [redacted] said he would not meet with her as it was Father's Day. Investigator Klein went on to state she asked Mr. [redacted] when he would be available to meet. Investigator Klein stated that Mr. [redacted] advised her that he has already provided his availability and Investigator Klein stated that Officers have been attempting to accommodate him and he has not been available. Investigator Klein stated that she suggested that it may be easier for him to come to Pima Animal Care Center to meet and Investigator Klein stated that Mr. [redacted] advised her that if a Supervisor called him he would make arrangements. Investigator Klein stated she advised Mr. [redacted] that a Supervisor has already attempted to make contact with him earlier in the day.

Investigator Klein then stated that Mr. [redacted] stated that he would not take care of the issue until an Officer came to his property to remove the red tape that was left on his gate. Mr. [redacted] believes his gate has been ruined. Investigator Klein stated that she would have an Officer meet with him today to remove the tape and meet with him and asked if he would be home. Investigator Klein stated Mr. [redacted] then hung up on her.

Subsequently Investigator Klein stated she checked the license and vaccination status of the [redacted] dog named Gracie. Investigator Klein stated she was able to find that Gracie's license was expired but had a current rabies vaccination.

On 06/15/14 at 2005 hour Pima Animal Care Center received an anonymous complaint from a male caller. The male caller was upset about the marks left on his gate by Pima Animal Care Center Officers. The male caller advised the dispatcher that no Officer was allowed on his property and indicated that his property started at three driveways. The male caller stated that he was upset about the times the Officers had responded to his residence and that he had been unable to reach a supervisor. The dispatcher stated that the male caller spent the next twenty (20) minutes repeatedly calling back stating that he wanted to speak to a Supervisor and to make complaints about the Officers involved in the activity. The dispatcher indicated that the male caller refused to be transferred to a Supervisor. The dispatcher indicated that on the final call the male caller stated that he was available to meet with an Officer.

On 06/16/14 at 1058 hours 1 Officer Meek badge number 2015 and Officer Kirby badge number 2057 responded to [redacted] to meet with Ms. [redacted] We were able to meet with Ms. [redacted] landlord who showed us to Ms. [redacted] Officer. We knocked at the door and were able to meet with Ms. [redacted]

DDI

... was currently on maternity leave and would not be back to the office until September first. We provided a notice to Ms. ... business partner again advising that the complaint would not go away until contact was made with an Officer.

On 06/17/14 at approximately 1735 hours Investigator Carver badge number 1901 stated he met with both Mr. and Mrs. ... at their residence. Investigator Carver stated he was able to obtain Ms. ... Arizona Drivers license. Investigator Carver stated he issued Ms. ... the appropriate citations. Investigator Carver stated he advised Ms. ... that with the citations she would need to appear in court and provided her with the date. Investigator Carver stated that Ms. ... stated she understood her need to appear and signed her copy of the citations. 2015

Officer's Signature:



Date: 06/18/14



DD #2

COMPLAINT # 14 161172  
OFFICER # CARVER 1961  
DATE: 12-11-14

PIMA COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT  
PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER  
4000 N. SILVERBELL RD. TUCSON, AZ 85745  
(520) 243-5900, option 3 FAX (520) 243-5960  
[www.pimaanimalcare.org](http://www.pimaanimalcare.org)

### DECLARATION OF DANGEROUS / VICIOUS ANIMAL

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

- An animal can be declared a dangerous animal if it, without provocation, bites or otherwise causes injury to a person which results in significant medical intervention/treatment.
- An animal can be deemed dangerous if it, without provocation, kills or severely injures a domestic animal.
- An animal declared vicious by a magistrate shall be automatically deemed dangerous.

**OFFICER COMMENTS:**

THE DOG KING HAS BEEN INVOLVED IN 3 INCIDENTS  
OF ATTACKING OTHER DOGS WITH EACH ONE BEING  
PROGRESSIVELY MORE SEVERE. THE LAST ONE RESULTED  
IN LIFE THREATENING INJURIES FOR ANOTHER DOG  
ALONG WITH BITES TO 2 PEOPLE. THE DOG  
KING IS DECLARED TO BE DANGEROUS  
[Signature] #1901

OWNER: RODGERS  
ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_  
PHONE: \_\_\_\_\_

ANIMAL NAME: KING  
ANIMAL ID#: A401760  
SEX: N COLOR: BROWN BREED: PIT BULL

### NOTICE

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

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

DD2

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Pima County Health Department
Pima Animal Care Center
1000 N. Oracle Rd.
Tucson, AZ 85705
Phone: (520) 243-5960
www.pimaanimalcare.org



Form containing fields for Suspect (Boggs), ACO Name (Harrington 1959), Complaint Number (A14-149343), Incident Location, Date/Time Reported (06/11/14 18:07), and various checkboxes for legal and medical details.

DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR AWAIVER 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. § 13-105 (B) and § 8-286 (B)

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)

[ ] ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

PHONE NUMBER

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS


SIGNATURE OF VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL

Table with columns for VICTIM/OWNER status and animal details for King Bull.

Table with columns for WITNESS 1-4, including gender (M/F) and contact information (DOB, ADDRESS, PHONE #).

DD 2



## INVESTIGATION REPORT

**Activity Number: A14-149343**

**ACO name & Badge: Harrington #1959**

On 6/11/14 around 18:49 hours, I, Officer Harrington #1959 arrived and met with Mr. [redacted]. Mr. [redacted] stated that he was out walking his Border Collie Toby on a leash near the address of [redacted] when a large brindle Pit Bull charged from the yard and attacked Toby. During the attack Mr. [redacted] scraped up his knees while holding the leash for his dog. Mr. Seiber was able to pull the Pit Bull off of his dog and with the assistance of another witness, [redacted] return the Pit Bull to its yard. Mr. [redacted] stated that Toby was not injured during the attack. Ms. [redacted] was on scene and I verified that she witnessed the attack. Mr. [redacted] is requesting that the dog owner be cited for Leash law and Biting Animal.

I arrived at the dog owners address and found a large brindle Pit Bull in the yard. Ms. [redacted] walked me to the gate where the dog had escaped. She had secured the gate with a chain and some baling wire. At this time the dog owner, Mr. [redacted] arrived home. I spoke with Mr. [redacted] regarding the incident. He showed me his brindle male Pit Bull King. Mr. [redacted] secured the gate with some chain and a lock. I walked around the property and determined that the confinement was secure. I issued Mr. [redacted] citations for Leash Law and Biting Animal on behalf of Mr. [redacted]. I also issued No License and No Rabies Vaccination to Mr. [redacted] as King was currently expired. Mr. [redacted] signed and received his copy of the citations and was made aware of his court date.

Officer's Signature:  1959

Date: 6/12/14



DD # 3

PIMA COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT  
PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER  
4000 N. SILVERBELL RD. TUCSON, AZ 85745  
(520) 243-5900, option 3 FAX (520) 243-5960  
www.pimaanimalcare.org 724-5900

COMPLAINT # A14. 162079  
OFFICER # 1926 KLEIN  
DATE: DEC. 10, 2014

### DECLARATION OF DANGEROUS / VICIOUS ANIMAL

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

- An animal can be declared a dangerous animal if it, without provocation, bites or otherwise causes injury to a person which results in significant medical intervention/treatment.
- An animal can be deemed dangerous if it, without provocation, kills or severely injures a domestic animal.
- An animal declared vicious by a magistrate shall be automatically deemed dangerous.

**OFFICER COMMENTS:**

ON DECEMBER 10, 2014 THE PITBULL MIX  
NAMED LEXI, OWNED BY ROBERT JAVEL  
WAS DECLARED VICIOUS BY CITY OF  
TUCSON JUDGE KYOTZ.

E. Klein #1926  
E. Klein

OWNER: JAVEL 8077359 ANIMAL NAME: LEXI  
ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_ ANIMAL ID#: A310426  
PHONE: \_\_\_\_\_ SEX: F COLOR: BLK BREED: PITBULL MIX

### NOTICE

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

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

DD3

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
Pit bull mix	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lexi	Bik/Wh	F	5	L15-176172		N	A310426
	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								
	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								
	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								
	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								
	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								
	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								
	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>								


  

WITNESS 1		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 2		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 3		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 4		M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #

<b>INVESTIGATION REPORT</b>		SUSPECT			ACO NAME / BADGE #		COMPLAINT NUMBER		
Pima County Health Department Pima Animal Care Center 4006 N. Campbell Tucson, Arizona Phone: (520) 243-5960 Fax: (520) 243-5960 www.pimaanimalcare.org		Jaxel			T.Foster 2042 D.Downing 1923		A14-154463		
		SUSPECT'S ADDRESS			BITE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>				
		ZIP	CITY	STATE	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER		CODE IF OTHER :		
		SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS			CI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CO <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>				
		ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER		DRIVERS LICENSE		
		N/A	N/A	AZ	N/A				
		SEX	WEIGHT	HEIGHT	EYES	HAIR COLOR	ORIGIN	DOB	
								SSN Not Given	
DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		LOCATION OF INCIDENT			DATE AND TIME REPORTED		DATE AND TIME OCCURRED		
					08/25/14 / 08:17		08/25/14 / 07:45		
		FOOD <input type="checkbox"/> WATER <input type="checkbox"/> SHELTER <input type="checkbox"/> INJURED/ILL <input type="checkbox"/> VENTILATION <input type="checkbox"/> ABANDONED <input type="checkbox"/> TIEOUT <input type="checkbox"/> BEATEN <input type="checkbox"/> WASTE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (EXPLAIN) <input type="checkbox"/>							
<input type="checkbox"/> I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case		VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME			DOB	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	BUSINESS PHONE NO.		
<input type="checkbox"/> I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.							UNK		
<input type="checkbox"/> REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (BD) and § 8-286 (B)		VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS			ZIP	CITY	STATE		
		UNK							
NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)		DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED	RESTITUTION REQUESTED	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE #		FOLLOW UP REQUEST		
		YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> TFD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:		<input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:		
<input type="checkbox"/> ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION		BITE SEVERITY: <b>2-Puncture</b>		TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED	PACC <input type="checkbox"/>
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM		<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION		PART OF BODY BITTEN: <b>Leg</b>				08/28/14	VET <input type="checkbox"/>
PHONE NUMBER		VET CLINIC		PHONE NUMBER		OWNER KNOWS OF BITE		RELEASE DATE: 09/03/14	HOME <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS						YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		FTQ <input type="checkbox"/>	UTQ <input type="checkbox"/>
		CLINIC'S ADDRESS		QUARANTINE		FRA HEAD#			
				10 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>					
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE		3 <sup>RD</sup> PARTY CITATIONS		CITING ACO		PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS		PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	
		YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		2042		YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		A12-099102	
		CODE/ORD VIOLATED						OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS	
		4-97; 4-7(2)(B)						REVIEWED BY 2002 Konst 8/29	
		CITATIONS/NUMBERS						BOND	
		#72346 (A, B)						YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

DD3



## INVESTIGATION REPORT

**Activity Number: A14-154463**

**ACO name & Badge: T. Foster 2042**

---

08/26/14 10:36 Officer D. Downing #1923 arrived at \_\_\_\_\_ and met with \_\_\_\_\_ reference to the bite incident that took place on 08/25/14. Ms. \_\_\_\_\_ stated to Officer Downing that on 08/25/14 at approximately 07:45 hours she was walking southbound on the west side of \_\_\_\_\_ and turned east onto \_\_\_\_\_ while walking her puppy. She stated that as they turned the corner she observed a black terrier type dog that was loose with it's owner in the driveway of \_\_\_\_\_. She went on to state that as they were in front of \_\_\_\_\_ the black dog exited it's yard and charged at her puppy in an attempt to attack it. She stated that she placed herself in between the attacking dog and her puppy to prevent her show quality puppy from being attacked. Ms. \_\_\_\_\_ stated that while the dog was trying to attack her puppy she was bitten on her leg by the attacking dog. She stated that the man who was in the front yard with the dog never came and got his dog. She stated that he was yelling at the dog to come back but did not come to her aid.

Ms. \_\_\_\_\_ also stated that she was wearing a leg brace when this incident happened since she has a pre-existing injury and stated that her leg was re-injured during the scuffle. Ms. \_\_\_\_\_ told Officer Downing that she wanted restitution and in lieu of that she is requesting citations be issued to the dog owner on her behalf.

08/28/14 15:08 I, Officer Foster 2042 arrived at \_\_\_\_\_ and observed a white mini van pull into the driveway as I was exiting the Pima Animal Care vehicle. I asked the man who got out of the van if he was \_\_\_\_\_ and he stated that he was. I then stated the reason for my visit. Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ invited me inside his home and stated that his dog did not bite that lady and that he believed she was crazy. I responded by stating that I am not able to determine who is or is not telling the truth when I respond to a bite complaint. Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ stated that he understood. I then requested proof of a current Pima County dog license and proof of current rabies vaccinations. Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ was able to supply me with proof of both current rabies vaccination and a license. I then photographed his license paperwork. While there I also met with Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ wife. Both husband and wife freely admit to the situation that took

DD3

place on 08/25/14 but dispute that a bite took place. They stated that Lexi has issues with other dogs but that they do not believe she would bite a person. I explained that Lexi the biting dog would need to be quarantined to their property and completed a Home Quarantine form while in the home. I explained the terms of the quarantine to the ; and asked for one of them to sign it if they agreed to the terms. Mrs. signed the form and accepted a copy. I then asked the couple if they had spoken with the victim since the incident. The ; stated that they have not. I then stated that I believed that she may be requesting citations and offered to contact the victim and find out for sure what she wanted. The ; agreed and I returned to the PACC vehicle to place the call.

08/28/14 15:30 I spoke with ; on my personal cell phone. I stated my name and the reason for my call and asked Ms. ; if she had a moment to speak with me. I explained that I had confirmed that the dog is current on her Rabies vaccination and that I needed to know if she is requesting citations be issued. Ms. ; stated that she has not yet seen her orthopedic specialist for her knee and that what she really wanted from the dog owners was a heartfelt apology and a promise to make sure it never happens again. I responded that I am unable to compel an apology on her behalf. She then stated that I should just issue the citations for her. Ms. ; also recounted the bite incident completely for me and I was able to confirm the notes created by Officer Downing on 08/26/14. I thanked Ms. ; for her time and returned to the ; residence.

I again knocked on the front door of the ; home and was again invited inside. I stated that the victim has requested that I issue citations. Mr. ; is the registered owner and the person who was with the dog when it bit Ms. ;. As such I felt he was the most responsible party. I then requested a copy of Mr. ; license. He complied and I completed citations for a leash law violation and a biting animal violation. Mr. ; acknowledged, signed, and accepted his citations. I then returned his license to him and provided him with his court date, time, and location. I then thanked Mr. and Mrs. ; for their time and cooperation.

Officer's Signature: *J. Foster 2042*

Date: *8/29/14*



DP #4

PIMA COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT  
PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER  
4000 N. SILVERBELL RD. TUCSON, AZ 85745  
7245900, option 3  
www.pimaanimalcare.org

COMPLAINT # 14-16922  
OFFICER # CAVER 1901  
DATE: 12-15-14

### DECLARATION OF DANGEROUS / VICIOUS ANIMAL

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

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

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

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

**OFFICER COMMENTS:**

ON 12/5/14 THE DOG SHILOH BELONGING TO SABRINA RINGQUIST WAS DECLARED VICIOUS IN TUCSON CITY COURT BY JUDGE CHAYET.

*[Signature]*  
1901

OWNER: Ringquist  
ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_  
PHONE: \_\_\_\_\_

ANIMAL NAME: Shiloh  
ANIMAL ID#: A475986  
SEX: M COLOR: B/W BREED: CR RET

### NOTICE

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

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

DD 4

**INVESTIGATION REPORT**

Pima County Health Department  
 Pima Animal Care Center  
 4000 N. Silverbell Rd.  
 Tucson, Arizona 85712  
 Phone: (520) 243-5960  
 Fax: (520) 243-5960  
 www.pimaanimalcare.org



SUSPECT				ACO NAME / BADGE #		COMPLAINT NUMBER	
Ringquist				T. Haynes #2032		A14-157108	
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS				BITE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>			
ZIP	CITY	STATE	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER				
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS				CODE IF OTHER :			
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER		CI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CO <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>		
SEX	WEIGHT	HEIGHT	EYES	HAIR COLOR	ORIGIN	DOB	SSN

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

DATE AND TIME REPORTED		DATE AND TIME OCCURRED							
10/02/14 / 1012 hours		10/02/14 / 1012 hours							
FOOD	WATER	SHELTER	INJURED/ILL	VENTILATION	ABANDONED	TIEOUT	BEATEN	WASTE	OTHER (EXPLAIN)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Attempt to Bite								

I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case

VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME		D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	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 (B) and § 8-286 (B)

VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS	ZIP	CITY	STATE
---------------------------	-----	------	-------

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)

DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED	RESTITUTION REQUESTED	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # E142750394	FOLLOW UP REQUEST
YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/> SO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> TFD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:	<input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:

ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

<input type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY:	TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED	PACC <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION	PART OF BODY BITTEN:			RELEASE DATE:	VET <input type="checkbox"/>
					HOME <input type="checkbox"/>

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

VET CLINIC	PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	FTQ <input type="checkbox"/>	UTQ <input type="checkbox"/>
------------	--------------	---------------------	--	------------------------------	------------------------------

PHONE NUMBER

CLINIC'S ADDRESS	QUARANTINE	FRA HEAD#
	10 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>	

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

3RD PARTY CITATIONS	CITING ACO	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS
YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	T. Haynes #2032	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	A14-144898	A14-147334, A14-148135

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE


CODE/ORD VIOLATED	REVIEWED BY
4-97, 4-7(2)(B), 4-81	10-7-14 DTH/911

CITATIONS/NUMBERS	BOND
73255, 73256	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL	ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
Golden Retriever VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Shiloh	Red/White	M	2 Y		223427		Agg	A475986
Golden Retriever VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Noah	Red/White	M	8 M		Cited		Norm	A497336
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									

WITNESS 1	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 2	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 3	M <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 4		DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #

DD 4



## INVESTIGATION REPORT

**Activity Number: A14-157108**

**ACO name & Badge: T. Haynes #2032**

---

On October 2, 2014 at approximately 1057 hours I, Officer T. Haynes #2032, arrived at [redacted] and met with Tucson Police in regards to a complaint of the dogs at this address being at large, chasing people and trying to bite. We went to the residence and met with the dog owners [redacted]. I explained that this was not the first call that we had responded to at this address for the same complaint and asked about license and rabies vaccinations for the dogs that reside at this address. Mrs. [redacted] provided me with the information for Shiloh and advised that there was a second dog, Noah, that was current on rabies vaccination, but it belonged to her father who lives in Mexico and was not current on license. Mr. [redacted] did not have a current license on his dog, Chowder. I requested their identifications and they both provided me with their Arizona Driver's Licenses. I requested that they bring out Noah and Chowder so I could photograph them. They brought out both dogs, one at a time and photos were obtained. I explained that they were going to be receiving citations and that I would return once my investigation was complete.

The officer and I then left the residence and he advised that a second officer, Officer Carter #53652, had been the initial officer on scene and observed two of the dogs from this address chasing an unknown female on a bicycle northbound on Park. He also advised that Officer Carter had gotten those two dogs back into their yard prior to his arrival. He advised that there were two separate neighbors that had encounters with the dogs today and they both wanted citations issued. He provided me with their names and information. He then cleared the scene.

I then went to speak with the first individual, [redacted]. She stated that this morning, October 2, 2014, at approximately 1005 hours she was returning home on her bicycle with her dog when, as she turned east onto [redacted] from [redacted] Ave, she noticed movement across the street at [redacted]. She said that she is diligent about watching the property because she has had encounters with the dogs at the address in the past acting aggressively, chasing her and her children. She said that as she came to her driveway, she

observed two dogs come off of the property at [redacted] and run towards her. She said that they were both barking at her as she headed up her driveway. She immediately dumped her bike, pushed her dog in the house, and then went into the house. She said that one dog stopped in the middle of the street and the second stopped at the end of her driveway but continued to bark at her. She said that she then went to her front door and it was at this time that she noticed her neighbor a couple of doors down out in her yard. The dogs noticed the neighbor at this time also and ran down the street and into her yard. Mrs. [redacted] said that she observed the dogs barking and charging at the neighbor and the neighbor trying to fend them off. Mrs. [redacted] said this is when she called 911.

Mrs. [redacted] is willing to testify to what she observed in court.

I then went and spoke to the second woman that had an encounter with the dogs today. [redacted] and she stated that she was out in her yard doing some yard work at approximately 1012 hours today (10/02/14) when she saw the three dogs, two red ones, and a tannish one, that reside at [redacted], out of their yard. She said that she was familiar with these dogs and that they have been terrorizing the neighborhood for several months. She said that she has made attempts to speak with the dogs' owner but it has been in vain. Because of her familiarity with these dogs and how aggressive they are, she said that she quickly headed to her front door and was trying to unlock the door when the two red ones charged at her, with their hackles up, barking, growling, and bearing their teeth. She said that the more aggressive of the two dogs had a green bandana on and seemed to initiate the attacks. She said that she had a shovel and kept swinging it at them to fend them off. She said that the two attacking dogs got to the edge of the patio, about five feet away, and continued to lunge at her. She said that the third dog, the large tan one, stayed way back at the edge of the yard and just barked, as if it was just following along but it never made any attempts to charge her and she said that she never felt threatened by that dog. She said that after several minutes of swinging the shovel at the dogs and fumbling with the keys in the door she was finally able to get it unlocked. It was at about this time, she said that, Tyler Owens, one of the other residents of the home, came to the door and observed the two dogs barking, growling, and bearing their teeth at Mrs. [redacted]. He was able to help Mrs. [redacted] into the house and the dogs ran off.

Mrs. [redacted] said that at some point during this encounter she observed the large tan dog turn around and go back to [redacted]. Mrs. [redacted] said that the neighbor across the street at [redacted] also attempted to help stop the attack by trying to get the dogs' attention but was unsuccessful.

Mrs. [redacted] said that after she was inside she was standing at the closed screen door and observed the two red dogs chasing another neighbor down the street on her bicycle. She did not know that individual's name or where on the street she resided.

Mrs. [redacted] is requesting citations for leash law on all three dogs and attempt to bite for the two red dogs.

DD 4

I then went to speak with the neighbor at \_\_\_\_\_ and met with \_\_\_\_\_ She said that she heard the neighbor across the street screaming and saw the dogs trying to attack her. Mrs. \_\_\_\_\_ said that she grabbed a hoe and went outside to try and distract the dogs. Mrs. \_\_\_\_\_ said that she was not able to get the dog's attention but that the neighbor was able to get inside her home. She said that she did observe the dogs chasing another woman down the street on her bicycle but did not know exactly who she was.

Mrs. \_\_\_\_\_ is willing to testify to what she saw today.

I then went back to Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ and Ms. \_\_\_\_\_ and advised them of what I had found out and the citations that would be issued to them.

I requested that they bring out the Golden Retriever, Shiloh, for photographs and when he was brought out, Shiloh had a green bandana around his neck, just as the neighbor had described.

Citations 73255 and 73256 were issued to Ms. \_\_\_\_\_ for no license on Noah and leash law and biting animal (attempt to bite) on Noah and Shiloh. Citations, court date, time and location were explained to Ms. \_\_\_\_\_. She acknowledged, signed and received a copy of the citations. Her Arizona Driver's License was then returned to her.

I was then asked by the residents to look at the fencing to see what they could do to help keep the dogs in. We went out into the back yard and I observed the common fence between their yard and \_\_\_\_\_ to be falling down. I also found the latch to the gate to be insufficient and would not latch properly. I provided them with a Premise Inspection to fix and/or replace the fence by 10/14/14.

The remainder of the fence appeared to be in good repair.

Officer's Signature: 

Date: 10.05.14



DD #5

PIMA COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT  
PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER  
4000 N. SILVERBELL RD. TUCSON, AZ 85745  
(520) 243-5900, option 3 FAX (520) 243-5960  
[www.pimaanimalcare.org](http://www.pimaanimalcare.org)

COMPLAINT # A14-162284.  
OFFICER # 1942 Eckelbarger  
DATE: 12-22-14

### DECLARATION OF DANGEROUS / VICIOUS ANIMAL

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

- An animal can be declared a dangerous animal if it, without provocation, bites or otherwise causes injury to a person which results in significant medical intervention/treatment.
- An animal can be deemed dangerous if it, without provocation, kills or severely injures a domestic animal.
- An animal declared vicious by a magistrate shall be automatically deemed dangerous.

**OFFICER COMMENTS:**

The dog "Chulo" was declared vicious by Tucson City Court Judge Berning on 12-18-14.

OWNER: Fernandez ANIMAL NAME: Chulo  
ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_ ANIMAL ID#: A421573  
PHONE: \_\_\_\_\_ SEX: N COLOR: black BREED: Pitbull

### NOTICE

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

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

DD 5



**INVESTIGATION REPORT**

Pima County Health Department  
 Pima Animal Care Center  
 4000 N. Silverbell Rd.  
 Tucson, Arizona 85715  
 Phone: (520) 243-5990  
 Fax: (520) 243-5990  
 www.pimaanimalcare.org



SUSPECT <b>Fernandez</b>				ACO NAME / BADGE # <b>Windauer #1984</b>		COMPLAINT NUMBER <b>A14-156730</b>	
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS							
ZIP	CITY	STATE	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER				
HOME PHONE ADDRESS						BITE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>	
APR. _____						CODE IF OTHER :	
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER				
DRIVERS LICENSE						CI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CO <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>	
SEX	WEIGHT	HEIGHT	COAT	HAIR COLOR	ORIGIN	DOB	SSN

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

LOCATION OF INCIDENT	DATE AND TIME REPORTED 9-26-14 / 1852	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 9-26-14 / 1845
FOOD <input type="checkbox"/> WATER <input type="checkbox"/> SHELTER <input type="checkbox"/> INJURED/ILL <input type="checkbox"/> VENTILATION <input type="checkbox"/> ABANDONED <input type="checkbox"/> TIEOUT <input type="checkbox"/> BEATEN <input type="checkbox"/> WASTE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (EXPLAIN) <input type="checkbox"/>		

I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case

VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME	D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	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 (B) and § 8-286 (B)

VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS	ZIP	CITY	STATE
---------------------------	-----	------	-------

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)

DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> TFD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:	FOLLOW UP REQUEST <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:
---	--	-----------------------	---	--

ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY: 3	TREATED BY <b>UMC</b>	PHONE NUMBER <b>694-7547</b>	DATE QUARANTINED <b>10-1-14</b>	PACC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------------------------	--

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION	PART OF BODY BITTEN: arms, legs, trunk	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	RELEASE DATE: 10-5	VET <input type="checkbox"/>	HOME <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--	--	--------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------

PHONE NUMBER

VET CLINIC	PHONE NUMBER	FTQ <input type="checkbox"/>	UTQ <input type="checkbox"/>
------------	--------------	------------------------------	------------------------------

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

CLINIC'S ADDRESS	QUARANTINE 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>	FRA HEAD# <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------	--	------------------------------------

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	CITING ACO same	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS
--	--------------------	--	----------------------	--------------------------

CODE/DRO VIOLATED  
**4-97, 4-7(2)(B), 4-81**

CITATIONS/NUMBERS <b>72595 A-C</b>	REVIEWED BY
---------------------------------------	-------------

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL


ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
---------------	-------	-----	-----	-----------	-----------	------------------	------	------------

<b>Pit bull mix</b>	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/>	OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Chulo</b>	<b>Brn w/wht</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>6y</b>	<b>L14-</b>	<b>194345</b>	<b>Exp 2/16/17</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>A421573</b>
	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/>	OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/>	OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/>	OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/>	OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/>	OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/>	OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									

WITNESS 1	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 2	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 3	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 4	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #

BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---

DD5



## INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-156730

ACO Name & Badge: Windauer #1984

---

On October 1, 2014 at approximately 1930 hours I, Officer Windauer met with bite victim at his apartment at reference a bite that occurred September 26, 2014.

Mr. told me the dog that bit him lives at property to north of his apartment on the other side of the block wall. He said at approximately 1845 hours on September 26, 2014 he had been walking along the west side of street walking northbound when he saw several members of the dog owner's family standing next to a vehicle parked along the northernmost driveway gate. He said the gate was open and the two pit bull mixes that lived there came out of the gate. I was told the male dog ran up at him and started biting him on his arms, torso and upper legs. He said at one point he was on the ground and the dog dragged him causing road rash on the front of his knee.

In that area on his leg I saw a scab approximately 1/2" wide by 1" long. I was shown bite wounds and bruises on his left forearm and right forearm, a wound on his back and a large bruise on one thigh and a bite wound on the other thigh. He said his clothes had also been damaged in the attack. Mr. said he had been reluctant to go to the hospital but his landlord had persuaded him to go. I took pictures of Mr. injuries.

We then walked to the front of the property where Mr. pointed to the neighbor's two pit mixes barking at us. I saw the block wall was approximately 5 foot high at rear and maybe 4 1/2' towards front. I took a picture of the two dogs inside the yard. Mr. identified the male dog, larger of the two dogs as the dog that had bitten him. I asked if he wished to pursue prosecution and he said yes. While checking for access to property, I saw no house number, so I called Dispatch to check Parcel Search and licensing records. I was advised the house number was and that a possible dog owner was with a listing for a dog named Patty.

I then called to the house and a hispanic looking man came outside. I explained who I was and why I was there and asked if he was the dog owner. He said he was. I then asked if the dogs were licensed and vaccinated because we needed to do a quarantine. He said he didn't understand much English. I then explained about quarantine procedures and he said that didn't

DD5

interest him. As he walked back towards the house I advised we had to do a quarantine and I needed his cooperation. He was still not interested. I advised the man that I was calling for Tucson Police to respond and then he also started calling someone. I then called our Dispatch to request Tucson Police to respond and I waited.

While waiting, the victim's landlord arrived and attempted to talk with the dog owner. A few words were exchanged in Spanish and then it ended and both men walked away. When Tucson Police Officer Macias #35656 arrived, the dog owner came back outside. Officer Macias spoke with the owner and also a young woman that had arrived. He advised in Spanish what was needed. We were then told a different beginning to the incident that ended with the victim being bit. The dog's owner refused to accept citations for the incident and maintained he had no identification, that it had been taken by other law enforcement. Officer Macias advised the man that unless he cooperated, he would have to arrest him. The young woman and a middle aged woman that had arrived and also appeared to be family appealed to the man again, seeking his identification and cooperation. This finally happened and the citations were issued to Mr. The family then maintained the male dog hadn't bitten just the female dog-Patty. I verified with Mr. Again he was 100% certain the male dog had been the biter. I requested the biter dog be brought out and put in my truck. Mr. wanted me to remove dog from house and I advised I wasn't going inside their house to take the dog. He then brought the dog out, but it was the wrong dog. Mr. then returned Patty to house and put Chulo in my vehicle. I provided him with a copy of the citations and a copy of the impound notice.

Officer's Signature:



Date:

10/2/14



DD #6

PIMA COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT  
PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER  
4000 N. SILVERBELL RD. TUCSON, AZ 85745  
(520) 243-5900, option 3 FAX (520) 243-5960  
www.pimaanimalcare.org

COMPLAINT # A14-162288  
OFFICER # 1942 Edelberger  
DATE: 12-20-14

### DECLARATION OF DANGEROUS / VICIOUS ANIMAL

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

- An animal can be declared a dangerous animal if it, without provocation, bites or otherwise causes injury to a person which results in significant medical intervention/treatment.
- An animal can be deemed dangerous if it, without provocation, kills or severely injures a domestic animal.
- An animal declared vicious by a magistrate shall be automatically deemed dangerous.

OFFICER COMMENTS:

The dog "Sweet Pea" was declared vicious by Tucson City Court Judge Cranshaw on 12-15-14.

OWNER: Verdugo ANIMAL NAME: Sweet Pea  
 ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_ ANIMAL ID#: A124529  
 PHONE: \_\_\_\_\_ SEX: F COLOR: Blk BREED: Chihuahua  
Span

### NOTICE

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

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

D D b

**INVESTIGATION REPORT**

Pima County Health Department  
 Pima Animal Care Center  
 4000 N. Silverbell Rd.  
 Tucson, Arizona 85712  
 Phone: (520) 243-5960  
 Fax: (520) 243-5960  
 www.pimaanimalcare.org



SUSPECT <b>Verdugo</b>		ACO NAME / BADGE # <b>1942 Eckelbarger</b>	COMPLAINT NUMBER <b>A14-156095</b>
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS		BITE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>	
ZIP	CITY	STATE	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS		CODE IF OTHER :	
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER
SEX	WEIGHT	HEIGHT	EYES
HAIR COLOR	ORIGIN	DOB	SSN

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

DATE AND TIME REPORTED <b>9-17-14 / 1250</b>	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED <b>9-17-14 / 1200</b>
FOOD <input type="checkbox"/> WATER <input type="checkbox"/> SHELTER <input type="checkbox"/> INJURED/ILL <input type="checkbox"/> VENTILATION <input type="checkbox"/> ABANDONED <input type="checkbox"/> TIEOUT <input type="checkbox"/> BEATEN <input type="checkbox"/> WASTE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (EXPLAIN) <input type="checkbox"/>	

I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case

VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME	D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	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 (B) and § 8-286 (B)

VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS	ZIP	CITY	STATE
---------------------------	-----	------	-------

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)

DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> TFD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:	FOLLOW UP REQUEST <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:
---	--	-----------------------	---	--

ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY: <b>2</b>	TREATED BY <b>Self</b>	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED <b>9-20-14</b>	PACC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION	PART OF BODY BITTEN: <b>R-Leg</b>			RELEASE DATE: <b>9-26-14</b>	VET <input type="checkbox"/>

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

VET CLINIC	PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	FTQ <input type="checkbox"/>	UTQ <input type="checkbox"/>
------------	--------------	--	------------------------------	------------------------------

PHONE NUMBER

CLINIC'S ADDRESS	QUARANTINE 10 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>	FRA HEAD#
------------------	---	-----------

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	CITING ACO <b>2002 Konst</b>	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS
--	---------------------------------	--	----------------------	--------------------------

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

CODE/ORD VIOLATED <b>4-7 (2)(B), 4-97</b>	REVIEWED BY <b>2002 KONST 9/27</b>
--	---------------------------------------

CITATIONS/NUMBERS <b>72915 (B-C)</b>	BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	---

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL	ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
Chihuahua mix VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sweet Pea	Black/Tan	F	8yr		L14-233698	Current	Ok	A124529
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									

WITNESS 1	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 2	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 3	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 4	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #

DD 6

## INVESTIGATION REPORT



**Activity Number: A14-156095**

**ACO name & Badge: 1942 Eckelbarger**

---

On 9-19-14 at 1020 hours, I Investigator Eckelbarger (1942) responded to St where I met with bite victim, who stated on 9-17-14 at approximately 1200 hours she was walking her baby in a stroller in the St when she observed two small black and brown Chihuahua dogs out loose near She stated the dogs then charged at her and the "Chubbier" one charged at her stroller so she turned the stroller away and the dog bit her on the right leg causing punctures and bruising. I took photographs of her bite wounds and attached to the activity.

Ms. requested citations for the incident. I then responded to the dog owner's address at 1030 W. Lincoln St where I met with (mother of the dog owner- stated that her daughter (dog owner- was at work and usually is available after 1600 hours. I advised of the bite report and she showed me Chihuahua "Sweet Pea" who was indoors upon my response. I took a photograph of Sweet Pea. I also observed the skinnier Chihuahua out loose next door. stated she was not sure who the other Chihuahua belongs to, but has seen the dog in the area for a while and stated sometimes the dog comes up on their property, but they do not own that dog. stated they don't close their gate sometimes and that may have been how Sweet Pea got out loose.

I then attempted to capture the stray skinnier Chihuahua, but it ran down the alley and I lost it.

I then responded back to the victims where Ms. i identified Sweet Pea as the biter dog.


On 9-20-14 at 0850 hours I responded to the dog owner's address at 1 where I met with the mother of the dog owner again. I then impounded the biter dog Sweet Pea for quarantine. release date 9-26-14. I issued a copy of the quarantine form to give to I also spoke to owner, | on the phone and advised to come to the Pima Animal Care Center on 9-26-14 to pickup Sweet Pea.

DD6

She stated she didn't think her dog bit advising there is another Chihuahua that looks like Sweet Pea. I observed the 2nd stray Chihuahua. I was unable to capture this dog again, but I was able to take photographs of it and attached to activity for comparison purposes. The victim described the two black and tan Chihuahuas; one chubbier and one skinnier.

On 9-26-14 at 1600 hours, Supervisor Konst (2002) met with dog owner, at the Pima Animal Care Center after the owner came in to redeem Sweet Pea from quarantine. Supervisor Konst then issued citations for biting animal and leash law as requested by the victim. Ms. then signed and received her copies of the citations.

Officer's Signature:



1942

Date: 9-27-14

DD # 7



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: A14-1101700  
OWNER: J TELLEZ  
ANIMAL NAME: BRANSON

ADDRESS: ---  
SEX: m BREED: PITBULL  
COLOR: CHOC / WHT DATE: 12-11-14

**EVALUATION CRITERIA**

**REPORTED BITES:**

NON-VIOLATION BITE + 3 \_\_\_\_\_  
VIOLATION-BITE + 6 +10

**SEVERITY OF INJURY TO HUMANS:**

(Check One Factor Only Per Victim)

NO BREAK IN SKIN + 1 \_\_\_\_\_  
BREAK IN SKIN OR BRUISING + 2 \_\_\_\_\_  
MEDICAL CARE (RELEASED) + 3 \_\_\_\_\_  
MULTIPLE BITES-SINGLE INCIDENT + 4 +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 +3  
OTHER CITATIONS / OR COMPLAINTS + 1 +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 +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

**OWNER ACCOUNTABILITY / RESPONSIBILITY:**

REPAIRED DEFICIENT CONFINEMENT - 3 -3  
ANIMAL IS NEUTERED / SPAYED - 1 \_\_\_\_\_  
OWNER AWARE OF ANY AGGRESSION + 1 +1  
OWNER FAILED TO REPAIR CONFINEMENT + 5 +5  
CURRENTLY LICENSED LIC # \_\_\_\_\_ - 1 \_\_\_\_\_  
NO CURRENT LICENSE + 1 +1  
NO CURRENT RABIES VACCINATION + 1 +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 <5XYR + 1 \_\_\_\_\_  
ANIMAL OBSERVED AT LARGE >5XYR + 2 \_\_\_\_\_  
ANIMAL OBSERVED BEING AGGRESSIVE + 2 \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

**Confinement / Fencing:**

THE PROPERTY DOES NOT HAVE A FENCE A SMALL WOODEN PEN HAS BEEN PLACED NEAR THE BACK PATIO. IT IS NOT SECURE AND DOES NOT HAVE A SECURE GATE.

**General Comments:**

BRANSON WAS AT LARGE ON 11-28-14 WHEN HE ATTACKED A HUMAN AND A DOG CAUSING SIGNIFICANT INJURY TO PATH. HE HAS DISPLAYED EXTREME ANIMAL AGGRESSION WHILE AT PACC. BRANSON IS DEEMED DANGEROUS.  
E. KLEIN  
EX OFFICER # 19216

TOTAL SCORE: +26

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

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

AST

DD7

**INVESTIGATION REPORT**

Pima County Health Department  
 Pima Animal Care Center  
 4000 N. Silverbell Rd.  
 Tucson, Arizona 85712  
 Phone: (520) 243-5960  
 Fax: (520) 243-5960  
 www.pimaanimalcare.org



SUSPECT <b>Tellez</b>		ACO NAME / BADGE # <b>Klein 1926</b>	COMPLAINT NUMBER <b>A14-160905</b>
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS		BITE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>	
7P	CITY	STATE	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS		CODE IF OTHER:	
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER
SEX	WEIGHT	HEIGHT	EYES
	HAIR COLOR	ORIGIN	JOB
			SSN

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

LOCATION OF INCIDENT	DATE AND TIME REPORTED <b>11-28-14 / 1715</b>	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED <b>11-28-14 / 1700</b>
FOOD <input type="checkbox"/> WATER <input type="checkbox"/> SHELTER <input type="checkbox"/> INJURED/ILL <input type="checkbox"/> VENTILATION <input type="checkbox"/> ABANDONED <input type="checkbox"/> TIEOUT <input type="checkbox"/> BEATEN <input type="checkbox"/> WASTE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (EXPLAIN) <input type="checkbox"/>		

I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case

VICTIM/TEMPORARY NAME	DOB	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	BUSINESS PHONE NO.
-----------------------	-----	---------------------	--------------------

I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.

VICTIM'S ADDRESS	7P	CITY	STATE
------------------	----	------	-------

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

VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS	ZIP	CITY	STATE
---------------------------	-----	------	-------

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)

ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # <b>1411280311</b> <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> TFD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:	FOLLOW UP REQUEST <input type="checkbox"/> SO <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:
---	--	-----------------------	--	--

ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY: <b>3</b>	TREATED BY <b>Urgent Care</b>	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED <b>11-28-14</b>	PACC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION	PART OF BODY BITTEN: <b>arms</b>			RELEASE DATE:	VET <input type="checkbox"/>
					HOME <input type="checkbox"/>

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

VET CLINIC <b>Valley Animal Hospital</b>	PHONE NUMBER <b>520-748-0331</b>	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	FTQ <input type="checkbox"/>
			UTQ <input type="checkbox"/>

PHONE NUMBER

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

CLINIC'S ADDRESS <b>4984 E 22nd st</b>	QUARANTINE 10 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>	FRA HEAD#
---	---	-----------

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	CITING ACO <b>Klein 1926</b>	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS
CODE/ORD VIOLATED <b>4-87, 4-7(2)(B), 4-76, 4-81</b>				REVIEWED BY <b>2002</b> <b>KONST 12/4</b>
CITATIONS/NUMBERS <b>73741 A,B,C,D,E</b>				BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL	ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
Beagle VICTIM <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Molly</b>	<b>Tri</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>8Y</b>		<b>073195</b>	<b>current</b>	<b>Inj</b>	<b>A119685</b>
Pit VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Bronson</b>	<b>Choc/wh</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>3Y</b>		<b>cited</b>	<b>cited</b>	<b>ok</b>	<b>A502999</b>
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>									

WITNESS 1 TPD Officer Burson Badge 51077	M <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS <b>270 S.Stone</b>	RESIDENCE PHONE # <b>520-791-4925</b>	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 2	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 3	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 4	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #

DD 7



## INVESTIGATION REPORT

**Activity Number: A14-160905**

**ACO name & Badge: Klein Badge 1926**

---

On November 28, 2014 at 1715 hours the Tucson Police Department (TPD) contacted the Pima County Animal Care Center (PACC) dispatch department and requested assistance regarding a bite. They provided the location of . No other information was given.

On November 28, 2014 at 1738 hours I, Investigator Klein Badge 1926 arrived at and met with Tucson Police Department (TPD) Officer Burson Badge 51077. Officer Burson stated he responded under TPD case 1411280311 as requested by the Tucson Fire Department. Officer Burson stated was walking her Beagle named Molly on a leash in front of when the Pitbull known as Bronson who lives at came running across the street and started attacking Molly.

came running after Bronson and was able to take Bronson back to told Officer Burson that Bronson belongs to his roommate, who was currently at work. Mr. stated they have to keep Bronson separated from the other two dogs they are dog sitting or he will fight with them.

Officer Burson said the bite victim had left to take her dog for emergency medical treatment.

Officer Burson and I then went to where we met with and Ms. stated Bronsons owner is her son. was cleaning blood off of Bronsons face as we talked. She explained that she does not live here and this was her first visit to the house. She said her son called her and asked her to come over to find out what happened. I asked if Bronson has a current rabies vaccination and license. She provided her address of and said Bronson might be registered to her address. I checked the PACC data base and found one female dog listed under Mr. and two female dogs listed under Ms. I did not find any license or rabies vaccination for the male Pitbull Bronson.

DD7

Mr. [redacted] offered to show me the pen that had been built for Bronson. He stated they have to keep Bronson in the pen because he will fight with the dogs they are sitting. He said he does not know how Bronson gets out and added that he told Mr. [redacted] when Bronson had gotten out the day before. The pen does not have a secure latch or secure gate. When Mr. [redacted] grabbed the sides of the wooden panels the entire pen moved back and forth. The property does not have any other type of fencing. I took photographs of the pen.

I explained that I would be impounding Bronson and he would have to remain at PACC for quarantine because they do not have adequate confinement or proof of a current rabies vaccination and license.

I also explained the possibility of citations and a dangerous dog assessment. I gave Mr. [redacted] and Ms [redacted] the PACC case number and contact information to be given to Mr. [redacted]. Mr Uhl then placed Bronson in a kennel on my vehicle.

Officer Burson and I then went to urgent care on Old Spanish Trail and met with Mrs. [redacted]. I showed Mrs. [redacted] the photograph I took of Bronson. Mrs [redacted] identified the dog and stated she was walking her 8 year old Beagle named Molly on a leash like she does every night. She said the Pitbull came running across the street and grabbed Molly by the neck and violently shook Molly. When Mrs. [redacted] tried to grab Molly the Pitbull then bit Mrs [redacted] forearm and shook it. Mrs. [redacted] was knocked to the ground. Several people came to help. Mrs. [redacted] said the boy from [redacted] finally came and got the Pitbull off of Molly. Mrs. [redacted] rushed Molly to Valley Animal Hospital and was told she will require emergency surgery and will need to stay over night. I took several pictures of Mrs. [redacted] hands and arms. They were wrapped in gauze and blood began to seep through the wraps. Mrs. [redacted] requested citations, restitution and a dangerous dog assessment.

I then drove to Valley Animal Hospital and met with the medical staff treating Molly. I took several photographs of her injuries and was told that she is stable and will go into surgery tonight to repair the damage to her neck and ear. I provided my contact information and asked that the Veterinarian treating Molly fax me the medical records.

I then returned to PACC with Bronson. I placed a hold on his kennel card and observed extreme animal aggression from him as I placed him in the quarantine area at PACC.

On December 5, 2014 at 1636hours I arrived at [redacted] and met with [redacted]. Mr. [redacted] provided his Arizona drivers license as identification. I explained the incident as it was explained to me. I issued citation 73741 for the leash law violation, Biting Animal (Human Bite), Biting Animal (dog on dog), No Rabies Vaccination, and No License. I provided Mr. [redacted] with his signed copy and explained the court appearance.

DD7 ○ ○

I explained that due to the severity of injuries to the victim and her dog Bronson will be declared dangerous. I provided a dangerous dog pamphlet and explained the Order Of Compliance. I asked Mr. [redacted] if he was going to be able to redeem Bronson and meet the requirements. He said he was not sure. I provided my contact information and informed Mr. [redacted] and explained that if he does not make contact with me by the end of quarantine at 5 pm on December 7th 2014 Bronson will be put to sleep. Mr. [redacted] understood and stated he will contact me. E.Klein Badge 1926

Officer's Signature:



Date: 12.6.14

E. Klein #1926

**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 **12**

**A12-102940**

**K14-175847 A247678 DOG SATIVA ROTTWEILER/**  
 11/6/14 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN AGGRESSIVE Activity:A12-102940 **D002**  
 Kennel Comment: chip 494D4C3F3D  
 DO NOT RELEASE!  
 Bond hold.1926 SAFE LOCK

**R**

12/17/2014 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 12/17/14 17:42  
 12-16-14 OSC hearing scheduled for 1-2-15. 1914  
 11/17/2014 DTENKATE 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 ENFORCEM EKLEIN 11/6/14 20:29  
 11-6-14, Do not release Sativa. Owner must meet with enforcement.1926  
 11/10/2014 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 11/10/14 10:14

If Mr Westfall 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 Mr Westfall 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 Mr Westfall 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 Mr. Westfall 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 ENFORCEM 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

**A14-141780**

**K15-179759 A456241 DOG NO NO PIT BULL/MIX**  
 1/2/15 CONFISCATE FIELD AGGRESSIVE Activity:A14-141780 **DR016**  
 Kennel Comment: (( dangerous dog ))

**R**

02/20/2014 DTENKATE 2/20/14 15:44  
 Bond Posted/ OSC Hearing set for 3/14/14. 1911  
 02/13/2014 SMONTANC 2/13/14 17:26  
 Dangeous Dog Hold.  
 01/03/2015 ENFORCEM EKLEIN 1/3/15 14:22  
 1-3-14, If anyone calls or comes to pacc asking about this dog they are to be refered to enforcement department.  
 This dog was declared dangerous and was moved out of pima county. This dog was not to be brought back to pima county. 1926

**A14-160905**

**K14-177394** A502999 DOG BRONSON PIT BULL/  
 11/28/14 QUARANTINE FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A14-160905

**DR003**

Kennel Comment: 3c3c3c3c3  
 dd hold. read memo

R

11/28/2014 ENFORCEM 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 ENFORCEM 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

**A14-162549**

**K14-179694** A398186 DOG TOOTSIE MIN PINSCHER/  
 12/31/14 CONFISCATE FIELD NORMAL Activity:A14-162549

**D038**

Kennel Comment: owner P258247 requests A456789, A398186, and A505971 be kenneled together

R

01/05/2015 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 1/5/15 11:37  
 1-5-14 I spoke to the owner to inquire about the dog's shelter and pending redemption fees, he said he is  
 currently working on the shelter and will redeem them before the release date. 1914  
 12/31/2014 DHINTE 12/31/14 22:05  
 12/31/14 1844 CONFISCATED FOR NEGLECT NO SHELTER HOLD FOR ACO TO VERIFY SHELTER  
 OBTAINED...2019

**K14-179695** A456789 DOG BALKO ROTTWEILER/  
 12/31/14 CONFISCATE FIELD NORMAL Activity:A14-162549

**D038**

Kennel Comment: owner P258247 requests A456789, A398186, and A505971 be kenneled together

R

\*RESERVED\*

01/05/2015 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 1/5/15 11:36  
 1-5-14 I spoke to the owner to inquire about the dog's shelter and pending redemption fees, he said he is  
 currently working on the shelter and will redeem them before the release date. 1914  
 12/31/2014 DHINTE 12/31/14 22:04  
 12/31/14 1844 CONFISCATED FOR NEGLECT NO SHELTER HOLD FOR ACO TO VERIFY SHELTER  
 OBTAINED...2019

**K14-179697** A505971 DOG SHORTY YORKSHIRE TERR/  
 12/31/14 CONFISCATE FIELD NORMAL Activity:A14-162549

**D038**

Kennel Comment: owner P258247 requests A456789, A398186, and A505971 be kenneled together

R

01/05/2015 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 1/5/15 11:37  
 1-5-14 I spoke to the owner to inquire about the dog's shelter and pending redemption fees, he said he is  
 currently working on the shelter and will redeem them before the release date. 1914  
 12/31/2014 DHINTE 12/31/14 22:04  
 12/31/14 1844 CONFISCATED FOR NEGLECT NO SHELTER HOLD FOR ACO TO VERIFY SHELTER  
 OBTAINED...2019

**A14-162845**

**K14-179545** A429827 DOG COOKIE LABRADOR RETR/MIX  
 12/30/14 STRAY FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A14-162845

**D029**

Kennel Comment: microchip 0A13547C2A  
 came in with A505806

R

12/30/2014 ENFORCEM

KWALTON 12/30/14 11:33

12-30-14 upon arrival I patrolled around for the 2 dogs. I located the dogs along with 2 police units and some workers and the public. The white male was a Pit/Sharpei mix with a 2 1/2 pnd weight clipped to a med-heavy chain. The seal/wht female was a Lab/Pit mix with a brn leather collar with studs and spikes. This dog A429827 had a chip 0A3547C2A and it came back to a Scott Mcgeal P307655. We tried calling the number and it was disconnected. The license is expired as of 4-4-14. The white dog was scanned no chip found. I impounded both dogs and took photos.  
If owner tries to redeem, check to see if white dog is his as well and find out why there was a chain and weight around the neck. Also how the dogs got out. 1925

**A14-162901**

<b>K14-179627</b>	<b>A505898</b>	<b>DOG</b>	<b>PIT BULL/MIX</b>
12/31/14	CONFISCATE	POLICE	NORMAL
Activity:A14-162901			<b>D121</b>
Kennel Comment: NO CHIP. 2021RT 3C 3C 3C 3C 3C 3C			<input type="checkbox"/>
RESERVED Christie Blair paid \$50.00 R15-719549			

12/31/2014 ENFORCEM

RTOVAR 12/31/14 1:59

12/30/14 22:49 hours the puppy was confiscated as it was tied-out to a chair in the back area of a business at 901 N Grande Avenue. The puppy did not have shelter or water. Citations pending. 2021rt

**A14-162925**

<b>K14-179662</b>	<b>A505926</b>	<b>DOG</b>	<b>GERM SHEPHERD/MIX</b>
12/31/14	CONFISCATE	FIELD OWN	UNDRAGE/WT
Activity:A14-162925			<b>D003</b>
Kennel Comment: No Chip Detected - On To Do List 3C 3C 3C			<input type="checkbox"/>

**A15-162970**

<b>K15-179805</b>	<b>A506084</b>	<b>DOG</b>	<b>SNOWY</b>	<b>SIBERIAN HUSKY/MIX</b>
1/2/15	CONFISCATE	FIELD OWN	NORMAL	
Activity:A15-162970			<b>D007</b>	
Kennel Comment: will scan at center3c3c3c			<input type="checkbox"/>	
*RESERVED* p359203				

**A15-163219**

<b>K15-179964</b>	<b>A506242</b>	<b>DOG</b>	<b>GERM SHEPHERD/</b>
1/5/15	CONFISCATE	FIELD OWN	NORMAL
Activity:A15-163219			<b>DR002</b>
Kennel Comment: 3c3c3c3c3c			<input type="checkbox"/>
no bite/unable to scan in field			

**NO ACTIVITY NUMBER RECORDED**

<b>K14-179649</b>	<b>A442834</b>	<b>DOG</b>	<b>FIFTY GIRL</b>	<b>PIT BULL/</b>
12/31/14	STRAY	OTC	NORMAL	
Activity:			<b>D102</b>	
Kennel Comment: no bite, 0A13507925 (copy sent to lic)			<input type="checkbox"/>	

**HOLD TYPE VET**

Number on Hold 1

**A14-151102**

**K14-179620 A505891 DOG CHIHUAHUA SH/**

12/30/14 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN ILL SEVERE Activity:A14-151102

**CLINIC**  
R

Kennel Comment: no chip/3c3c3c3  
OWNER P358760 WILL REDEEM

01/07/2015 VET ASANCHEZ 1/7/15 13:48  
VET HOLD FOR MONITOR OF WEIGHT GAIN AS URI SYPMTOMS RESOLVE AND TO DOCUMENT  
HAIR REGROWTH IN BODY REGIONS WHERE HYPERPIGMENTATION AND ALOPECIA EXSISTED.

RECHECK SCHEDULED FOR 1/14/15. BL/ 00

01/05/2015 ENFORCEN JCHAVEZ 1/5/15 9:38  
12-31-14 Owner relinquished ownership of all the dogs and was cited for the violations. 1914



# Donation Activity

Period:

12/1/14

To:

12/31/14

Donation Code	Amount
DONATION	\$5.00
DONATION ADOP	\$2,878.00
DONATION GEN	\$59,626.48
DONATION OUTR	\$417.00
DONATION S/N	\$19,600.20
DONATION SAMS	\$31,833.00
Grand Total	\$114,359.68

# Donation Activity

Period:

7/1/14

To:

12/31/14

Donation Code	Amount
DONATION	\$130.00
DONATION ADOP	\$5,258.86
DONATION GEN	\$184,874.74
DONATION OUTR	\$3,806.00
DONATION S/N	\$83,752.46
DONATION SAMS	\$43,984.50
DONATION SHEL 0974	\$20,585.00
Grand Total	\$342,391.56

## Complaints and Commendations for the Month of December 2014

### 12-3-14 thank you letter sent to PACC

#### Commendation

Household very happy with sweet dog adopted from PACC

### 12-19-14 call into PACC Chief of External Affairs Office

#### Complaint

Reported dead dog not picked up for a week

#### Course/Action

Contact made with complainant and dead animal picked up the next day. There was no record of request(s) for pick up; requests were made to another agency not PACC.

### 12-19-14 call into County Administration

#### Complaint

Person's lost dog was at PACC then at a rescue and owner cannot locate her dog.

#### Course/Action

Staff left a message telling owner her dog was in foster care with Pima Paws for Life and providing contact information.

### 12-29-14 call into Ward 5 City Council Office

#### Complaint

Loose dogs in neighborhood

#### Course/Action

Staff met with complainant and is addressing loose dog concern.

Tucson, Az  
December 3, 2014

Pima County Animal Control,

We adopted a dog named M.J. Nov.1, 2014. We would like to thank all the people that didn't adopt her. She had been in the kennel since May and I can't imagine how many people passed her up. She has been the sweetest dog we could have ever hoped for. We changed her name to Ebony because of her black color. She bonded to us in just a matter of days. She loves her big back yard and also her doggie door which gives her so much freedom. She has never touched anything in the house and is completely house broken. She loves to cuddle which makes us so happy. She also loves her walks and loves to smell everything in her path. She has added so much to our lives after we lost our dog Haley who we had for nine years. We only wish that more people would adopt a dog. They do not know what joy, pleasure and love they will get in return.

Thank You

---

---

---

## Michael Schlueter

---

**From:** Jose Chavez  
**Sent:** Friday, December 19, 2014 5:55 PM  
**To:** Michael Schlueter  
**Cc:** Kim Janes; Kristin Barney  
**Subject:** RE: Dead Dog Complaint Call

I spoke to the complainant who had reported the dead dog to other agencies, but not our center. I did search prior to calling the complainant and found no such reported call. I advised her that I will have our DOA driver pick up the dog first thing tomorrow morning. She said ok and thank me.

Jose

---

**From:** Michael Schlueter  
**Sent:** Friday, December 19, 2014 4:15 PM  
**To:** Jose Chavez  
**Cc:** Kim Janes; Kristin Barney  
**Subject:** Dead Dog Complaint Call

I just received a call from \_\_\_\_\_ who works at Soulistic Hospice. She said there is a dead dog in the back parking area, against a brick wall; and she has been trying to get PACC to pick up the carcass for a week to no avail. She said the address is \_\_\_\_\_ She said she calls and calls, but doesn't get anywhere and said she was ecstatic to talk to a live person. Please let me know when this is resolved.

Thank you,

Michael Schlueter  
Administrative Specialist  
Pima County Health Dept.  
3950 S. Country Club Rd.  
Tucson, Arizona 85714  
(520) 243-7729  
[michael.schlueter@pima.gov](mailto:michael.schlueter@pima.gov)



## Michael Schlueter

---

**From:** Kristin Barney  
**Sent:** Friday, December 19, 2014 11:26 AM  
**To:** Maura Kwiatkowski; Jan Lesher; Francisco Garcia; Michael Schlueter  
**Cc:** Justin Gallick  
**Subject:** FW: Feedback Form 2014-12-19 05:06 AM Submission Notification

**From:** Justin Gallick  
**Sent:** Friday, December 19, 2014 11:22 AM  
**To:** Kristin Barney  
**Subject:** RE: Feedback Form 2014-12-19 05:06 AM Submission Notification

I just left her a message that Champ is in foster care with Pima Paws for Life and gave them their contact information as well as mine for future contact if needed.

Justin

---

**From:** Kristin Barney  
**Sent:** Friday, December 19, 2014 9:04 AM  
**To:** Justin Gallick  
**Subject:** FW: Feedback Form 2014-12-19 05:06 AM Submission Notification

Kristin



[Follow us on Facebook!](#)

---

**From:** Celina Cuaron  
**Sent:** Friday, December 19, 2014 8:28 AM  
**To:** Kristin Barney; Kim Janes; Jose Ocano  
**Cc:** Jan Lesher; Maura Kwiatkowski  
**Subject:** FW: Feedback Form 2014-12-19 05:06 AM Submission Notification

Please assist with this request and update us on the resolution.

Thank you,  
Celina for Jan Lesher  
Deputy County Administrator's Office  
724-8228

---

**From:** Maura Kwiatkowski  
**Sent:** Friday, December 19, 2014 8:10 AM  
**To:** Jan Lesher

**Cc:** Celina Cuaron

**Subject:** FW: Feedback Form 2014-12-19 05:06 AM Submission Notification

**From:** notification@pima.gov [mailto:notification@pima.gov]

**Sent:** Friday, December 19, 2014 5:07 AM

**To:** Maura Kwiatkowski

**Subject:** Feedback Form 2014-12-19 05:06 AM Submission Notification

**Feedback Form 2014-12-19 05:06 AM** was submitted by Guest on 12/19/2014 5:06:40 AM (GMT-07:00)  
US/Arizona

Name	Value
First Name	
Last Name	
email	
Zipcode	
Message subject	Requesting information
Comment	Hello, my dog Champ was brought there Dec. 1st. I found him on the PAC website his ID # A503167. When I called to inquire about him, the man I spoke to said that a rescue took him, but he would not tell me the name, he said that PAC is not allowed to disclose that. I have looked through pages upon pages of shelters, and rescues, including those provided on the PAC website as ones that work with PAC to rescue animals. I cannot find him anywhere. I am trying to get him back. Since PAC will not tell me who adopted him, I want to know what I need to do to get a public record on him? If he has been euthanized, I would like someone to just tell me that so I can find closure in this dog was the best dog I have ever had, my best friend, now he seems to be mia. I at least want to know if he ok?

**Response requested** Yes

**Referred\_Page** [http://webcms.pima.gov/community/animal\\_care/animal\\_rescue\\_groups/](http://webcms.pima.gov/community/animal_care/animal_rescue_groups/)

Thank you, Pima County, Arizona

## Michael Schlueter

---

**From:** Kim Janes  
**Sent:** Monday, December 29, 2014 4:55 PM  
**To:** 'Heileen Evans'  
**Cc:** 'Mark Kerr'; 'Melinda Jacobs'; 'Richard G. Fimbres'; 'Susan Gradillas'; Kristin Barney; Michael Schlueter; Jose Chavez; Robert Hendrix  
**Subject:** RE: David Valencia 784-1116

Good afternoon Ms. Evans, an enforcement officer met with Mr. Valencia on December 28 and is addressing the loose dog concern he reported.

Respectfully,

Kim



---

**From:** Kim Janes  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 24, 2014 7:57 AM  
**To:** 'Heileen Evans'  
**Cc:** Mark Kerr; Melinda Jacobs; Richard G. Fimbres; Susan Gradillas; Kristin Barney; Michael Schlueter; Jose Chavez; Robert Hendrix  
**Subject:** RE: David Valencia 784-1116

Good morning Ms. Evans and Happy Holidays to you as well.

Our enforcement staff will contact Mr. Valencia and help him with his concerns.

Respectfully,

Kim



---

**From:** Heileen Evans [<mailto:Heileen.Evans@tucsonaz.gov>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 23, 2014 4:44 PM  
**To:** Kim Janes  
**Cc:** Mark Kerr; Melinda Jacobs; Richard G. Fimbres; Susan Gradillas  
**Subject:**

Good Afternoon Kim,

The Ward 5 Council Office received a call from a gentleman named \_\_\_\_\_ He stated within 6 months to a year, there has been loose dogs in his neighborhood and some of them have been barking and almost biting adults as well as children in the neighborhood and fears that people in the area will get hurt.

David Valencia's Contact Information:  
2720 S. Euclid Ave.  
520-784-1116

Thank you and Happy Holidays!!!  
Heileen

Heileen Evans  
Office Assistant  
Councilmember Richard G. Fimbres  
Ward 5 Council Office  
4300 S. Park Avenue  
Tucson, AZ 85714  
(520) 791-4231

I am writing in response to the Pima Animal Care Center Partnership Agreement.

This document is insulting and patronizing to all involved. There is no credibility. There is no equal or mutual representation or input from whom PACC staff considers Partners.

Let's get started shall we?

A **partnership** is an arrangement where parties, known as **partners**, agree to cooperate to advance their mutual interests Partnerships present the involved parties with special challenges that must be navigated unto agreement. Overarching goals, levels of give-and-take, areas of responsibility, lines of authority and succession, and often a variety of other factors must all be negotiated.

The introductory paragraph is fluff and very egotistical, it uses numbers and percentages that are currently in dispute and should not be included in a document that will span many years.

The second part of this paragraphs states, "PACC staff, rescue partners, volunteers and committed citizens." that statement alones seems to suggest those that PACC considers partners.

The last part of the opening paragraph mentions PACC and its partners and goes on to say that mutually respectful partnerships will be the key.

Now for the bullet points:

"PACC staff and rescue partners agree" (not agreed, mandated by PACC) now all of a sudden this document clearly defines that PACC has written this document for the rescue partners and none of the other partners as described in the opening paragraph.

Item #2:

Inflammatory is: tending to excite anger, disorder, or tumult:

Just by having the word inflammatory in this document is very unprofessional and in itself is inflammatory. Better wording would be more along the lines of "to have courtesy and respect for each other to include PACC staff, PACC programs, volunteers, and rescue partners."

How would this even be addressed in its current content? For example, I might say that Peaches was PTS, because she was scared and skittish and thus did not pass her evaluation. This would be a true statement, some will be angry and take action, and others will not, it is all in how one perceives the statement. There are a few members of PACC management that are constantly calling others out on what they perceive to be inflammatory comments, yet no one else thinks so. How would this be enforced? I am not only a director of a rescue, but also a volunteer, a taxpayer, and a concerned citizen, how would you enforce it, because one would never know what hat I am wearing when I make a statement that might inflame a PACC staffer.

This item in itself I find inflammatory and it violates my constitutional right to freedom of speech. Basically all staff from shelters get the worse of the worse in people, if they cannot handle it, then they are in the wrong profession.

#### Item #4

To bring complaints to the attention of \_\_\_\_\_ WHO???? I would want this to be a neutral party,

#### Item #5

To allow PACC access to adoption records.....this is clearly a violation of the Personal Identifiable Information laws. I understand that County ord. 6.04.180 states, "Such verification shall include announced and unannounced inspections of the organization's facilities and records." Well, I take that to mean sterilization records. As far as adopting to a suitable home, PACC has to trust that the rescue partners are doing their job and only adopting to suitable homes. If PACC does not trust rescue to do that, then rescue should not be partnered with PACC. Rescue trusts that PACC is adopting to suitable homes.

#### Item #7

I don't even know where to start on this one. This is very insulting and discriminates against 501c3.

County ord 6.04.180 clearly states "duly incorporated humane society or other nonprofit corporate animal-welfare organization devoted to the welfare, protection and humane treatment of animals."

A.R.S. 11-1022 states an animal shelter means a duly incorporated humane society, animal welfare society, society for the prevention of cruelty to animals or other nonprofit corporate organization devoted to the welfare, protection and humane treatment of animals.

Anyone can call themselves a nonprofit. Incorporated means that a corporation was formed, and Articles of Incorporation were file with the State of Arizona. For one to be a 501c3 means the corporation went a step further and asked for exemption from the IRS, and was granted exemption.

In September of this year I asked the live release manager what happens to those rescues that are not a 501c3 currently working with PACC? I was told that they will be grandfathered in. But since reading both the county and the state statues I do not find the term 501c3 in either one of those. So how did PACC get there?

I did some research on this and looked at the rescue partner list that is currently on the website. There are only 66 rescues on this list. Of those 66 rescues 66% are 501c3.

As far as the rest of the language goes regarding political activity and lobbying, those activities are restricted or tightly controlled by the IRS. As for the charitable solicitations and fundraising, yes there are some rescues out there that are not following the rules and should revisit them. But why is PACC taking it upon themselves to be the enforcer of said rules when it is up to the IRS to investigate and

sanction those in violation? All PACC can do is report the violations, I would hate to see a rescue taken out of the partnership with PACC because PACC believes the rescue is in violation. It is not up to them to decide that it is up to the IRS. But again how is PACC going to monitor this when they are already complaining about being overworked and under staffed?

But given the number of rescues that are currently partnered with PACC, with the majority being 501c3 having a bullet in this agreement targeted towards 501c3 is discriminatory if these other partners are going to remain partners.

The last bullet: Reads "PACC and stakeholders" earlier in the document it was stated that the agreement was between PACC staff and rescue partners, this bullet point needs to be reworded.

The summary of ending this agreement also leads back to PACC only and against the rescues.

In short this document clearly shows it was thrown together on the spur of the moment, with highly charged emotions from the management at PACC. It is clearly one-sided and does not show any hint of mutual agreement between whom it was designed for. Such an agreement needs to come about with mutual trust and respect for both sides and not be completely one-sided.

One solution would be to form a committee or group to put together an agreement that not only is mutually agreed upon, but also benefits both sides.

I will not be signing this agreement as it currently stands, with more than 95% of my animals coming from PACC it is sad that a partnership relationship may be ending because PACC cannot and refuses to work mutually with its partners. I have already started the shift to pulling from out of county shelters and taking owner surrenders as well as strays.

Lea Ann Kelly

I am here today to address two specific instances in which PACC officers failed very clearly to enforce county and city codes and ordinances for animals experiencing severe neglect. One officer even went as far as to assist an offender in obtaining drastic surgical remediation for the results of the owner's neglect of his animal, and furthermore, failed to see that the animal in question received even the most basic aftercare for amputation of a rear leg.

I receive calls as a volunteer with People For Animals, and in one such call on or around the 4th of December, I became aware of the suffering of an unneutered, unvaccinated and unlicensed pitbull mix ~~dog~~ named Chewy belonging to Dale Zupp.

2

Mr Zupp informed me that on or around november 10th, Chewy burst through a door severing his achilles tendon and lacerating his leg to the bone. Mr Zupp presented the dog to Southern Arizona Vet Services, and was referred to counselor Nancy Emptage with People For Animals, who in accordance with the veterinarian's recommendation, authorized euthanasia for Chewy, in lieu of a nearly \$3000.00 operation that was well outside of PFA's care provisioning guidelines. Mr Zupp chose to take Chewy home that night. He also chose to not provide Chewy any further medical care until he contacted me nearly a month later. After providing two separate appointments for Chewy that Mr Zupp failed to arrive at, I chose to contact Mr Zupp and give him and Chewy a ride to

VCA. When Chewy got in the truck, the overwhelming odor of decomposition came with him. At the vet, Dr Avon with VCA found she had to soak the bandage off of Chewy's leg, as it was moulded on like a cast despite being a soft bandage with pus and fluids from the wound. At this time I informed Mr Zupp that because of his neglect of Chewy and his failure to provide even the most basic pet needs, only euthanasia would be offered.. Mr Zupp also likes to regularly state that he is homeless and jobless and plans on staying that way. Mr Zupp began yelling at that time, and announced his intention to further deprive chewy of veterinary care. ~~Due to her unwillingness to tolerate the circumstances any longer,~~ Dr Avon wrapped Chewy's leg, changed her story regarding what was good

for this dog from what she and I had discussed in an adjacent exam room, and sent Mr Zupp to the waiting room. I contacted animal control at this time, and reported not only Chewy's previous blatant neglect in direct and willful violation of several city, county and state laws regarding provisioning veterinary care for his dog, as well as his violations regarding vaccination and licensing. Mr Jose Chaves spoke with the veterinarian, and both of them very cleverly and carefully worded the scenario to suit themselves, rendering Mr Chaves with no further work to do at the moment, and Dr Avon free of the highly obnoxious and odiferous situation in her lobby. Chewy got no help. Later in the week, we got animal control to respond to a location Mr Zupp had been staying<sup>Q</sup> and

S

force him to provide Chewy with a vet visit. People For Animals was again contacted because Mr Zupp has no means, and I, myself, transported Chewy and Mr Zupp to Valley Animal Hospital, where the veterinarian presented amputation or euthanasia as the only reasonable care plans for Chewy. Mr Zupp was informed that People For Animals would not authorize amputation, not only because of our long held policies against it as a program assisted course of treatment, but also due to Mr Zupp's constant failure to provide Chewy with any kind of aftercare. Mr Zupp expressed his intention to leave with Chewy without any further care and I again contacted Animal Control. At this time, Mr Chaves hastily and aggressively informed me that a private donor would pay

for the amputation for Chewy. I expressed my concerns about aftercare and Chaves assured me there would be follow up to see Chewy did not suffer any further. To date, there is no record of further animal control contact, and the veterinarians assure us Chewy did not arrive for even his first aftercare appointment. The condition of Chewy is not known at this time as Mr Zupp has not responded to contact attempts from myself or the veterinarian.

A similar case was brought to my attention on December 23rd, regarding a mixed breed female dog owned by a Mr Philip Smith. Mr Smith called me and informed me that in March of 2014, his dog was severely injured, resulting in a broken shoulder and leg, as well as likely internal injuries, for

which he did not provide the dog with any medical care whatsoever. He went on to explain, that in the last week, the dog had also been attacked by cattle she had been chasing, and was now screaming in pain constantly, which I could hear very clearly in the back ground. I immediately dispatched them to VCA and authorized only a pain injection to relieve the dog's immediate suffering while we investigated the circumstances further. I also made VCA aware of my impending contact of Animal Control. I spoke to Officer Koonst, Welfare Supervisor, and made him aware of the ongoing violation of several city, county and state laws regarding provisioning veterinary care for Mr. Smith's dog, as well as Smith's violations regarding vaccination and

licensing. Koonst spoke to the veterinarian, who's horribly conceived plan was to allow the dog's abusers to take her home until after Christmas in her miserable state, so that the children didn't lose their dog on Christmas. I was speechless. How horribly misplaced is the empathy of this veterinarian, was my initial thought. My shock turned to disgust quickly when the realization that this failure of the animal medical community was being backed by a WELFARE SUPERVISOR at our animal welfare enforcement agency.

In light of these two cases, one has to ask. Is our current effort at becoming a no kill county interfering with enforcement's ability to seize and relieve the suffering of severely injured and neglected animals, or

is it simply not the goal of this agency to enforce the welfare laws and county ordinances as they are written? These are not the only instance of failure to provide even the most basic enforcement. There is plenty of case evidence of not only animal control, but law enforcement's unwillingness to enforce these codes and ordinances. Numerous other welfare agencies have adopted no kill models after several years of very heavy enforcement by cities such as San Francisco, San Diego, Austin, and New York. Enforcement of animal cruelty laws coupled with restrictions on outdoor cats, unaltered pets, and pet abandonment provided an environment where "No Kill" did not mean "Over Crowded and Ineffective", those models did not force the suffering into the field, where

officers are often discouraged from doing their job because of space, bad press for even necessary euthanasia, and limited funding. I feel we need to open a dialogue about our lack of enforcement, lack of citations for violations, and the environment it has created for those truly interested in seeing animal welfare in Pima County catch up with the rest of our nation. We also need to discuss Animal Control Officer's, especially supervisor's, ability to over-ride a veterinarian's opinion in the event it does not reflect the severity of a dog's need for care considering previous neglect. It was tragic and gut wrenching to watch so many systems fail these and many other animals as I work as a People For Animals counselor to report abuse and neglect, and to provide assistance to animals with

consideration to their circumstances of care. Both city and county have clear and strong laws prohibiting cruelty and neglect of animals and both also have a civil law providing for the removal of animals from neglectful and abusive owners. Tragically, none of these laws were used by enforcement officers in these and many other cases in which an animal was allowed to suffer tremendously. Thank you for your time.