MEMORANDUM

Date: February 4, 2014

To: Chairman and Members
Pima County Bond Advisory Committee

From: C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator

Re: **Pima Animal Care Center Improvements and a Bond Election in November 2014**

The Bond Advisory Committee (BAC) has been considering a number of community capital improvements since 2007. Among these is a major improvement and reconstruction of the Pima Animal Care Center (PACC), which is now over 50 years old. Modifications have been made in the past using County bonds, but only modestly, to improve kennel conditions and not to significantly expand animal care operations such as veterinarian services, adoptions, volunteer programs, and development activities related to charitable contributions for animal care services.

The BAC has considered and included in a future bond election a $22 million investment in animal care facilities designed to substantially replace and augment existing facilities on Silverbell Road at Sweetwater Drive.

Recently, these facilities have been in a number of news reports, primarily related to animal overcrowding based on the attempt by the County and PACC to reduce the number of euthanized animals. Our euthanization rates have improved dramatically over the past two years; ranging from 51 percent of all animals entering the facility being euthanized to now as low as 28 percent. Changing these rates has not occurred by accident. Significant and additional efforts by staff, including boarding a substantial number of increased animals at the center awaiting adoption, has been the result of lower euthanization rates.

Recently, the County faced a crisis in overcrowding at this facility, and the Board of Supervisors approved a temporary emergency measure to construct a tent at the facility. The tent has been constructed; and we are awaiting kennels, which should substantially reduce the overcrowding in existing kennels. Today, there are as many as four to five animals housed in a kennel measuring 4 feet by 10 feet. Such is not healthy; it is unsafe and clearly inappropriate.

So concerned has been the Animal Care Advisory Committee, as well as a number of animal care advocacy groups within the County, that these groups have called for the acceleration of the capital improvements for PACC. The Committee has unanimously voted to ask the Pima County Board of Health to endorse early bond authorization; and, in

turn, the Board of Health has voted unanimously to ask the BAC, as well as the Board of Supervisors, to endorse placing the question of animal care capital improvements on the ballot in November 2014. It should be noted that such an action is not without precedence, as the behavioral and mental health facilities included in the 2006 bond authorization were independent, stand-alone questions. This is an accelerated schedule as compared to what we had been contemplating, which is November 2015.

Clearly, the need for these improvements has been already recognized by the BAC. The Animal Care Advisory Committee and the Board of Health, as well as numerous nonprofit animal welfare groups, now request that the BAC endorse and recommend to the Board of Supervisors the inclusion of a $22 million capital bond question for the PACC on the November 2014 ballot. This action can occur with little or no additional cost to the County, since the ballot will include a number of items for elective offices or other referrals.

CHH/mjk

Attachment

c: The Honorable Chair and Members, Pima County Board of Supervisors
Nicole Fyffe, Executive Assistant to the County Administrator
Diana Durazo, Special Staff Assistant to the County Administrator

Project Sheet

Department: Health Department
Date: Updated July 15, 2013

Future Pima County Bond Election Proposed Project

Project Name: Pima County Animal Care Center (PACC) Improvements

Location: PACC Main Facility – 4000 N. Silverbell Road and possibly other satellite locations in Pima County

Scope: The new animal care facility will be constructed in the Greater Tucson Area, which may incorporate improvements to and use of the current structures and may include collaborative facilities with local animal welfare and rescue organizations as needed.

Benefits: Since the original facility was constructed in 1968, standards for animal care have changed significantly, together with public expectations regarding providing nationally accepted humane animal care and animal control functions. The current center has not kept pace with advances in the areas of pet housing, technology, communications, and work place safety. The public expects better conditions for the animals in the shelter and improved conditions conducive to saving as many pets as possible through adoptions and effective collaborations with local and national animal welfare and rescue agencies. A new facility which provides for such collaboration, offers good visibility, and is attractive and convenient for the public will encourage visitors and increase adoptions, rescues and returns to owners. Last year alone, PACC handled 22,000 animals. In a new facility designed to keep animals healthy, we will be able to better rehabilitate sick, injured and behaviorally challenged pets and display all in a more conveniently located, modern, efficient and friendly facility. This will facilitate maximizing the number of pets saved each year by the County and its partners, which will, in turn, encourage community support and pride.

Costs: $22,000,000

Bond Funding: $22,000,000

Other Funding: None identified at this time

Fiscal Year Project Start and Finish Date: TBD

Project Management Jurisdiction: Pima County

Future Operating and Maintenance Costs: There will not be an increase in operating and maintenance costs associated with construction of this facility.

Regional Benefits: Building new animal care facilities will provide a state of the art, healthier environment for both animals and staff. Additionally, the new facility will provide updated, proven, attractive and positive environments for the public, resulting in increased adoption rates. Furthermore, new construction of adequate, modern animal sheltering facilities is less expensive than remodeling old buildings and would allow the present site to remain in operation while the new facility is under construction. This would save significant money and allow adoptions and owner recovery of pets to continue during construction, ultimately minimizing the number of animals euthanized.

Supervisor District of Project Location: District 3 – Supervisor Sharon Bronson

Pima County Board of Health and Pima Animal Care Center Advisory Committee Letter

PIMA COUNTY BOARD OF HEALTH
3950 S. COUNTRY CLUB, STE 100
TUCSON AZ 85714

PIMA COUNTY ANIMAL CARE CENTER ADVISORY COMMITTEE
4000 N. SILVERBELL RD
TUCSON, AZ 85745

January 27, 2014

Lawrence M. Hecker, Jr.
Chairman
Pima County Bond Committee

Dear Mr. Hecker:

This joint letter is to advise you of the congruent actions of the Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) Advisory Committee and the Pima County Board of Health concerning the current $22 million Pima Animal Care Center Improvement Proposal, and to formally request the Pima County Bond Committee recommend said proposal be put to a vote as a stand-alone item on the 2014 ballot.

On November 21, 2013 the Pima Animal Care Center Advisory Committee passed a motion to support a Pima Animal Care Center only bond proposal for $22 million. On December 11, 2013 the Pima County Board of Health passed a similar motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that the current Pima Animal Care Center Improvement Proposal go to the voters in 2014. Both motions carried unanimously by members present. Both of these bodies serve in an advisory capacity to the Board of Supervisors (Pima County Code 6.040.100, ARS 36-184).

Conditions at the current aged Animal Care Center are already exigent; and further delay of the bond proposal will only exacerbate the conditions. The necessary addition of planning and construction time will make the wait much longer. Any further delay in approving this proposal will push the realization of new animal care facilities too far into the future.

We understand there is sound underlying economic logic for the recommendation to delay; however, if the $22 million PACC proposal would be considered individually, separated out from a hefty package of over half a billion dollars in proposals, then the PACC proposal becomes considerably more economically palatable. Additionally, the 2013 Pima County Bond Preference Survey indicates an overwhelmingly positive response for the PACC improvements proposal.

Sincerely,

Paul R. Horwitz, M.D.
President
Pima County Board of Health

Jack Neuman
Chair
Pima Animal Care Center Advisory Committee

PIMA COUNTY ANIMAL CARE CENTER ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

November 21, 2013

PRESENT: Chair: Jack Neuman, PACC Volunteers
Tamara Barrick, F.A.I.R.
Nancy Emptage, Animal Welfare Coalition
Mary George, Disabled Community
Pat Hubbard, Humane Society of Southern Arizona
Sophia Kaluzniacki DVM, ASPCA of AZ, Inc.
Derek Marshall, Public Education
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
Margaret Watson, Tucson Kennel Club

ABSENT: Angela Spencer, City of Tucson

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION / FOLLOW-UP
I. CALL TO ORDER		
The meeting was called to order at: 5:31 PM.		
II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE		
III. ADOPTION OF PAST MEETING MINUTES		
Approval of Minutes for October 17, 2013	Ms. George pointed out 3 minor corrections. Page 5 change Mr. Emptage to Ms. Emptage. Further down the page paragraph starting Dr. Kaluzniacki; change "in humane" to inhumane. Lastly page 15 "brochure" is spelled wrong. Ms. Emptage suggested the minutes be summarized vs. transcribed in the interest of saving staff time. Discussion members could request a copy of the recording and times would be placed in the minutes to correspond with discussion. Members could also request a particular discussion be address in more detail in the minutes. Recording time 2:49-7:03.	Motion approved to accept October minutes with minor corrections.
IV. CALL TO THE AUDIENCE		
• Carol Gelfan	She did a special needs adoption last week and commented what a good experience it was and commended the acting Rescue Coordinator. She asked about an answer to her question presented last month about spaying the possibly early pregnant animals before they go to rescue and thus reducing the numbers and costs to rescue groups. Mr. Janes stated she should have received an answer by now and commented PACC has started a program where possibly pregnant, obviously pregnant, animals are being altered with some limitations for advance pregnant and were the vet determines it should not be done. Both PACC and Humane Society clinics are	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION / FOLLOW-UP
	doing this for PACC animals.	
• Jean Price	She is President of Old Pueblo Dog Training Club and presented a donation of $324.73 from the proceeds of their recent fun match. The money will go to Sam's Fund.	
• Cindy Kirlin	She asked for an explanation of why dogs held on the rescue line, previous biters, and dogs needing socialization that are being walked/handled daily by the volunteers but are not being altered at PACC for adoption. Recording time 7:03-12:42.	
V. REPORTS		
Operations-Manager's Report		
• Jody McCloskey – Tainted jerky Treats	Ms. McCloskey spoke about tainted jerky treats associated with deaths of pets throughout the country as a result of concerns brought up by Ms. Schwerin. This does not fall under Pima County jurisdiction to ban the sale of jerky treats. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has jurisdiction regarding the sale of these treats. The FDA is looking for reports within 24 hours of possible exposure from veterinarians. Ms. Schwerin distributed a flyer to members and warned pet owners not to feed these treats. The Pima County Health Department is looking for public comments on this subject. Discussion by committee members as to how to best notify the public. Press release, different websites Pima County, SAVMA, vet clinics. It was published in the Arizona Daily Star Nov. 8, 9, 10. Recording time 12:42-23:30.	
• Manager's Report	Mr. Janes commented on the altering of pets and limited capacity of the center. PACC is hoping to hire seven positions to increase staffing by mid-December via a job fair. There are some key positions; one is a fund development position to help secure grants, major donors, etc. Second is a foster/rescue specialist to find fosters who can take animals after surgery to allow for recovery outside of PACC. They would come back for adoption or to an offsite. PACC needs to reduce the amount of time animals spend in the shelter and reduce intake as well. These positions are key to moving PACC forward to increase contracts for treatment, altering pregnant animals or animals that could not be routinely altered at the center. The tent is coming. The pad is out there and needs to cure for a	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION / FOLLOW-UP
	week. The tent will be put up once the pad has cured then the utilities will be added, heating, cooling, water. By the end of December the kennels will arrive and be installed. They are being specially built and can be use when a more permanent facility is built. The hiring action will include 7 positions, six of which will be Animal Care Technicians including the foster/adoption specialist and the one program coordinator for fund development. The new Shelter Manager interviews will take place tomorrow. With the Shelter Manager in place, the Animal Advocate will be able to focus more on rescues and adoptions and PACC will be better able to focus on minimizing intakes, caring for the pet population and getting them out faster and more efficiently. This being said it is absolutely necessary PACC still has the help of all its rescue partners and volunteers. All of this is not replacing anything but rather supplementing what needs to be done. There will be 100 kennels in the tent. It will house mostly bigger dogs. With the bigger dogs coyotes and bobcats should not be a problem. There will be a security/perimeter fence that will be locked to keep intruders out. The fence will be snake proofed. Mostly the larger, longer term dogs will be housed here. PACC will work to market/get the word out/use social networks so that people know they are there and will come in for them. The employee survey that was created has been review by the County Human Resources and will be put up on the County website for employees. It is important employees understand the results will not be going directly to Mr. Janes or Health Department personnel unless it is release by the committee for their review. Mr. Marshall is the point of contact for technical questions involving the survey. Ms. Emptage commented on a new virus, circovirus, it comes from pigs and birds. Ms. Watson commented there have been no cases in Arizona. It has similar symptoms to Parvo and a Parvo test comes up negative. Dr. O'Donnell comment they are not 100% sure it is the circovirus. She has treated some dogs with associated symptoms that have tested negative for Parvo. There is a vacinne for pigs for the circovirus but not one for dogs. Ms.	Mr. Janes will email the web address so committee members may review it before it is posted for employees.

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION / FOLLOW-UP
	Emptage stated she is receiving increased calls for help with animals that are displaying symptoms but come up Parvo negative on the test. There are other viruses/illnesses that causes gastrointestinal problems and the treatment is much the same for all. Recording time 12:42-40:12.	
VI. OLD BUSINESS		
• PACC Services-Owner Requested Euthanasia	Comment by Mr. Neuman there was a letter written in response to Mr. Huckelberry that was previously tabled. There is so much more going on right now, Mr. Neuman asked for a motion to table this item, Ms. Hubbard so moved and Ms. George seconded. Ms. Emptage asked this item be kept on the agenda, and Mr. Neuman commented discussion of this subject will come up in relation to discussion of other items on the agenda.	Committee agreed to table this item for now.
	Mr. Janes referred the committee to an item of the Managers report on page 22 referring to five actions for the committee to look at that could aid the Center in controlling intake numbers. These are used by other shelters successfully. These would be 1. No longer take in healthy stray and free roaming cats and increase spay/neuter funding for these animals and set up a TNR program. 2. Limit owner turn in of healthy cats and dogs to those on public assistance and refer others to various community resources for help. 3. Limit owner requested euthanasia to owners on public assistance and refer others to local veterinarians. 4. No longer take in pets from Tribal Nations or Tribal addresses. The nations currently do not provide any funding as the other jurisdictions do. This could increase loose dog problems along Tribal borders and Pima County. 5. License Cats, staff projects a very low compliance rate of maybe 10%. Mr. Janes asked for committee input on these items. Discussion this refers to the item just tabled and Mr. Neuman suggested these items should be put on the next agenda for discussion. It was suggest members put their comments in writing for the next meeting. Motion to table this discussion for the next meeting by Mr. Neuman and second by Ms. Hubbard passed by members. Recording time 40:12-51:29.	Item to be put on next agenda.

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION / FOLLOW-UP
• PACC Staffing	Mr. Neuman commented on the report recently sent to committee members by Deputy County Administrator Jan Lesher regarding the staffing at PACC. There seven new positions that are coming up at PACC and he suggested this be read in depth and discussed at the next meeting. Mr. Neuman asked about the report from Best Friends and if there was a copy available. The evaluation was commissioned by The PAAW organization and they have a draft at this time. It is up to them to provide a copy. Recording time 51:29-53:40.	Place on next agenda.
• Status of Sick Bay Contract	Mr. Neuman mentioned the contract comes up for bid on the 27th. Mr. Janes commented that he has found out there will not be a bond package until 2016 and discussion this was too long for PACC to wait. Mr. Janes suggested with the members' approval he would be willing to take it up the chain of command to propose a PACC only bond for 2014. There are risks associated with this and others who may think their items are just as important. It has already been demonstrated this is an emergency; PACC is getting a tent to help with this issue. Jack Neuman made a motion to propose a PACC only bond proposal for $22 million for 2014 with a second by Ms. Hubbard. Ms. Watson commented PACC has the ear of the Board of Supervisors now and a lot of other support that was not there a few years ago and now would be the time to go for it. Discussion of what type of facility and the vision for a new facility. PACC has an opportunity to move from the existing warehousing shelter operation to a more modern animal care operation. It needs to include a facility that can treat, triage, isolate, rehab, and rehome the pets coming through here. Research of existing facilities and programs to find out what they are doing and how to incorporate that into getting a facility or facilities and a program that would best serve PACC and the community. Part of the bond would be designated for Ajo. The motion was passed unanimously. There are 1or 2 vendors interested in the contract. Bids close on the 26th. The key is to find the money to do this. PACC will at least keep it to doing what is being done now for URI dogs, at	Motion passed to propose a 2014 PACC only bond of $22 million.

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION / FOLLOW-UP
	least 32 dogs at a time. Hopefully more as funding and added space would allow. Sick bay and U-bay will change. Tick infested or other animals needing isolation now held in U-bay will be held in Sick Bay. U-bay will be used for very temporary confinement of an animal until it can be moved to the main floor. Recording time 53:40- 1:02:55.	
• Cat Room Sound Proofing	Facilities Management has advised the door is filled with a honey comb material and cannot be filled with sound proofing material. Staff has attempted to find sound proofing baffles that can be attached to the door but to date has not found a material which can be disinfected and kept from harboring disease. The next step is to request replacement of the door. Recording time 1:02:55-1:04:11.	Ongoing
• General Donations	Mr. Neuman asked to pass over this topic.	Ongoing
• Outreach Curriculum	This was a holdover from the last meeting. Mr. Marshall asked to meet with the Outreach Coordinator. Mr. Neuman asked if this could be done with input from Communications, Rhonda Bodfield. Recording time 1:04:11-1:05:35.	Ongoing
• Inmate Contract	Discussion the inmate crew schedule was changed in order to get a full crew in the morning of 14 with a correction officer (CO). The crews are in place from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. PACC is limited to 14 inmates at a time as it is a 15 passenger van used to transport them. Mr. Neuman commended the work done by the inmates. Now that the CO is in place are some tasks like a bed is needed, this dog needs to be moved, they need water etc., being directed by them or to the inmates? Per Mr. Janes it is not required in in the job description but some of them are more helpful than others. PACC staff is still responsible to check/do these things. The inmates have been asked to advise staff if something is needed and they are not taking care of it. Ms. Emptage suggested a letter of appreciation to the prison to commend an inmate's performance above and beyond what they are required to do. Per staff the inmates may be directed to do a task but may not be given anything like food, and other things. If it does not come from the prison with them they're not to have it. PACC has done certificates and letters in the past and will do it again once the new shelter manager is in place. Recording time	Ongoing

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION / FOLLOW-UP
• Medical Services	1:04:11- 1:13:15. Mr. Neuman combined medical service, and under new business the euthanasia protocols for this discussion. He asked if a dog comes in injured and is being treated and is put on rescue what are the reasons why it could not be taken by the rescue groups. Mr. Janes answered he is looking at all of this and it is going change. There are times when there maybe be a welfare case that is being treated and there is some forensics that need to be completed. For example an animal comes in emaciated and with food and water it improves, if it is under medical treatment, an owner pet. He is looking at ways to try to get the animals out faster. Right now other that the 4 day hold time rescues can take anything they want as soon as it is available. There are some vet holds and enforcement holds that will not be released; it is a case by case reason. PACC is going to try to minimize these. Mr. Neuman provided an example of a poodle with a swinging broken leg, with puppies that Poodle Rescue wanted. The dog came in in October and was placed on a vet hold. The dog had a prior break that had healed poorly; it was an ugly looking leg. The dog was put on pain meds and antibiotics preemptively and x-rays were taken. The x-rays indicated it was a prior break. Even though there were weekly inquires by Poodle Rescue starting Nov. 2 the dog is still on vet hold. Why was the dog not allowed to go to rescue? Mr. Janes comment there are some things we do that don't make sense to those who don't have to live in the world of vet/patient/client relationship. He stated he himself doesn't fully understand this. He is not going to tell a professional that he is going to override their decision and that is on him. If you need a target make him the target. He will be reviewing all these things and hopefully within a couple of months there will be a marked change in the way these things are done. What is also interesting is PACC has pets that have been here with say behavioral issues for a length of time and no one comes in for those so this is a double sided coin. Mr. Janes is committed to make the changes to start moving these animals out faster. Mr. Neuman suggested when there is a vet hold more information be provide as to why, when , how, medication, etc., so that people	Motion passed to provide more information about vet holds and number of vet holds.

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION / FOLLOW-UP
	know what is going on with an animal on vet hold. Mr. Neuman made a motion to get this information for vet holds. Ms. Hubbard seconded the motion and commented the vet can put a hold on any animal but the vet and staff should be focused on getting the animals out as quickly as possible. Ms. Barrick also seconded the motion. She would like to know what the lengths of stays are for enforcement and vet holds. The average length of stays is increasing for most animals and that is why PACC does not have space. Staff has no issue with providing the requested information and trying to move the animals out as soon as possible. There are a lot of animals here that are available that no one is coming in for. Mr. Neuman would like a report to the committee detailing vet holds much like the DD and Welfare Reports. Mr. Neuman commented rescues also need to step up when animals are put on the rescue list. Ms. George left the meeting at about 19:00 hours. Recording time 1:13:15 -1:36:30.	
VII. NEW BUSINESS		
• Euthanasia Protocols	Mr. Neuman was sent a photograph of an injured dog that was brought into PACC at about 3:15 p.m. at which time a volunteer took the picture. The dog had an eye that was hanging out and an infected puncture wound in its nose oozing pus. He distributed the photo the members. The dog was not euthanized until the next morning. Discussion as to why the dog was not euthanized when it came in. There was a delay getting the report in by the intake person, a new employee, to the euthanasia team. Per Mr. Janes PACC has had animals which looked as bad or worse come in and be treated and held for the required time and have been saved. PACC battles this every day when deciding to hold and treat or to euthanize injured animals. The evening before this animal was up and alert and this indicated maybe it could be treated with pain meds and antibiotics and held for the mandated time. However, this was not the case for this animal and the next morning it was clear the animal's condition had changed and the animal was euthanized. By statue in the State of Arizona a veterinarian must administer the euthanasia. This is not necessarily the practice throughout the state and at PACC. PACC does have a team that is trained to do this when a vet cannot be here and it was done for this dog that morning. PACC has reinstituted a process where animals will be taken to an emergency vet for assessment and/or euthanasia when the vet is not available. PACC has been successful in treating these types	Ongoing

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION / FOLLOW-UP
	of animals in the past who were up and alert, eating, drinking and they have been saved. The question is what is savable, how and when those calls are made. Ms. Emptage asked if a vet/kennel tech is available over night. To check on the animals. Staff is available from 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. daily to monitor the animals. From 9:00 p.m.-6:00 a.m. no one is available to do this. PACC is moving towards getting one dog per kennel so the concerns for dog fights/injury are reduced overnight. For injured animals overnight officers will take the animals to a vet. Once the Shelter Veterinarian is hired more time can be spent on these cases. Ms. Watson commented on responsibility and at the end of the day the responsibility with this is with the owner of the dog who let the dog get this way. It happened because somebody did not take care of their dog. Ms. Schwerin asked why the dog was not taken to one of the contract veterinarians. Per Mr. Janes determining the severity of the injury has to be weighed by the officer as to if it goes to a vet or to PACC. Although the injury looked bad the dog was up and alert, and wagging its tail. In this case there was a lapse of about four hours before treatment was started and this has been addressed by staff. PACC is bordering on hording animals to get to the point of saving what we are saving. An animal can be transported to an emergency vet overnight by an officer after contacting the enforcement supervisor on duty for permission. Ms. Schwerin read the City of Tucson law regarding euthanasia. For a licensed dog euthanasia must be authorized by a veterinarian, for an unlicensed dog this is not required. Mr. Neuman asked who makes the decision to euthanize an animal. Staff consults with the veterinarian who makes recommendations. Usually the decision is made by the Animal Advocate, Rescue Coordinator and Shelter/Clinic Supervisor or a combination. In some cases there is a discussion with Enforcement regarding aggressive animals. Nancy Emptage leaves the meeting at 19:27 hours. Dr. Sophia Kaluzniacki leaves the meeting at 19:29 hours.	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION / FOLLOW-UP
	Mr. Neuman offered advice for holding employees accountable. Mr. Janes briefly explained how staff can be held accountable for lapses in procedure. Margaret Watson leaves the meeting at 19:30 hours. There is still a quorum. Recording time 1:36:30-2:00:00.	
• Keeping Advisory Committee Apprised of Ongoing PACC Changes and Activities	The committee is getting more information now per Mr. Neuman.	Closed
• Adoption Program	Mr. Neuman asked about the new Reserved Program he has heard about. PACC will be implementing a program called Meet Your Match. That will help to match potential adopters with an animal that best meets their need. There has also been a change in the interested party (IP) program. In the past PACC has called interested parties and if there was more than one once the animal is available a drawing would be held. Now if there is an interested party they would pay a non-refundable fee, the animal would be put on reserve, and the IP would be notified once the animal is available. If there is no response from the IP staff would move on to the next IP, adoption, or rescue. Recording time 2:00:00- 2:03:30	Ongoing.
• Alarm for Emergency Help (Dog fights)	There is a need for staff & volunteers to be able to call for help or get the attention of staff, or other volunteers, inmates in the case of a fight or attack/injury some sort of alarm that is audible and or can be seen. Recording time 2:03:30- 2:05:45.	Ongoing
• Redemption Program and Fees	Mr. Neuman asked about the redemption fees at PACC being really high. Per Staff PACC works with people all the time to reduce fees where we can. Mr. Neuman suggested all the fees be waived if it is a first and the owner agrees to spay/neuter the dog. The Humane Society has a similar program where they waive all intake and daily care fees and the owner just pays the surgery fee of $60.00. PACC will also do this and in some cases the owner will just pay to license the dog. The owner has to agree to alter the dog to get the deal. Recording time 2:05:45-2:09:43.	Closed.
• Floor Plan Changes	Mr. Neuman asked if the committee received the diagram of the	Ongoing

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION / FOLLOW-UP
	floor plan. It is the floor plan now in place with some splits in some of the kennels. It was sent to the volunteers and he is getting a lot of feedback. If sick bay is changing then the floor plan would change. Mr. Janes is open to any suggestions on this topic. There are some conditions that have to meet with changing the floor plan. Ms. Hubbard offered her help as well.	
	Ms. Schwerin went back to the topic of adoptions and mentioned the copy of the guide provided is not the most recent one. There was information added to the back of the guide regarding vaccinations etc. that was not included in the one they received. Recording time 2:09:43- 2:14:00.	A correct copy of the guide will be provided.
• Ideas to Reduce Number of Dogs Coming into PACC	Ms. Watson has left. Ms. Schwerin mentioned one idea which is the banning the retail sales of pets. This has been done in Los Angeles and other cities. The Los Angeles ban prohibits the sale of dogs, cats and rabbits unless they come from shelters. This also reduces the number of animals coming into the animal care shelters. Ms. Schwerin suggested a similar law could be passed here. Mr. Neuman is working with an attorney to get copies of these laws at this time. Ms. Hubbard mentioned the County Board of Supervisors have been very cooperative with PACC when it comes to passing laws, but we need to put this before the City as the majority of these shops are located in the city. Ms. Schwerin volunteered to look at all of the laws to pull out the good points. Recording time 2:14:00-2:18:20.	Ongoing
VIII. ANIMAL WELFARE AND DANGEROUS ANIMAL CASES FOR THE MONTH OF NOVEMBER		
• Welfare and Dangerous Animal Cases	Ms. Schwerin mentioned Welfare #6 the dogs are on a tangled tie out with no shelter and water. PACC had been there in July for tie out. The owner was cited and this is not enough for these repeat offenders. Welfare #9 – Ms. Schwerin commended Officer Bowdon who returned several times to check on the dog which was in bad shape and subsequently picked up and euthanized. Ms. Barrick thanked Mr. Janes for the statistics on tie outs. Even though the numbers are small, the high intake areas are also the high tie out areas so some education in these areas might be beneficial.	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION / FOLLOW-UP
	Dr. Smith inquired if the officers are able to know if they are dealing with repeat offenders. They do have access to that information. No dangerous dog cases discussed specifically. Ms. Schwerin mentioned several of the cases involved dogs that charged out and bit people or attacked other animals resulting in medical care. It is common sense to her that these dogs should be declared dangerous. Recording time 2:18:20-2:23:40.	
IX. DONATIONS		
• November 2013	946 individuals donated $16,289 along with food, treats and pet supplies to Pima Animal Care Center. The monthly donations are consistently going up.	
X. COMPLAINTS / COMMENDATIONS RECEIVED BY STAFF DURING THE MONTH OF NOVEMBER		
• November 2013	Five (5) complaints and three (3) commendations were received by staff.	
XI. CALL TO THE AUDIENCE		
• Mariana Parker	She spoke about the poodle that Poodle Rescue wants. Poodle Rescue has offered to take the dog and her puppies. She expressed a concern the dog was being given medication while nursing. She asked that Staff contact Poodle Rescue regarding this dog and work to get to dog to them.	
• Larry Franks	Mr. Franks offered the services of him and his wife who is a licensed Reiki practitioner. He commented Reiki can offer a tremendous comfort to the animals being sheltered and euthanized here. Recording time 2:23:40 -2:28:20	
XII. ANNOUNCEMENTS		
• The Shelter Vet position has been advertised for recruitment. PACC has been trying to get a Vet in place for the last two years. This position will report to the Shelter Manager. • Next meeting December 19, 2013		
XIII. ADJOURNMENT		
The meeting was adjourned at: 20:05 P.M.		

MEMORANDUM

Date: January 16, 2014

To: Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH
Director
Pima County Health Department

From: Kim Janes
Manager
Pima Animal Care Center

Re: Pima Animal Care Center Advisory Committee Bond Motion

At the Pima Animal Care Center Advisory Committee's November 21. 2013 meeting, the Committee discussed the status of the treatment area at the Center. During the discussion, the Committee was advised the County does not plan to present a bond for public vote until at least 2016.

The attached approved meeting minutes record the Committee supported the position that 2016 was much too late to begin the major improvements needed in order to accomplish the modern sheltering and care of Pima County's pets. Therefore, the Committee made and unanimously passed a motion to propose the County pursue a PACC only bond for $22 million in 2014.

As I recall, this action was reported to the Board of Health by its representative to the Advisory Committee, Dr. Smith, at the Board's December 11, 2013 meeting.

Should you have any questions, please contact me at 243-5908.

Pima County Board of Health
Minutes
December 11, 2013
Room 1108, Abrams Building
3950 S. Country Club Road
Tucson, Arizona 85714

1. CALL TO ORDER:

Dr. Horwitz called the meeting to order at 3:08 pm.

Mr. Schlueter called the roll as follows;

Mr. An - absent
Mr. Elías - absent
Mr. Gastelum - absent
Mr. Geoffrion
Ms. Gonzales
Dr. Horwitz
Ms. McComb-Berger
Mr. Rojas
Dr. Smith
Mr. Stopani - absent
Ms. Trowbridge

A quorum was established.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Geoffrion led the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. MINUTES ADOPTION

- Adopt Board of Health October 23, 2013 Minutes

The motion was made and seconded (McComb-Berger/Rojas) that the October 23, 2013 Minutes be adopted as written. The motion carried 7-0.

4. DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY PRESENTATION ON ILLEGAL DUMPING

Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Director Ursula Kramer introduced Enforcement Manager Jennifer Lynch, who utilized the attached PowerPoint presentation to brief the Board on illegal dumping. Pima County Code Title 7 covers storage and disposal of solid waste. It is unlawful to dispose of waste anywhere but landfills, transfer stations, or via a permitted waste hauler. Illegal dumping pollutes, creates breeding grounds for disease carriers, is a fire hazard, is hazardous to people and wildlife, is an eyesore, lowers property values and costs taxpayer money. Solid waste / illegal dumping complaints can be made to DEQ over the phone or on line. Complaints are investigated and evidence may identify the dumper. Property owners who illegally store waste and illegal dumpers are issued a Notice of

Violation. Responsible parties are required to remediate the site, pay County court costs and document to DEQ the proper disposal of the waste. Repeat violators face court-ordered fines and can face jail time for contempt of court if ordered by the judge. Since 2011 DEQ has issued 1,107 Notices of Violation and the County Attorney's Office has been referred 149 cases for litigation. On public land when the illegal dumper cannot be identified, the agency owning the land is responsible for cleanup. Since 1989 DEQ has cleaned up 3,917 tons of waste.

5. NOVEMBER 15, 2013 "REVIEW OF ANIMAL CARE SERVICES IN SIX CITIES/COUNTIES" REPORT BY THE OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR HEALTH

The Board was provided with copies of the November 15, 2013 *Review of Animal Care Services in Six Cities/Counties* report along with the November 18 cover memo from County Administrator C.H. Huckelberry. Kim Janes, Manager of the Pima Animal Care Center (PACC), went over the attached PowerPoint presentation to inform the Board on this topic. The report compares Pima County's animal care services to five other western jurisdictions. In Fiscal Year 2013 the PACC handled 26,100 animals, which is a service volume of 1,535 animals per full time employee equivalent (FTE). This figure is drastically higher than those from other reporting jurisdictions in the report; the other jurisdictions reported volumes ranging from 894 to 453 animals per FTE. Other than animals turned in for euthanasia, PACC's current (first quarter of Fiscal Year 2013/14) live release rate is 72 percent, up from 64 percent in Fiscal year 2012/13. PACC's ability to treat animals is extremely limited. PACC is mandated to keep strays for three days and owned dogs for seven; these animals are treated as needed.

6. PET TREATS LINKED TO PET ILLNESS AND DEATH

Health Department Director Francisco García said there has been recent media attention about pet jerky treats related to pet deaths. Special Staff Assistant Jodi McCloskey said since 2007 the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is aware of 580 pet deaths reported to the FDA as attributed to jerky treats. The Health Department contacted the Pima County Attorney's office regarding whether or not the Health Department has the jurisdiction to ban these treats, and the answer was the Health Department does not have regulatory authority over animal food. The Arizona Department of Agriculture has the authority, but only for food produced in Arizona. These treats are not made in Arizona; many are from China, so the body with jurisdiction is the FDA. The FDA has done testing on jerky treats and has been unable to identify what is causing harm to pets. The Health Department is trying to raise awareness about the issue and steer complaints to the FDA. A Press Release will be released and posted on the Health Department website.

7. DISCUSSION ON STATUS OF PIMA ANIMAL CARE BOND PROPOSAL

Dr. Smith reported that the County's current, Bond Advisory Committee bond package of over half a billion dollars in bonds, including the $22 million Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) Improvements Bond Proposal, is recommended postponed, and is therefore not expected to go before the voters in 2014. The Board discussed PACC's current volume challenges and how a delayed vote plus planning and construction would push the realization

of a new Animal Care Center far into the future. The appeal of presenting the PACC proposal to the voters separately was discussed and it was pointed out that the PACC proposal was very favorably rated in a survey conducted regarding the pending proposals.

The motion was made and seconded (Rojas/Gonzales) that, in light of current overcrowding at PACC, and in light of the *Review of Animal Care Services in Six Cities/Counties* report, the Board of Health recommend to the Board of Supervisors that the PACC Improvement Bond Proposal go to the voters in 2014. The motion carried 7-0.

8. CALL TO AUDIENCE

Jane Schwerin, from People for Animals in the Prevention of Cruelty and Neglect, Inc. said that in light of pet deaths related to jerky treats she placed an ad in the paper in November and passed out flyers (attached) urging people not to feed jerky treats to pets and urging people to report jerky treat related issues to the FDA and the Health Department.

I regards to overcrowding at PACC, Ms. Schwerin urged the passing of an ordinances to help prevent animals from being born, such as an ordinance banning the sale of dogs and cats at pet stores. She said there are a number of cities, including Los Angeles, that already have such an ordinance. Regarding PACC operations, Ms. Schwerin agreed that the shelter needs more staff, but added that PACC also needs more Field Officers. Finally she said she hopes PACC never increases the fee for euthanasia because it would discourage people from bringing their sick suffering animals to PACC for that service and animals will suffer more.

9. SUMMATION OF ACTION ITEMS AND PROPOSED AGENDA ITEMS

Dr. Horwitz gave a brief summation of the meeting. The only action item going forward was a letter to the Board of Supervisors supporting the PACC Bond Proposal. There was also a request to have the next meeting at PACC and have a tour of PACC at that time.

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Pima County Board of Health Letter

PIMA COUNTY BOARD OF HEALTH
3950 S. COUNTRY CLUB, STE 100 • TUCSON AZ 85714-2056

January 10, 2014

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

Re: Request for the Pima Animal Care Center Improvement Bond Proposal to be presented to the voters in 2014

Dear Chairman and Members:

The Board of Health is aware of the Pima County Bond Advisory Committee's recommendation that all Bond Proposals not go to the voters until November 2015, at the earliest. This recommendation is particularly discouraging as it relates to the Pima County Animal Care Center. As you are aware, the Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) is experiencing ongoing overcrowding; additionally the recent (November 15, 2013) *Review of Animal Care Services in Six Cities/Counties* report from the Office of the Assistant County Administrator for Health annotates that Pima County residents have the highest demand for shelter services of all the responding agencies in the report. Furthermore, delaying the vote on the PACC improvement proposal would delay construction well into 2016, with a new Animal Care Center potentially not opening until sometime in 2017.

We understand there is sound underlying economic logic for the recommendation to delay; however, if the $22 million PACC proposal would be considered individually, separated out from a hefty package of over half a billion dollars in proposals, then the PACC proposal becomes considerably more economically palatable. Additionally, the 2013 Pima County Bond Preference Survey indicates an overwhelmingly positive response for the PACC improvements proposal.

At our December 2013 meeting, the Board of Health passed a motion requesting the Board of Supervisors place the Pima County Animal Care Center Improvements proposal before the voters in 2014, in light of the aforementioned ongoing overcrowding and *Review of Animal Care Services in Six Cities/Counties* report. The motion carried unanimously by members present.

Sincerely,

Paul R. Horwitz, M.D.
President

cc: Members, Pima County Board of Health
Mr. C. H. Huckelberry, County Administrator
Jan Lesher, Deputy County Administrator for Medical and Health Services
Francisco García, Director, Health Department
Chairman and Members, Bond Advisory Committee