

1. Call to Order

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

- Attendance

Present:

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

Absent:

Nancy Emptage, Vice-Chair, Animal Welfare Coalition
Angela Spencer, City of Tucson

- Pledge of Allegiance

2. Adoption of the Minutes

- Adoption of the August 21, 2014 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Neuman requested the minutes include the statement from Shelter Manager Jose Ocano saying with current shelter staffing PACC has more animals than they can take care of.

The motion was made and seconded (Hubbard/Kaluzniacki) that the August 21, 2014 meeting minutes be adopted as written with the addition of Mr. Ocano's comment. The motion carried (10-0).

3. Call to the Audience

There were no speakers from the audience.

4. Manager's Report

Kim Janes, Pima Animal Care Center Chief of External Affairs, reported that intakes continue on a downward trend while saves continue to go up, and some challenges remain in enforcement and licensing. Mr. Janes fielded some questions. On his report total animals handled refers to animals actually brought into the shelter; and the "other" category of animals refers to wildlife, turtles, chickens, goats, snakes, bats, etc. PACC works with owners to try to get pets back to their homes and

the owners pay about \$60 to \$65 to redeem their animal, while the average cost per animal, per stay in the shelter is approximately \$115. In some cases cited owners are allowed to redeem their animal.

- Arizona Open Meeting Laws Presentation

Mr. Janes introduced Civil Division, Deputy County Attorney Barbara Burstein. Ms. Burstein provided a handout and spoke on open meeting law. Members of public bodies, such as the Advisory Committee, should be familiar with open meeting law. Open meetings are established by ARS § 38-431.09(A). Meetings are to be conducted openly with notices and agendas provided to inform the public of the matters to be discussed or decided. Open meeting laws are designed to protect the public; to avoid decision making in secret; to promote accountability and government responsiveness; to protect the public officials; to maintain the integrity of government; and to build trust between government and citizenry. A meeting is defined as any gathering, in person or through technological devices, of a quorum, at which they discuss propose or take legal action, including deliberations. A quorum has been interpreted as a majority of the total number of members set forth in law, not of the total positions filled. (The Committee's by-laws say a quorum is five; Ms. Burstein will research on that.) Legal action is a collective decision, commitment or promise; and all legal action must take place during a public meeting. If a quorum happens to be at any gathering, they should not discuss, propose, take or deliberate a legal action on any matters which might foreseeably require final action or decision by a quorum. It is possible to have a discussion between less than a quorum of members; however, it would be a violation if done so to circumvent the purposes of the open meeting law. A 24-hour notice is required before meetings. The public has the right to attend, listen to, record and video tape the meeting, but not to speak or disrupt. An agenda may provide for a call to the public; however, if a matter that is not on the agenda is raised, the public body shall not discuss it at the meeting; action cannot be taken because there was no public notice on the subject. At the conclusion of the call to the public, individual members may only respond to criticism made; ask staff to review a matter raised; or ask to include the matter on a future agenda. Complaints of open meeting law violations are investigated by either the County Attorney's office or the State Attorney General's office.

After her presentation Ms. Burstein fielded a few questions. She confirmed there is a civil penalty of up to \$500 for a violation of open meeting laws and that the penalty is to be paid by the individual member. She gave an example of e-mails being circulating between an eventual quorum even though that was not the original intent, and said it is better to have staff send out information. In response to a question about required detail on agenda items, Ms. Burstein said it is better to err on the side of more detail. She confirmed the statute says public bodies can discuss agenda items "and related matters." Ms. Burstein invited further questions be sent to her.

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

Mr. Neuman asked Mr. Janes if there was any update on this item. Mr. Janes deferred to Chief of Operations Kristin Barney, who then deferred to Health Department Director Francisco García. Dr. García said that to respond to the July meeting's 22 item motion staff wanted to walk the Committee through various aspects of PACC's operations and staff divided the 22 items into three different categories: adoptions, shelter operations and volunteer coordination/program. Dr. García said staff is

prepared to discuss the first category of adoptions and would like to address the other two categories at future meetings. He added that the arenas of enforcement and clinical services, although independent of the 22 item motion, also merit interaction with the Committee at some point in the future. Adoption Program Policies and Procedures was already on the agenda under Old Business, so the discussion and these minutes continue under that item.

- Vet Holds and Confiscation Holds – Specific Details of Each Case and Ways to Shorten Length of Hold Time

Mr. Neuman referred back to the last meeting wherein he said the holds report was lacking relevant information and noted that this month's report has more information. Mr. Janes said information has been added and said if more is needed please let him know. There were some minor clarifying questions and answers on the report. Regarding shortening the length of stay, Mr. Janes reported that only Sahuarita has changed their code as requested to reduce the required hold time for owned dogs from seven to five days. The city of Tucson is still considering the change, while Marana has decided to keep the seven day requirement at this time.

- Customer Service

Mr. Neuman said he brought up this topic because of the upcoming PACC bond proposal. PACC does receive positive comments, but complaints represent offended customers who become negatives toward the direction PACC is trying to go. He cited how some companies have policies of recording calls and by rule asking if all of a customer's questions have been addressed in an effort to promote good customer service. He shared a list of suggestions he drafted: staff presence, staff clearly identified, customer surveys, undercover shoppers (adopters), having customer service goals, ongoing mandatory customer service training, having schedules posted and providing for absence coverage.

In response to a question about customer service training for volunteers, Ms. Barney and Mr. Janes expressed thanks to Dr. Smith for providing a contact and training materials utilized for customer service training. Also Adoption Coordinator Ellie Beaubien said there is a monthly Adoption Counselors' workgroup which deals largely with customer service.

- Adoption Program Policies and Procedures

Ms. Ellie Beaubien talked about the adoption program. During her discussion she referred to the adoption manual, adoption procedures and dog and cat adopter surveys provided in the Committee's packets. She recruits adoption counselors from current volunteers, usually dog walkers or cat socializers, who then go through adoption training. Being an adoption counselor is not for everyone and the desperate need for them can potentially pull in volunteers unsuited in this capacity. Ms. Beaubien said finding volunteers with the right balance is her greatest challenge. There was discussion on how a good animal / adopter match is found and a poor match avoided. The process begins with the survey and continues through conversation. Prospective adopters are shown animals suited to their parameters based on the survey and conversation. Education is a major aspect of the adoption process; if prospective adopters are moving toward poorly deemed animal scenarios, then adoption counselors are to educate them on why the scenario is a poor choice.

Ms. Schwerin emphasized that the code requires animals be adopted into suitable homes and therefore gives authority to turn people down if a home is not suitable. Animal Care Advocate Justin Gallick

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

- Committee's Report to the Board of Supervisors

There was no discussion on this item.

- Draft Letter Requesting the Health Department Hire More Enforcement Staff

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

6. New Business

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

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

with the group and request to do a home inspection on one of their foster homes. Conversation brought out that rescue numbers have gone down since PACC has started treating and trying to save more animals, because the rescue groups haven't felt the need as being as urgent as before.

- Post Adoption Medical Care

Ms. Schwerin said that some people who adopt from PACC are unable to pay for veterinary care and come to her organization for help. She expressed that the ability to afford veterinary care should be addressed as part of the adoption process or the County should provide for it. Mr. Janes acknowledged it is a problem to be worked on and added it is a community wide problem not just a problem for those adopting from PACC. He cited that people sometimes drop off animals with PACC because they cannot afford needed veterinary treatment as a problem that impacts intake. Dr. García added that part of the Health Department's Strategic Plan is for pet owners to be able to identify a primary veterinary provider.

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

There was no discussion on this item.

8. Donations: 1,282 individuals gave a total of \$58,026.80 during the month of August.

Mr. Neuman referred to the August donations total as amazing. Mr. Janes was careful to point out that our Fund Development Coordinator (Karen Hollish) is largely responsible for this total, which includes \$20,000 for the trap neuter release cat trailer.

9. Complaints and Commendations There were three complaints received by staff during August. Two July complaints, not previously reported are also included. No commendations were received during August.

There was no discussion on this item.

10. Call to the Audience

There were two speakers from the audience: Mariana Parker and Cathy Neuman.

Ms. Parker is a volunteer at PACC and is associated with Ratheon's Animal Club, from which she was forwarded a complaint. Two neighbors are caring for feral cats, which are all spayed and neutered, and loose dogs from another neighbor are killing the cats. PACC has been called three times about the problem and reportedly said nothing can be done. On September 8 there were seven animals put on a rescue list and were set to be euthanized on the 11th. One of the animals was on the list for food aggression and she posed the question, why can't the dog be fed separately? About three dogs were on the list for being old. All of the animals were saved through either adoption or rescue. One six-year old dog had hip problems and donations were collected to pay for the veterinary bills. A foster stepped up, but when the dog was scanned a microchip was found and the owner subsequently was contacted and retrieved his pet. She requested any animal set for euthanasia be double scanned to prevent such an occurrence. Ms. Parker voiced objection to there being only a three-day window before the animals were to be euthanized and suggested one week. She added that there weren't staff available on the 11th to process the paperwork to save these animals.

Ms. Neuman referred to Old Business, Vet Holds and Confiscation Holds – Specific Details of Each Case and Ways to Shorten Length of Hold Time and requested the Committee work on the ‘ways to shorten length of hold time’ part of the agenda item. Mr. Neuman said he would put the item on the next meeting’s agenda.

11. Announcements, Schedules and Proposed Agenda Items

Ms. Hubbard thanked the staff who attended/participated in the meeting.

Mr. Janes said PACC hopes to hear soon about how PACC performed in the ASPCA Challenge and what monetary award will be received.

Ms. Hubbard requested regular updates on the feral cat project.

12. Next Meeting – October 16, 2014

There was no discussion on this item.

13. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:28 pm



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

September 18, 2014 – 5:30 p.m.
Pima Animal Care Center
4000 N. Silverbell Road
Tucson, Arizona 85745
Admin Building
(520) 243-7729

Functions of the Committee

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

AGENDA

1.	Call to Order <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roll Call • Establishment of Quorum and Pledge of Allegiance 		
2.	Adoption of Minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August 21, 2014 Meeting 		
3.	Call to the Audience		
4.	Manager's Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arizona Open Meeting Laws Presentation (Pima County Attorney's Office) 		
5.	Old Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on July 19, 2014 Motion for Resolution for PACC to Remedy Issues Relating to the Care and Welfare of Pets at PACC (Chair Neuman/PACC Management Team) • Vet Holds and Confiscation Holds – Specific Details of Each Case and Ways to Shorten Length of Hold Time (Chair Neuman/PACC Management Team) • Customer Service (Chair Neuman) • Adoption Program Policies and Procedures (Chair Neuman) 		
6.	New Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rescue Program - Procedures, Criteria, Follow-Up, Inspections, Reporting (Chair Neuman) • Post Adoption Medical Care (Chair Neuman/Ms. Emptage) 		
7.	Animal Welfare, Dangerous Animal Cases and Holds for the Month of August		
	Welfare		Dangerous Dogs
	A14-152766	A14-142418	A14-152996
	A14-153170	A14-153317	A14-151504
	A14-151724	A14-154493	A14-143184
	A14-152419	A14-154558	A14-149847
	A14-152536		A14-152093
8.	Donations: A total of 1,282 individuals gave a total of \$58,026.80 in donations during the month of August.		
9.	Complaints and Commendations: There were three complaints received by staff during August. Two July complaints, not previously reported are also included. No commendations were received during August.		
10.	Call to the Audience		
11.	Announcements, Schedules and Proposed Agenda Items		
12.	Next Meeting – October 16, 2014		
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.

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



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

September 18, 2014 – 5:30 p.m.

Pima Animal Care Center

4000 N. Silverbell Road

Tucson, Arizona 85745

Admin Building

(520) 243-7729

Functions of the Committee

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

ADDENDUM

- | | |
|----|---|
| 5. | Old Business <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Committee's Report to the Board of Supervisors• Draft Letter Requesting the Health Department Hire More Enforcement Staff |
|----|---|

Copies of this addendum 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.

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
August 21, 2014
4000 N. Silverbell Rd.
Tucson, Arizona 85745

Draft

1. Call to Order

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

- Attendance

Present:

Tamara Barrick, Foundation for Animals in Risk
Nancy Emptage, Vice-Chair, Animal Welfare Coalition
Pat Hubbard, Humane Society of Southern Arizona
Pat Jacobs, Tucson Kennel Club
Sophia Kaluzniacki, DVM, ASPCA of AZ, Inc
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, Ex-Officio

Absent:

Angela Spencer, City of Tucson
Derek Marshall, Public Education

- Pledge of Allegiance

2. Adoption of the Minutes

- Adoption of the June 19, 2014 Meeting Minutes
- Adoption of the of the July 17, 2014 Meeting Minutes

Ms. Schwerin requested the July 17 minutes include that she requested Mandatory Spay / Neuter be added back on the July 17 agenda.

The motion was made and seconded (Hubbard/Barrick) that both sets of minutes be adopted: June 19 as written and July 17 with Ms. Schwerin's request added. The motion carried (10-0).

3. Call to the Audience

There were no speakers from the audience.

4. Manager's Report

Dr. Francisco García, Health Department Director, reported that the Arizona Department of Corrections (ADOC), which has been providing inmate cleaning crews for the Pima Animal Care Center (PACC), is making new restrictions in relation to people around their inmate crews. Restrictions include background checks on volunteers and not having minors serve as volunteers.

These restrictions coupled with ongoing inmate crew shortages have caused staff to explore other options; and an arrangement has been made with the Pima County Adult Detention Center (jail) to provide inmate crews. It will take a couple of months to put the new agreement into action.

Kim Janes, Pima Animal Care Center Chief of External Affairs, reported that the recent animal care ordinance passed, codifying rescue relationships and authorizing working with trap neuter release (TNR) providers. Additionally, the Board of Supervisors approved the Best Friends Animal Society Community Cat Project (CCP) contract for TNR of cats. It will take a few weeks to operationalize the project, which will include placing a trailer on site to facilitate the program. Mr. Janes has requested local municipalities modify their local codes to be congruent with the new County code as it relates to disposition of animals. Additionally, he requested municipalities reduce their codified requirements to hold owned pets, from seven days down to five days. He indicated that a very small percentage of owners redeem their animals in the last two days. Dogs are redeemed at a low percentage and cats at a much lower percentage. Reducing the hold requirement will allow for shorter kennel stays. Mr. Janes said the County has been spending \$200,000 on spay / neuter (SN) in recent years and is increasing SN funding to \$600,000 this fiscal year, with \$200,000 of that going to the CCP. Contract SN providers and the contract amounts are being increased. Cities and towns have been informed that SN funding participation is now part of the animal care services package and is no longer optional or voluntary. Costs are expensed to municipalities on a per capita basis. Mr. Janes said the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) Challenge tracking has PACC at 487.5 more points than it would be at this same point last year, with 694 more adoptions. Returns last year were at 117 and are at 118 this year; although adoptions are up, returns are essentially the same.

Discussion brought out that State statute requires three day holds for unlicensed dogs and five for licensed. Mr. Janes indicated that if there is indication the animal is owned it is held for the longer requirement and efforts are made to get the animal back to its home. Discussion also brought out that the animal ordinance does not go into effect for 30 days after it was passed.

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

Mr. Janes referred to Chief of Operations Kristin Barney's August 14, 2014 *July 17, 2014 Meeting Feedback and Update* letter in the packet, and introduced Ms. Barney, Shelter Manager Jose Ocano, Adoption Coordinator Ellie Beaubien, Animal Care Advocate Justin Gallick and Volunteer Coordinator Andrew Stocker. Mr. Neuman referred to Ms. Barney's aforementioned letter where it stated PACC would need a shelter staff of 75 to humanely care for 900 animals, but only has 25, and asked if there are no other programs utilizing the existing staff plus volunteers to address the 22 items in the motion. Mr. Ocano provided a handout entitled *Insufficient Care of Animals Model*. The handout presented seven factors, including saving animals versus euthanizing them, which contribute to overcrowding resulting in insufficient care. It also presented seven factors being pursued that would mitigate the overcrowding / insufficient care without resorting to euthanizing. Mr. Ocano said he has made an invitation to volunteers to join a kennel card committee to address kennel card problems. He said PACC's intake is approximately 50 animals per day and pointed out the No Kill Pima County help desk has helped reduce intake. He stressed that his staff is insufficient. He added that sometimes there are good days, but explained that a full inmate work crew, no sick calls and a low euthanasia volume are factors that contribute to such days. He said as long as shelter staff is

overextending themselves, things will continue to be insufficient and unpredictable; and no one hates it more than those of us who live it every day. Ms. Barney pointed out another handout which showed the staffing of a comparably sized shelter in San Antonio to illustrate PACC's woeful staffing. Mr. Neuman said that staffing variations are not unusual; the specific items were not brought up to hear an excuse about staffing; you'll never have enough staff. He continued that feeling bad about the situation is not an answer and stressed that volunteers are available to step up and assist. He asserted that volunteers see the staff very little. He requested specifics on what is actually being done to solve the issues and said the motion gave 60 days to remedy the issues. He concluded by summing up his assessment of staff's response to the motion as unacceptable. Ms. Hubbard referred to Mr. Neuman's assessment as harsh; characterized staffing as one third staffing; and said there is a need for an improved relationship between staff and volunteers, a need to build bridges not dissention. Mr. Neuman said he agreed regarding Ms. Hubbard's staff / volunteers comment, but added that dissention has been high over the last three months and the volunteers don't see the Volunteer Coordinator or the Adoption Coordinator.

- Ideas to Increase the Number of Pima Animal Care Center Officers

Dr. Smith said she thought PACC was going to hire more people. Mr. Janes said his recollection is that a recommendation to hire more staff has been forward up the chain of command. There was discussion on crafting a letter strongly encouraging more staff, with the intent of sending the letter up the chain of command. Dr. Smith agreed to work on the letter with Dr. O'Donnell volunteering to assist Dr. Smith.

- Schedule, Number and Training of Department of Corrections Inmates

Mr. Neuman said he was tabling this item in light of comments from Dr. García during the Manager's Report.

- Adoption Program

Ms. Emptage said she had issues with fast track adoptions. She has received calls from adopters with new pets that turn out to be sick and require medications / veterinary care, but the people say they cannot afford it. She suggested the Board of Supervisors set up a fund to help pay for medications for pets that need them within a certain time period, such as 72 hours, after adoption. One individual told Ms. Emptage that people shouldn't be required to pay for veterinary care when adopting. She also said an individual was returning an intact animal that was adopted as altered. Some people say that there is no screening in the adoption process, while others say there is too much screening. Ms. Emptage called for consistency and better education in the adoption process and requested the adoption process be reviewed. In response to questions Mr. Janes indicated that with special needs adoptions a cost estimate is provided for expenses related to the special need and with regular adoptions it is politely expressed in writing and signed for that that the animal is essentially as is. Ms. Schwerin said she dealt with an individual who adopted a cat from PACC and indicated there was no screening, just go over to the desk and pay for the adoption. The cat then developed an upper respiratory infection.

Mr. Neuman passed out what he referred to as Exhibit A, which was made up of four redacted copies of e-mails he received from volunteers. He said Exhibit A's e-mails were all about adoptions and represented about three percent of the e-mails he receives from the volunteers. The e-mails complain

about lack of access to the Adoption Coordinator and other staff. He continued that many potential adopters come to PACC and have to wait to be helped or get frustrated and leave. Ms. Hubbard pointed out that adoption numbers are going up, so something must be going right.

In response to a question about volunteer scheduling Ms. Beaubien said volunteers are scheduled with a database called Volgistics. To be an adoption counselor a volunteer needs to complete 16 hours of training. Peak hours are announced and absences or shortages are addressed by sending out a please help e-mail. She added that Sundays usually are a great day for volunteer numbers. Mr. Neuman said that he is not staging an inquisition, but is trying to raise a level of uncomfortableness so that we can work together to establish a better way. Dr. Smith requested a presentation at the next meeting of, step by step, how adoptions are done. Ms. Beaubien added that she has a pool of about 80 volunteers, but only has about 20 who help regularly. She also said that volunteer perspectives range from no one is good enough to adopt, to here take one; are you sure you don't want another; so consistency is a challenge. Ms. Schwerin said she is against the frenzy to increase adoptions, stressing that animals are only to be placed in suitable homes and citing that adopters are not being properly screened. During discussion others members echoed the request for receiving details of the adoption process in their packet for next meeting. Mr. Neuman added a request for perceived daily, per hour, public traffic of perspective adopters.

- Committee Member Input to Semi Annual Board of Supervisors Report

Mr. Neuman had sent a working draft of the report to Committee members. Ms. Emptage pointed out, in relation to Goals and Upcoming Projects, item 8, regarding micro-chipping, that all animals leaving PACC are micro-chipped. She said that owners may or may not want to do this, adding that she has paid anywhere from nothing to \$75 for micro-chipping. In relation to Goals and Upcoming Projects, item 10, Ms. Emptage said there is no money in the budget for these and staff shortages prohibit using PACC staff.

She requested said item be removed from the report and a vote was taken. The vote was 9-0 to remove, with Mr. Jacobs abstaining. Mr. Jacobs expressed he felt that per open meeting laws an item mailed out and not included in the agenda packet should not be discussed; Mr. Neuman disagreed. Mr. Jacobs requested a ruling on this point from the County Attorney's Office. Mr. Neuman went over some edits since he sent out the document. Edits included some specific numbers and details that were originally not available and therefore left blank.

Ms. Hubbard pointed out that many points in the report were PACC accomplishments or items PACC leadership should be reporting, and asked why is the Committee reporting on things it wasn't involved in doing. Mr. Neuman acknowledged her point, but said the Committee has had some involvement in many of the items. There was discussion on the purpose of the report and possible retitling of the Accomplishments in the report. Dr. Kaluzniacki said that the items were items observed, things that have happened, regardless of direct involvement of the Committee. Ms. Schwerin referred to Accomplishments, item 10, regarding an April 2014 Committee motion, and said the report does not accurately reflect the referred to motion. Mr. Janes recalled two different motions. Mr. Neuman and Ms. Schwerin agreed to work on amending that item. Ms. Schwerin said she disagreed with some of what the report touts as accomplishments to include: increased adoptions; increased live animal release rates; decreased intake; and increased reuniting pets with owners. She repeated her comments from the adoptions item discussion; said cruel and neglectful owners are allowed to retrieve animals after the owners get citations; and said she disagreed with the Help Desk persuading people to keep

animals they don't want and/or cannot care for. There was some discussion on possible pros and cons of potential adoption and Help Desk scenarios. Dr. Kaluzniacki pointed out that the report states what happened, not that the items are necessarily good or bad.

6. New Business

- Vet Holds and Confiscation Holds

Mr. Neuman said that a while back there was a vote for the Committee to receive more particulars on animals with holds: the reason for the hold; is the animal on medications; is there an anticipated hold duration, and the Committee is not receiving that information. Mr. Janes acknowledged a need to improve information on holds.

- Customer Service Issues at PACC

Mr. Neuman tabled this item.

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

Dr. Kaluzniacki asked how the ten welfare cases presented are selected. Mr. Janes replied that he asked the enforcement staff to look at cases at or near completion and provide a sampling of the various types of cases handled. Dr. Kaluzniacki said the Committee should not just get the well-handled cases, but would like to see more problematic cases. Ms. Schwerin discussed welfare case 5. She objected to the report saying the owner was educated. The dog died at PACC. Ms. Emptage said that the clinic in this case has a standing order where People for Animals would pay the expense for an animal to be put down if the owner could not afford the cost. Ms. Schwerin discussed welfare case 9. Dogs were in cages without water. The enforcement officer offered the owner an informational brochure, but the owner said, "Just write the ticket." Ms. Schwerin said the officers seldom impound animals, but when they do they usually let the owner take them back. She expressed that many PACC practices are dictated by an unnamed high level official.

8. Donations: 1,237 individuals gave a total of \$26,525.07 during the month of July.

There was no discussion on this item.

9. Complaints and Commendations: Four complaints were received by staff during July.

Ms. Schwerin said that in the past the Committee used to get the actual complaints, not just a summary. Mr. Janes said staff can provide the actual complaints and replies.

10. Call to the Audience

There were three speakers from the audience: Kimberly Walker, Kim Silver and Marcie Velen.

Kimberly Walker spoke about the length of time animals are held. She said she knew a shelter director in Washington State and they changed their ordinances for young puppies so they are not held. She said little puppies are not strays walking down the road. No hold requirement allows for the dogs to be adopted quicker and reduces the chance of them getting sick in the shelter.

Kim Silver spoke about the Help Desk. She said the partnership between PACC and No Kill Pima County has been extraordinary. The Help Desk provides education to people who are bringing an animal to PACC because they think it is the right thing to do, but they don't always have information on options. So far 151 animals have been diverted by the Help Desk. She gave an example of an adopter who took a dog home, didn't read the information from PACC and did a poor dog introduction which resulted in a fight. The owner brought the adopted dog back to PACC. The Help Desk connected the owner with a dog trainer to educate him on the dog introduction. Two weeks later the Help Desk received an e-mail from the owner with a picture of the two dogs sleeping together. She said the purpose is information and education, and the Help Desk has a list of veterinarians who will provide a free visit. She said the Help Desk is not putting animals in danger and there have been many times when they do feel the shelter is a better place for an animal than with the person who brought it in, and in those cases they do not work for an alternative to intake.

Marcie Velen invited the Committee to spend time at the Help Desk and see what they do. She said concerns would be alleviated if time was spent at the Help Desk. The Help Desk is not trying to persuade people to keep animals they don't want; they are trying to help those who want their animals, but didn't realize they could do something else. The Help Desk scans animals; they don't send people home with other owners' animals. The Help Desk has reunited owners with their animals right in the parking lot, preventing the pet from even entering the shelter. Ms. Velen said that if an animal looks abused or afraid of the person who brought it in, they don't even ask about the individual keeping it or provide alternatives.

11. Announcements, Schedules and Proposed Agenda Items

Mr. Janes said PACC's three month participation in the ASPCA Challenge will wind down with a 36 hour weekend event.

There were proposed agenda items, adoption process and post adoption medical care, which were brought up during other agenda item discussions.

12. Next Meeting – September 18, 2014

There was no discussion on this item.

13. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:54 pm

PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
AUGUST 2014 OPERATIONAL REPORT

	THIS MONTH			THIS YEAR TO DATE			LAST YEAR TO DATE			YEAR TO YEAR	
	TUCSON	COUNTY	TOTAL	TUCSON	COUNTY	TOTAL	TUCSON	COUNTY	TOTAL	DELTA	%+/-
SHELTER OPERATIONS											
ALL ANIMALS HANDLED											
DOGS	741	684	1,425	1,470	1,382	2,852	1,523	1,212	2,735		
CATS	401	265	666	815	576	1,391	993	637	1,630		
OTHERS	33	68	101	69	127	196	51	104	155		
TOTAL ANIMALS HANDLED	1,175	1,017	2,192	2,354	2,085	4,439	2,567	1,953	4,520	-81	-2%
Live Animals Handled	810	729	1,539	1,903	1,730	3,633	2,299	1,761	4,060	-427	-11%
IMPOUNDED ANIMALS											
ADOPTED											
DOGS	289	285	574	593	602	1,195	464	390	854		
CATS	175	156	331	332	289	621	185	143	328		
OTHER	1	1	2	1	5	6	9	1	10		
TOTAL ADOPTED	465	442	907	926	896	1,822	658	534	1,192	630	53%
RETURNED TO OWNER											
DOGS	81	67	148	177	146	323	159	120	279		
CATS	6	11	17	9	18	27	5	13	18		
OTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3		
TOTAL RETURNED	87	78	165	186	164	350	166	134	300	50	17%
RESCUED											
DOGS	99	85	184	185	188	373	217	304	521		
CATS	60	38	98	128	70	198	243	171	414		
OTHER	2	1	3	4	2	6	1	15	16		
TOTAL RESCUED	161	124	285	317	260	577	461	490	951	-374	-39%
*TOTAL LIVE RELEASES	713	644	1,357	1,429	1,320	2,749	1,285	1,158	2,443	306	13%
**TOTAL LIVE RELEASE RATE			84%			83%			71%		
EUTHANIZED											
DOGS	170	149	319	317	266	583	441	342	783		r
CATS	40	21	61	100	62	162	391	257	648		
OTHER	8	14	22	18	33	51	7	19	26		
TOTAL EUTHANIZED	218	184	402	435	361	796	839	618	1,457	-661	-45%
(-)Owner Requested Euthanasia			139			227			457		
Adjusted Total Euthanasia			263			569			1,000		
***EUTHANASIA RATE			16%			17%			29%		
OTHER	434	318	752	548	415	963	309	236	545	418	77%
ENFORCEMENT OPERATIONS											
Welfare Responses	169	76	245	399	156	555	483	215	698	-143	-20%
ENFORCEMENT CALLS FOR SERVICE	1,391	742	2,133	3,012	1,681	4,693	3,071	1,835	4,906	-213	-4%
LICENSING OPERATIONS											
ALTERED	3,438	3,654	7,092	7,437	7,812	15,249	7,828	9,506	17,334		
UNALTERED	243	228	471	482	482	964	545	691	1,236		
OTHER	72	115	187	133	203	336	180	234	414		
TOTAL SOLD	3,753	3,997	7,750	8,052	8,497	16,549	8,553	10,431	18,984	-2,435	-13%

*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)

OPEN MEETING LAW

A Reference Guide to A.R.S. § 38-431 through 38-431.09

Prepared by the Pima County Attorney's Office Civil Division
Karen S. Friar, Deputy County Attorney



A.R.S. § 38-431.09(A) provides:

It is the public policy of this state that meetings of public bodies be conducted openly and that notices and agendas be provided for such meetings which contain such information as is reasonably necessary to inform the public of the matters to be discussed or decided. Toward this end, any person or entity charged with the interpretations of this article shall construe this article in favor of open and public meetings.

The Open Meeting Law is specifically intended to *maximize the public access to the governmental process*. Therefore, official proceedings and deliberations by any public body must, with very limited exceptions, be conducted openly. Uncertainty in whether or not the Open Meeting Law should apply should always be resolved in favor of openness.

Public Bodies covered by the Open Meeting Law (A.R.S. § 38-431):

- 1) Boards, commissions, and other multi-member governing bodies;
- 2) Corporations and other instrumentalities whose boards are appointed or elected by the State or political subdivision;
- 3) Quasi-judicial bodies (such as the Arizona Board of Tax Appeals);
- 4) Advisory committees*;
- 5) Standing and special committees; and,
- 6) Subcommittees* of any of the above.

*An advisory committee or a subcommittee is a group “officially established, on motion and order of a public body or by the presiding officer of the public body whose members [are] appointed for the specific purpose of making a recommendation concerning” a decision or course of conduct to be made or considered by the public body. A.R.S. § 38-431(1).

With few exceptions, the Open Meeting Law (“OML”) applies to multi-member bodies created by law or an official act pursuant to some legal authority.

Actions and Activities covered by the Open Meeting Law:

- 1) Any gathering of a quorum, *in person or through technological devices*, at which they discuss, propose or take *legal action*, including deliberations on the topic (or action); and,
- 2) Contested case proceedings or quasi-judicial or adjudicatory proceedings by the public body.

Arizona law defines a **quorum** as “*a majority of a board or commission.*” A.R.S. § 1-216(B). This has been interpreted to mean a *majority of the total number of members set forth in law or in the board or commission’s by-laws*. Thus, if the law or by-laws require that there be seven (7) members

on the commission, but there are only five (5) currently appointed and serving, a quorum is still based on the seven members that should be on the board and would be four (4). The quorum would not be based on the five sitting members (where the quorum would be three (3)).

Legal action is a collective decision, commitment or promise. A.R.S. § 38-431(3). All legal action must take place during a public meeting. A.R.S. § 38-431.01(A). The requirements of OML must be followed regarding ***any matters which might foreseeably require final action or a decision by the quorum.*** Therefore, meeting of a quorum must be open to the public whenever members:

- a) **Discuss** (speak together about) a legal action;
- b) **Propose** (suggestion of a member) a legal action;
- c) **Take** (a collective decision, commitment or promise by a majority) a legal action; or,
- d) **Deliberate** (exchange of facts or opinions) with respect to a legal action.

Every “legal action” must be conducted in either a public meeting or, when allowed by law, an executive session. Consequently, ***all meetings where there is a gathering of a quorum either in person or through technological devices (such as conference phones, e-mail and facsimiles) must, pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.01(A), be public.***

The safest course of action is to comply with the Open Meeting requirements ANY TIME a majority of the public body discusses the business of the body.

It may be possible to conduct discussions and/or deliberations between less than a quorum of members, but it is a violation of the Open Meeting Law to do so when the meeting of less than a quorum is used to circumvent the purposes of the Open Meeting Law. ***Discussion of business by a quorum of the public body may take place ONLY in a public meeting or an executive session convened pursuant to law.***

Topics which may be discussed in executive session:

- 1) Personnel matters (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(1));
- 2) Confidential records (exempt by law from public inspection)(A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(2));
- 3) Legal advice (with the attorney FOR the public body) (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(3));
- 4) Instruction on contract negotiations, litigation, or settlement to avoid or resolve litigation (with the attorney FOR the public body) (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(4));
- 5) Employee salary (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(5));
- 6) International and interstate negotiations (applies to cities and towns) (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(6)); and,
- 7) Instruction to public body’s representative regarding the purchase, sale or lease of real property (NOT with the party with whom the public body is negotiating) (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(7)).



Executive session allows for the private ***discussion*** of matters in categories specified above. ***No final action, no debate over what action to take, and no straw poll may take place in executive session.*** If the proposed discussion does not plainly fall within one of the above mentioned categories, it should take place only in a public meeting. A quorum must vote to hold an executive session, and such vote must be public. All public notice provisions apply.

Personnel matters are confined to the discussion or consideration of employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, salary, discipline, resignation, or dismissal of a *specific* public officer, appointee, or employee. The affected individual must receive a minimum of 24 hour advance notice of the executive session (no emergency exception) with sufficient content. The individual may request that the discussion be held in public and such request must be honored. The individual may be permitted to attend the executive session. It is unclear whether there is a right to attend.

Confidential records are those which are exempt from public inspection either expressly or by implication.

Legal advice may be discussed with the attorney for the public body. The attorney must represent the public body either as an employee, as a contract hire, or as provided by an insurance company. The discussions are limited to advice on the legal ramifications of facts and situations. ***Debate and discussion on what actions to take based on the advice must be conducted in open public session!*** The mere presence of an attorney in the room does not justify an executive session.

Litigation, either pending or contemplated, may be discussed with the attorney for the public body. The discussion or consultation is to consider the public body's position and instruct the attorney on how to proceed.

Contract under negotiation may be discussed with the attorney for the public body. The discussion or consultation is to consider the public body's position and instruct the attorney on how to proceed.

Employee salary discussions and consultations may be held to consider the position of the public body on negotiating salaries and/or benefits and instruct representatives on how to deal with employee organizations. Meetings with the employees' representatives are to be held in public, as are any negotiations conducted by the public body.

International and interstate negotiations permit a city or town to conduct an executive session with members of a tribal council, or its representatives, of a reservation within or adjacent to the city or town.

Purchase or lease of real property negotiations may be discussed in executive session. Instructions may be given to the representative (for example, authorizing negotiations to a certain dollar amount). Any meeting with the seller, or lessor, or representative of the seller or lessor is to be held in public and the contract must be approved in a public meeting.

Discussion and considerations are strictly limited in executive session to the seven categories authorized. Once the session is concluded, the public body must reconvene in a public meeting to take the final vote or make a final decision.

Notice of meetings:



Notice must be given at least 24 hours prior to the start of the meeting. The 24 hours includes Saturdays, if the public has access to the physical location where notice is posted or if notice is available on the internet. Excluded from the 24 hour notice period are Sundays and the fifteen holidays established under A.R.S. § 1-301(A).

Notice MUST be given to:

- 1) Each member of the public body; and,
- 2) The public.

It is sufficient to mail a copy of the notice to each member of the public body. Notice must be made available to the general public.

The public is informed of meetings of the County's public bodies (including special districts) in a two-step process:

- 1) A disclosure statement is filed on the public body's website or, in the case of special districts, on the district's website or with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors. The statement identifies where public notices of meetings will be displayed both physically AND electronically. A.R.S. § 38-431.02(A). The physical location should have regular business hours and be easy to find and access; and,
- 2) A notice of each meeting is then posted on the public body's website AND at the physical location identified in the disclosure statement. The public body should also provide such additional notice which is reasonable and practicable. A.R.S. § 38-431.02(A). Additional notice includes: news releases, mailings to persons requesting they be informed, and newsletters or other publications. Notice must also comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act for accommodation of needs of persons with disabilities.

When the public body meets for a specified calendar period on a regular day or date, in a regular place, at a regular time notice need only be posted at the beginning of the calendar period. However, the agenda requirements discussed below must still be met, unless the notice contains a clear statement that the agenda for each meeting will be available at least 24 hours in advance and provides directions on where and how to obtain a copy.

Notice must contain the following:

- 1) Identification of the public body;
- 2) The date, time and place of the meeting -- specify the street address and specific room number or other identifying information;
- 3) Either the agenda for the meeting and any executive session or information on how the public may acquire a copy of the agenda; and
- 4) A statement regarding accommodations for persons with disabilities.

If an action is taken in violation of the Open Meeting Law, it is null and void. A meeting may be convened within 30 days of discovering the violation to ratify that action. The ***notice to ratify an action must also contain:***

- 1) A description of the action to be ratified;
- 2) A clear statement that the public body proposes to ratify a prior action; and,
- 3) Information on how the public may obtain a written description of the action to be ratified.

Notice must be given at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting unless one of three situations exists:



- 1) An **actual emergency exists** when, due to unforeseen circumstances, immediate action is necessary to avoid the serious consequences which would result from delaying 24 hours. (This does not apply to notice to an employee to be discussed in executive session);
- 2) The meeting is for the **ratification** of a prior act taken in violation of the Open Meeting Law. In such an instance, **72 hours'** notice is required; and,
- 3) A properly noticed meeting is **recessed and resumed within less than 24 hours**. Before recessing, notice must be given publicly on the time and place for the resumption. (If an executive session is recessed and resumed within less than 24 hours, the public body should reconvene to provide public notice of the place where and time when the meeting will be resumed.)

Additionally, a meeting may still be held when there has been a temporary technical problem preventing notice of a meeting on the public body's website, but only if the posted notice and other additional notice requirements have been met. A.R.S. § 38-431.02(A).



Agendas must inform the public of matters to be discussed:

The agenda for any meeting of the public body is the road map for the conduct of the meeting. ***Carefully crafting and following the agenda promotes public confidence and provides protection to the members of the public body.***

The agenda must be **available 24 hours before** the meeting, unless one of the exceptions noted above applies. The agenda **must be sufficiently detailed** to advise the public of the specific matters to be discussed, considered, or decided at the meeting. Use of **generic or broad terms**, such as: "staff reports", "personnel", "new business", "old business", or "other matters", is **not permitted**. The degree of specificity depends upon the circumstances. ***When in doubt, resolve in favor of more detail.***

An **agenda for an executive session** must contain a **general description** of the matter to be considered, but should not contain information that would defeat the purpose of the session. Weight the legislative policy to favor public disclosure with the legitimate confidentiality concerns of the Executive Session in determining the agenda content. Remember that the **specific legal authority** for the executive session from A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A) must be included on the agenda.

If there are any changes in an agenda after it has been posted and distributed, a new agenda must be prepared, posted and distributed at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting.

There is one general term which may now be placed on the agenda. It is the "summary of current events." This summary may only be presented by **the chief administrator, presiding officer, or member of the public body** and then only if:

- 1) The summary is listed on the agenda; and,
- 2) No discussions, deliberations, proposals or legal actions may take place regarding the current event presented.

The agenda may provide for a “**call to the public**” (but not a “call to members”). The purpose of the “call to the public” is to allow citizens to address the public body. As there is no way to know specifically what topics the public will address, this broad heading is acceptable. However, *if a matter is raised by the public that is not on the agenda, the public body shall not discuss it at that meeting.*




*At the conclusion of the open call to the public, individual members may **ONLY**:*

- 1) Respond to criticism made;*
- 2) Ask staff to review a matter raised; or,*
- 3) Ask to include the matter on a future agenda (if discussion of the matter is desired).*

Discussions and decisions at a meeting are limited to matters specified on the agenda and “other matters related thereto”. Extreme caution should be exercised in utilizing the “other matters related” provision; such matters must be, in some reasonable manner, related to the specified agenda item. The better course of action is to defer discussion and decision until a later meeting, when the matter can be specifically listed as an agenda item.

The public must be allowed to attend and listen to deliberations:

Under the Open Meeting Law the public has a right to attend and listen to the meetings of the public body. But, there is no public right to participate in the discussion or decision-making activities of the public body.



Because the right to attend and listen is paramount, nothing should be done which in any way obstructs or inhibits public attendance. Reasonable efforts must be made to accommodate persons with disabilities. Access requirements are not met when things occur such as:

- 1) Requiring the public to sign an attendance sheet (except a member of the public who wishes to speak at the meeting may be required to register, as it complies with minute-taking requirements);
- 2) Using remote locations or ones where public access is prohibited;
- 3) Using small rooms; or,
- 4) Conducting the meeting at unreasonable times.

The public must be allowed to record the public meeting as long as there is no active interference in the conduct of the meeting. Audio recording and video recording are allowed.

Keep in mind that some public bodies must follow other statutes, rules or regulations which may require public participation or public hearings. In such instances, the public must be provided an opportunity to be heard.

Minutes must be kept and made available to the public:



All public meetings and executive sessions must have minutes. Minutes may either be **written or recorded** (audiotape or video) and must be available for public inspection **within three (3) working days** of the meeting. Minutes must be reduced to a **form readily accessible** to the public. Thus, access to the recording would meet the accessibility requirement, but shorthand notes would not.

Executive session minutes are confidential and may only be disclosed to authorized persons which are: members of the public body; the officer, appointee, or employee who was the subject of the session; staff personnel as necessary to prepare and maintain the minutes; the attorney; the auditor general; the court; and the Attorney General or County Attorney in response to an investigative request.



Minutes for a public meeting must contain:

- 1) The date, time, and place of the meeting;
- 2) The members present or absent;
- 3) A general description of the matters discussed or considered (even where no formal vote is taken);
- 4) An accurate description of the legal actions proposed, discussed, or taken. This must include the name of the person making each motion. It is wise to also include how the body voted and the numerical breakdown of the vote;
- 5) The names of each member of the public addressing the public body and the specific legal action to which the comments are related;
- 6) Sufficient information to allow the public to investigate the background or specific facts involved in a decision, when the subject matter is not adequately disclosed in public session (i.e. consent agenda items);
- 7) A full description of the nature of the emergency that precipitated an emergency discussion of items not on the agenda; and,
- 8) A copy of the required disclosure statement, when a prior act is ratified.

Minutes for an executive session (which are confidential) must contain:

- 1) The date, time, and place of the meeting;
- 2) The members present or absent;
- 3) A general description of the matters considered;
- 4) An accurate description of instructions given under A.R.S. § 431.03(4), (5) and (6);
- 5) A statement of reasons for emergency consideration, when appropriate; and,
- 6) Other information deemed appropriate.

Meetings may occur by means other than in person:

Remember that ***any gathering of a quorum*** of members of the public body, in person ***or through technological devices***, at which the members discuss, propose or take legal action, must be held in public. A ***legal action does not require a vote***; discussions about or deliberations on a possible action is a meeting subject to the provisions of the Open Meeting Law. ***A quorum of the public body need not be at the same location or at the same time in order to have a meeting under the Open Meeting Law.*** **Meetings may occur serially.** With the advances of technology, hyper-vigilance is required to avoid unwittingly conducting a meeting without complying with the Open Meeting Law requirements. Conference calls, video conferences, facsimiles and e-mails all pose a risk.

A member may attend a meeting via telephone or other conferencing device:

Members of the public body may participate in a meeting by telephone or video conference, if such attendance is approved by the public body and not prohibited by statutes. This should be used, however, only when no other reasonable alternative to personal attendance exists. If the public body wishes to allow such appearances in certain circumstances, the body should adopt rules or procedures which specify when telephonic (or video conference) attendance will be allowed and how those appearances will be handled.



Telephonic attendance requires compliance with the following:

- 1) Notice and agenda indicate one or more members will participate via telephone;
- 2) The meeting place adequately provides for the public to observe and hear all telephone communications;
- 3) Procedures are developed to clearly identify the member(s) participating telephonically; and,
- 4) The minutes identify the member(s) participating by telephone and describe the procedures followed to assure public access to all communications during the meeting.

A meeting may be conducted online (BUT, only with very special attention to details):



The Arizona Attorney General opined in September 2008¹ that a public body may conduct an online meeting for the purpose of *deliberation and discussion*. ***Final action (motion and vote) must take place in a traditional face-to-face public meeting.*** The online meeting would only be legal, however, if all requirements of the Open Meeting Law are met. This includes:

- 1) Proper notice and an agenda;
- 2) The taking and preservation of minutes; and
- 3) Public access to the entire course of deliberation and discussion (the public must be able to identify which member contributed which edits and which comment);

Notice must provide:

- 1) A specific beginning and end time;
- 2) Clear instructions on how to access the meeting and operate any software used by the public body to host the online meeting;
- 3) An indication of how the public body will facilitate public access to the meeting (including the location of any free Internet access);
- 4) A proposed date and time for the meeting at which the final action of adoption will take place; and
- 5) Reasonable accommodations for any member of the public with a disability that requests an accommodation (there will be technological obstacles to access for some disabled citizens).

¹ See A.G. Opinion I08-008.

Additionally, a policy must be developed for the retention of records created during the course of the online meeting.

An online meeting, while potentially convenient for many members and the public, is fraught with the potential for abuse. Scrupulous compliance with the provision of the law and the recommendations of the Attorney General are imperative.




WATCH OUT FOR THESE OPEN MEETING LAW PITFALLS:

REMEMBER: A quorum of the public body need not be at the same location or at the same time in order to have a meeting under the Open Meeting Law. Any communication between at least a quorum about a topic that might foreseeably come before the group is a meeting!

Care must be taken to avoid the unintended serial meeting and, consequently, a violation of the Open Meeting Law.

E-mail communications can be a meeting:



E-mail communications constitute a meeting when the e-mail has the equivalent components of a meeting:

- Between a quorum
- Via technological device; and
- Discussions, deliberations, proposals or take legal actions


Such e-mails constitute a meeting and are subject to all of the provisions of the Open Meeting Law.²

E-mails between a quorum of members that concern matters that have come before the public body or might foreseeably come before the public body, including the exchange of facts regarding these matters, may be a legal action which must take place in public. (It is irrelevant if the materials shared in the e-mails (such as a newspaper article) are part of the public domain.)²

Because the original sender of an e-mail cannot control its dissemination once it has been sent the risks of using e-mail are great. E-mails can be copied and forwarded and exchanged from one member to another, then forwarded or printed and shown to other members and a communication between a quorum of members has suddenly occurred. It is better to avoid using e-mail to discuss the business of the public body.

² A.G. Opinion 105-004 (“When members of the public body are parties to an exchange of e-mail communications that involve discussions, deliberations or taking action by a quorum of the public body concerning a matter that may foreseeably come before the public body for action, the communications constitute a meeting through technological devices under the OML.” See, also the attached Exhibit A.

Splintering the Quorum or Polling:



As mentioned previously, it may be possible to conduct discussions and/or deliberations between less than a quorum of members, but it is a violation of the Open Meeting Law to do so when the meeting of less than a quorum is used to circumvent the purposes of the Open Meeting Law.

“Splintering the quorum” or “polling” is not allowed. These practices occur when individual members have separate or serial discussions with a majority of the members and tell the information received from each member to the other members or when a non-member is used as a spokesperson in the same manner. It is advisable to always avoid even the appearance of impropriety in this regard.



Social gatherings can be a meeting:



When a quorum of members of the public body are at the same social gathering, they must be very careful not to discuss anything that is even remotely (or tangentially) related to the business of the public body.

A FAX transmission can be a meeting:

Facsimile transmissions pose the same threats as e-mail.



Penalties exist for violations of the Open Meeting Law:



As the consequences for violating Open Meeting Law provisions can be serious, it is incumbent upon every member of a public body to be fully informed of the requirements of the law and to further investigate the penalties which may be assessed. Every effort should be made to avoid technical violations (those which would seem to have no demonstrated prejudicial effect on a complainant).

Any actions taken in a meeting which was conducted in violation of the provisions of the Open Meeting Law are null and void. The actions may be resurrected and given force through a properly noticed ratification held within 30 days of discovery of the void action.

Additional penalties include:

- 1) The issuance of a writ of mandamus in which the court compels compliance or prevents a violation from occurring;
- 2) A civil penalty up to **\$500.00 against the individual** who violates the provision(s) of the Open Meeting Law or against anyone who knowingly aids, agrees to aid, or attempts to aid another person in violating the law (*the public body may not pay the fine which is deposited in the public body's general fund*);
- 3) Reasonable attorney's fees to the successful plaintiff (these are normally paid by the political subdivision, but the court must assess such fees against the individual if it determines he or she

violated the law with the intent of depriving the public either of information or opportunity to be heard); and,

4) Removal from office.

The public body may not hire counsel or expend monies for legal services to defend against Open Meeting Law challenges, unless it has specific legal authority to do so. If so authorized, the retention rate and expenditure must be approved in a properly noticed open meeting, before any obligation is incurred.



An excellent detailed resource and guide for the conduct of meetings by public bodies is the Arizona Agency Handbook prepared by the Attorney General's Office. The handbook may be accessed through the Attorney General's website:

www.azag.gov


Type “**Arizona Agency Handbook**” in the search box located under “AZ.GOV” in the upper right. A list will appear on the left hand side. Click “Open Meeting Law” and then **Arizona Agency Handbook: Chapter 7: Open Meetings**” for the full text..

The open meeting law statutes (§38-431 through §38-431.09) are also available on the “Open Meeting Law” page.



Motion for Resolution for PACC to permanently remedy the following PACC issues within 60 days. If an extension is required, action plans and a progress report are to be submitted to the PACC Advisory Committee members no later than September 8, 2014.

- 1. Dogs not to be fed together because it causes fights and results in many dogs not eating.**
- 2. Large dogs not to be placed with small dogs, young dogs not to be placed with elderly dogs, etc. unless they are bonded.**
- 3. Meet and greet areas to be cleaned and sanitized on a regular basis.**
- 4. Water bowls in the front kennels to be continually cleaned.**
- 5. More help with adoptions.**
- 6. Dogs with cones and small dogs always be provided with low water dishes so they can reach them.**
- 7. Dogs that come in together and are bonded not be separated.**
- 8. Kennels be used to maximize individual space for dogs.**
- 9. U-Bay be discontinued and a humane alternative be made.**
- 10. Small "B cages" be cleaned on a more regular basis and animals in these cages be taken out more often due to the cramped conditions.**
- 11. More inmates and a contingency plan for the inmates.**
- 12. A floor manager to be present and affirmatively manage the shelter conditions.**
- 13. Toys to be cleaned and sanitized and placed in a central area for use.**
- 14. A supervisor/manager to be present and available during operating hours.**
- 15. Dogs with bad teeth be consistently given soft food.**
- 16. Mother dogs consistently have food, preferably soft food.**
- 17. Mother dogs and their puppies be placed in kennels located in one area that may be less noisy and away from the flow of traffic to assist with stress.**
- 18. All dogs consistently be provided with bedding.**
- 19. A better system so all kennels always have kennel cards and have cards that actually match the animals in the kennel at all times.**
- 20. A computer or kiosk so the volunteers can readily look up animal information to assist with adoptions.**
- 21. All sanitizer stations, disinfectant bottles, ear protection and first-aid stations be filled on a regular basis.**
- 22. A consistent and timely evaluation process so animals can be placed for adoption as soon as possible.**



4000 N. Silverbell Road Tucson, AZ 85745 • (520) 243-5936 • www.pima.gov/animalcare

August 14, 2014

Chair and Members, Pima Animal Care Center Advisory Committee

RE: July 17, 2014 Meeting Feedback and Update

Dear Chair and Members,

The following information is provided for your consideration and information.

During the July 17, 2014 Advisory Committee Meeting, the Committee introduced a list of items for PACC to address. The following is in response to these issues:

The twenty two items on this list are items that the shelter too has recognized as areas of concern. We also have many other concerns which are not on the list, in the way our cats are housed and cared for. Many of these concerns are the result of an overcrowded shelter. PACC is continuing to treat and save more animals. We are also housing and caring for more animals. We have recently been caring for around 900 dogs and cats. Based on a staffing formula by the National Animal Care and Control Association (NACA), to humanely care for 900 animals, we would need a staff of 75. We currently have 25 shelter staff, including program coordinators and managers. With this staffing model, we are unable to provide the level of care we desire, or is the national standard without significant assistance from others.

We agree that these areas of concern are important and should be rectified. Jose Ocano, Shelter Operations Manager, has recently identified volunteer opportunities that would require specialized training and would address many of the listed concerns including: cleaned water bowls, checking that each animal has the appropriate bowls for their size and condition, better matches for kennel mates, refreshed or refilled soft food for appropriate animals, bedding in all kennels, and frequent spot cleaning.

The partnership with the Arizona Department of Corrections has proved challenging. PACC leadership has been in discussions with the Pima County Jail to provide inmate services. Some of the benefits of this program are more inmates in each shift and a corrections officer trained in proper cleaning techniques to supervise the work. There are multiple pieces that need to be put in place before we can launch this program, but PACC is working feverishly to have this change in place.

Very recently the Community Cat Program and associated ordinance were passed. In partnership with Best Friends Animal Society and PetSmart Charities, PACC will be able to address the issue of community cats while also freeing up valuable space and resources for the shelter, as many community cats will be altered and returned to their outdoor home.


Additionally, the PACC management team has been looking at large picture strategies to improve the level of care with the current level of resources- resources that must also cover much more than the just the shelter portion of PACC's operation. We are examining best practices for intake, fast track adoptions, shortening hold times, and making owner redemption easier and more educational to reunite families and avoid repeat offenses. It is these big picture strategies that need to be examined and implemented for us to meet our standards of care while continuing to save more lives than ever before.

The PACC management team understands the level of care we are working to achieve. We desire much more for our animals than we are currently able to provide. By pulling resources from one area to tend to another, we do not solve the problem. The result is another program or another room full of animals that isn't getting the care or advocacy that they deserve. PACC is looking at big picture solutions to humanely operate within our current resources. We are asking for the support of the volunteers, the community, and the advisory committee to help us find and implement these solutions.

Respectfully,


Kristin Barney
Chief of Operations
and
PACC Management Team

Insufficient Care of Animals Model




ANIMAL CARE SERVICES ORGANIZATIONAL CHART

- May 28, 2013 -



Jo
Ar
30
Al
Ar
30
Jo
An
30
M:
An
30
Sa
Ar
(D
30
VF
An
(D.
30
E
Ar
S
30



Manual

For


Ad ption

Counselors



PIMA COUNTY

ANIMAL CARE



INTRODUCTION TO ADOPTING

The Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) seeks to find new, quality homes for as many animals entrusted to our care as we possibly can. In doing so, it is the fundamental objective of the Pima Animal Care Center to find homes in which each animal may live out the rest of its life free from harm, with adequate food, water, exercise, protection from the elements, quality veterinary care, and frequent and positive interactions with human beings.

There are certain basic requirements which must be met by any client before we will place an animal with that person. We are not a pet store. We endeavor to make quality placements and to educate clients about the animal and the emotional and financial commitment, which can last as long as twenty years. Such a commitment cannot and should not be entered into lightly.


At the same time, great care and judgment must be used by staff and volunteers when determining whether a client is qualified. While The Pima Animal Care Center certainly encounters people whose attitudes and lifestyle may not be adequate or suitable for an adoption placement, we must bear in mind that our main objective is to educate the public. Clients may not, at the outset, be qualified to adopt an animal that they have chosen. Yet we may, through a process of discussion and education, be able to convince them that, with certain changes, their situation may indeed be adequate for us to place the animal in their home or find an animal that better matches their lifestyle and desires.

Judgmental, self-righteous and arrogant attitudes on the part of the staff/volunteer members do not help in the process of changing attitudes or philosophies, and such attitudes are prohibitive to the process of education. All clients should be considered at the outset to be qualified until and unless proven otherwise.


As with all situations where rules or guidelines must be applied, exceptions may be appropriate in certain cases. Our adoption counselors are advised to consult with a supervisor or coordinator whenever communication between a client and the counselor breaks down and the counselor is unsure which course of action to take. The welfare of the animal must always be considered. However, public relations in dealing with clients are also important. Each case should be dealt with on an individual basis.

Volunteers and staff must always put the needs of the animals first and remember it is not the quantity of adoptions made but rather the quality of the adoption. If an adoption counselor feels that a potential adoption is not in the best interest of the animal, the client should always be referred to a staff member.

TOOLS TO ENHANCE ADOPTIONS




- Staff and volunteers will greet clients and direct them to the appropriate animal area/s.
- Adoption counselors will remain in the animal adoption areas, assisting clients in selecting an animal that matches their desires. The goal of the adoption counselor in the kennel environment is to converse with the customer in a way that enhances their visit and knowledge; a customer should be approached numerous times to ensure this opportunity. All staff and volunteers should balance the Pima Animal Care Center’s procedural expectations with the personal needs of a customer; if a customer acts uncomfortable with this approach or they request to be left alone, adoption counselors should cease contact until approached.
- Adoption counselors should engage clients with inquiries that generate detailed answers from clients; the use of yes or no questions must always be followed up with further, more detailed questions to create a “verbal volley” between the staff member and the customer. A verbal volley is designed to maximize the educational opportunity of visitors by increasing their comfort level with counselors and to ensure both parties gain a better understanding of what type of animal will be the best fit for the customer. (Volunteers and staff will be trained to ask appropriate questions in order to succeed at verbal volley)
- When clients are leaving the facility empty handed, counselors should attempt an EXIT verbal volley to identify if they have further unmet needs. Brochures, business cards and educational materials should be distributed if appropriate.
- We should always strive to ensure the animals at PACC are well-cared for and living in a sanitary environment. This helps animals to stay healthy and increases their chances for adoption. Volunteers and staff should help clean up animal waste as soon as possible, both in the kennels and in the visiting areas.
- Loving and responsible pet owners are not necessarily born that way. Given the right information in the right way, most people can become good pet owners.
- Once a person decides to get a pet, they are liable to get one somewhere else if they are denied at the shelter.
- Anyone taking the time to come to an animal shelter to adopt a pet, when so many pets are available for free in the community, deserves to be given every consideration.
- Our goal should be to make the right “match” between animal and adopter, not to find reasons to refuse clients.



CAN-DO ATTITUDES TO ENHANCE ADOPTIONS:

- EDUCATIONAL-Thinks of every interaction with the public as an educational opportunity.
- INDIVIDUALLY DRIVEN- Uses guidelines not absolute directives.
- FLEXIBILITY-Strives for the most positive solution.
- RESPONSE TO CRITISISM-Willing to change outdated policies or programs in response to internal and external feedback.


ADOPTION PROCESS



1. **Every client must fill out the Adopter Survey prior to visiting an animal.** (If a customer is not interested in adopting and only wants to visit our pets, please provide the customer with a Volunteer Open House schedule)
2. Once the Adopter Survey has been completed and reviewed by the Adoption counselors, they may begin the selection process. This is the time to use “Verbal Volley” to engage the customer in conversation.
 - A. What kind of pet are you looking for?
 - B. What is the activity level in your home
 - C. How many pets have you owned?
 - D. Do you have children?


These types of conversation starters will help the client to feel more comfortable and willing to offer personal information. In addition, as adoption counselors, a little information can go a long way. For example, when we find out that Mable is turning 105 next month, and she spends 10 hours a day at her quilting club, we would advise against the 8 week old Queensland Heeler puppy. However, we would want Mable to have a companion that will fit her lifestyle; something mature and independent like a very small lap dog or a cat.

3. After finding out the basics from the adopter, we direct them to choose from the animals that have a red letter A or SNA on the card. If neither an A nor SNA are on the cards, then we may refer the client to the licensing lobby for “RESERVATION” options or ask a shelter supervisor for the animal’s status.
4. Once the client has selected an animal, it is the responsibility of the adoption counselor to check and do the following things before escorting the client, and animal, to the meet-&-greet areas.
 - A. Ensure the kennel number on the card and the kennel are the same.
 - B. Ensure the animal is actually available indicated by the red letter A or SNA
 - C. Remove the top portion of the card (this stays with the animal at all times) and leave the bottom portion on the kennel.
 - D. Place an “I’m visiting” card on the animal’s kennel.




5. Escort the client and the animal to the appropriate visiting area. (Puppies under 4 months of age may only be placed in the green pen, located on the north wall of the inside adoption area). Once secured in the area, make sure that the client and the animal are comfortable, answer any questions, and inform them that someone will be back to check on them shortly. Also, never allow customers to walk/carry any animals to or from the kennel. This includes walking personal pets through our adoption areas.
6. After 5-10 minutes, check on the client.
7. If they have decided that they do not wish to adopt the animal they had selected, we should follow up with additional verbal volley to determine if there are other animals they may be interested in visiting with. If they do not wish to see other animals that day, provide them with informational brochures and a free adoption coupon for their future visit.
8. If they have decided to adopt the animal, follow the next steps.
 - A. If the card has a “SNA” written on it, place the animal back in the kennel and escort the adopter to the resource room.
 - B. If the card has an A on it, simply verify that the animal has a microchip by scanning the animal. The microchip scanners should be accessible and kept on the adoption desks.
 - C. If the animal has a microchip, place the animal back in its kennel and complete the Survey with the adopter. Ensure both the top half and the bottom half of the kennel card have the microchip sticker in place. Notate on the bottom half of the kennel card that the animal has been adopted, along with your initials and the date, and place it back on the animal’s kennel. Document the adoption on the Adoption Report. (Note, if there are many animals that look alike in the same kennel, place a band around the adopted animal’s neck with the animal ID number and an adopted notation to avoid confusion.)
 - D. Send the client to the licensing lobby, with their Adopters Survey, the animal’s top half of the kennel card and the microchip packet.
 - E. If the animal does not have a microchip, find a staff member or volunteer to implant the microchip. Scan the animal to verify that the microchip was implanted properly. Place one of the microchip stickers on the top and bottom of the animal’s kennel card.
 - F. Place the animal back in its kennel and follow the remaining instructions in item C above.

ADOPTION GUIDELINES



1. Adopters must present a valid photo identification.
2. Adopters must be over the age of 18 years.
3. If the client indicates that the animal will be a gift, a counselor must first offer the person a gift certificate. Gift adoptions are permissible, but never recommended.
4. If a client is turned down for any reason, no one that was with him/her at that time will be allowed to adopt on the same day.
5. No person who is suspected of being under the influence of alcohol or drugs can adopt. Please see a supervisor, manager or coordinator if this situation arises.
6. PACC reserves the right to conduct premises inspections before, and after, the adoption of an animal.
7. No animal will be adopted to any person who states he/she will chain or tie the animal up for any length of time. Please find a supervisor, coordinator or manager if this situation arises.
8. Any client wishing to adopt an “outside-only” dog must have adequate shelter for the dog. They must adopt a dog that is over the age of one (1) year, is already spayed/neutered, has recovered from surgery, and is used to the outdoor lifestyle.
9. Any client that has resident dogs of the “Bully Breed” type or that is adopting a dog of the “Bully Breed” type (pit-bull, Am. Bulldog, English Bulldog and so on) is required to bring their dog/s in for a dog-to-dog introduction.
10. De-clawed cats must be kept indoors at all times.
11. If the client indicates that he/she will de-claw the cat after adoption, he/she may only adopt a cat that is under the age of 1 year.
12. Cats may not be outdoor-only.
13. If a client indicates that a dog has died from the parvo virus or a cat has died from panleukopenia, adopters must wait no less than six (6) months before adopting.
14. The public is not allowed to walk dogs (either ours or theirs) in adoption areas.
15. If a volunteer believes that a client does not meet these guidelines, the client should be referred to a staff member.
16. The Pima Animal Care Center Staff reserves the right to deny any person that does not meet these specified guidelines.

ADOPTERS AND ANIMALS: POINTS TO CONSIDER



When the Pima Animal Care Center's animals are on display for adoption, it is their chance at a new and loving home. As a representative of PACC, it is your responsibility to present animals to the public. They cannot speak and must trust us to represent them to the public, and act responsibly in doing so. ***When you speak about the animals, remember that you are speaking for them.***

When you are speaking to the public about our animals:

- Refer to the animal by using his/her name
- Keep any comments about the animal simple and positive
- Offer any information you may have on the animal
- Allow the client to spend ample time with the animal
- If you are not familiar with the standards of a breed, DO NOT engage in conversation about a breed, its traits, personality or temperament
- When talking about a mixed breed, it is difficult to determine size or temperament. If we make a guess or blanket statements, we risk giving only partial information, or worse, wrong information. To be fair, it is best if we concentrate on the specific traits of each individual animal.
- DO NOT play on people's emotions and try to encourage an adoption
- DO NOT take dogs into the cat room. The cats are already under an incredible amount of stress.
- NEVER adopt an animal just to get it out of PACC! We owe these animals a chance for a better life.

Remember:

Be as patient with these animals and understand, between shelter life, adoption day events, and whatever happened before they came to the shelter, these animals are under an incredible amount of stress and confusion and need a lot of love. Think about how you would act or feel if you lived in a closet every day for over 23 hours a day without knowing whether you would ever get out. It just goes to show how truly remarkable, resilient, and patient these animals are so please do all you can to give them the chance they deserve.

Written by Justin Gallick and Ellie Beaubien. Revised 2013

Special thanks to the dedicated volunteers who helped with the development of this manual; Nancy Young-Wright; Cathy Neuman; Anne Watson; Wesley Csop; Judy Christenson and Amber Parker

PURPOSE

To provide a policy of processing adoptions.

OBJECTIVE

To ensure that all employees and volunteers are uniformly processing adoptions using the same process and guidelines.

PROCEDURE

1. In order to participate in the adoption process, attendance in an Adoptions Concepts Workshop is required.
2. **Every potential adopter must fill out the Adopter Survey prior to visiting an animal.** (If a customer is not interested in adopting and only wants to visit our pets, please provide the customer with a Volunteer Open House schedule)
3. Once the Adopter Survey has been completed and reviewed by the Adoption counselor, they may begin the selection process. This is the time to use “Verbal Volley” (see; Manual for Adoption Counselors) to engage the customer in conversation.
4. After finding out the basics from the adopter, we direct them to choose from animals that have a red letter A or SNA on the card. If neither an A nor SNA are on the cards, then we may refer the client to the licensing lobby for “RESERVATION” options or ask a shelter supervisor for the animal’s status.
5. Once the potential adopter has selected an animal, it is the responsibility of the adoption counselor to check and do the following things before escorting the potential adopter, and animal, to the meet-&-greet areas.
 - A. Ensure the kennel number on the card and the kennel are the same.
 - B. Ensure the animal is actually available indicated by the red letter A or SNA
 - C. Remove the top portion of the card (this stays with the animal at all times) and leave the bottom portion on the kennel.
 - D. Place an “I’m visiting” card on the animal’s kennel.

6. Escort the potential adopter and the animal to the appropriate visiting area. (Puppies under 4 months of age may only be placed in the green pen, located on the north wall of the inside adoption area). Once secured in the area, make sure that the potential adopter and the animal are comfortable, answer any questions, and inform them that someone will be back to check on them shortly. Also, never allow customers to walk/carry any animals to or from the kennel. This includes walking personal pets through our adoption areas.

I. After 5-10 minutes, check on the potential adopter.

II. If they have decided that they do not wish to adopt the animal they had selected, we should follow up with additional verbal volley to determine if there are other animals they may be interested in visiting with. If they do not wish to see other animals that day, provide them with informational brochures.

III. If they have decided to adopt the animal, follow the next steps.

- If the card has a “SNA” written on it, place the animal back in the kennel and escort the adopter to the resource room.
- If the card has an A on it, simply verify that the animal has a microchip by scanning the animal. The microchip scanners should be accessible and kept on the adoption desks.
- If the animal has a microchip, place the animal back in its kennel and complete the Survey with the adopter. Ensure both the top half and the bottom half of the kennel card have the microchip sticker in place. Notate on the bottom half of the kennel card that the animal has been adopted, along with your initials and the date, and place it back on the animal’s kennel. Document the adoption on the Adoption Report. (Note, if there are many animals that look alike in the same kennel, place a band around the adopted animal’s neck with the animal ID number and an adopted notation to avoid confusion.)
- Send the potential adopter to the licensing lobby, with their Adopters Survey, the animal’s top half of the kennel card and the microchip packet.
- If the animal does not have a microchip, find a staff member or volunteer to implant the microchip. Scan the animal to verify that the microchip was implanted properly. Place one of the microchip stickers on the top and bottom of the animal’s kennel card.
- Place the animal back in its kennel and follow the remaining instructions in item C above.

1. Adopters must present a valid photo identification
2. Adopters must be over the age of 18 years
3. If the prospective adopter indicates that the animal will be a gift, a counselor must first offer the person a gift certificate. Gift adoptions are permissible, but never recommended.
4. If a prospective adopter is turned down for any reason, no one that was with him/her at that time will be allowed to adopt on the same day.
5. No person who is suspected of being under the influence of alcohol or drugs can adopt. Please see a supervisor, manager or coordinator if this situation arises.
6. No animal will be adopted to any person who states he/she will chain or tie the animal up for any length of time. Please find a supervisor, coordinator or manager if this situation arises.
7. Any prospective adopter wishing to adopt an “outside-only” dog must have adequate shelter for the animal. They must adopt an animal that is over the age of one (1) year, already spayed/neutered, have recovered from surgery, and used to the outdoor lifestyle.
8. PACC does not adopt out outdoor only cats.
9. De-clawed cats must be kept indoors at all times.
10. If the prospective adopter indicates that he/she will de-claw the cat after adoption, he/she may only adopt a cat that is under the age of 1 year.
11. If a prospective adopter indicates that a dog has died from the parvo virus or a cat has died from panleukopenia, adopters must wait no less than six (6) months before adopting.
12. The public is not allowed to walk dogs (either ours or theirs) in adoption areas.
13. PACC reserves the right to conduct premises inspections before, and after, the adoption of an animal.
14. The Pima Animal Care Center reserves the right to deny any person that does not meet these specified guidelines.
15. If at any time a volunteer is uncomfortable with a client; that client shall be referred to a staff member. Only PACC staff may deny an adoption to a client.

PACC Cat Adopter Survey



First name _____ Last name _____

Date _____

Address _____ City _____

State _____ Zip _____

Home phone _____ Work phone _____

email _____


1. I have lived with cats before Yes No Currently
2. I currently own; Dogs Cats Other How many? _____ Breed/species _____ Male/Female
3. I would consider my household to be like; A Library Middle of the road A carnival
4. I am comfortable with a cat that likes to play "chase my ankles" and similar games; Yes No
5. My cat needs to be able to adjust to new situations quickly; Not important Somewhat Yes
(understand that typical adjustment period is 3-4 months)
6. My cat needs to be good with children under the age of 10 years; Yes No
7. I want my cat to be de-clawed; Yes No
8. My cat will be; Inside Inside and Outside Outside
9. I want my cat to be active; Yes No
10. I am financially capable and prepared to provide medical treatment when/if needed; Yes No
11. I am willing to consider a Special Needs cat; Yes No

PACC staff only: A D Explain _____ Initials _____

Approved for: Any Indoor/Outdoor Good with children Other Guidelines

Comments _____

PACC Dog Adopter Survey



First name _____ Last name _____

Date _____

Address _____ City _____

State _____ Zip _____

Home phone _____ Work phone _____

email _____

1. I have owned a dog before; Yes No I currently own dogs
2. I currently own; Dogs Cats Other How many? _____ Breed? _____ Gender? _____
3. My dog needs to be good with children under the age of 10 years; Yes No
4. My dog will be; Inside Outside Both Fence type? _____ Height? _____ dog door Y N
5. When I am not home, my dog will spend time; outside in the garage in a crate in the house
6. I want a guard dog; Yes No If 'yes', please explain _____
7. I want a dog to hunt or herd with me; Yes No
8. I want my dog to be the type that is very enthusiastic in the way he/she shows he/she loves people;
 Not at all Somewhat Very
9. I would like my dog to be like; a marathon runner a brisk walker, 1-2 times a week a couch potato
10. I am comfortable doing some training with my dog to prevent destructive behavior, jumping, stealing food, pulling leash;
 No training Some training A lot of training
11. I am willing to consider a special needs dog; Yes No
12. I am financially capable and prepared to provide medical treatment when/if needed; Yes No

PACC Staff only A D explain _____ Initials _____

Approved for Any Outdoor only Good with children under 10 Good with cats Other dogs Other guidelines

Dog intro needed? (circle one) Y / N Pass Fail PACC dog AID _____ Resident dog

Comments; _____

The PACC Advisory Committee strongly urges the Board of Health and Board of Supervisors to support PACC'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 6 communities reviewed at 9200 Square Miles. The largest in size is Maricopa County at 9224 square miles. Pima County only has 25 field officers to serve this large area, compared to the 30 Field Officers in Maricopa County. The Pima County Field Officers responded to 29,079 calls with the 25 Field Officers, while the Maricopa County 30 Field Officers respond to only 21,368 calls.

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

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

At this time the citizens of Pima county are considering a 22 million dollar Bond to rebuild the Pima Animal Care Center. Unfortunately many people in the county do not understand how hard the staff at PACC work. Unless they come to the Center, they do not see the hard working staff who are trying to save and rehabilitate as many animals as possible, to then adopt them into good homes. The most publicly visible representatives of Pima County's efforts on the behalf of pets are the Field Officers on the street. These officers often times come to community events to educate the public on the services that PACC provides for the county, in addition to all the other service calls they make. But with only 25 Officers available, dispatch must tell many callers that they will have to wait, or that the officer cannot attend the issue at this time, but will come as soon as possible. Our Field Officers would be able to better serve the community, and demonstrate to the public the progress that Pima County has made with regard to animal welfare, if there were more of them. As it is now, our Officers are spread too thin and stretched to the breaking point. They need help and we urge you to approve the funds for the four extra officers we need.

**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 7

A14-143538

K14-156507 A473734 DOG HYPER CANE CORSO/
 3/14/14 QUARANTINE EXPOSURE AGGRESSIVE Activity:A14-143538 **D070**
 Kennel Comment: no bite/ NO CHIP
 HOLD FOR DD ASSESSMENT 1911
 Hold for wildlife exposure. 1942

R

09/10/2014 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 9/10/14 13:52
 9-10-14

This dog was declared dangerous for attacking and killing live stock and also was quarantined for 180 days at PACC for having contact and possibly killing a Javalina , the quarantine release date was 9-9-14. The investigator in charge of the dangerous dog case has made numerous attempts to contact the owners to close the investigation and the owner has been avoiding the Investigator. I have attempted to make contact with the owner all day today with no return calls. I left a messages indicating the dog is released from quarantine and can be redeemed, but before releasing him it would need to be altered, microchipped and tatoood. I also stated they have until tomorrow 9-11-14 before 7pm to make contact with me or a field supervisor to dicuss the dangerous dog issues and if they neglect to make contact after 7pm tomorrow the dog will become the property of PACC and the dog will be euthanized .

J. Chavez
 05/12/2014 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 5/12/14 16:56
 4-1-14 Dog Hyper under wildlife exposure quarantine (QRD 9-9-14). Cannot be released to owner as no proof of rabies vaccination per 1911 Tenkate and 1999 Dr . Lilley. 1942 Eckelbarger

A14-153974

K14-171227 A494626 CAT DOMESTIC SH/
 9/9/14 CONFISCATE EVICTION NORMAL Activity:A14-153974 **IGR15**
 Kennel Comment: 3c3c3c3c3c3c3c3c

R

09/11/2014 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 9/11/14 12:39
 9-11-14

Cite owner if redeemed for neglect. #2057

The animal will be released from the enforcement hold on the release date 9-16-14 after 1900hrs.

J. Chavez

A14-155173

K14-170725 A493965 DOG PIT BULL/MIX
 9/4/14 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A14-155173 **D102**
 Kennel Comment: no chip. 2021rt
 3C 3C 3C 3C 3C 3C

R

09/10/2014 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 9/10/14 15:41
 9-10-14

The dog will be released from enforcement hold on the release date 9- 11-14.

J. Chavez

A14-155372

9/12/14 8:37

HOLD TYPE VETNumber on Hold **4****A14-154339**

K14-169747 **A379716** **DOG** **CAIRO** **PIT BULL/MIX**
 8/22/14 **CONFISCATE CRUELTY** **UNDRAGE/WT** **Activity:A14-154339**
 Kennel Comment: 3c 3c 3c-left notice p348857

D045

vet hold when enforcement hold is removed.00

09/01/2014

nkonst 9/1/14 7:44

09/01/14 This kennel card came to enforcement for review. I can not find any record of a vet examination.
 Officer stated TPD was looking into charges. I sent email to 1999 in reference to dog being on to do list. I
 changed review date to 09/03/14.....2oo2

09/04/2014 **VET**

ASANCHEZ 9/4/14 16:19

Vet Hold for AWI reassessment. on meds for 14 days.00

A14-155402

K14-171018 **A494329** **DOG** **SUGAR** **TERRIER/MALTESE**
 9/7/14 **STRAY** **FIELD OWN** **INJ MINOR** **Activity:A14-155402**

Kennel Comment: no bite/ no chip
 180 day quarantine...2oo2
 Poss. Owner at 520-444-5174

CLINIC**NO ACTIVITY NUMBER RECORDED**

K14-170927 **A494237** **DOG** **COFFEE CRISP** **PIT BULL/MIX**
 9/6/14 **STRAY** **OTC** **NORMAL** **Activity:**

Kennel Comment: **NO BITE**
 NO CHIP

D084

K14-170956 **A305214** **DOG** **PEPPER** **AM PIT BULL TER/MIX**
 9/7/14 **EUTH REQ** **OTC OWNED** **ILL SEVERE** **Activity:**

Kennel Comment: no bite, no chip
 Also A305214

CLINIC



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

MEMORANDUM


TO: Kristin Barney and Kim Janes
FROM: Kelli Saline 1918
DATE: 08.21.2014
SUBJECT: Welfare report for August 2014

-
1. A14-152766 One animal was impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner. Cited at Pima Animal Care. The animal owner did not redeem the dog and it has been adopted.
 2. A14-153170 Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. One animal was relinquished to Pima Animal Care for euthanasia. The animal was euthanized due to the severity of it's illness.
 3. A14-151724 No animals were impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited. The animal owner was found to be in compliance on the recheck.
 4. A14-152419 Seven animals were impounded. One animal died in transit to Pima Animal Care. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited. This complaint is still open pending a recheck.
 5. A14-152536 No animals were impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. This complaint is closed.
 6. A14-152418 No animals were impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited. This complaint is closed.
 7. A14-153317 Three animals impounded with three separate owners. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at PACC. That animal was redeemed. The other two animals have been adopted.
 8. A14-154493 No animals were impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and caretaker and cited. This complaint is closed.
 9. A14-154558 One dog was impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited. The dog was returned to the owner. This complaint is closed.

WC 1

INVESTIGATION REPORT		SUSPECT				ACO NAME / BADGE #		COMPLAINT NUMBER			
Pima County Health Department Pima Animal Care Center 4000 N. Silverbell Rd. Tucson, Arizona 85714 Phone: (520) 243-5600 Fax: (520) 243-5600 www.pimaanimalcare.org		SUSPECT Quiana				M. Fish #1995		A14-152766			
		SUSPECT'S ADDRESS				BITE <input type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>		CODE IF OTHER :			
		ZIP	CITY	STATE	RESIDENTIAL PHONE NUMBER		CI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CO <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>				
		SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS				DRIVERS LICENSE					
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			
						7-13-14 / 09:48		7-31-14 / 10:19			
		FOG <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 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.		Officer Chris Meek #2015				N/A		N/A			
<input type="checkbox"/> REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B) and § 8-286 (B)		VICTIM'S ADDRESS				ZIP		CITY STATE			
		N/A				N/A		N/A			
NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)		DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED		RESTITUTION REQUESTED		DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER		OTHER AGENCY CASE #			
		YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input 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 type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION		BITE SEVERITY:		TREATED BY		PHONE NUMBER			
		<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION		PART OF BODY BITTEN:							
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM		VET CLINIC				PHONE NUMBER		OWNER KNOWS OF BITE			
PHONE NUMBER								YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>			
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS		CLINIC'S ADDRESS				QUARANTINE		FRA HEAD#			
						10 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>					
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE		3RD PARTY CITATIONS		CITING ACO		PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS		PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER			
		YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		1995		YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
		CODE/ORD VIOLATED				REVIEWED BY					
		4-3(1) / 4-3(2)(B)				8/1/14 Monst 2002					
		CITATIONS/NUMBERS				BOND					
		73028				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 Mix VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Chad		Tan	M	11m	N/A	None	None	Nrm	
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"/>											
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 #		

WC 1



INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-152766

ACO name & Badge: M. Fish #1995

On July 31st, 2014 at 10:19 hours Officer Meek #2015 responded to an emergency welfare complaint at _____ regarding a dog in a wire crate with no access to water or shelter. Officer Meek knocked on the front door but received no answer. On the East side of the residence Officer Meek observed a Tan Pit mix in a wire crate with no shelter and in direct sunlight. Officer Meek entered the yard and when he got to the crate he found that the dog also had no access to water. According to Officer Meek there was a small amount of dry dog food on the ground in and around the wire crate. The crate had nothing under it keeping it up off the ground. Officer Meek stated that he did observe a pan inside of the crate with the dog, however, it was empty. Officer Meek photographed the dog, the crate, and the area surrounding the crate. He then impounded the dog for transport to Pima Animal Care Center. Officer Meek requested that if the owner came in to Pima Animal Care Center to claim their dog that they be issued citations for Neglect-No water and cruelty.

On 7-31-14 at approximately 18:30 hours I, Officer M. Fish #1995, met with the dog owner, Quiana _____ when she came in to Pima Animal Care Center to claim her dog, Chad. I explained to Mrs. _____ why Officer Meek had impounded her dog and I issued her the citations for Neglect-No Water and Cruelty as Officer Meek had requested. I filled out a premises inspection form and noted that Chad did not have access to shelter or water. I explained to Mrs. _____ that an officer would be coming out on or after August 2nd, 2014 to meet with her and make sure that Chad had access shelter and water.

Officer's Signature:


Handwritten signature of Marcus Fish in cursive script.

Date: 8/01/14

WC 2

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Pima County Health Department
 Pima Animal Care Center
 4000 N. Silverbell Rd
 Tucson, AZ 85714
 Phone: (520) 243-5992
 Fax: (520) 243-5990
 www.pimaanimalcare.org



SUSPECT Alfredo		ACO NAME / BADGE # 1942 Eckelbarger		COMPLAINT NUMBER A14-153170	
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS		BITE <input type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>		CODE IF OTHER :	
ZIP	CITY	STATE	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER		
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS		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	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 8-6-14 / 0906	
				DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 8-6-14 / 0920	
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 1942 Eckelbarger		D.O.B	
<input type="checkbox"/> I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.		RESIDENCE PHONE NO.		BUSINESS PHONE NO. 243-5992	
<input type="checkbox"/> REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B) and § 8-286 (B)		VICTIM'S ADDRESS		ZIP	
NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)		VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS 4000 N. Silverbell Rd		CITY STATE Tucson AZ	
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:	
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM		<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION		PART OF BODY BITTEN:	
PHONE NUMBER		VET CLINIC		PHONE NUMBER	
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS		CLINIC'S ADDRESS		OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	
				DATE QUARANTINED	
				PACC <input type="checkbox"/> VET <input type="checkbox"/> HOME <input type="checkbox"/>	
				RELEASE DATE:	
				FTQ <input type="checkbox"/> UTQ <input type="checkbox"/>	
		3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		CITING ACO 1942 Eckelbarger	
		QUARANTINE 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>		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 4-3 (2)(D)		REVIEWED BY E-7-14 Konst 2002	
		CITATIONS/NUMBERS 73014 (A)		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#					
G. Shep/G. Ret mix		Daisy		Red	
VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		F		4mo	
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 #	

WC 2



INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-153170

ACO name & Badge: 1942 Eckelbarger

On 8-6-14 at 0925 hours, I Investigator Eckelbarger (1942) responded to where I met with dog owner, Alfredo (DOB who had his dog "Daisy" in his arms. Mr. stated Daisy is a 3-4 month old Golden Retriever mix puppy. He stated he's had Daisy for about 3-4 months and stated that someone gave him the dog. The dog appeared to be dying and was very limp. The dog could barely hold her head up and was emaciated. I could easily see her hip, rib, and spine bones on her body. Her eyes were also covered in yellow discharge and were crusted. Daisy could not walk at all and was just lying on her side. I took photographs of Daisy while Mr. was holding her and after he put the dog in my truck. Mr. stated that he first noticed the dog getting sick about 2 weeks ago. He stated he had no money to take Daisy to the veterinarian for treatment and had no vehicle to transport the dog either.

Mr. then relinquished ownership of Daisy to the Pima Animal Care Center by signing a release of ownership form. I then cited Mr. for neglect-vet care. Mr. signed and received his copy of the citation. Daisy had access to a dog house, water, and food but Mr. stated she was not eating or drinking.

I contacted the Pima Animal Care Center dispatch who advised me they had received the anonymous complaint from a woman who walked by the address and noted that the dog appeared to be dying, crying, and could not get up.

I then setup for Daisy to be examined by Dr. Lilley at the Pima Animal Care Center. After the examination and subsequent euthanasia, the dog was transported to the Arizona Diagnostic Lab for necropsy.


Officer's Signature:

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a large, stylized loop and a horizontal line extending to the right. Below the signature, the number "1942" is written in a simple, blocky font.

Date: 8-7-14

WC 3

INVESTIGATION REPORT		SUSPECT Alvina				ACC NAME / BADGE # S.Adkins 1961		ACTIVITY/BITE NUMBER A14-151724		
Pima County Health Department Pima Animal Care Center 4000 N Silverbell Rd Tucson, AZ 85745 Phone: (520) 243-5900 Fax: (520) 243-5960 www.pimaanimalcare.org		CITY STATE ZIP RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER				BITE <input type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/>		OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>		
CITY STATE ZIP BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER		SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS				CI <input type="checkbox"/> CO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>		DRIVERS LICENSE		
SEX	WEIGHT	HEIGHT	EYES	HAIR	ORIGIN	DOB	SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER			
DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		LOCATION OF INCIDENT 5061 N Myakka Ave				DATE AND TIME OF INCIDENT 8-17-14/16:30		DATE AND TIME REPORTED 7-16-14/01:27		
FOOD <input type="checkbox"/> WATER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SHELTER <input type="checkbox"/> VENTILATION <input type="checkbox"/> ABANDONED <input type="checkbox"/> TIED OUT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BEATEN <input type="checkbox"/> WASTE <input type="checkbox"/> INJ/ILL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OTHER (EXPLAIN) <input type="checkbox"/>		VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME S.Adkins				DATE OF BIRTH		RESIDENCE PHONE		BUSINESS PHONE
<input type="checkbox"/> I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case		VICTIM'S ADDRESS				CITY		STATE	ZIP	
<input type="checkbox"/> I WAVE "upon request" rights in this case.		VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS 4000 N Silverbell Rd				CITY Tucson		STATE Az	ZIP 85745	
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"/> SHERIFF DEPT <input type="checkbox"/> TUCSON POLICE <input type="checkbox"/> FIRE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:			FOLLOW UP REQUEST <input type="checkbox"/> SD <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"/>	VET <input type="checkbox"/>	
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM		<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION	PART OF BODY BITTEN:		OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	RELEASE DATE:	FTD <input type="checkbox"/>	UTD <input type="checkbox"/>		
PHONE NUMBER		VET CLINIC				PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE			
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS		CLINIC'S ADDRESS				QUARANTINE (DAYS) 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/> FRA HEAD#		
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE		3 rd PARTY CITATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CITING ACC S.Adkins 1961		PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS			
CODE/ORD VIOLATED		6.04.110(B)(5)tie out,6.04.110(B)(2)no water,6.04.070 no license							REVIEWED BY	
CITATIONS/NUMBERS		69725 A-E							BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	
BREED/DESCRIPTION		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	LICENSE #	CONDITION	ANIMAL ID#		
Pit Bull mix	VICTIM OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tigre	brindle/white	M	3 yr	Cited	poor			
Pit Bull mix	VICTIM OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Chulo	black/white	M	2 yr	Cited	poor			
	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 #			



INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-151724

ACO Name & Badge: S.Adkins 1961

08/17/14 16:29 I, Officer Adkins 1961 arrived at _____ to do welfare check on 3 dogs per Pima County Sheriffs Department; for a dog on tie out and another needing vet care. I entered the yard and observed a thin black and white male pit bull mix come out from under the trailer, and a thin brindle/white male pit mix on a chain which was about 5 feet long and secured to a cylinder block. The hips and ribs were visible on both dogs. Before I could knock on the door, Alvina _____ came out of the trailer. I explained the reason for my visit. I asked why the brindle pit bull named Tigre was on a tie out and Ms _____ stated because the dog jumps the fence. I then explained it was illegal to tie out a dog no matter what the reason.

Tigre had no water available and the black and white pit bull named Chulo had access to a 5 gallon bucket of water that was dirty and had Oleander plants in it which I explained to Ms _____ is toxic to dogs and makes the water impotable.

I then asked if the dogs were current on licensing and rabies vaccine and Ms _____ stated the dogs belong to her sister who does not reside at this address and she is just taking care of them for her she would not give her sister's name, phone number, or address. Ms _____ confirmed she has been caring for the dogs for a couple of months now.

I then asked for Ms _____ identification in which she gave me her Arizona Drivers license. I issued citation 69725 A-E for No license on both dogs, no water on both dogs, and dog on tie out on Tigre. Ms _____ signed and received a copy of the citation with the court date, time, and location and I returned her identification to her.

Officer's Signature:

Date:

8-21-14

WC 4


INVESTIGATION REPORT

Pima County Health Department
 Pima Animal Care Center
 4000 N. Silverbell Road
 Tucson, AZ 85745
 Phone: (520) 243-5500
 Fax: (520) 243-5500
 www.pimaanimalcare.org



SUSPECT Taira		ACO NAME / BADGE # Windauer #1984		COMPLAINT NUMBER A14-152419	
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS 		BITE <input type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>		CODE IF OTHER:	
ZIP	CITY	STATE	RESIDENTIAL PHONE NUMBER		
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS 		CI <input type="checkbox"/> CO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>		DRIVERS LICENSE	
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 <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		LOCATION OF INCIDENT		DATE AND TIME REPORTED 7/28/14 / 1607	
				DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 7/28/14 / 1746	
		FOOD <input type="checkbox"/> WATER <input checked="" 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. Windauer		D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.
<input type="checkbox"/> I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.		VICTIM'S ADDRESS		ZIP	CITY
<input type="checkbox"/> REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B) and § 8-286 (B)		VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS 4000 N. Silverbell Road		ZIP 85745	CITY Tucson
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		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 Windauer	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER
CODE/ORD VIOLATED 6.04.110(B)(2)		CITATIONS/NUMBERS 77268 A-B		OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS	
				REVIEWED BY B-4-14 Kunst 2002	
				BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE
Rottweiler VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Zach	bk/bn	M	1.5
Rottweiler VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Missy	bk/bn	F	1.5
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 #
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 #

WC 4



INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-152419

ACO Name & Badge: Windauer #1984

On July 26, 2014 at approximately 1654 hours I, Officer Windauer #1984 arrived at _____ on a complaint involving a black kitten that appeared badly injured by dogs inside a kennel run. I was pointed to the lot involved and told the kennel was at the rear of the trailer.

I saw the kennel run and was greeted by a tan chihuahua/dachshund running at large but very friendly. Inside the kennel run I saw two adult rottweilers. At the northside of the run, almost outside of the pen, I saw a small black furry kitten? I took a second look and saw several of these little black animals and realized they were newborn puppies belonging to the female dog inside the run. The puppy on the outer edge appeared overheated and I moved it into the shade and tried to cool it with water.

I then checked the larger dogs and saw that the two pans provided for water only had a layer of moist dirt/mud at the bottom and the dogs tongues were hanging out. I saw the kennel run was of adequate size and had several metal panels to provide shade on top and side. Also a camouflage net was installed for more shade. I saw no shelter inside the kennel run. The entire floor area was dirt with several deep holes dug by dogs. I removed the rest of pups through the hole where the one pup had started through. There were a total of 5 puppies with some still having the umbilical cord/sac still attached.

I then impounded the two rottweilers and the chihuahua/dachshund. I checked on the puppy and saw its breathing was very deep and irregular. I took pictures and posted doorknocker on the front door. I drove down the road a little ways and finished my memo and saw the puppy had died.

On August 1, 2014 at approximately 1400 hours, I met with the dog owner, Taira _____ at the Pima Animal Care Center. I advised of what I had seen and what needed correcting for her dogs. I filled out premise inspection recheck for a larger/secured water container and shelter for the dogs. Ms.

_____ accepted citations for the two rottweilers not having water. I was told the female and her pups would be inside until shelter was complete. The two males would be at PACC till Monday to get neutered.

Officer's Signature:

Handwritten signature of Officer Windauer.

Date:

Handwritten date 8/2/14.

WC 5

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Pima County Health Department
 Pima Animal Care Center
 4000 N. Silverbell Rd
 Tucson, Arizona 85714
 Phone: (520) 243-5900
 Fax: (520) 243-5900
 www.pimaanimalcare.org



SUSPECT DULCE				ACO NAME / BADGE # K. WALTON #1925		COMPLAINT NUMBER A14-152536	
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS							
710		CITY		STATE		RESIDENTIAL PHONE NUMBER	
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS						BITE <input type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>	
ZIP						CODE IF OTHER: LL	
CITY		STATE		BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER		CI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CO <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>	
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS				DRIVERS LICENSE			
SFX	WEIGHT	HEIGHT	EYES	HAIR COLOR	ORIGIN	DOB	SSN

DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>				DATE AND TIME REPORTED 7-28-14 / 1302		DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 8-4-14 / 1930	
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> LL	

<input type="checkbox"/> I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case				VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME OFFICER K. WALTON #1925		D.O.B		RESIDENCE PHONE NO.		BUSINESS PHONE NO. 520-243-5900			
<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 4000 N. SILVERBELL RD				ZIP 85745		CITY TUCSON		STATE AZ	
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:	

<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:		OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		RELEASE DATE:		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"/>		<input type="checkbox"/> FRA HEAD#					
3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				CITING ACO 1925				PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER		OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS			

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE				CODE/ORD VIOLATED 4-3(Z)(E)(Z), 4-3(Z)(C), 4-81, 4-76				CITATIONS/NUMBERS 731176 731177		REVIEWED BY 2002 KORST 8/5/14			
										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 type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	BUGIE	TRI	M	5Y		CITED	CITED	N	
HUSKY VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	JASPER	RED/WHT	M	2Y		CITED	CITED	N	
HUSKY MIX VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	BOLT	BLK/BRN	M	1.6		CITED	CITED	N	
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 #

WC 5



INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: K.WALTON

ACO name & Badge: #1925

On August 4th 2014 at 1930 hours, I, Officer K.Walton #1925, arrived on scene at _____ in reference to a Beagle on a tie out and 2 Huskies running at large. Upon arrival I observed a tricolor Beagle on a tangled tie out, that was approximately 1 ft long and tied to a tree. The dog had no access to shelter, and the water container that was next to the dog had green algae inside of it. I observed a black/brown Husky mix loose in the yard, with no access to shelter and shared the same water. Behind the Trailer was a red/white Husky that was blocked off from the front area, with no shelter and not much exercise room to run. The water container also had green algae inside of it. I took photos of the dogs and premises, however the photo of one of the dogs did not turn out.

I met with owner Dulce _____ regarding the dogs, and I advised her of the complaint. She had her young daughter help with translation when needed. I was told Ms. _____ ties the dog out when they leave, and that the other 2 dogs get out. I advised her of the welfare requirements, and told her that the water, shelter, and confinement, were not adequate. I advised her that tie outs were illegal and that she needed to remove the dog off the tie out. I inquired about the vaccinations and license, and she informed me the red/white Husky known as Jasper was given to her and she never changed ownership into her name, but she did have his paperwork. The Beagle known as Bugie and the Husky mix known as Bolt also had paperwork. I observed the paperwork and all vaccinations were expired.

I issued her citations for neglect tie out, no shelter, no license and no rabies vaccination for the Beagle. I issued citations for no shelter, no license and rabies vaccinations for the Huskies. She signed the citations, and was given her copies.

Officer's Signature: *K. Walton*

Date: *8.5.14*

WC 6

INVESTIGATION REPORT

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

SUSPECT RODERICK		ACO NAME / BADGE # J RADEMAKER	COMPLAINT NUMBER A14-152418
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS		BITE <input type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input checked="" 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 REFUSED

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 07/28/14 / 0900	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 07/29/14 / 1605
FOOD WATER SHELTER INJURED/ILL VENTILATION		ABANDONED	TIEOUT
<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		BEATEN	WASTE
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OTHER (EXPLAIN) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EXERCISE SPACE			

<input type="checkbox"/> I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case	VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME OFFICER J RADEMAKER 2019	D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	BUSINESS PHONE NO. 243-5900
<input type="checkbox"/> I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.	VICTIM'S ADDRESS PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER	ZIP	CITY	STATE
<input type="checkbox"/> REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 17-405 (B) and § 17-206 (D)	VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS 4000 N SILVERBELL RD	ZIP 85745	CITY TUCSON	STATE AZ

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:
---	--	---	-----------------------	---	--

<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 RD 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
--	------------	---	----------------------	--------------------------

ICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE	CODE/TWO VIOLATED 4-3(2)(B); 4-3(2)(C); 4-3(2)(E); 4-81	REVIEWED BY 7-31-14 KONST # 2002
	CITATIONS/NUMBERS 73060A-0; 73061A-0	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 #	COMB	ANIMAL ID#
ITBULL VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	LADY	TW	F	9M		CITED	CURRENT	N	
ITBULL VICTIM OWNER <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	APOLLO	GW	F	5M		CITED	CURRENT	N	
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 #

WC 6



INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-152418

ACO name & Badge: J RADEMAKER 2019

On July 26, 2014 at 01:42PM Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) dispatch received an anonymous complaint that there were 2 dogs in a crate on the patio at [redacted]. The caller stated that there was little shade on the patio and that the caller was not able to see if water was present for the dogs.

On July 29, 2014 at 3:05PM I, Officer Rademaker 2019, went to [redacted] and saw 2 pitbull dogs, a tan and white adult and a gray and white puppy, confined on the second floor south facing patio in a single wire training crate. I could not see if water was present. There were empty bowls on the patio that the dogs did not have access to because of the confinement in the crate. The portion of the patio that the crate was in was in shade but would have been in sun earlier. I could see that the dogs were cramped in and were on top of each other with inadequate shelter and lack of exercise space. No one was home so I posted a notice and a highlighted law brochure.

I went to the office and the staff would not give me the tenant information. They said they would call the tenant and I said to tell them I would return after 06:00PM.

On July 29, 2014 at 6:25PM I returned to [redacted] and met with the dog's owner Roderick [redacted] Mr. [redacted] is active duty [redacted] in the Civil Engineering Squadron. He said he has been at the [redacted] address for 2 weeks, having moved from the Lakeside Casitas on Golf Links. He said he has been resident in Tucson since August 2012. He still has a Texas drivers license.

Mr. [redacted] says his 2 dogs are 9 month old tan/white female pitbull Lady which he has owned since December 2013 and 5 month old gray/white male pitbull Apollo which he has owned since April 2014. He had documentation that both dogs have received their initial 1 year rabies vaccinations. He said neither dog is licensed. He said that he was told by the Humane Society that if the dogs have their rabies vaccinations they do not need to be licensed.

WC 6

I informed Mr. that I had seen both dogs confined in the small wire training crate on the patio and that was a violation of the law. I asked why they were confined like that with no water and he said that that was his dog trainers idea. He said the trainer said the dogs should have food and water only in the morning and then later in the day. He said that the dogs were on the patio, in the small training crate with no access to water, for at least 5 hours.

I told Mr. what adequate shelter was and that dogs must have access to clean water at all times. I explained that the crate was much too small for 2 dogs, and not shelter, and he argued that they could both stand and move. I told him that they were on top of each other. I issued him citations both dogs for no license, neglect no water, neglect no shelter and neglect no exercise space. I explained the citations, court and compliance and he said he understood.

Officer's Signature:


2019

Date:

7/30/14

WC 7

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Pima County Health Department
 Pima Animal Care Center
 4000 N Silverbell Rd
 Tucson, Arizona 85712
 Phone: (520) 243-5900
 Fax: (520) 243-5900
 www.pimaanimalcare.org



SUSPECT LEATHA		ACO NAME / BADGE # D.WINDAUER #1984		COMPLAINT NUMBER A14-153317	
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS		BITE <input type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>			
ZIP	CITY	STATE	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER		
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS NA		CODE IF OTHER :			
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER		DRIVERS LICENSE
SEX	WEIGHT	HFRHT	EYES	HAIR COLOR	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 8/8/14 / 2:27PM	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 8/8/14 / 3:00PM
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 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.WINDAUER #1984		D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	BUSINESS PHONE NO. 243-5900
<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 4000 N SILVERBELL RD		ZIP 85745	CITY TUCSON	STATE AZ
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 # 140801179 <input checked="" 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	PHONE NUMBER
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM	<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION	PART OF BODY BITTEN:		DATE QUARANTINED	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"/>	
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 D.TENKATE #1911	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 6.04.110(B)(5)		REVIEWED BY 2002 KONST 8/22/14		
	CITATIONS/NUMBERS 73029		BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL	ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR
PIT BULL MIX	BUDDY	BROWN/WHITE	M	ZY	
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"/>					
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 #

WC 7



INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-153317

ACO name & Badge: D. TENKATE #1911

ON 8/8/14 AT 1500 HOURS OFFICER WINDAUER #1984 ARRIVED AT [REDACTED] IN REFERENCE TO AN ASSIST POLICE CALL. OFFICER WINDAUER WAS TOLD BY A PIMA COUNTY SHERIFF DEPUTY THAT THERE WERE 3 DOGS LOOSE, ON THE PROPERTY THAT CONTAINED MULTIPLE DWELLINGS, AND 1 PIT BULL MIX ON A TIE OUT. SHE WAS ADVISED THAT LEATHA [REDACTED] WAS THE OWNER OF THE PIT BULL MIX THAT WAS TIED OUT. ALL OF THE DOG OWNERS HAD BEEN ARRESTED.

OFFICER WINDAUER ONLY FOUND 2 LOOSE DOGS AND IMPOUNDED THEM. SHE THEN OBSERVED THE MALE PIT BULL MIX THAT WAS TIED TO THE END OF A TRAILER. SHE PHOTOGRAPHED THE TIE OUT AND IMPOUNDED THE DOG. ALL OF THE DOG OWNERS WERE AWARE THAT THEIR DOGS HAD BEEN IMPOUNDED. OFFICER WINDAUER NOTED TO ISSUE A CITATION TO OWNER OF THE PIT BULL MIX, FOR NEGLECT TIE OUT, IF SHE CAME TO REDEEM THE DOG.

ON 8/21/14 1700 HOURS I, SUPERVISOR TENKATE #1911 MET WITH THE DOG OWNER LEATHA [REDACTED] WHEN SHE CAME TO REDEEM HER DOG BUDDY AT THE PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER. SHE PROVIDED ME WITH AN IDENTIFICATION CARD FROM THE STATE OF LOUISIANA. SHE WAS ADVISED NOT TO UTILIZE A TIE OUT AS IT IS ILLEGAL IN PIMA COUNTY. SHE SAID THAT BUDDY IS ONLY ON A TIE OUT TO BE FED AND IS ALWAYS KEPT INSIDE THE HOME. SHE THEN STATED THE POLICE RAIDED THE PROPERTY AND SHE WAS NOT ABLE TO PUT THE DOG BACK INTO THE HOME. MS [REDACTED] SIGNED AND RECEIVED A COPY OF CITATION #73029 FOR NEGLECT TIE OUT. SHE IS AWARE OF HER COURT DATE, TIME AND LOCATION.

Officer's Signature: *Debra Ten Kate*

Date: *8/21/14*

WC 8

INVESTIGATION REPORT

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

SUSPECT Freddy				ACO NAME / BADGE # Bowdon #2013		COMPLAINT NUMBER A14-154493	
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS							
ZIP	CITY	STATE	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER				
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS							
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

LOCATION OF INCIDENT	DATE AND TIME REPORTED 08/25/14 / 12:34	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 08/25/14 / 13:14
FOOD <input type="checkbox"/> WATER <input checked="" 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 PACC Officer Bowdon #2013	D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	BUSINESS PHONE NO. (520) 243-5900
---	-------	---------------------	---

I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.

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

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

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

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)

DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES <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"/>
------------------------------------	----------------	------------	--------------	------------------	-------------------------------

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION	PART OF BODY BITTEN:	RELEASE DATE:	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# <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------	--	------------------------------------


VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CITING ACO Bowdon #2013	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS No
--	-----------------------------------	--	----------------------	---------------------------------------

CODE/ORD VIOLATED 4-81, 4-76, & 4-3(2)(B)	CITATIONS/NUMBERS 72939	REVIEWED BY 2002 KONST 9/1/14	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 Mbx VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kilo	Blue / White	M	3y		cited	cited	N	
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 #



INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-154493

ACO name & Badge: Bowdon #2013

**On 08/25/14 at 12:34 hours Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) received a report of a distressed dog confined to a small cage with no access to water located at
in the City of Tucson.**

On 08/25/14 at approximately 13:14 hours I, PACC Officer Bowdon #2013, arrived at and observed an unconfined black Lab/Chow mix (later identified as Princess) roaming in and out of the property barking aggressively at by passers. Further investigation revealed a blue a white male Pit Bull mix (later identified as Kilo) confined to a wire dog crate on the west side of the property. I observed that Kilo was sheltered from the sun by a board placed on the top of the crate, but he did not have access to water.

I attempted contact with the residents by knocking on the residence door and honking the horn on my vehicle while I was trying to confine Princess. After about 30 minutes I made contact with the resident who identified himself as Freddy and stated he was the owner of Kilo. Mr. expressed his displeasure with my presence and stated that he took good care of his dog. Initially Mr. stated that he had been sleeping and that he had placed Kilo in the crate the previous evening, but he later stated that Kilo had only been in the crate for a short time and that he was closely watching Kilo. Mr. did not have an explanation for the length of time it took for him to respond to my presence. Mr. was very argumentative and provided false information regarding the unconfined black dog by stating that the dog, Princess, was an unknown stray.

I then met with Mr. mother, Geraldine Ms. stated that the black dog, Princess, belongs to her other son, Johnny who was not present. Ms. stated that her sons stay with her on and off as they please. Ms. then stated that although she has told Johnny that he should confine Princess, she has knowingly allowed Johnny to leave Princess at her residence unconfined.

Mr. Freddy accepted citations for Kilo being unlicensed, without current rabies vaccination, and being confined with no access to water. Ms. Geraldine accepted a citation for allowing Princess to violate Leash Law while in

WC 8

her care. I advised them both of their court date, time and location.

Officer's Signature: *J. J. J. #2013* Date: 8/29/14

WC 9

INVESTIGATION REPORT

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



SUSPECT DORA		ACO NAME / BADGE # K. WALTON #1925	COMPLAINT NUMBER A14-154558
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS			
ZIP	CITY	STATE	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS N/A		CI <input type="checkbox"/> CO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>	
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

LOCATION OF INCIDENT	DATE AND TIME REPORTED 8-26-14 / 0815	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 8-26-14 / 0830
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 CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case

VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME OFFICER K.WALTON #1925	D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	BUSINESS PHONE NO. 243-5900
--	-------	---------------------	---------------------------------------

I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.

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

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

VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS 4000 N. SILVERBELL RD	ZIP 85745	CITY TUCSON	STATE AZ
---	---------------------	-----------------------	--------------------

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)

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

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

3 RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CITING ACO # #1925	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER See Report	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS YES
--	------------------------------	--	---	--

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

CODE/DRO VIOLATED 6.04.HD(B)(5), 6.04.HD(B)(3), 6.04.HD(B)(2)	REVIEWED BY 2002 KDNST 9/1
---	--------------------------------------

CITATIONS/NUMBERS 72714	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 VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DIAMOND	BRND/WHT	M	1YR	NA	NA	NA	N	
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 #

WC 9



INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-154558

ACO name & Badge: K.Walton #1925

On August 26th 2014 approximately 0815 hours, I, Officer K.Walton #1925, arrived at _____ in reference a leash law complaint A14-154547. After further investigation, I observed several welfare violations such as tie out, no shelter, and no water for a brindle/white Boxer who was in the back yard.

I attempted to reach the owner, but I received no response at the front door. I took photos of the dog, and of the violations. The dog was on a short tie out underneath a wood awning which had 2 enclosed sides, which I believe would not be considered adequate shelter. The elements such as the sun and the rain, could still reach the dog in this situation. The tie out consisted of a pink leash which was about 3-4 ft long, and not long enough to reach the water containers that were near by. There was a small empty metal bowl on top of the picnic table, which I assumed was for water. The Boxer was then impounded for the violations. There was another dog in the yard as well, a small white/black Lhasa mix. That dog had access to everything needed. I left a notice for both complaints on the front door.

As I was leaving, I stopped and spoke with a neighbor regarding the same dogs and the problems he was having with them. As I looked around, a man was exiting the house where I just impounded the dog from. He came up to the truck with the notice speaking Spanish and little English. I could tell he was complaining about the neighbor I was talking with. He stated his dogs get out and go to certain neighbors, but never to the house where I was at the moment. He stated other neighbors don't have a problem with the dogs getting out. He got his wife on the phone for translation, and I spoke with Dora Ms. _____ argued and with me as I tried to explain the complaints we received. I already had priority calls waiting for me to respond to, so I handed the phone back to her husband since she was being uncooperative. Officer Bowden #2013 had stated to me, that Ms. _____ did the same thing to her the day before.

A few hours later, I was sitting in my truck out of the area writing notes when

WC 9

Ms. came up to my truck to speak with me. For the first 10 minutes or so she wanted to argue, but after talking with her she calmed down and understood what the issues were. She stated the dog was not tied out very long. She took her daughter to school and tied it up until she came back. I advised her I was there at least an hour for both cases, and it was tied up before I got there. She then stated it took her awhile to get back.

I advised her I could release the dog back into her custody if she wanted to receive the citations for tie out, no water, and no shelter. She agreed and the citations were then issued to her, and the dog was released. I advised her to get the confinement fixed. I will be doing follow ups at the residence. 1925

Officer's Signature:

K. Wadsworth

Date:

8-29-14



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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Kim Janes, Chief of External Operations
FROM: Debra Tenkate, Animal Care Field Supervisor 
DATE: August 29, 2014
RE: Dangerous Dog Cases for August 2014

City of Tucson:

1. A14-152996---Cory Bruggeman, dog named Jack was declared vicious by Judge Pollard . Investigator Klein served the declaration and is monitoring compliance.
2. A14-151504---Martha Franco, dog named Blackie was declared not dangerous by Investigator Carver.
3. A14-143184---Samantha Zambrano, dog named Louie was declared vicious by Judge Cranshaw. Investigator Carver served the declaration and is monitoring compliance.
4. A14-149847---Cayce Miners, dog named Willy was declared dangerous by Investigator Carver. Investigator Carver is monitoring compliance.


Sahuarita:

5. A14-152093---Linda Keller, dog named Dude was declared dangerous by Investigator Klein. The dog is residing in Graham County. Graham County animal control has been advised of the declaration of dangerous.

DD#1

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Pima County Health Department
 Pima Animal Care Center
 4006 North Campbell Road
 Tucson, Arizona 85719
 Phone: (520) 243-5960
 Fax: (520) 243-5960
 www.pimaanimalcare.org



SUSPECT Cory Allen Bruggeman		ACO NAME / BADGE # Downing #1923	COMPLAINT NUMBER A14-152996
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS			
ZIP	CITY Tucson	STATE Az.	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER
SUBJECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS None		CI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CO <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>	DRIVERS LICENSE
SEX	WEIGHT	HHEIGHT	FEET
HAIR COLOR	ORIGIN	DOB	SSN

DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	LOCATION OF INCIDENT	DATE AND TIME REPORTED 8-3-14 / 2000	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 8-3-14 / 2000
FOOD <input type="checkbox"/> WATER <input type="checkbox"/> SHELTER <input type="checkbox"/> INJURED/LL <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 Alexandra Mouw	DOB Adult	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	BUSINESS PHONE NO.
<input type="checkbox"/> I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.	VICTIM'S ADDRESS		ZIP	CITY Tuc.
<input type="checkbox"/> REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B) and § 8-286 (B)	VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS		ZIP	STATE

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)	DANGEROUS 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 # <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY: 2	TREATED BY Nexcare	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED 8-3-14	PACC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM	<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION	PART OF BODY BITTEN: Rt. Hand	PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	RELEASE DATE: 8-12-14	VET <input type="checkbox"/>
PHONE NUMBER	VET CLINIC					HOME <input type="checkbox"/>
						FTQ <input type="checkbox"/>
						UTQ <input type="checkbox"/>

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS	CLINIC'S ADDRESS	QUARANTINE 10 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> FRA HEAD#
	3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	CITING ACO Downing #1923	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE	CODE/ORD VIOLATED 4-97 4-7 (2) (B) x2	CITATIONS/NUMBERS 72812 A, B, C	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER
			OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS
			REVIEWED BY 8/7/14 KMST 2002
			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#
German Shep. Mix VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jack	Bik	M	4 Y	L14-166417	Rabvac 3		A343488
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#1



INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14- 152996

ACO name & Badge: Downing #1923

On August 4,2014 at about 1000 hours, I met with the victim, Alexandra Mouw at her residence. She related that on August 3, 2014 at about 2000, she took her dog a blk. Lab mix dog namer Roamer for a walk. When she got in front of , the two dogs from that address cleared the fence and charged toward her dog. The blk. dog a German Shepherd Mix named Jack attacked her dog. While trying to get the dog off her dog she was bitten by Jack on the right hand. The other dog a wht. dog with brown spots named Garret was owned by another person at that location. Alexandra was treated at Nexcare for her bite. The skin was slightly broken. Her dog received treatment at a veterinarian office. He had some punctures on his backside.

Alexandra is requesting restitution and citations . She is also requesting a Dangerous Animal Evaluation.

On August 5,2014 I met with the owner of Jack. Cory Bruggeman claimed ownership of the dog. I explained the complaint and issued citations on behalf of the victim. Submitted are a photo of Jack and the victims injury.

Officer's Signature:

Date: 8.6.14



DD#1

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 # A14-153555
OFFICER # 1926 Klein
DATE: 8-25-14

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 APRIL 7, 2014 CITY OF TUCSON JUDGE POLLARD
ORDERED THE DOG KNOWN AS JACK, BELONGING
TO CORY BRUGGEMAN BE DECLARED VICIOUS.

E. Klein #1926
E. Klein

OWNER: CORY BRUGGEMAN
ADDRESS: _____
PHONE: _____

ANIMAL NAME: JACK
ANIMAL ID#: A 343488
SEX: m COLOR: BLK BREED: SHEP 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.

DD#2

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Pima County Health Department
 Pima Animal Care Center
 4000 N. Silverbell Rd
 Tucson, Arizona 85717
 Phone: (520) 243-5960
 Fax: (520) 243-5960
 www.pimaanimalcare.org



SUSPECT Francisco Molina Urquijo				ACO NAME / BADGE # Klein 1926		COMPLAINT NUMBER A14-151504	
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS							
ZIP	CITY Tucson	STATE Az	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER				
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS Not Given							
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER				
SEX	WEIGHT	HEIGHT	RACE	HAIR COLOR	ORIGIN 1	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 7-13-14 / 1526		DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 7-13-14 / 1516	
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 Osmar Jimenez		DOB		RESIDENCE PHONE NO.		BUSINESS PHONE NO.	
--	--	--	--	---	--	-----	--	---------------------	--	--------------------	--

<input type="checkbox"/> I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.				VICTIM'S ADDRESS				ZIP		CITY Tucson		STATE Az	
--	--	--	--	------------------	--	--	--	-----	--	-----------------------	--	--------------------	--

<input type="checkbox"/> REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B) and § 8-286 (B)				VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS Unknown				ZIP		CITY		STATE	
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	-----	--	------	--	-------	--

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE) Osmar Jimenez				DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER		OTHER AGENCY CASE # <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:	
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	-----------------------	--	--	--	--	--

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION		BITE SEVERITY:		TREATED BY		PHONE NUMBER		DATE QUARANTINED		PACC <input type="checkbox"/>	
---	--	--	--	---	--	----------------	--	------------	--	--------------	--	------------------	--	-------------------------------	--

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM Father				<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION		PART OF BODY BITTEN:		PHONE NUMBER		OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		RELEASE DATE:		FTQ <input type="checkbox"/>	
--------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	----------------------	--	--------------	--	---	--	---------------	--	------------------------------	--

PHONE NUMBER 520-358-7726				VET CLINIC				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#			
----------------------------------	--	--	--	------------	--	--	--	------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	------------------------------------	--	--	--

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS				3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>				CITING ACO Konst 2002				PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>				PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER A13-122201				OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS			
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--------------------------	--	--	--

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE				CODE/DRO VIOLATED 4-97, 4-7(2) (B)				CITATIONS/NUMBERS 6909G A,B,C				REVIEWED BY 7/17/14 KONST 2002				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#
Lab	VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Blackie	Black	M	2y	Exp	198591	Exp	ok	431169
Poodle Mix	VICTIM <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>	Biscuit	wht	M	5Y			Current	ok	
	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 Granados Badge #52784	M <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> F <input 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 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#2



INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-151504

ACO name & Badge: E. Klein, Badge #1926

On July 13, 2014 at 1526 hours the Pima County Animal Care Center (PACC) dispatch department received a call from the Tucson Police Department (TPD) stating they were sending an officer to regarding a dog running loose. It was reported that the victim, Mr. Jimenez stated the loose dog attacked his dog and tried to attack another person. Mr. Jimenez also reported that PACC and TPD have both previously responded to the same address regarding the same dog.

At approximately 1602 hours TPD dispatch called back and stated their officer was on scene and had confined the dog to its own yard at: 3. The yard was not secure and the dog was still able to get out.

On July 13, 2014 at 1610 hours I, Investigator Klein badge #1926 arrived at where I met with TPD Officer Granados Badge # 52784. Officer Granados stated he responded under TPD case number regarding an aggressive dog at large.

Officer Granados stated the black lab in the yard of had ran out of his yard and attacked a white dog and child who reside at space #140. He stated there were no injuries but the yard at is not secure and the black lab could still get out.

I contacted PACC dispatch who stated there is a black lab named Blackie listed at The owner is listed as Martha Franco. Dispatch called Ms Franco and received no answer.

I then went to and found the entry gate open. The fence at the entrance is 3 feet tall. The second part of the fence has chicken wire added to the top making that section approximately 5 feet tall. There is a make shift gate made out of the back rest of a wooden chair dividing this section of the yard from the entrance. I found food and water available. No shelter was provided. I took photographs, impounded the aggressive male black lab and I left a notice of impound on the front door.

DDA 2

I met with Mr. Osmar Jimenez and his daughter . stated she was returning from a walk with her Poodle Mix, Biscuit when the black lab from across the street tried to attack her.

Joseline stated she was standing on her porch removing Biscuits leash when she heard a dog growling from behind her. Joseline turned around and saw the black lab from approaching. The lab charged at Joceline and she began screaming. She said the lab then grabbed Biscuit and started attacking him. Joseline said her parents came out of the house and started helping. Biscuit has one bruise and puncture. Mr. Jimenez will be treating Biscuits injury. I took photographs of Biscuit and the area where the incident occurred.

Mr. Jimenez requested citations be issued for the incident with his dog and his daughter. He stated he has witnessed the same dog charge at another child that lives in the mobile home park and that he has seen PACC several times. He asked if the dog can be evaluated. I explained a dangerous dog assessment and Mr. Jimenez stated he would be willing to testify regarding what he has experienced with the dog. He will get ahold of the other child's parents and will provide their address to PACC. I advised Mr. Jimenez to keep all records and receipts if he determines that Biscuits injury needs treatment from a veterinarian.

On July 14, 2014 at 1520 hours Mrs. Dulce Urquijo called PACC to file a lost report. She stated that her sister ,Martha Franco is the owner of Blackie and she is caring for Blackie while Ms. Franco is on military leave. Mrs. Urquijo was informed of the incident involving Blackie and was told she would need to talk to an enforcement supervisor to make arrangements to redeem Blackie.

On July 14, 2014 at 1900 hours Field Enforcement Supervisor Neil Konst, Badge #2002 met with Mr. Francisco Urquijo and Mrs. Dulce Urquijo at PACC. Francisco Urquijo stated he is the brother of the dog owner. Mr. and Mrs. Urquijo stated they are responsible for Blackie while the owner is gone for 15 days of military service. Supervisor Konst issued citation 69096 to Mr. Urquijo for the violations of leash law, biting animal for the attempted bite on Joseline, and biting animal for the attack on Biscuit. Mr. Urquijo stated he understood the violations and the court appearance. Supervisor Konst then explained the dangerous dog assessment and explained that Blackie will remain at PACC during the assessment.

Officer's Signature:



Date:

7-17-14



DD#2

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: 14-151836
OWNER: MARCHA FRANCO
ANIMAL NAME: BLACKIE

ADDRESS:
SEX: N/A BREED: LABRADOR
COLOR: BIK DATE: 8/20/14

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

SEVERITY OF INJURY TO ANIMALS:

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

Confinement / Fencing:

5 foot WELDED WIRE FENCE WITH GATE OF SAME MATERIAL. REPAIRS WERE MADE & SUPPORT POSTS INSTALLED AFTER THE INCIDENT.

General Comments:

THE DOG BLACKIE IS VERY VOCAL & HAS BEEN SEEN AT LARGE 3 TIMES BY 1 NEIGHBOR NONE OF THE OTHER NEIGHBORS HAVE HAD AN ISSUE. THERE WERE NO INJURIES WITH THIS INCIDENT. THE DOG BLACKIE IS DECLARED NOT DANGEROUS AT THIS TIME. JC

OFFICER # CARVER 1901

TOTAL SCORE: 16


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 8.04.150. The owner has ten (10) days in the City, five (5) days (County & other jurisdictions) as to appeal the declaration of dangerous by filing a request for a dangerous dog hearing, providing the dog has not been declared vicious by a court. The owner may obtain this form at PACC IN PERSON.

DD#3

INVESTIGATION REPORT		SUSPECT Samantha Monique Zambrano				ACO NAME / BADGE # C. Young 1908		ACTIVITY/BITE NUMBER A14-143184	
Pima County Health Department Pima Animal Care Center 4000 N. Campbell Ave. Tucson, AZ 85719 Phone: (520) 243-5900 Fax: (520) 243-5960 www.pimaanimalcare.org		SUSPECT'S ADDRESS				BITE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/>		OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>	
CITY Tucson		STATE AZ	ZIP	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER		CI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CO <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>		DRIVERS LICENSE	
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS		CITY Tucson				STATE AZ	ZIP	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER	
SEX		WEIGHT	HEIGHT	EYES	HAIR	ORIGIN	DOB	SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER Unknown	
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 OF INCIDENT 03/11/2014 @ 08:30		DATE AND TIME REPORTED 03/11/2014 @ 08:30	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case		FOOD <input type="checkbox"/>	WATER <input type="checkbox"/>	SHELTER <input type="checkbox"/>	VENTILATION <input type="checkbox"/>	ABANDONED <input type="checkbox"/>	TIE/UT <input type="checkbox"/>	BEATEN <input type="checkbox"/>	WASTE <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.		VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME Geraldine Anderson				DATE OF BIRTH		RESIDENCE PHONE	
REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B) and § 9-286 (B)		VICTIM'S ADDRESS				CITY Tucson		STATE AZ	ZIP
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"/> SHERIFF DEPT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TUCSON POLICE <input type="checkbox"/> FIRE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:		FOLLOW UP REQUEST <input type="checkbox"/> SD <input type="checkbox"/> TPD <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER:		BUSINESS PHONE
<input type="checkbox"/> ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY: 2		TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED 03/11/14	PACC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	VET <input type="checkbox"/>
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM		<input type="checkbox"/> NON-VIOLATION	PART OF BODY BITTEN: Leg		OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	RELEASE DATE: 03/20/14	FTB <input type="checkbox"/>	UTB <input type="checkbox"/>	
PHONE NUMBER		VET CLINIC				PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE		YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS		CLINIC'S ADDRESS				QUARANTINE (DAYS) 10 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 15 <input type="checkbox"/> 45 <input type="checkbox"/> 180 <input type="checkbox"/>	FRA HEAD#		OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE		3 rd PARTY CITATIONS YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	CITING ACO C. Young 1908	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS			
CODE/DRO VIOLATED		4-7(2)(B), 4-97				REVIEWED BY <i>3/11/14</i> 520 1994			
CITATIONS/NUMBERS		71981A, B				BOND YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
BREED/DESCRIPTION		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	LICENSE #	CONDITION	ANIMAL ID#	
Miniature Schnauzer		Louie	White	M	5Yr	None	Normal	A473345	
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 #	



DD #3

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-143184

ACO Name & Badge: C. Young 1908

On March 11, 2014 at approximately 09:00 hours I met with Tucson Police Officer, Maldonado #53106 and the bite victim, Geraldine Anderson, in the _____, in reference to Ms. Anderson being bitten by a dog that was at large. Officer Maldonado had the dog owner's address and told me that the biting dog has been confined at this time.

I interviewed Ms. Anderson and she explained that she was walking on the sidewalk when she saw two small dogs running loose, one white and one brown. She said the dogs came toward her and the white dog bit her on the leg. The dogs then ran back toward their home where the owner placed them inside. I took a photo of the bite wound and explained her options concerning prosecution and restitution against the dog owner because the biting dog was at large when it bit. Ms. Anderson is requesting to pursue prosecution against the dog owner but says there will be no need for restitution because she is not going to seek medical attention.

I then met with the dog owner, Samantha Zambrano, at _____ Ms Zambrano was very cooperative and offered her Arizona Driver's License for identification. I issued citations as requested by the bite victim and impounded the biter dog. Ms. Zambrano also signed the animal quarantine agreement stating that she will redeem the dog at the end of the quarantine period.

Officer's Signature:

Date:

3/11/14



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

COMPLAINT # 14154164
OFFICER # CARVER 1901
DATE: 8-21-14

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 8-20-14 THE DOG LOUIE BELONGING TO
SAMANTHA ZAMBRAID WAS DECLARED
VICIOUS BY JUDGE CRANSHAW IN TUCSON
CITY COURT, JC
1901

OWNER: SAMANTHA ZAMBRAID
ADDRESS: _____
PHONE: _____

ANIMAL NAME: LOUIE
ANIMAL ID#: 473345
SEX: M COLOR: W BREED: SBHW X

NOTICE

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

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

DD#4

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Pima County Health Department
 Pima Animal Care Center
 4000 N Silverbell Rd
 Tucson, Arizona 85705
 Phone: (520) 243-5960
 Fax: (520) 243-5960
 www.pimaanimalcare.org



SUSPECT Cayce Walker Miners		ACO NAME / BADGE # Carver #1901	COMPLAINT NUMBER A14-149847
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS		Haynes #2032	BITE <input type="checkbox"/> WELFARE <input type="checkbox"/> DANGEROUS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ZIP	CITY Tuc	STATE AZ	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER
VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS		CODE IF OTHER :5L	
ZIP	CITY Tuc	STATE AZ	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER
KEY	WEIGHT	HEIGHT	EYES
HAIR COLOR	ORIGIN	DOB	SSN

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

DATE AND TIME REPORTED: **6-19-14 / 1940** DATE AND TIME OCCURRED: **6-19-14 / 1935**

COLLATER INJURED/ILL VENTILATION ABANDONED TIEOUT BEATEN WASTE OTHER (EXPLAIN)

I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case

I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.

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

VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME: **Marco Zazueta** RESIDENCE PHONE NO. BUSINESS PHONE NO.

VICTIM'S ADDRESS: [REDACTED] CITY: **Tucson** STATE: **AZ**

VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS: [REDACTED] ZIP: CITY: STATE:

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)

DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED: YES NO RESTITUTION REQUESTED: YES NO DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER

OTHER AGENCY CASE # 1406190543
 SO TPD TFD OTHER:

FOLLOW UP REQUEST
 SO TPD OTHER:

ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

VIOLATION BITE SEVERITY: TREATED BY PHONE NUMBER DATE QUARANTINED PACC

NON-VIOLATION PART OF BODY BITTEN: RELEASE DATE: VET

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

PHONE NUMBER VET CLINIC: **Southern Arizona Veterinary Specialty & Emergency Center** PHONE NUMBER: **888-3177** OWNER KNOWS OF BITE: YES NO FTQ

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS CLINIC'S ADDRESS: **141 E Fort Lowell Rd, Tucson, AZ 85705** QUARANTINE: 10 15 45 180 FRA HEAD#


3RD PARTY CITATIONS: YES NO CITING ACO: **Carver #1901** PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS: YES NO PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE CODE/ORD VIOLATED: **4-87, 4-7(2)(B)** CITATIONS/NUMBERS: **72985 A B C** REVIEWED BY: **7/22/14 KANST 2002** SEND YES NO

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL	ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
Poodle VICTIM <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/>	Angle	White	F	A				Dead	
Pit Bull VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Willy	Tan	M	A		14-045667		G	A096214
Mastiff VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Arya	Fawn	F	A		14-045668		G	A109133
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 PACC Tenkate #1911	M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS 4000 N Silverbell Rd	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE # 243-5911
WITNESS 2 TPD Reese # 52902	M <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/>	DOB	ADDRESS 270 S Stone Ave	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE # 791-5059
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#4



INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-149847

ACO name & Badge: Carver #1901

On 06-19-14 at 2114 hours Officer Haynes arrived at [redacted] and was redirected to [redacted]; where she met with Tucson Police (TPD) Officer Reese #52902 she was advised that according to the victim dog owner, he was walking his Poodle mix by [redacted] when the tan, male, Shepherd mix in that yard stuck its head out through the fence, grabbed his dog, and pulled it into the yard. Officer Haynes observed a small white Poodle laying in the yard not moving the dog appeared to have labored breathing. The TPD officers asked if she could control the attacking dog so they could enter the yard and retrieve the injured dog. Officer Haynes was able to leash and distract the dog while the TPD officers entered the yard and retrieved the injured Poodle. The Poodle was given to the owner and rushed off to the emergency vet before Officer Haynes could speak to him. After the Poodle was removed, the resident of [redacted] arrived home. Officer Haynes and Officer Reese met with her and advised her of the situation. She was very distraught about the situation as the dog, Willy, had never shown that type of behavior before. Officer Haynes explained to Mrs. Miners the possible repercussions of the incident but at this time there were no citations to be issued as the victim dog owner had left prior to her speaking to him.

On 6/27/14 Supervisor Tenkate, #1911, met with the dog owner Marco Zazueta who resides at [redacted] and his sister Imelda Zazueta when they came to the Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) to report the attack on Marco's dog "Angel".

Marco stated the following:

On 6/19/14 at approximately 1930-1945 hours he was walking on [redacted] with his dog on leash, when a large dog put its head through the wrought iron fence and grabbed his dog, Angel. His dog was pulled into the fenced yard where a second large dog joined in the attack. Marco pulled on Angel's leash and tried to get the dog out of the yard. He began yelling for help, but no one came. The police were called to respond as well as PACC. The Tucson Police and PACC Officer Haynes were able restrain one of the dogs and remove Angel from the yard at [redacted]

DD#4

Mr. Zazueta took his dog to Southern AZ Veterinary Specialty Clinic at 141 E Fort Lowell Rd. for treatment. The veterinarian treated Angel, who was severely injured and had to be euthanized.

Mr. Zazueta requested that biting animal and leash law citations issued to the owner of the dogs, a dangerous dog evaluation and restitution for the veterinary bills.

On 7-17-14 at 1735 I, Officer Carver #1901, met with Cayce and Sarah Miners at their home at I advised them that I was there in regards to the incident involving their dogs. I let them know that I was there to issue citations which were requested by the victim. They stated that they understood and were very sorry for what happened. They then took me around to the back gate where the incident occurred to show me they have installed solid metal sheeting over the wrought iron gate to prevent anything else from ever happening. They also asked me to express to the victim how sorry they were for what happened and they were willing to do what they could to make things right. I told them I would do that. I then issued citations for a leash law violation for the dog Willy for pulling Mr. Zazueta's dog through the gate and biting dog citations for both dogs attacking it.

I observed both of the Miners's dogs; Willy is a tan Pit Bull mix, neutered male. Arya is a fawn Mastiff, spayed female. It should be noted that the dog Arya is 9 years old, with sever hip issues, she is unsteady on her feet and can only take about 5 steps before she has to sit down and rest also both dogs were friendly and well behaved in my presences.

Officer's Signature:

 #1901

Date: 7/22/14



DD#4

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 # 14152698
OFFICER # CARVER 1901
DATE: 8-21-14

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 6-19-14 THE DOG WILLY BELONGING TO CAYCE
MINERS CAUSED THE DEATH OF THE DOG ANGLE
WHICH WAS BEING WALKED ON LEASH. WILLY
REACHED THRU THE FENCE OF HIS CONFINEMENT
AND PULLED ANGLE INTO HIS YARD AND MAILED
IT. THE DOG HAD TO BE EUTHANIZED DUE TO
ITS INJURIES. THE DOG WILLY IS DECLARED TO
BE DANGEROUS. JC
1901


OWNER: CAYCE MINERS
ADDRESS: _____
PHONE: _____

ANIMAL NAME: Willy
ANIMAL ID#: A096214
SEX: M COLOR: TAXI BREED: PITBULL X

NOTICE

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

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



INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-152093

ACO name & Badge: T.Foster 2042

I, Officer Foster 2042 arrived at [redacted] to meet with a dog bite victim in case A14-152093. I Knocked on the front door and was met by an older woman who stated that she is the wife of the victim Steve Szmutki. Mrs. Szmutki invited me into their home where I met with Mr. Szmutki. I stated the reason for my visit and asked Mr. Szmutki if he could describe the events that led to him being bitten. Mr. Szmutki stated that he was at the dog park located at [redacted] and had just entered the dog park when he and his two dogs were approached by a tan and white dog believed to be a Lab mix. Mr. Szmutki stated that the dogs began to sniff noses and then seconds later the Lab mix grabbed Mr. Szmutki's dachshund by the neck. The woman who had care and custody of the attacking dog and Mr. Szmutki were able to get the attacking dog off the dachshund and the tan dog's caretaker had hold of the dog's collar. The dachshund was still laying on her back in a submissive fashion. Mr. Szmutki stated that the attacking dog lunged out of it's handler's grip and again attacked the dachshund on the right side of her body. Mr. Szmutki stated that as he and the dog's caregiver were attempting to stop the attack Mr. Szmutki was bitten by the attacking dog on the left hand and fingers. Mr. Szmutki stated that his dog was bleeding profusely and he wrapped his shirt around the dog and applied pressure to the injuries.

Mr. Szmutki stated that he immediately asked the woman for her name and contact information and was told that the dog did not belong to her and that she was just watching the dog for a friend. Mr. Szmutki stated that the woman refused to provide any additional information to him and instead loaded the dog and herself into a vehicle and left the scene. There was a second woman in the parking lot that witnessed the attack that led to the human bite incident. The woman was able to obtain a license plate number of the caretaker's vehicle at the request of Mr. Szmutki. The witness Caroline Walton later contacted Mr. Szmutki and provided him with that information.

Mr. Szmutki then drove his severely injured dog to the nearest animal hospital for treatment. "Pearl" the dachshund was seen and stabilized but the damage caused by the attacking dog was too extreme to repair and the decision was made to humanely euthanize her. Mr. Szmutki then left the vet clinic and drove to North West Urgent Care in Sahuarita for treatment. Following treatment, Mr. Szmutki contacted the Sahuarita Police Department

and filed a police report: and met with Officer J. Oviedo #SP248 in reference to the human bite and dog attack incident. Mr. Szmutki provided Officer Oviedo with the witness information as well as the license plate number provided by the witness. Mr. Szmutki stated that his wounds later festered and were causing him great pain and he returned to a second Urgent Care (UCHC) on 07/23/14 and received additional treatment for his bite wounds.

Mr. Szmutki requested citations be issued on his behalf. I informed Mr. Szmutki that because the attack occurred inside a dog park, that I was unable to issue leash law violations and a biting animal citation for the dog on dog attack. I contacted Supervisor Tenkate 1911 to confirm that I was able to issue a biting animal citation for the injuries that Mr. Szmutki sustained and she confirmed that I was able to issue a citation for the human bite. Supervisor Tenkate also confirmed that I was unable to issue the leash law violation for both the dog on dog attack and the human bite. Mr. Szmutki stated that he was satisfied with any citations that could be issued on his behalf and stated that he will be pursuing restitution for the vet bills through the civil courts. I then asked Mr. Szmutki if he had any questions or concerns before I attempted to locate the caregiver/owner of the attacking dog. Mr. Szmutki stated that he was very concerned over the possibility of contracting the rabies virus and requested that he be notified about the dog's vaccination status as soon as it became known. I stated that I would contact him as soon as I had some information to share. I then thanked Mr. Szmutki for his time and cooperation and left his residence.

A records search of the Pima Animal Care Center database revealed that the attacking dog owner/caretaker is Linda S Keller located at

. There was also a record of Mrs. Keller owning a dog named "Dude" that closely matched the description provided by the victim. I then drove the short distance to the address on file for the attacking dog owner/caretaker.

I arrived at and as I was parking the Pima Animal Care Truck I observed a white sedan pull into the driveway and a man and a woman exited the vehicle and met with me in the driveway. I stated the reason for my visit and requested to see the dog known as Dude to perform a health check on the dog. Mrs. Keller stated that she no longer owns Dude but does pay for his food, vaccinations, and paid for a surgery recently performed on him. Mrs. Keller explained that when she gave the dog to his current owners she was concerned about their ability to pay for the dog's basic needs and continues to provide them for Dude. Mrs. Keller stated that she had Dude with her for two weeks in order to have the surgery performed and to allow the dog to completely recover before returning him to his owners.

Mrs. Keller freely admitted to being at the dog park on 07/21/14 at approximately 11:31 am and admitted that Dude did bite the other dog. Mrs. Keller initially blamed Mr. Szmutki for the incident and stated that he had his large and small dog inside the large dog run instead of separating his dogs into two different dog runs. She then stated that his dog bit Dude on the lip and that Mr. Szmutki fled the scene to avoid the responsibility of his dog biting Dude. She went on to state that all the blood she observed originated from Dudes injury to the lip. I stated that the small dog was fatally wounded by

the attack and surely some of the blood came from the severely injured Dachshund. Mrs. Keller admitted the possibility but went on to state that she did not believe that Dude bit Mr. Szmurtni. I responded that I was not in a position to decide who is or is not telling the truth in situations like this but that the judge who presides over her case is able to make that determination. I then asked where Dude was physically at and Mrs. Keller responded that Dude was returned to his owners Candice and James Tippy, who reside

..... Mrs. Keller also provided me with two phone numbers for the dog owners, and I informed Mrs. Keller that as the person responsible for Dude's care and custody at the time of the attack that she is also responsible for the damages caused by him on 07/21/14 and as such I would be issuing a biting animal citation at the request of the bite victim. I asked Mrs. Keller for a copy of her driver's license. Mrs. Keller handed me her license and I returned to the PACC truck and completed the citation for biting animal. I then returned to the driveway and presented Mrs. Keller with her citation. Mrs. Keller acknowledged, signed, and accepted her citation. I returned her license to her and provided her with her court date, time, location, and a copy of the citation. I then thanked Mrs. Keller for her time and cooperation. Closed call. 2042

Officer's Signature: J. Foster 2042

Date: 8/1/14



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

COMPLAINT # A14-153634
OFFICER # 19210 KEM
DATE: 8.14.14

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 JULY 21, 2014 THE LAB MIX KNOWN
AS DUDE ATTACKED ANOTHER DOG CAUSING
INJURIES SO SEVERE THE DOGS HAD TO
BE EUTHANIZED.
DUE TO THE INCIDENT DUDE IS
DEEMED DANGEROUS.

KEM #19210

OWNER: LINDA KELLEN ALBAG ANIMAL NAME: DUDE
ADDRESS: _____ ANIMAL ID#: A009448
PHONE: _____ SEX: M COLOR: TAN BREED: LAB MIX
+ WHT

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.

Donation Activity

Period:

8/1/2014

To:

8/31/2014

Donation Code	Amount
DONATION	\$0.00
DONATION ADOP	\$825.00
DONATION GEN	\$33,732.80
DONATION OUTR	\$393.00
DONATION S/N	\$19,335.00
DONATION SAMS	\$3,741.00
Grand Total	\$58,026.80

Donation Activity

Period:

7/1/2014

To:

8/31/2014

Donation Code	Amount
DONATION	\$0.00
DONATION ADOP	\$1,532.50
DONATION GEN	\$44,389.07
DONATION OUTR	\$2,826.00
DONATION S/N	\$30,507.30
DONATION SAMS	\$5,297.00
Grand Total	\$84,551.87

**Complaints for the Month of August 2014
(Plus two July complaints)**

7-9-14 complaint came through the District 3 Supervisor's Office
Complaint
An individual complained about feral cats the neighbor is feeding, and the resulting cat waste in complainant's yard.
Course/Action
TNR is being employed for cats. Education provided for both parties. Non-lethal options to be pursued with national TNR provider.

7-29-14 complaint came through the District 2 Supervisor's Office
Complaint
Dog noise coming from neighbors home
Course/Action
Citation issued

8-7-14 complaint called into PACC Admin
Complaint
An injured stray boxer won't leave someone's property.
Course/Action
PACC staff picked up the animal

8-19-14 letter
Complaint
Adopter of PACC dog complained the animal was sick and cost them a lot of money. Complained that PACC allows animals to be adopted without proper vaccinations and does not provide sufficient communication to adopters.
Course/Action
Response pending

8-20-14 complaint came through the District 1 Supervisor's Office
Complaint
Woman and small dog were attacked by another dog. PACC has yet to issue any citations to the owner of the attacking dog.
Course/Action
An officer followed up on 8-22-14; however, the owner of the attacking dog had moved. Attempts to contact owner have been unsuccessful and law enforcement is being consulted to help find owner.

Michael Schlueter

From: Kim Janes
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 10:14 AM
To: Michael Schlueter
Subject: FW: Supervisor Sharon Bronson feedback form 2014-07-09 10:05 AM Submission Notification

From: Kim Janes
Sent: Wednesday, July 09, 2014 4:11 PM
To: Francisco Garcia
Cc: Kristin Barney; Julia Flannery; Marcy Flanagan; Jose Chavez
Subject: FW: Supervisor Sharon Bronson feedback form 2014-07-09 10:05 AM Submission Notification

Good afternoon Francisco, this morning, we received the initial email at the bottom of the chain complaining about a neighbor's TNR'd feral cats causing problems on his property and PACC not being able to do anything about it. I recommend the following response to D3.

"Good afternoon Ms. Cabrera, according to PACC records:

On 06/12/14 09:09 a.m., an officer met with [REDACTED] neighbor, [REDACTED] who had two traps set on the property and said he is working with the landlord and they are trapping the cats, having them altered, and releasing them. The officer observed 5 adult cats and one kitten all appeared healthy. [REDACTED] said none of the cats are sick. He said there are only about a dozen cats and 8 have been altered so far.

[REDACTED] approached the officer and asked if there was anything that could be done about the landlord bringing the cats back to the property after they are altered, because it doesn't fix the problem. The cats are still present and still poop on their property. I told them they can legally trap them and bring them to PACC and we will accept them at no charge.

On 6-30-14 [REDACTED] met with another officer at PACC and explained his complaint to her who shared it with the Enforcement manager. He will send an officer to meet with [REDACTED] to advise him to stop feeding the feral cats or he will be considered as the pet owner and could be held responsible for the animal waste being deposit on his property and the neighbor's property.

Finally staff is engaged in initiatives to develop and provide non-lethal solutions to such situations in our community. Staff plans to partner with a nationally recognized cat trap, neuter and return expert to bring in additional resources to assist in such cases and avoid having to catch and euthanize. The program would provide humane cat deterrents to [REDACTED] and possibly others to protect particularly sensitive areas (like sandboxes). The program also educates on how to best "cat proof" property. The video <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5nnOibg6nYc> is an example of that training. Additionally, at times, it is possible to pull kittens out and place them with adoption organizations which would immediately reduce the numbers at that locale."

VR

Kim

From: Jennifer Cabrera On Behalf Of District3
Sent: Wednesday, July 09, 2014 11:08 AM
To: Kim Janes; District3
Cc: Kiki Navarro; Anissa Ramirez; Kristin Barney; Jose Chavez
Subject: RE: Supervisor Sharon Bronson feedback form 2014-07-09 10:05 AM Submission Notification

Sounds good, thanks Kim.

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

From: Kim Janes
Sent: Wednesday, July 09, 2014 10:53 AM
To: District3
Cc: Kiki Navarro; Anissa Ramirez; Kristin Barney; Jose Chavez
Subject: RE: Supervisor Sharon Bronson feedback form 2014-07-09 10:05 AM Submission Notification

Good morning Ms. Cabrera, let me look into this further and I will get back to you as soon as possible.

Respectfully,

Kim

From: Jennifer Cabrera On Behalf Of District3
Sent: Wednesday, July 09, 2014 10:29 AM
To: Kim Janes
Cc: Kiki Navarro; Anissa Ramirez
Subject: FW: Supervisor Sharon Bronson feedback form 2014-07-09 10:05 AM Submission Notification

Good Morning Kim,

Please take a look at the following email and let me know what can be done.

Thank you,

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

From: notification@pima.gov [mailto:notification@pima.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, July 09, 2014 10:05 AM
To: District3
Subject: Supervisor Sharon Bronson feedback form 2014-07-09 10:05 AM Submission Notification

Supervisor Sharon Bronson feedback form 2014-07-09 10:05 AM was submitted by Guest on 7/9/2014 10:05:24 AM (GMT-07:00) US/Arizona

Name

Value

First Name [REDACTED]

Last Name [REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

Phone [REDACTED]
Address [REDACTED]
City [REDACTED]
State [REDACTED]
Zipcode [REDACTED]

District_of_Concern Supervisor District 3 - Sharon Bronson

Department_of_concern Animal Care Center

Subject_or_Nature_of_Concern public health hazard, no help from Animal Control

Supervisor Bronson and staff, I was encouraged to write to you during a conversation works for Pima County where I was discussing an ongoing and growing problem with a neighbor who is sustaining a large colony of feral cats. The cats are causing damage to the property of my other neighbors and I firmly believe the situation is a public health hazard. I am writing to you because I have already tried going through the channels that I expect and have had no success whatsoever. There are gaps within the county laws regarding feral cats so I am powerless to do anything to improve the situation. I began trying to do so about a situation over two months ago, beginning with simply trying to reason with my neighbor about the damage that was occurring because of his behavior. When that did not work I contacted Animal Control. An officer came to inspect my neighbor's property and explained that since the cats are on the neighbor's property he is not responsible for what the cats do on other properties even though he is maintaining the colony by providing them with food and water. Essentially, even though he is considered the owner of the animals since he provides food and water, Animal Control treats wild animals no different than pigeons. I can tell you that having a large colony of feral cats in a yard as a litterbox is very different from having too many pigeons. Specifically, I would like to see dogs, there is no leash law for cats. Additionally, the officer stated that he saw no signs of a head even though he was standing no more than three feet from a headless, decaying cat. My neighbor told him explicitly that he does nothing to care for the cats' medical needs. I have a litter of kittens from underneath his trailer and was informed by my veterinarian that if they had intervened they would have died within a day. My neighbor told me at the time that he was not doing anything for the kittens and that they wouldn't have been the first to die. I contacted Animal Control and was informed that because I intervened the animals were not neglected and therefore there was no neglect. I was also informed by the officer that I am free to remove my property and relinquish them to Animal Control but I have been told my neighbor will be as long as my neighbor provides food and water, more cats will simply take their place. I have contacted Animal Control, I have spent countless hours on the phone with the Humane Society and other cat rescue organizations in town. I am aware of the trap, neuter/spay, and release program. Initially I thought this may be a solution but it was quickly apparent that it would do nothing to solve the situation in the present. There are simply too many cats right here and now. I contacted the Animal Enforcement department of Tucson, hoping there was something that could be done. They informed me that Pima County has jurisdiction over animal control issues. They suggested I sue my neighbor to civil court and sue him for damages but he has no income other than his disability. I don't know what else to do at this point. The laws are structured in a way that make it difficult to deal with the problem on my own property while absolving my neighbor of any responsibility. As long as he continues his current behavior any efforts on my part are futile. My wife and I have a 10 year old daughter and as much as we want to make our yard a nice place for her to play, the yard work will be ruined by the cats. I have a habitat that I constructed for a desert tortoise from the Desert Museum's rescue program and the cats have rendered it unusable. I cannot use my backyard anymore because of the smell of cat urine emanating from my neighbor's property. The problem is growing worse. Just within the last week I have seen a new litter of kittens. It seems inconceivable to me that there are not laws preventing what my neighbor is doing.

seems to be the case and Pima Animal Control has told me that I'm on my own. I n
Thank you for your time and consideration, [REDACTED]

Would_like_a_response Yes

Referred_Page [http://webcms.pima.gov/government/board_of_supervisors/supervisor_sharon bro](http://webcms.pima.gov/government/board_of_supervisors/supervisor_sharon_bro)

Thank you, Pima County, Arizona

Michael Schlueter

From: Kim Janes
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 10:09 AM
To: Michael Schlueter
Subject: FW: Constituent Concern

From: Jose Chavez
Sent: Wednesday, July 30, 2014 10:44 AM
To: Kim Janes
Cc: Kristin Barney
Subject: RE: Constituent Concern

Mr. [REDACTED] was contacted and advised that his complaint was still pending a response to meet with the animal owner to issue the noise violation citation sometime this week. The complaint was responded to and the owner received a citation several hours after speaking with Mr. [REDACTED]

Jose

From: Kim Janes
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 9:38 AM
To: Michael Lundin
Cc: Jennifer Eckstrom; Ramon Valadez; Jan Leshner; Benny Gomez; Jose Chavez; Kristin Barney
Subject: RE: Constituent Concern

Good morning Mr. Lundin, an enforcement supervisor will contact Mr. [REDACTED] today.

Respectfully,

Kim

From: Michael Lundin
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 8:47 AM
To: Kim Janes
Cc: Jennifer Eckstrom; Ramon Valadez; Jan Leshner; Benny Gomez
Subject: Constituent Concern

Kim,
Our office was contacted by a [REDACTED]. He indicated to me that there is a major dog noise issue from his neighbors home. He said he has contacted PACC a couple times since November of last year and has yet to have someone come out and investigate. I know these complaints fall low on the totem pole but could you have someone look into this and give him a call.

Thanks,
Mike

Michael Lundin, M.B.A.
Special Staff Assistant
District 2
Pima County Board of Supervisors

Michael Schlueter

From: Neil Konst
Sent: Thursday, August 07, 2014 6:42 PM
To: Michelle Moore; Jose Chavez
Cc: Kristin Barney; Kim Janes; Michael Schlueter
Subject: RE: [REDACTED] Complaint

Officers Kirby #2057 (or #2061) and Rademaker #2019 have reported they picked up the dog about a hour ago.

Neil

From: Michelle Moore
Sent: Thursday, August 07, 2014 1:56 PM
To: Jose Chavez; Neil Konst
Cc: Kristin Barney; Kim Janes; Michael Schlueter
Subject: [REDACTED] Complaint

Hi All,

Tammi Barrack of FAIR and also on PACCAC committee called me about an injured stray boxer that won't leave the area of the [REDACTED] house. Apparently the [REDACTED] called into PACC 2-3 days ago and PACC has yet to respond. They are moving and will be gone tomorrow. Ms. Barrack received the call through FAIR. She did not have the [REDACTED] address and just a phone number for Mrs. [REDACTED]. I told Ms. Barrack I would have an enforcement supervisor call Mrs. [REDACTED]. When I went to find you all you were in a meeting. I checked with dispatch and Celine Anne told me the call had already been flagged for a must get by Neil. Thank you.

Michelle Moore

Pima Animal Care Center, 4000 N. Silverbell Rd., Tucson, AZ 85745
PH: 520 243-5934, FAX: 520 243-5954



A Healthy Pima County: Everyone. Everywhere. Everyday.

To the General Manager/Administrator of the PACC,

On June 18th 2014 my significant other and I visited the Pima Animal Care Center (from here on referred to as PACC) in hopes of adopting a puppy found on their website. That day we adopted a 2 month old German Shepard Mix by the name of Skylar, number A483633. Initially Skylar appeared to be in excellent health. Upon the adoption of Skylar, the front desk employee (Carey Cessna) informed us that Skylar was up to date on her shots (non-specific information given), due for a Rabies shot when she turned 3months old, and that she was too young to have an official license purchased. She then advised us to schedule an appointment with a veterinarian as soon as possible (for no specific reasoning other than general health). This was the extent of verbal information provided to us about the adoption and puppy's needs. Carey also gave us the packet with all of Skylar's information and suggested adoption procedures, including her medical history. After reading the packet thoroughly, it informed us in bold lettering, "YOUR PET NEEDS A BOOSTER VACCINATION WITHIN 3 WEEKS. CALL YOUR VETERINARIAN TODAY TO SCHEDULE AN APPOINTMENT".

Four days after adoption, Skylar began showing signs of exhaustion. She lost her appetite and was unwilling to eat or drink on her own. By day five (June 23rd) Skylar was having severe bouts of diarrhea, and continued to become more and more lethargic. It should be noted that Skylar was not allowed outside of the confines of our home prior to this (because of previous knowledge), and had no interaction with any other animals besides the resident cat whom is up to date on all vaccinations and has no history of illness.

On June 24th we made an appointment at the Pima Pet Clinic on Speedway. The appointment was scheduled for 2:00pm of June 25th. By 11:00am on the 25th, Skylar was no longer moving, eating or drinking, and began vomiting along with constant diarrhea. We made an emergency trip at 12:00pm to the Pima Pet Clinic. The initial examination by hospital staff members led them to believe Skylar was exhibiting signs of Parvovirus: They reviewed Skylar's medical history, the same medical history provided to us by the PACC, and concluded that although Skylar had been tested for Parvovirus (which we later discovered often comes back negative when tested at shelters because of testing version), she had not actually received a booster vaccination. After hearing this information I called the PACC and spoke with a staff member named Melissa at approximately 5pm on June 25th. I asked Melissa if the medical history provided to adopters was exhaustive to which she replied yes. I then asked her if Skylar had in fact received her booster vaccination, would it appear on Skylar's medical history. To which she replied yes.

After several tests the Pima Pet Clinic hospital staff determined Skylar did in fact have Parvovirus, and they strongly recommended she be checked into the hospitals care for treatment. We were warned that puppies are extremely susceptible to Parvo, and have a very high mortality rate if not hospitalized. Ultimately we decided it was in Skylar's best interest to admit her to the Pima Pet Clinic, which we did on June 25th. The hospital then informed us that this was not the first case of Parvovirus that they had seen this week, nor was it the first case of Parvovirus that they had seen from an animal adopted from the PACC.

Four days, and almost \$2,000 in hospital bills later, the hospital staff released Skylar into our care on Saturday, June 28th. After several days of blood tests, IV drips, and medication, Skylar was well enough to eat and drink on her own, and was deemed healthy enough to return home. We then were informed that she would be contagious for at least a month and should be isolated for that time, which we have followed accordingly. Also, we were then responsible for purchasing her entire series of booster vaccinations (currently in progress at the Catalina Pet Hospital), which we hadn't realized was a series prior to hospitalization. Skylar now has an extremely weak immune system and had to wait two weeks to begin her booster vaccinations. In this two week delay, Skylar began to have diarrhea and bloating. She was diagnosed with Giardia at the Catalina Pet Hospital on July 10th, which in turn resulted in more medication.

I find it very disturbing that the PACC is blatantly allowing animals to be adopted that do not have the proper vaccinations, is providing misinformation about vaccinations, and the overall lack of verbal communication on the importance of Booster Vaccinations. Furthermore, the PACC provided no verbal information to us at the time of the adoption that forewarned us, or advised us, to get Skylar the booster vaccinations, but only a three week suggestion on their take-home packet with no further information. The vaccination series would have neither been a burden, nor an inconvenience to us. What I find even more troublesome is that a co-worker, and a personal friend of mine, adopted a dog from the PACC the day immediately prior to the day we got Skylar, and had her puppy die three days after the adoption; of Parvovirus.

We adopted Skylar knowing full and well the risks of owning a dog, as well as the responsibilities a care taker has in regards to his or her pet. We have very clearly exhibited our commitment to Skylar's good health and care, as was demonstrated by our actions in ensuring she got the best treatment available and the diligence and care we have shown with our cat, Mijita. What we did not expect was the lack of care and responsibility by the PACC.

Skylar has pulled through, and is a happy puppy at our home once more, however, we are now burdened with \$2000 in medical bills; all due to the absolute negligence, and overall lack of commitment to an animal's wellbeing by the Pima Animal Care Clinic.

I am saddened to know that more and more animals are leaving the PACC only to become ill and die due to a lack of proper care, verbal communication, and cleanliness on the part of the clinic. That such an organization exists under the guise of being a steward of animals in need within Pima County is a tragedy.

I have authored this letter to make you aware of our situation and our negative experience with your clinic. I have also written to inform you that I believe you should be financially liable for the full amount of Skylar's medical bills. A copy of this letter will not only be distributed to the PACC, but the ASPCA and Pima County Health Department as well.

Sincerely,

Michael Schlueter

From: Jose Chavez
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 9:05 AM
To: Kim Janes; Joseph Cuffari
Cc: Kristin Barney; Michael Schlueter
Subject: RE: D1 - Constituent Issue [REDACTED]

I contacted Mr. [REDACTED] and advised him that I would attempt to have an officer respond to his complaint today and it was not possible today it would definitely be with in the next couple of days. He understood and thanked me, I provided him with my direct line should he have any other concerns.

Jose

From: Kim Janes
Sent: Wednesday, August 20, 2014 3:30 PM
To: Joseph Cuffari
Cc: Jose Chavez; Kristin Barney; Michael Schlueter
Subject: RE: D1 - Constituent Issue - [REDACTED]

Good afternoon Mr. Cuffari, we will certainly look into this and assist Mr. [REDACTED] with his concern.

Respectfully,

Kim

From: Joseph Cuffari
Sent: Wednesday, August 20, 2014 3:27 PM
To: Kim Janes
Cc: Jose Chavez
Subject: D1 - Constituent Issue - [REDACTED]

Mr. Janes,

Below is an email from a constituent. He has an issue with his neighbors bulldog, and the bulldog owner has not yet been cited for negligence (Mr. [REDACTED] claims the owner is negligent).

Do you mind looking into this for us and issue a warning/citation if necessary to the bulldog owner?

Thanks,
Joseph Cuffari
Constituent Liaison – Supervisor Ally Miller

From: notification@pima.gov [<mailto:notification@pima.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, August 20, 2014 2:25 PM
To: District1
Subject: Supervisor District 1 Feedback Form 2014-08-20 02:25 PM Submission Notification

Name	Value
First Name	[REDACTED]
Last Name	[REDACTED]
Email	[REDACTED]
Phone	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED]
City	[REDACTED]
State	[REDACTED]
Zipcode	[REDACTED]

District_of_Concern Supervisor District 1 - Ally Miller

Department_of_concern Animal Care Center

Subject_or_Nature_of_Concern Undelivered Citation

Comments MY WIFE AND SMALL DOG WERE ATTACKED BY A PIT BULL ON 12/20/13. ANIMAL CONTROL OFFICER MEEK WENT TO THE PIT BULL RESIDENCE AND WROTE A REPORT, STATING THAT THERE WAS A DEFECT IN THE BACKYARD FENCE WHERE THE PIT BULL COULD(AND DID)GET OUT. THE DOG'S OWNER CONTACTED US BY PHONE BUT EXPLAINED THAT AS A SINGLE MOM SHE COULD NOT REPAY THE \$988 VET BILL THAT RESULTED FROM HER OBVIOUS NEGLIGENCE. HER HOUSE IS NOT AN INEXPENSIVE HOME AND WE HAVE OBSERVED SEVERAL CARS IN THE DRIVEWAY. WE HAVE CONTACTED ANIMAL CONTROL SEVERAL TIMES AND HAVE BEEN GIVEN PROMISES AND ASSURANCES BUT UNTIL A CITATION IS DELIVERED TO [REDACTED], WE CANNOT FILE FOR PUNITIVE DAMAGES. WE WOULD APPRECIATE SOME HELP WITH THIS MATTER. THANK YOU, [REDACTED] AND [REDACTED]

Would_like_a_response Yes

Referred_Page <http://www.allymillerdistrict1.com/>

Thank you, Pima County, Arizona