NOTICE
PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
PIMA COUNTY ANIMAL CARE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

March 19, 2015 – 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	
7.	New Business • County Budget Control Measures

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

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

NOTICE
PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
PIMA COUNTY ANIMAL CARE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

March 19, 2015 – 5:30 p.m.
Pima Animal Care Center
4000 N Silverbell Road
Admin Building
(520) 724-7729

AMENDED

Functions of the Committee

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

AMENDED AGENDA				
1.	Call to Order • Roll Call • Establishment of Quorum and Pledge of Allegiance			
2.	Review and Adoption of Minutes: • Adoption of January 15, 2015 meeting minutes • Adoption of February 19, 2015 meeting minutes			
3.	Animal Welfare and Dangerous Animal Cases for the Month of February and Recent Holds Snapshot			
	Welfare		Dangerous Dogs	
	A14-154739	A15-165954	A15-164275	A14-163282
	A15-163387	A15-166165	A14-162205	A14-157399
	A15-165129	A14-155481		
	A15-165775	A15-166099		
	A15-166027	A15-166650		
4.	Call to the Audience			
5.	Management Report			
6.	Old Business • County Administration response to the Committee's request to add additional field officer and shelter staff; and Jurisdiction IGA Discussion and County Obligation for Animal Care Services. (Neuman/Janes) • PACC Protocols for Treatment of Tick Fever/Valley Fever (Jacobs/PACC Management Team) • Volunteer Policy and Partnership Agreement (PACC Management Team) • Castaway Treasures Animal Sanctuary (Schwerin/Emptage) • Ways to Shorten Duration of Hold Time for Confiscation Cases (Neuman)			
7.	New Business • Proposed Ordinance to Amend Pima County Code 6.04.060 – Pound Fees to add a surrender fee for pets from non contracted jurisdictions and increase dog licensing fees (Neuman/Janes) • Proposed Ordinance to Amend Pima County Code 6.04.100 – Advisory Committee… to Modify Membership Composition (Neuman/Janes) • Housing Animals at the Ajo Animal Care Facility (Neuman/PACC Management Team) • Committee's Semiannual Report to Board of Supervisors (Neuman) • Humane Society's Zip Code 85705 Dog Spay/Neuter and Vaccination Initiative (Hubbard)			
8.	Donations: A total of 1,271 individuals gave $25,267.26 in donations during the month of February.			
9.	Complaints and Commendations: There were two complaints (topics) and no commendations received by staff during February.			
10.	Call to the Audience			
11.	Announcements, Schedules and Proposed Agenda Items			
12.	Next Meeting – April 16, 2015			
13.	Adjournment			

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

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

Pima County Animal Care Advisory Committee
Minutes
January 15, 2015
3950 S. Country Club Road
Tucson, Arizona 85714

Draft

1. Call to Order

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

- Attendance

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

Absent:
Tamara Barrick, Foundation for Animals in Risk
Pat Jacobs, Tucson Kennel Club
Sophia Kaluzniacki, DVM, ASPCA of AZ, Inc
Erin O'Donnell, DVM, Southern AZ Veterinary Medical Association
Angela Spencer, City of Tucson

- Pledge of Allegiance

2. Adoption of the Minutes

- Adoption of the December 18, 2014 Meeting Minutes

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

3. Call to the Audience

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

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

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

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

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

4. Management Report

There was no discussion on this item.

5. Old Business

- Volunteer Policy and Partnership Agreement

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

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

DRAFT

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

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

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

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

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

DRAFT

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

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

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

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

DRAFT

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

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

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

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

DRAFT

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

6. New Business

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

See discussion at previous bullet.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DRAFT

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

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

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

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

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

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

10. Call to the Audience

There were no speakers at this call to the audience.

11. Announcements, Schedules and Proposed Agenda Items

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

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

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

12. Next Meeting – February 19, 2015

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

13. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:53 pm

DRAFT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Pima County Animal Care Advisory Committee
Minutes
February 19, 2015
4000 N. Silverbell Road
Tucson, Arizona 85745

Draft

1. Call to Order

Mr. Neuman called the meeting to order at 5:32 pm

- Attendance

Present:
Nancy Emptage, Vice-Chair, Animal Welfare Coalition (Late: 5:56)
Pat Hubbard, Humane Society of Southern Arizona (Late: 5:39)
Pat Jacobs, Tucson Kennel Club
Sophia Kaluzniacki, DVM, SPCA of AZ, Inc (Left early: 6:38)
Derek Marshall, Public Education
Jack Neuman, Chair, PACC Volunteers
Erin O'Donnell, DVM, Southern AZ Veterinary Medical Association
Jane Schwerin, People for Animals in the Prevention of Cruelty and Neglect
Gail Smith, MD, Board of Health
Kim Janes, Pima Animal Care Center (PACC), Ex-Offico

Absent:
Tamara Barrick, Foundation for Animals in Risk
Helen Mendelsohn, Disabled Community
Angela Spencer, City of Tucson

- Pledge of Allegiance

2. Adoption of the Minutes

- Adoption of the January 15, 2015 Meeting Minutes

The motion was made and seconded (Jacobs/Kaluzniacki) that the January 15, 2015 meeting minutes be adopted as written

Regarding *5. Old Business, Criteria required for PACC to Respond and Investigate a Service/Welfare Issue Wherein an Animal is in Distress*, Ms. Schwerin contended the minutes should say Ms. Gray authorized only euthanasia regarding the second animal welfare case Ms. Gray spoke about. (Instead the dog was taken home for Christmas.) Mr. Neuman requested the printed paper which Ms. Gray read from be added to the record. Mr. Janes said the paper and recording will be reviewed for possible modification of the minutes; and any updates can be brought back for consideration at the next meeting.

The motion was amended to table approval of the minutes and have Ms. Gray's aforementioned paper provided for review at the next meeting. The motion carried (6-1) with Ms. Hubbard abstaining.

- Adoption of the February 4, 2015 Meeting Minutes

The motion was made and seconded (Smith/Hubbard) that the February 4, 2015 meeting minutes be adopted as written. The motion carried (7-0) with Mr. Jacobs abstaining.

Dr. Kaluzniacki pointed out that she is with "SPCA" not "ASPCA" as the minutes have been reflecting. That will be corrected.

3. Animal Welfare and Dangerous Animal Cases for the Month of January and Recent Holds Snapshot

Ms. Schwerin made the general statement that animals in these welfare cases would be better off if they were taken away from their owners and not returned.

Regarding the holds snapshot Ms. Schwerin asked about the dog Sativa. Mr. Janes said the judge ruled that the owner is to forfeit the dog, but the owner has until March 3rd to appeal the decision.

4. Call to the Audience

There were no speakers from the audience.

5. Management Report

Mr. Janes reported the City of Tucson contacted him about placing a new representative on the Committee and Mr. Janes requested they submit the request in writing, which hasn't occurred yet. He said there have been monthly meetings on the approved PACC bond project, including a meeting that day. Public meetings are being set up; architect bids are due in by February 24; and it is anticipated the architectural firm will be selected by April 1, with the contract manager selection to follow. There was discussion on the importance of involving entities with animal care experience and allowing for proper input in the process. In response to a question Mr. Janes reported that a County inmate walked away from PACC and was subsequently taken back into custody within a few short days. The incident caused no interruption in receiving the crews. Mr. Neuman added that he has heard very positive feedback from the volunteers regarding the County inmates; and said the inmates have addressed the bulk of the items in the July 19, 2014 motion for resolution (first bullet under old business).

6. Old Business

- Update on July 19, 2014 motion for resolution for PACC to remedy issues relating to the care and welfare of pets at PACC – Operations

Mr. Neuman withdrew this item since his concerns have been addressed to his satisfaction.

- Possible Ordinance Related to the Sale of Tie Outs

Ms. Emptage said she wants something passed that required local retailers selling tie-outs to post that tie-outs are not legal in the specific jurisdictions wherein they are not legal to use. She also wants the code to specify a significant fine for those who do not comply. She cited that people purchase tie-outs not knowing that they are illegal to use in most local jurisdictions.

DRAFT

The motion was made and seconded (Emptage/Schwerin) that the Committee support to the Board of Supervisors an ordinance to codify the requirement to post signage stating that tie-outs are illegal, where tie-outs are sold.

Ms. Hubbard said tie-outs are an abomination, but questioned how the code would be enforced and how many hours will be spent to enforce the code versus doing other important animal related duties. Ms. Emptage suggested a number of volunteers would be willing to check stores for the required signage. In response to a question, Mr. Janes said the requirement to post would only apply to jurisdictions which codify such an ordinance, so if one or more of the local cities doesn't pass an ordinance, then such requirements wouldn't apply to them. He also cautioned that the code would need to specify what constitutes a tie-out; does it include a clothes line and twine? Discussion turned to using public service announcements or an educational campaign to educate the public on the problems associated with tie-outs and that they are illegal. Reference was made to a past school spay/neuter campaign wherein an I-Pad was offered as a prize. Mr. Marshall volunteered to take the lead on a school audio/visual, graphic design campaign related to tie-outs. In light of the school campaign direction, the aforementioned motion was withdrawn. Mr. Janes suggested the County's Communication Office be collaborated with for the campaign.

- County Administration response to the committee's request to add additional field officers and shelter staff; and Jurisdiction IGA Discussion and County Obligation for Animal Care Services

Mr. Neuman summarized that the Committee had sent a letter to County Administrator Huckelberry requesting additional field officers, to which Mr. Huckelberry replied that the request couldn't be granted without funding and buy-in from the municipalities. Mr. Janes and others have been meeting with the municipalities and the Committee discussed also meeting with the municipalities; however, the County Attorney's Office and County Administration is currently contemplating the appropriateness of such meetings. Ms. Schwerin referred to the *Enforcement Calls by Jurisdiction – January 2015* handout in the packet and pointed out that the overwhelming majority of calls for service where from the City of Tucson or the County, with comparably few from other jurisdictions. She questioned why we need their contributions. Others contended that although the numbers are smaller, services are provided, costs are incurred and their contributions are needed. Ms. Hubbard added that the County's direction of saving more lives costs money and we need all the municipalities on board.

- General Criteria required for PACC to respond and investigate a service/welfare issue wherein an animal is in distress, with Enforcement concerns from Jessica Gray as representative of People for Animals

Jessica Gray, a volunteer with People for Animals in the Prevention of Cruelty and Neglect (PFA), read the attached statement regarding animal conditions at Castaway Treasures (Animal Shelter), located on Mars Road, and provided a picture of the horse referred to in her statement. She reported that Livestock Control checked out the horse in the picture and said it is acceptable to allow the horse to suffer in its current condition because it is old. She stated that in 2011 there was a court order prohibiting Castaway Treasures from taking in more animals, but they have taken in more. Ms. Gray added that she has sent numerous certified letters to various officials and entities about this situation; and that the owners of Castaway Treasures have taken legal action against her keeping her at a distance from the property.

DRAFT

There was discussion on PACC's involvement related to the dogs, including PACC requiring certain dogs receive medical care and requiring one dog to be euthanized. Mr. Janes said PACC can provide the case file. He added he has been in communication with the Sheriff's Department Detective and she is investigating the case the same as she would any other case. Ms. Schwerin contended that PACC legally can and should take action on behalf of the aforementioned horse citing that the code refers to "animals" not just pets. Mr. Janes replied that PACC is not staffed or resourced for livestock, while the State Agriculture Department is; and that it is the County's policy to not cross over to deal with livestock or wildlife. He added that he will forward the concerns presented up his chain-of command. A number of Committee members commented that the Castaway Treasures situation is disturbing.

Mr. Jacobs made a motion that Ms. Gray's written statement be forwarded to the applicable State Agriculture enforcement officer and that PACC's management provide the Committee with the case file(s) related to the Castaway Treasures animals PACC has been involved with, as soon as possible (seconded by Dr. Kaluzniacki). The motion carried (9-0).

- PACC Protocols for Treatment of Tick Fever and Valley Fever

Mr. Janes indicated that PACC treats for 30 days; if the animal is then adoptable, then they will proceed, but if not then it is placed on the rescue list. Mr. Jacobs expressed concern that the speaker from the audience who brought up the matter be contacted and be made aware of PACC's official treatment position.

- Animal Defense League of AZ Membership Request

Mr. Janes reminded the Committee that they had passed a motion to request the Board of Supervisors eliminate the Animal Defense League of Arizona's (ADLA) long vacant seat from the Committee in code. An ordinance to accomplish this has not yet been sent to the Board of Supervisors and Mr. Janes was recently contacted by an ADLA contact who said they are interested in filling the position, although no name was provided. He left it to the will of the Committee on how to proceed.

The motion was made and seconded (Emptage/Marshall) that the original motion to eliminate the seat remain as the Committee's intent concerning the ADLA seat. The motion carried (6-1, Hubbard voted against) with Mr. Jacobs and Ms. Schwerin abstaining.

7. New Business

There was no new business on the agenda

8. Donations: A total of 1,444 individuals gave $43,567.76 in donations during the month of January.

Mr. Janes pointed out these monthly donations are only monetary donations directly to PACC and only a portion of the roughly $160,000 in total donations through partnerships in January. He added that PACC is receiving approximately $30,000 worth of donated dog food, some of which will be shared with partners so that it will be consumed before expiration.

9. Complaints and Commendations: There were four complaints and two commendations received by staff during January.

DRAFT

10. Call to the Audience

There were no speakers from the audience.

11. Announcements, Schedules and Proposed Agenda Items

Ms. Emptage said she recently watched a Pima Alliance for Animal Welfare (PAAW) sponsored presentation on service and therapy animals. She found the presentation very interesting and informative and recommended the presentation be afforded to staff and volunteers. Mr. Janes said he would forward her suggestion to the Chief of Operations.

12. Next Meeting – March 19, 2015

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

13. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:11 pm

DRAFT

I would like to close by saying that the horse in the picture I am showing you is down and dying at castaway treasures as we speak. At 3:30 today, a panicked neighbor called me and also the sheriff and livestock control, and now those parties are dealing with in some way, hopefully, the current extreme suffering inflicted by the brunos.

Castaway Treasures was reported against extensively for the condition of a number of dogs and horses that are in a state of obvious neglect there during late January and into early February by concerned citizens who witnessed conditions at the property or became aware of it through extensive calls to action by Wild Hearts Rescue Ranch. There are a number of underweight dogs in filthy kennels with no comfort items or enrichment beyond plastic dogloos and chewed up food bowls. Dogs are regularly without water and/or food for lengthy periods of time, and PACC did indeed cite them for the resulting condition of several of the dogs. There are several emaciated horses, and every horse there has at least one obvious neglect issue, be it hooves destroyed by neglect, emaciation from improper feeds and lack of dental care, or untreated wounds. There are more than two decades of complaints by the community and surrounding neighbors against the Brunos regarding the treatment and living conditions of the animals. I would say their intentions towards their animals are very well documented. Especially in an Arizona Daily Star article from 2011 in which Adrian Bruno describes, quite specifically, the forced isolation of the dogs, stating they are never taken out of their kennels, given toys, or allowed human contact. Her excuses for this range from the other dogs barking because of it to activating the prey drive of dogs that will never see the outside of a kennel by giving them toys or comfort items like blankets. This makes no sense to any animal care professional. The same attitude is given to the neglected and obviously confinement-deranged horses. Volunteers are FIRED for touching them, talking to them, brushing them or trying to dig them out of their feces filled corrals in any way. Animal Care regularly states that they cannot act on behalf of distressed livestock. I assure you this is not true as a matter of law, but perhaps as a matter of some ill-conceived policy. In fact, ANY of the numerous code enforcement agencies, animal care officers, sheriff's deputies and detectives could have acted for any and all of these animals to remove them from these squalid and hopeless conditions. At least at PACC the dogs would get comfort items, care and attention from volunteers and veterinarians, the chance to be adopted and experience a life outside of waiting to die in a filthy kennel alone. Surely, if PACC is a better quality of life than they now have, they qualify for removal, not to mention the ongoing and well documented neglect of animals at that location being a good indicator of how their future will look. Wild Hearts Rescue Ranch stands at the ready to provide the horses with immediate medical care, clean, dry ground and hoofcare to stop lameness and infection, and humane euthanasia for the obviously irreparably suffering equines. My hope is, speaking today will at least provide relief to the dogs and horses by getting them out of their feces filled kennels and corrals and into an environment where they receive medical care and can be evaluated better to assess the grave cost of their current environment to their health and mental welfare. Some of these dogs may still be saveable. Most of the horses likely are. If relief could be found for those animals, my heart along with theirs would receive tremendous relief. I cannot imagine the mental and physical cost of living out the remaining years of your life with such purposeful, even ENFORCED, isolation and desperation. My wish is to return dignity, health and enrichment to

every animal unfortunate enough to have fallen victim to these outrageous circumstances and create an awakening amongst our enforcement officials who essentially joined in the Bruno's quest to see these animals live out a life of loneliness, pain, neglect, and filth. This situation is a blight on our county's reputation and moral good standing. Anyone who agrees with seeing these animals live out their life in such desperation should be relieved of their position so that a moral, decent person can take their place. Thank you for your time this evening and do consider doing the right thing. We, the citizens of Pima County, will be carefully considering the future of our current elected and appointed officials based on matters like this.

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

MEMORANDUM

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

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

DATE: **3-4-15**

SUBJECT: **Welfare report for February 2015**

---

1. A14-154739 No animals were impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. This complaint is closed.

2. A15-163387 Seven animals were impounded. The case was followed up on staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. The animals were not redeemed they were placed for adoption and were adopted. This complaint is closed.

3. A15-165129 One animal was impounded. Staff reviewed the animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. The animal was redeemed this complaint is closed.

4. A15-165775 One animal was impounded and a Bond Notice was served to the owner for the safety of the animal. The owner failed to post bond and the animal was automatically forfeited to PACC. This complaint is closed.

5. A15-166027 No animal was impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. This complaint is closed.

6. A15-165954 Two animals were impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at PACC. This complaint is closed.

7. A15-166165 No animals were impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. A recheck was conducted and found the dog had been euthanized. This complaint is closed.

8. A14-155481 No animals were impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. This complaint is closed.

9. A15-166099 No animals were impounded. Staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. A recheck is pending.

10. A15-166650 No animals were impounded. The case was followed up on staff reviewed animal welfare requirements and laws with the owner and cited at the scene. A recheck is pending.

WC 1

INVESTIGATION REPORT

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

SUSPECT				ACO NAME / BADGE #	COMPLAINT NUMBER
				D. Hinte 2068	A14-154739
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS				BITE ☐ WELFARE ☒ DANGEROUS ☐ OTHER ☐	
ZIP	CITY: Marana	STATE: AZ	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER	CODE IF OTHER :	
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS				CI ☐ CO ☒ OTHER ☐	
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER	DRIVERS LICENSE	

SEX	WEIGHT	HEIGHT	EYES	HAIR COLOR	ORIGIN	DOB	SSN
	173	5'5"	BRO	BK	1		REFUSED

DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES ☐ NO ☒	LOCATION OF INCIDENT: / Avra Valley Rd	DATE AND TIME REPORTED: 8/28/14 / 1520	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED: 2/10/15 / 1612

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

☐ I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case	VICTIM/COMPLAINTANT NAME: Officer D. Hinte 2068	D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	BUSINESS PHONE NO.: 520-724-5900	
☐ I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.	VICTIM'S ADDRESS: Pima Animal Care Center		ZIP	CITY	STATE
☐ REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B0 and § 8-286 (B)	VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS: 4000 N. Silverbell Rd		ZIP: 85745	CITY: Tucson	STATE: AZ

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

☐ ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM	☐ VIOLATION ☐ NON-VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY: PART OF BODY BITTEN:	TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED / RELEASE DATE:	PACC ☐ VET ☐ HOME ☐
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM / PHONE NUMBER	VET CLINIC		PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES ☐ NO ☐		FTQ ☐ UTQ ☐
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS	CLINIC'S ADDRESS		QUARANTINE 10 ☐ 15 ☐ 45 ☐ 180 ☐	☐ FRA HEAD#		
	3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES ☐ NO ☐	CITING ACO: D. Hinte 2068	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES ☐ NO ☐	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS	
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE	CODE/ORD VIOLATED: 6.04.070; 11-1010(A) ARS; 6.04.110(B)(5)			REVIEWED BY 2-12-15 ATK 1911		
	CITATIONS/NUMBERS: 74036 A-E; 74037 A			BOND YES ☐ NO ☐		

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
Hound mix	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Cocoa	Tan	F	2yr	CITED	CITED	N	A510146
Hound mix	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Bandit	Tan	M	2yr	CITED	CITED	N	A510147
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐								
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐								
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐								
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐								
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐								

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

WC 1

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-154739

ACO name & Badge: D. Hinte 2068

On August 28, 2014 at 3:20 PM, Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) dispatch received a complaint stating that there were about 30 dogs which all appeared to be fed and cared for, but the owner also has a Bloodhound named Hunter which they have turned out. The caller stated that the owners didn't want the dog anymore and had taken to not feeding it or providing it with water. The caller reported that the dog was very thin and its bones were beginning to show.

On February 10, 2015 at 4:12 PM, Officer Rademaker 2019 and I, Officer Hinte 2068. arrived at W Avra Valley Rd. We met with property owner who stated that he did not own any animals. He informed us that the tenant, named Ralph, of his rental property at W Avra Valley Rd owned a bloodhound mix that would escape and roam at large. Mr. stated that that the dog owner now keeps the dog on a tie out to prevent it from escaping.

We arrived at W Avra Valley Rd and met with . We advised him of the complaint and he stated that the neighbors to the southeast of his property had "stolen" his dog several months ago. We inquired about other animals on the property and walked around the side of the house to view the backyard. We observed four dogs in the yard, two of which were on tie outs. We informed Mr. that tie outs are illegal and asked him to take the dogs off the tie outs. Mr. complied. He stated that the two dogs, which he has had for 9 months, had a history of jumping over or crawling under the fence. The male dog on the tie out, Bandit, had a water bowl that was knocked over. The female dog on the tie out, Cocoa. had a metal bucket full of water available to her. We advised Mr. that water must be available at all times. He mentioned that he had four crates in the house to contain the dogs as an alternative to the tie outs. We inquired about license and vaccination for the dogs. The black and white pitbull mix, Oreo A469144, was current on both. Mr. stated that the hound mixes, Cocoa and Bandit, were not licensed or vaccinated. We advised Mr. that the 2 month old Sharpei puppy named Rolo would need to be licensed and vaccinated at 3 months of age.

WC 1

We issued Mr. citations in the County for 2x no license, 2x no rabies vaccination, and 2x neglect- tie out. We explained his court date, time, and location. He stated that he understood, signed, and received his copy. We also provided literature regarding laws of animal ownership.

On February 10, 2015 at 7:35 PM, Supervisor Tenkate 1911 received a call from who said that 2 Animal Control Officers came onto his property without permission. He said he asked them to get off his property several times and the 2 officers refused. Mr. was angry and continued to utilize profanity and she asked him to stop. This angered him more and she explained that the officers had spoken to his landlord(18750 W Avra Valley Rd) who told them the hound mix lived on his rental property at W Avra Valley Rd. Mr. threatened to get his gun and shoot the Animal Care Officers in the conversation about the complaint at his property. Mr. continued to use profane language and she ended the call.

Officer's Signature: Date: 2/11/15

WC 2

INVESTIGATION REPORT

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

SUSPECT	
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS	Ocotillo Ridge Trail
CITY	
STATE	AZ
ZIP	
RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER	(520):
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS	UNK
CITY	N/A
STATE	N/A
ZIP	N/A
BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER	N/A
ACO NAME / BADGE #	Hendrickson #2066
ACTIVITY/BITE NUMBER	A15-164387
BITE ☐ WELFARE ☒ DANGEROUS ☐ OTHER ☐	
CI ☐ CO ☒ OTHER ☐	
DRIVERS LICENSE	Unknown

SEX	WEIGHT	HEIGHT	EYES	HAIR	ORIGIN	DOB	SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER
	UNK	5'2"	BR	BR	3		

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

LOCATION OF INCIDENT: Ocotillo Ridge Trail
DATE AND TIME OF INCIDENT: 01/22/2015
DATE AND TIME REPORTED:

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

☐ I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case
☐ I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.
☐ REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B0 and § 8-286 (B)

VICTIM/COMPLAINTANT NAME	M Hendrickson
DATE OF BIRTH	
RESIDENCE PHONE	(520)724-5900
BUSINESS PHONE	(520)724-5900
VICTIM'S ADDRESS	N/A
CITY	N/A
STATE	N/A
ZIP	N/A
VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS	4000 N Silverbell
CITY	Tucson
STATE	AZ
ZIP	85645

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)

DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES ☐ NO ☒
RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES ☐ NO ☒
DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER
OTHER AGENCY CASE # 150122067 ☒ SHERIFF DEPT ☐ TUCSON POLICE ☐ FIRE ☐ OTHER:
FOLLOW UP REQUEST ☐ SO ☐ TPD ☐ OTHER:

☐ ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

☐ VIOLATION ☐ NON-VIOLATION
BITE SEVERITY:
PART OF BODY BITTEN:
TREATED BY
PHONE NUMBER
DATE QUARANTINED
RELEASE DATE:
PACC ☐ VET ☐ HOME ☐

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM
PHONE NUMBER

VET CLINIC
PHONE NUMBER
OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES ☐ NO ☐
FTQ ☐ UTQ ☐

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

CLINIC'S ADDRESS
QUARANTINE (DAYS) 10 ☐ 15 ☐ 45 ☐ 180 ☐
☐ FRA HEAD#

3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES ☐ NO ☒
CITING ACO
PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES ☐ NO ☒
PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER
OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

CODE/ORD VIOLATED: 6.04.110(A); 6.04.110(B)(6); 6.04.110(B)(2); 6.04.100(B)(5)
REVIEWED BY: DTH 1911 2-6-15
CITATIONS/NUMBERS: #74131(A-E); #74133(A-E); #74134(A-D); #74135(A-E); #74136(A,B)
BOND YES ☐ NO ☒

BREED/DESCRIPTION		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	LICENSE #	CONDITION	ANIMAL ID#
Lab Mix	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	unknown	Black	F	2yr		N	A508097
Lab Mix	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	unknown	White	M	2yr		N	A508098
Shepherd Mix	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Unknown	Tan	F	Pup		N	A508099
Shepherd Mix	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Unknown	Tan	M	Pup		N	A508100
Rottweiler Mix	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Unknown	Tan/blk	M	Pup		N	A508101
Rottweiler Mix	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Unknown	Tan/Blk	F	Pup		N	A508102
Chihuahua Mix	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Unknown	Tan/Blk	M	AD		N	A508103

WITNESS	M	F	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
PCSO Deputy Judd #1112	☒	☐	N/A	1750 E. Benson Highway	N/A	(520) 351-4600
T Foster #2042	☐	☒		4000 N Silverbell	N/A	(520)724-5900 X3
	☐	☐				
	☐	☐				

WC 2

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-164387

ACO Name & Badge: M Hendrickson #2066

On 01/22/15 at approximately 10:19hrs Pima Animal Care dispatch operators received a call from the Pima County Sheriff's Department requesting that an Animal Care Officer respond to S Ocotillo Ridge Trail in reference to a report of several dogs in cages without food or water. The Sheriff's Department dispatcher also stated that the dogs' owner had not been seen in four days.

01/22/15 11:48hrs I, Officer Hendrickson badge # 2066 and Officer Foster badge #2042 arrived at S Ocotillo Ridge Trail. Upon arrival we met with Pima County Sheriff Deputy, Judd badge # 1112. Deputy Judd stated he questioned two neighbors about how long the resident living at Ocotillo Ridge Trail had been gone, the neighbors stated about four days. Deputy Judd stated he could hear many dogs in the home barking. Deputy Judd stated he hopped the fence to check on the welfare of the animals. He said he found a ladder and looked through an open window where he could see several dogs in crates in filthy conditions, he did not observe any water in the crates.

Officer Foster and I contacted supervisor N. Konst badge # 2002, he advised us to do a record search and attempt to contact the owner. We then asked dispatch to call the number we had on file for the dog owner. Dispatch stated that they could not get a hold of anyone and the numbers on file were no longer valid. Supervisor Konst had stated that if we were unable to reach the owner that we should enter the property and attempt to confirm the Deputy's observation that the animals did not have access to water. He went on to say that if we confirmed the lack of water at that point we had probable cause to enter the home due to exigent circumstances.

Officer Foster and I then entered the perimeter fence of the property accompanied by Deputy Judd and looked through the window. The first thing we noticed was the home had an over powering odor of animal waste. We then looked through the open window and saw several dogs kept in undersized crates in the living room. The home was completely disheveled. It had piles of animal waste everywhere along with miscellaneous belongings scattered throughout the room.

We also confirmed Deputy Judd's observation that the confined animals had no access to water. Officer Foster then climbed in through the open window and unlocked the front door. Prior to entering the residence Deputy Judd removed the gate from its hinges to allow us to drive the Pima Animal Care truck into the property. Deputy Judd stated he did not want to cut the lock off the property fence.

On entry we were able to observe a total of seven dogs in the home that were confined in their own filth and five of the seven dogs were kept in three undersized animal crates. All but one of the crated dogs was kept two to a crate. The dogs in the crates did not have any water, food or adequate space provided to them. The two dogs roaming the home did not have any potable water and could only access the toilet bowl and a mop bucket with dirty brown water. With Deputy Judd observing we began to photograph the home and impound the dogs. We first impounded a white lab mix that was not in a crate along with a small tan puppy that the deputy stated had jumped out of the home through the open window. There were five dogs left in the home that were in crates. The first crate contained dog a tan puppy without any water or food. The bottom of the crate was covered in feces and clumps of hair. The second crate contained two black and tan Rottweiler mix puppies. Both of these puppies were covered in urine and feces. The Rottweiler puppies lacked adequate space to sit, stand, turn around and lay down comfortably. The third crate contained a medium to large sized black lab mix and a black and tan Chihuahua mix.

Officer's Signature: **Date:**

WC 2

INVESTIGATION REPORT CONTINUATION

Activity Number: A15-164387

ACO Name & Badge: M Hendrickson #2066

Those two dogs also had feces and urine covering them and the inside of their crate. They did not have access to water.

We took numerous pictures documenting the deplorable conditions both in the crates and the house. Prior to leaving the front door was secured and a notice of impound was posted on the front door. Deputy Judd reattached the gate before leaving the area.

On 02/01/15 13:16 Officer Foster spoke with the dog owner on Pima Animal Care phone line #45956 and asked to meet with her. Ms. agreed to meet us at the Valero station located at Benson highway and Valencia Rd.

02/01/15 16:19 Officer Foster and I arrived at the Valero gas station to meet with to issue citations based on the neglect of the seven dogs impounded from her home on 1/22/15. We met with Mrs. and spoke to her about why her seven dogs were found in such deplorable conditions.

Mrs. stated that her friend was coming to her house 2-3 times a day to care for her dogs. She also said that was at the house on the morning of the 22nd before animal care arrived. She said would take the dogs out of the crates, let them outside, clean the crates, feed and water the dogs at least twice a day. Mrs. also stated that the dogs were never in the crates for more than six hours at a time. Mrs. stated that was the woman who called Pima Animal Care Center on 1/25/15 18:46 hours and represented herself as Mrs. mother. She also stated that she and Ms. believed that Mr. had removed the dogs, although she later stated she knew him to be incarcerated at the time of the impound. Mrs. stated that they did not notice the door knocker on the security door until 01/26/15.

Mrs. stated many times that her neighbors did not want her in the neighborhood and were racist. She went on to say that her neighbors are harassing her and that their dislike of her has prompted all the complaints.

She admitted that the dogs did not have water provided for them inside the home and felt that they had enough free time outside to drink plenty of water. The only potable water provided for the dogs was located outside of the home. The bowl was filled continuously from a leaky irrigation line.

Mrs. received citations for neglect- no water, cruelty, neglect of ventilation for all seven dogs. Mrs. received additional citations for the five confined dogs for neglect of exercise space. She signed and received her copy of the citations issued to her. She was informed of her court date, time and new court house location.

Officer's Signature: Marilyn Hendrickson **Date:** 2/6/15

WC 3

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Pima County Health Department
Pima Animal Care Center
4000 N. Silverbell Rd
Tucson, Arizona 85745
Phone: (520) 724-5900
Fax: (520) 724-5960
www.pimaanimalcare.org

SUSPECT					ACO NAME / BADGE # A. Kirby #2057	COMPLAINT NUMBER A15-165129	
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS W. 28th St.					BITE ☐ WELFARE ☒ DANGEROUS ☐ OTHER ☐		
ZIP	CITY Tucson	STATE AZ	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER 520-		CODE IF OTHER :		
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS N/A					CI ☐ CO ☐ OTHER ☒ South Tucson		
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER		DRIVERS LICENSE		
SEX	WEIGHT 200	HEIGHT 5'04"	EYES BRO	HAIR COLOR BR	ORIGIN 1	DOB 1	SSN N/A

DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES ☒ NO ☐	LOCATION OF INCIDENT W. 28th St., Tucson, AZ	DATE AND TIME REPORTED 02/03/15 / 13:05 hrs	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 02/03/15 / 1245 hrs

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

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

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

☐ ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM	☒ VIOLATION ☐ NON-VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY: 3	TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED 02/03/15	PACC ☒ VET ☐ HOME ☐
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM		PART OF BODY BITTEN: Left Leg			RELEASE DATE: 02/12/15	
PHONE NUMBER	VET CLINIC		PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES ☒ NO ☐		FTQ ☐ UTQ ☐
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS	CLINIC'S ADDRESS		QUARANTINE 10 ☒ 15 ☐ 45 ☐ 180 ☐		☐ FRA HEAD#	

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE	3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES ☒ NO ☐	CITING ACO A. Kirby #2057	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES ☐ NO ☒	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS
VERBAL	CODE/ORD VIOLATED 3-3(2)(D)(2), 6.04.110(B)(3), 3-3(2)(B), 3-81, 3-76				REVIEWED BY 2-7-15 BTK 1911
	CITATIONS/NUMBERS 74112, 74113				BOND YES ☐ NO ☒

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
Pit Bull Mix	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Libby	Gray/White	F	A		Citation	Citation	N	A509426
Pit Bull Mix	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Leah	Black/White	F	A		Citation	Citation	N	A509665
Pit Bull Mix	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Diamond	Brown Brindle	F	A		Citation	Citation	N	A509666
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									

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

NC 3

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-163129

ACO name & Badge: A. Kirby #2057

On February 03, 2015 at approximately 1329 hours, I Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) Officer A. Kirby #2057 arrived at W. 28th St. and met with South Tucson Police Officer (STPD) Zormefer #618, in reference to STPD case # 1502030002 involving a dog bite with a gray/white Pit Bull named Libby. The Police Officer advised that the victim (had already been transported to the hospital by ambulance, however he did want citations issued with restitution and told STPD Officer Zormefer that he was walking down the sidewalk in front of W. 28th St. when a gray/white Pit Bull mix, which he later identified to Officer Zormefer, came charging out at him from an unknown location, biting him on his left leg puncturing the skin. Details and photographs of the injury are included in the South Tucson Police report.

Upon arrival at W. 28th St. I observed a black and white Pit Bull mix on a tie-out in the front yard of the residence. Officer Meek #2015 had already removed the dog identified by the victim as the biter, Libby and loaded her onto my truck. Officer Meek #2015 then cleared the scene and had no further involvement.

I then met with the dog owner Mr.) and explained to him that tie-outs are illegal and the dog on the tie-out did not have access to shelter, and that the water for the dog was green and full of algae and not safe for the dog to drink. Mr. stated the tied dog's name was Leah, and that Leah was tied out because she is able to jump the fence and escape the yard. I also observed a 3rd dog in the yard named Diamond, a brown brindle Pit Bull.

I then issued citations for biting animal and leash law on behalf of the victim and citations for no license no rabies vaccinations for the three dogs I saw on the property. I also issued citations for Neglect - Tie out, no shelter, and no potable water for the dog that was on the tie out. Mr. was explained his citations, court date, time, and location, stated he understood and signed the citation.

Officer's Signature: **Date:** 02/03/15

NC 4

NVESTIGATION REPORT

'ima County Health Department
'ima Animal Care Center
.000 N. Silverbell Rd.
'ucson, Arizona 85745
'hone: (520) 243-5900
'ax: (520) 243-5960
'ww.pimaanimalcare.org

SUSPECT		ACO NAME / BADGE # Klein 1926	COMPLAINT NUMBER A15-165775
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS E Colette Circle Apt.		BITE ☐ WELFARE ☐ DANGEROUS ☐ OTHER ☑	
ZIP	CITY Tucson / STATE Az / RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER	CODE IF OTHER :	
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS Unknown		CI ☑ CO ☐ OTHER ☐	
ZIP	CITY / STATE / BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER	DRIVERS LICENSE	

SEX	WEIGHT	HEIGHT	EYES	HAIR COLOR	ORIGIN	DOB	SSN
		6'5	Blu	Br	1		Unknown

LOCATION OF INCIDENT E Colette Circle Apt	DATE AND TIME REPORTED 2-12-15 / 1616	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 2-12-15 / 1616

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

JES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR AIVER OF RIGHTS? YES ☐ NO ☑

] I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this se

] I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this se.

] REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-05 (B0 and § 8-286 (B)

VICTIM/COMPLAINTANT NAME	D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	BUSINESS PHONE NO.
E.Klein Badge # 1926			520-724-5900

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

ME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE APPLICABLE)

DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED	RESTITUTION REQUESTED	DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # 1502120389	FOLLOW UP REQUEST
YES ☐ NO ☑	YES ☐ NO ☑		☐ SO ☑ TPD ☐ TFD ☐ OTHER:	☐ SO ☐ TPD ☐ OTHER:

] ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS ITIM

☐ VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY:	TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED	PACC ☐
☐ NON-VIOLATION	PART OF BODY BITTEN:			RELEASE DATE:	VET ☐ HOME ☐

ATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

IONE NUMBER

VET CLINIC	PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES ☐ NO ☐	FTQ ☐ UTQ ☐

WFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

CLINIC'S ADDRESS	QUARANTINE 10 ☐ 15 ☐ 45 ☐ 180 ☐	☐ FRA HEAD#

3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES ☐ NO ☑	CITING ACO	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES ☐ NO ☑	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS

CTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE GNATURE

CODE/ORD VIOLATED	REVIEWED BY 2-16-15
CITATIONS/NUMBERS	BOND YES ☑ NO ☐

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
tbull	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☑	Hot Shot	Wht/Tan	m	9m		242490		ok	A508071
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									

TNESS 1 D Officer Dunton Badge 43876	M ☑ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS 270 S Stone	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE # 520-791-4925
TNESS 2	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
TNESS 3	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
TNESS 4	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #

WC 4

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-165775

ACO name & Badge: Klein Badge #1926

On Feb 12, 2015 at 1740 hours I, Investigator Klein arrived at E Colette Circle and met with Tucson Police Department (TPD) Officer Dunton, Badge 43876 who responded under TPD case 1512120389. Officer Dunton stated the dog owner, Aiden told officers that he had been making his own experimental drugs. Aiden claimed that he gave the mixture to his dog before taking some himself. The officers do not know what kind of drugs but showed me a prescription pill bottle sitting on a computer desk. The label was removed and the lid was off. I saw no pills on the computer desk or in the bottle.

Officer Dunton then showed me two medical marijuana identification cards from two different states for Aiden. One listed his name as being and the other listed . I explained that Pima County Animal Care Center (PACC)records indicate he adopted the dog from PACC on Jan. 26, 2015 under the name .

Officer Dunton stated some neighbors told him the dog barks and claws at the front door nonstop. He then showed me the scratched up door frame and the broken blinds next to the front door.

Officer Dunton stated he placed the dog in the bedroom while they were trying to talk to Aiden. He said Aiden was not doing well and was transported to a hospital by ambulance.

I then opened the bedroom door to meet the dog. I immediately smelled a very strong odor consistent with marijuana. Hot Shot (A 508071) is a young, white and tan neutered pitbull. He was very friendly and of good body weight. After interacting with Hot Shot and taking him to better lighting I explained to Officer Dunton that I did not see anything abnormal about Hot Shots appearance or behavior. He did not have odd pupils, he was not dehydrated, he was not lethargic, and he was not overly hyper or shaking. I explained that I would transport Hot Shot to PACC to be examined and monitored by a veterinarian.

WB 4

I also explained that due to , s statements I will place him on the do not adopt list. I told him that I will also place a Bond on Hot Shot as it would be dangerous to allow Aiden to have any dogs after stating he was making experimental drugs and giving them to his dog.

I impounded Hot Shot and provided a notice of impound to be left inside of , 's apartment. I returned to PACC, placed Hot Shot in Dr. Wilcox's care and explained the incident.

On February 13, 2015 at approximately 1500 hours Enforcement Operations Manager Jose Chavez, Officer Hinte and I, Field Investigator Klein met with Mr. , when he came to the Pima County Animal Care Center (PACC). Mr. stated he found the notice that was left inside of his apartment stating PACC impounded his dog. Mr. , said his dog did not bite anyone and he was scared that he would not get his dog back.

Mr. was wearing pajamas, he was shaking, and his eyes were glassy and bloodshot. We asked how he was feeling and he said fine. We asked him to tell us what happened the day before.

Mr. stated that he is a Buddhist and practices different forms of meditation. He stated that he experiments with different drugs once a month. He stated he usually tries different forms of Hallucinogens. He stated that he had taken Acid and when it was done he spit it out onto the floor. He watched his dog eat two of the tabs he had spit out. He stated he wanted to bond with his dog on a totally different level. He said the dog is his best friend and his soul mate.

Mr. , said he wanted to make sure his dog had a good trip. They began tripping together and had a blast. Mr. , stated that his dog was rolling around on his back and acting like a puppy again. He said his dog loved it.

Mr. , said he left his house around 3:00 and came back around 11:00 but he made sure his dog was in a good place and a safe place before he left. I asked Mr. if that would have been when the ambulance took him to the hospital. He said yes. We then asked him who called 911. He stated he called 911 because he thought he had made a mistake and had taken too much.

I told Mr. , that I am the one who met with the police officers at his apartment. When I removed the dog from his bedroom I could smell a very strong odor that smelled like marijuana in his bedroom. He explained that he has a medical card for marijuana. He said that he is a vet and has PTSD. I asked if he ever gives marijuana to his dog. He then explained in detail how to prepare leaves from a marijuana plant before feeding it to a dog. He said you cannot just feed the buds to a dog because they do not ingest it properly. He also explained what he believes to be the benefits associated with this. He was asked if he has done this for his dog and he said no.

He was asked if he gave the Acid to his dog. He said he did not do it on purpose. He just saw his dog eat two of the tabs after he had spit them out.

WC 4

Mr. ; then said that this dog is his therapy dog and he would like to take it through some training.

He repeated that they are best friends. He began to cry and said he doesn't know what he will do if he doesn't get his dog back. I asked if he adopted the dog from PACC on January 26, 2015 and he said yes. I asked if he has had other dogs before and he described the dogs that his family had when he was a child.

Mr. ; was asked to give us few minutes to review his case. He began to cry and his face turned a very dark red color. I asked him to practice his breathing techniques and give us a few minutes. He continued to tell me he didn't know what he might do if he doesn't get his dog back. He mumbled several times that he needs to go get calm. I asked him what the meant and he just repeated the word calm.

After reviewing the statements made by the TPD officers and Mr. statement it was determined that a Bond would be served to Mr. Aarons and the dog adopted as "Hot Shot" would not be returned to him.

Officer Hinte and I then returned to Mr. . I asked Mr. if he is still calling the dog "Hot Shot". He said he calls the dog "Mello" because he looks and feels like a marshmallow. I asked Mr. ; if he brought any identification with him today and he said he only brought the notice of impound that was left in his apartment.

I showed Mr. the completed Bond form and explained that Mello will not be returned to him. It would be a danger to the dogs' health and well-being to return him. I explained that he will need to pay the amount of $375 to PACC no later than February 23, 2015 in order to contest the impoundment and forfeiture of Mello. I explained that when he does that a hearing will then be scheduled.

Mr. said he threw away several hundred dollars' worth of Acid and that he believes there isn't any left in his house. He said he doesn't have any money left to pay for the Bond. I told him that it was probably best for his own health as well but Mello will not be returned to him. Mr. then told me it is legal in other countries and that I do not have the right to say any different. I explained that I do not believe Acid is legal here and asked if he was referring to giving drugs to dogs or the drugs in general.

Mr. starred at me for several minutes while I asked him if he heard me and if he was alright. I told him that I needed him to sign the Bond. He said no. I wrote that he refused to sign, dated it and provided him with a copy. He continued to stare at me. I asked him again if he was alright and if he understood what I had explained to him. He then told me that I am Satan.

I told Mr. it was time to leave. As Officer Hinte and I escorted him to the lobby he called me a sick fuck. He said he wanted to tell me to have a good day but he couldn't because he wishes bad things for me. Once in the lobby he began to cry again.

WC 4

I asked Mr. if he was going to be alright and if he thought he was able to drive. He told me he can drive and walked outside.

Approximately 20 minutes later Mr. was walking through the dog adoption kennels at PACC. Officer Hinte approached him and saw that he had an adoption questionnaire in his hand. She explained the he would not be allowed to adopt any animals. Mr. told her that he knew that and thought he had to have the form to walk through the shelter. He spoke to several people in the lobby before leaving the facility. 1926 E.Klein

Officer's Signature: E. Klein Date: 2-14-15

E. KLEIN #1926

NC 5

INVESTIGATION REPORT

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

SUSPECT						ACO NAME / BADGE #	ACTIVITY/BITE NUMBER
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS: Leslie Ave Unit						T. Foster 2042	A15-166027
CITY: Tucson	STATE: AZ	ZIP	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER: 520-			BITE ☐ WELFARE ☒ DANGEROUS ☐ OTHER ☐	
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS: UNK						CI ☒ CO ☐ OTHER ☐	
CITY: N/A	STATE: N/A	ZIP: N/A	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER: N/A			DRIVERS LICENSE	
SEX	WEIGHT: 180	HEIGHT: 5'8"	EYES: BRO	HAIR: BR	ORIGIN: 5	DOB	SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER

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

LOCATION OF INCIDENT: S Leslie Ave Unit — DATE AND TIME OF INCIDENT: 02/16/15 17:44 — DATE AND TIME REPORTED: 02/16/15 17:44

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

☐ I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case

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

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

VICTIM/COMPLAINTANT NAME	DATE OF BIRTH	RESIDENCE PHONE	BUSINESS PHONE
T. Foster	N/A	N/A	724-5900 Ext 3

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

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)

DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES ☐ NO ☒ — RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES ☐ NO ☒ — DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER — OTHER AGENCY CASE # ☐ SHERIFF DEPT ☐ TUCSON POLICE ☐ FIRE ☐ OTHER: — FOLLOW UP REQUEST ☐ SO ☐ TPD ☐ OTHER:

☐ ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

☐ VIOLATION ☐ NON-VIOLATION — BITE SEVERITY: — PART OF BODY BITTEN: — TREATED BY — PHONE NUMBER — DATE QUARANTINED — RELEASE DATE: — PACC ☐ VET ☐ HOME ☐

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

PHONE NUMBER

VET CLINIC — PHONE NUMBER — OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES ☐ NO ☐ — FTQ ☐ UTQ ☐

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

CLINIC'S ADDRESS — QUARANTINE (DAYS) 10 ☐ 15 ☐ 45 ☐ 180 ☐ — ☐ FRA HEAD#

3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES ☐ NO ☒ — CITING ACO: 2042 — PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES ☐ NO ☐ — PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER — OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

CODE/ORD VIOLATED: 6.04.110(B)(2); 6.04.110 (B) (5); 11-1010 (A) ARS — REVIEWED BY

CITATIONS/NUMBERS: #74004 (A, B, C, D) — BOND YES ☐ NO ☒

BREED/DESCRIPTION		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	LICENSE #	CONDITION	ANIMAL ID#
American Bull Dog	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Barney	Wh/ Brindle	M	1y 5m	L14-224638	N	A477859
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐							
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐							
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐							
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐							
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐							
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐							

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

WC 5

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-166027

ACO Name & Badge: T. Foster 2042

02/16/15 17:44 I, Officer Foster 2042 arrived at S Leslie Unit 2 to meet with the dog owner in case# A15-165713. I knocked on the door but did not receive an answer. While I was waiting for a response I noticed a white and brindled American bulldog type dog in the adjacent yard tied out to a metal pole by a long blue nylon leash. The dog's water source was a dark colored Christmas tree stand that was overturned leaving him with no access to water. I photographed the dog and then attempted to get the attention of the residents inside the home. An adolescent girl exited the home and I asked her if there was an adult at home, she advised me that there was and went inside to get her.

I was met moments later by , the dog owner. I asked Ms. if that was her dog and she acknowledged that he is hers. Ms. told me his name is Barney and he is just over one year old. I asked to see her drivers license and she complied. I then asked her if she was aware that chaining up a dog is illegal in Pima county and she stated that she was not aware and told me she had just moved from Wilcox to Tucson. I returned to the Pima Animal Care Center truck and did a record search and found that Ms. has lived in Pima county for over one year. I then issued citations for Neglect -Tie out; Neglect- No Water; No Rabies Vaccination; and No License. Ms. acknowledged, signed and accepted her copy of the citations. I then returned her license to her and provided her with her her court date, time, and new court house location.

Officer's Signature: J. Foster **Date:** 2/19/15

WC 6

INVESTIGATION REPORT

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

SUSPECT		ACO NAME / BADGE # D. Hinte 2068 T. Foster 2042	COMPLAINT NUMBER A15-165954
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS S Carson Ave Unit		BITE ☐ WELFARE ☒ DANGEROUS ☐ OTHER ☐	
ZIP	CITY Tucson / STATE AZ / RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER 520-[illegible]	CODE IF OTHER :	
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS E Broadway Blvd.		CI ☒ CO ☐ OTHER ☐	
ZIP	CITY Tucson / STATE AZ / BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER 520-[illegible]	DRIVERS LICENSE	

SEX	WEIGHT	HEIGHT	EYES	HAIR COLOR	ORIGIN	DOB	SSN
	220	6'0"	BLU	BR	5		

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

LOCATION OF INCIDENT: S Carson Ave/[illegible] S Carson Ave Unit
DATE AND TIME REPORTED: 02/15/15 / 1706
DATE AND TIME OCCURRED: 02/15/15 / 1740

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

☐ I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case
☐ I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.
☐ REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-405 (B) and § 8-286 (B)

VICTIM/COMPLAINTANT NAME	D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	BUSINESS PHONE NO.
Officer T. Foster			520-724-5900

VICTIM'S ADDRESS	ZIP	CITY	STATE
Pima Animal Care Center			
VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS 4000 N Silverbell Rd	ZIP 85745	CITY Tucson	STATE AZ

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)

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

☐ ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

☐ VIOLATION ☐ NON-VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY: / PART OF BODY BITTEN:	TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED / RELEASE DATE:	PACC ☐ VET ☐ HOME ☐

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

PHONE NUMBER

VET CLINIC	PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES ☐ NO ☐	FTQ ☐ UTQ ☐

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

CLINIC'S ADDRESS	QUARANTINE 10 ☐ 15 ☐ 45 ☐ 180 ☐	☐ FRA HEAD#

3RD PARTY CITATIONS	CITING ACO	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS
YES ☐ NO ☒	D. Hinte 2068	YES ☐ NO ☒		

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

CODE/ORD VIOLATED	REVIEWED BY
4-97; 4-3(2)(E)(2)	2002 KmST 2/18
CITATIONS/NUMBERS 74041 A-B	BOND YES ☐ NO ☒

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE		LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
Australian Shepherd Mix	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Blaze	Sable/white	M	2yr		CURRENT	CURRENT	N	A510620
Australian Shepherd	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Jake	Blue merle/white	M	6yr		CURRENT	CURRENT	N	A510621
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									

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

WC 6

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-165954

ACO name & Badge: D. Hinte 2068

On February 15, 2015 at 5:06 PM, Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) dispatch received a complaint from Rachel Wyatt stating that a dog from S Carson Ave Unit had broken loose from a tie out and had gotten into her yard.

On February 17, 2015 at 5:40 PM, Officer Foster 2042 arrived at S Carson Ave and was met by Ms. in her driveway. Ms. t was able to help Officer Foster leash the sable and white dog that was at large. Officer Foster secured the dog on the truck and Ms. walked her over to where the second dog was on a tie-out. Officer Foster then impounded the blue merle and white dog off of the tie out. Officer Foster requested that citations be issued to the dog owner upon redemption for the tie-out and leash law violations.

On February 17, 2015 at 2:30 PM, I, Officer Hinte 2068, met with dog owner I. He claimed ownership of both the sable and white Australian Shepherd mix, named Blaze, and the blue merle and white Australian Shepherd mix, named Jake. I explained that Blaze was in violation of leash law when he was at large. I also explained that tie outs are prohibited. Mr. stated that he was unaware that tie outs are illegal. He stated that the dogs had a history of digging under the fence and he used the tie outs as an attempt to keep them safe until he could reinforce the bottom of the fence. I issued Mr. citations in the City on behalf of Officer Foster for leash law and neglect- tie out. I explained his court date, time, and location. He stated that he understood, signed, and received his copy.

Officer's Signature: **Date:** 2/17/15

WC 7

INVESTIGATION REPORT

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

SUSPECT: Z				ACO NAME / BADGE #: X. Delgadillo #2047	COMPLAINT NUMBER: A15-166165
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS: S. Richardson Dr				BITE ☐ WELFARE ☒ DANGEROUS ☐ OTHER ☐	
ZIP:	CITY: Tucson	STATE: AZ	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER: 520-[illegible]	CODE IF OTHER:	
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS				CI ☐ CO ☐ OTHER ☐	
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER	DRIVERS LICENSE	

SEX	WEIGHT	HEIGHT	EYES	HAIR COLOR	ORIGIN	DOB	SSN
	255	5'11"	Bro	Bro	1		

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

LOCATION OF INCIDENT	DATE AND TIME REPORTED	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED
S. Richardson Dr	02/18/15 / 14:57	02/18/15 / 15:05

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

☐ I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case

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

☐ REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-1405 (B0 and § 8-286 (B)

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)

VICTIM/COMPLAINTANT NAME	D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	BUSINESS PHONE NO.
Deputy Saline			520-351-4900

VICTIM'S ADDRESS	ZIP	CITY	STATE

VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS	ZIP	CITY	STATE
1750 E. Benson Hwy	85714	Tucson	AZ

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

☐ ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

PHONE NUMBER

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

☐ VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY:	TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED	PACC ☐
☐ NON-VIOLATION	PART OF BODY BITTEN:			RELEASE DATE:	VET ☐ HOME ☐
VET CLINIC		PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES ☐ NO ☐		FTQ ☐ UTQ ☐
CLINIC'S ADDRESS		QUARANTINE 10 ☐ 15 ☐ 45 ☐ 180 ☐		☐ FRA HEAD#	

3RD PARTY CITATIONS	CITING ACO	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS
YES ☒ NO ☐	X. Delgadillo#2047	YES ☐ NO ☒		

CODE/ORD VIOLATED	REVIEWED BY
6.04.110 (B) (5), 6.04.70, 11-1010(ARS)	

CITATIONS/NUMBERS	BOND
74064	YES ☐ NO ☒

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
leagle	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Bacardi	Brown/White	M	A		Cited	Cited		510878
lusky Mix	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Lilly	Black/White	F	A		Cited	Cited		510879
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									

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

WC 7

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-166165

ACO name & Badge:X. Delgadillo #2047

On February 18, 2015 at approximately 15:05 I, Officer Delgadillo #2047, arrived to S. Richardson to assist Pima County Sheriff Office regarding dogs being neglected.

I met with Deputy Saline badge# 7194 case#1502180191, she provided pictures regarding a male brown and white beagle on a tie-out inside a pen. I took her photos and entered them into this case file.

Deputy Saline and I then to backyard to view the area where the dog was tied out. I observed a chain tie-out approximately 4 ft. long; the dog had already been removed. I also observed a female black and white husky mix free roaming in the yard that appeared very thin. Upon further examination, the dog's back bone was beginning to protrude and hip bones. The dog also had nasal discharge and excessive saliva around the front of her mouth. Mr. : stated that he had taken the Lilly for vet care but could not provide any documentation.

Deputy Saline stated that the dogs and two turtles had water but it was not potable and when Mr. arrived he provided the animals with clean fresh water. The dogs had adequate shelter.

I asked Mr. if the dogs were licensed and vaccinated and he stated that he could not provide the documentation. I explained the neglect of the dogs regarding vet care, potable water and vaccinations. I also provided Mr. a brochure regarding animal laws in Pima County. Mr. was ordered to provide vet care for Lilly within 24 hours; failure to do so would result in additional neglect charges for refusal of vet care.

Mr. ____ was issued third party citations on behalf of Deputy Saline#7194 for the following violations:

For Bacardi, a male brown and white Beagle: neglect, tie-out; no license and no rabies vaccination.
For Lilly, a female black and white Husky mix, no license and no rabies vaccination.

WC 7

On February 20, 2015 at approximately 15:48, I arrived to S. Richardson Drive and met with Mr. (z as I had not received any documentation for vet care. Mr. (: provided estimates from Pima Pet Clinic and I asked him for treatment records. Mr. stated that the dog, Lilly, was euthanized. I verified with Ester at Pima Pet that the dog was euthanized.

Officer's Signature:

Date: 2/24/15

WC 8

W

INVESTIGATION REPORT

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

SUSPECT	
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS	E Benson Hwy Unit
CITY	Tucson
STATE	AZ
ZIP	
RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER	520-[illegible]
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS	UNK
CITY	N/A
STATE	N/A
ZIP	N/A
BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER	N/A
ACO NAME / BADGE #	T. Foster #2042
ACTIVITY/BITE NUMBER	A14-155481
BITE ☐ WELFARE ☒ DANGEROUS ☐ OTHER ☐	
CI ☐ CD ☒ OTHER ☐	
DRIVERS LICENSE	

SEX	WEIGHT	HEIGHT	EYES	HAIR	ORIGIN	DOB	SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER
	170	6'	BRO	BK	#1		Not Given

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

☐ I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case

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

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

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

LOCATION OF INCIDENT	E Benson Hwy Unit
DATE AND TIME OF INCIDENT	02/28/15 12:09
DATE AND TIME REPORTED	09/08/14 16:23

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

VICTIM/COMPLAINTANT NAME	Unknown	DATE OF BIRTH	N/A
RESIDENCE PHONE	N/A	BUSINESS PHONE	N/A
VICTIM'S ADDRESS	N/A	CITY	N/A
STATE	N/A	ZIP	N/A
VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS	N/A	CITY	N/A
STATE	N/A	ZIP	N/A

DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES ☐ NO ☒

RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES ☐ NO ☒

DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER

OTHER AGENCY CASE # ☐ SHERIFF DEPT ☐ TUCSON POLICE ☐ FIRE ☐ OTHER:

FOLLOW UP REQUEST ☐ SO ☐ TPD ☐ OTHER:

☐ ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

PHONE NUMBER

☐ VIOLATION

☐ NON-VIOLATION

BITE SEVERITY:

PART OF BODY BITTEN:

TREATED BY

PHONE NUMBER

DATE QUARANTINED

RELEASE DATE:

PACC ☐ VET ☐ HOME ☐

VET CLINIC

PHONE NUMBER

OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES ☐ NO ☐

FTQ ☐ UTQ ☐

CLINIC'S ADDRESS

QUARANTINE (DAYS) 10 ☐ 15 ☐ 45 ☐ 180 ☐

☐ FRA HEAD#

3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES ☐ NO ☒

CITING ACO 2042

PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES ☐ NO ☒

PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER

OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS

CODE/ORD VIOLATED

6.04.110 (B)(3); 6.04.070; 11-1010(A) ARS

REVIEWED BY 2002 KBN 3/2/15

CITATIONS/NUMBERS

#74009 (A-E) #74010 (A)

BOND YES ☐ NO ☒

BREED/DESCRIPTION		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	LICENSE #	CONDITION	ANIMAL ID#
Boxer	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Roscoe	Black/White	M	AD	None	Normal	A512085
Boxer	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Bailey	Fawn	M	AD	None	Normal	A512084
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐							
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐							
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐							
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐							
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐							

WITNESS	M/F	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE #	BUSINESS PHONE #
1 M. Eckelbarger #1942	M ☒ F ☐	N/A	4000 N Silverbell Rd	N/A	520-724-5900 Ext3
2 C. Young #1908	M ☒ F ☐	N/A	4000 N Silverbell Rd	N/A	520-724-5900 Ext3
3 T. Bowdon #2013	M ☐ F ☒	N/A	4000 N Silverbell Rd	N/A	520-724-5900 Ext3
4	M ☐ F ☐				

WC 8

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-155481

ACO Name & Badge: T. Foster #2042

09/08/14 at 16:23 hours Pima Animal Care Dispatch operators received an anonymous complaint regarding two Boxer puppies being housed in the yard at) E Benson Hwy #(without access to shelter. The caller stated that the dog owner kicks the puppies outside regardless of the weather.

09/28/14 09:37 hours Officer T. Bowdon #2013 arrived at E Benson Hwy # and knocked on the front door but did not receive an answer. She was able to observe that there was food and water available for them but that the water was dirty and placed in a location where it would not remain in the shade in the hottest part of the day. She also observed that the yard, which faces west, was mostly shaded at that time of day. Officer Bowdon posted a notice for the owner requesting that he or she have proof of current rabies vaccinations and licenses available when he or she meets with an officer.

02/03/15 10:22 hours Officer M. Eckelbarger #1942 arrived at E Benson Hwy # ' and knocked on the front door but did not receive an answer. Officer Eckelbarger was able to observe that both Boxer dogs appeared to be healthy at the time of his visit but he did observe an excessive amount of animal waste in the yard and no shelter available to the dogs. He also arrived in the morning and noted that there was a large amount of shade available to the dogs at that time of day.

02/13/15 11:53 hours Officer C. Young #1908 arrived at E Benson Hwy #(and knocked on the front door but did not receive an answer. Officer Young was able to observe both dogs and noted that they appeared healthy at the time of his visit. Officer Young also observed that the dogs had food and water available. He also noted that there was not any form of shelter available. Officer Young posted a notice advising the dog owner that he/she may receive criminal citations if he/she failed to provide shelter for the dogs.

02/28/15 12:09 hours I, Officer Foster 2042 arrived and knocked on the front door and was met by a Hispanic male. I stated the reason for my visit and tried to explain the shelter requirements for dogs in Pima County. The man interrupted me and stated that he was angry that we (Pima Animal Care Center) keep leaving notices on his door. He stated that he works a lot and has someone come let his dogs out while he is at work. I then tried to explain that dogs are required to have access to shade and shelter at all times when outside. I went on to explain that shelter is defined as a structure with three sides, a roof, and an elevated floor. I then asked the man for a copy of his state issued Identification and proof of rabies vaccinations and Pima County Dog Licenses for both of his dogs. The man asked me what I wanted his Identification for and I stated that I needed to see it to establish his identity and to run a records check. The man then stated in an angry way that he did not have to give me anything and then stated that he knew his rights and did not have to give me his Identification card. He then opened the gate to the yard and called to the dogs and told them they were "going inside". I then requested via my hand-held radio for a Pima Animal Care Center dispatch operator to contact Pima County Sheriffs Office (PCSO) and request that a deputy be dispatched to my location for failure to cooperate. The man stopped what he was doing, left the dogs in the yard, and went inside his residence. He returned moments later with his ID which he handed to me.

Officer's Signature: See Attached **Date:**

WC 8

INVESTIGATION REPORT CONTINUATION

Activity Number: A14-155481

ACO Name & Badge: T. Foster #2042

He then said something unintelligible and began to walk away from his residence toward the parking area. I followed him and he stopped at a passenger car in the parking lot and removed some papers from inside of it. He then slapped the papers down on the metal clipboard I was holding and informed me that the papers are his proof of rabies vaccination. The documents he provided were not a rabies certificate nor a receipt for a rabies vaccination. Instead they were folder type shot record "holders" that are provided to clients by many area vets. I advised the man, , that that I was unable to accept them as proof of rabies vaccination since thev did not contain vaccine lot numbers, expiration dates, or the administering veterinarian's signature. I then told Mr. that I needed to go to the Pima Animal Care dog truck and that I would return shortly. I also requested that he wait for me near or at his residence. I had just entered the PACC truck and closed the door when Mr. knocked on the window and was attempting to continue to try to argue with me. I did not feel very safe at that point and locked the truck door and completed his citations while I waited for the PCSO deputy to arrive.

I then issued two No-License citations; two No-Rabies Vaccination citations; and two Neglect-No Shelter citations. When the PCSO Deputy arrived I briefed her about the situation and told her that Mr. 's reaction seemed unnecessary and unusual to me. I also advised her that he had physically crowded me throughout our conversation and that I felt as if he was using body language and very close proximity to intimidate me. I requested that she remain on scene long enough for me to present the citations to Mr.

I then presented Mr. with his citations and he signed them willingly. Mr. was provided with his court date, new court location, and time. He accepted his copies of the citations and the Deputy returned his license to him. Mr. then asked me some questions regarding neutering his dogs, obtaining licenses, and what counts as a shelter. He then apologized to me for his attitude and stated that he has been on call and was exhausted and frustrated with his work. I then thanked him for his apology and apologized for getting off on the wrong foot with him. I thanked Mr. for his time and cooperation, we shook hands and I left the area.

Officer's Signature: J. Foster #2042 **Date:** 03/01/15

WC 9

W

INVESTIGATION REPORT

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

SUSPECT					ACO NAME / BADGE # D. Hinte 2068	COMPLAINT NUMBER A15-166099	
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS N Meredith Pl					BITE ☐ WELFARE ☒ DANGEROUS ☐ OTHER ☐		
ZIP	CITY Tucson	STATE AZ	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER 520-		CODE IF OTHER :		
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS					CI ☐ CO ☒ OTHER ☐		
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER		DRIVERS LICENSE		
SEX	WEIGHT 170	HEIGHT 5'9"	EYES BRO	HAIR COLOR BRO	ORIGIN 1	DOB	SSN REFUSED

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

LOCATION OF INCIDENT N Meredith Pl				DATE AND TIME REPORTED 02/17/15 / 1449			DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 02/28/15 / 1527		
FOOD ☐	WATER ☐	SHELTER ☐	INJURED/ILL ☐	VENTILATION ☐	ABANDONED ☐	TIEOUT ☒	BEATEN ☐	WASTE ☐	OTHER (EXPLAIN) ☐

☐ I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case

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

☐ REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-405 (B) and § 8-286 (B)

VICTIM/COMPLAINTANT NAME Officer D. Hinte	D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	BUSINESS PHONE NO. 520-724-5900		
VICTIM'S ADDRESS Pima Animal Care Center		ZIP	CITY	STATE	
VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS 4000 N Silverbell Rd		ZIP 85745	CITY Tucson	STATE AZ	

NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)

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

☐ ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM

RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM

PHONE NUMBER

LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS

☐ VIOLATION ☐ NON-VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY: PART OF BODY BITTEN:	TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED RELEASE DATE:	PACC ☐ VET ☐ HOME ☐
VET CLINIC		PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES ☐ NO ☐		FTQ ☐ UTQ ☐
CLINIC'S ADDRESS		QUARANTINE 10 ☐ 15 ☐ 45 ☐ 180 ☐		☐ FRA HEAD#	
3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES ☐ NO ☒	CITING ACO	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES ☒ NO ☐	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER A11-063294	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS A13-120731 A12-106393 A12-097838	
CODE/ORD VIOLATED 6.04.070;11-1010(A) ARS; 6.04.110(B)(5)				REVIEWED BY 200 KONST 3/2/15	
CITATIONS/NUMBERS 74178 A-E				BOND YES ☐ NO ☒	

VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE		LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
Pit bull	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Lucky	Black/white	M	7yr		CITED	CITED	OK	A247724
Poodle mix	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Snoopy	White	M	2yr		CITED	CITED	OK	A512116
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									

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

WC 9

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-166099

ACO name & Badge: D.Hinte 2068

On February 17, 2015 at 2:49 PM, Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) dispatch received a complaint stating there was a black and white dog on a tie out at N Meredith Pl.

On February 28, 2015 at 3:27 PM, I, Officer Hinte 2068, arrived at N Meredith Pl. I parked in the alleyway that runs along the north side of the house. I observed a tricolor Chihuahua mix in the confined yard and no evidence of a tie out. I continued walking along the wash area and found a black and white Pitbull, as described in the call, on a tie out in a yard two houses down. I observed a dog house and a bucket of water within reach. The dog appeared to be in good body condition. I took several photographs of the dog. I updated the address and went to N Meredith Pl. I met with owner and informed him of the complaint. He stated that he only puts the dog, named Lucky, on the tie out for 30 minutes to an hour at a time so he can go to the bathroom. Mr. stated that Lucky is kept in the garage the rest of the time. I informed him that tie-outs are prohibited and asked him to take the dog off the tie out. He escorted me around the side of the house to show me that he had already taken the dog inside.

Mr. stated that Lucky is a fence-jumper and he was only trying to keep him confined. I showed Mr. a photograph that I took of his dog on top of the fence. I explained that on the tie out, the dog could have jumped the fence and strangled himself. I discussed alternative solutions such as a covered kennel run. Mr. stated that he used to have one but sold it because individuals from the office building behind his house complained to him that it was neglect. I informed him that covered kennel runs are legal as long as they are of adequate size and have shelter, water, food, etc. I advised Mr. that as long as the kennel run was in compliance with the law, any complaints made would have no basis. Mr. did not seem open to purchasing another kennel run but instead he stated that he would shorten the tie out so that the dog couldn't jump the fence. I again advised him that tie outs are prohibited.

WC 9

I inquired about current rabies vaccination and license for Lucky. He stated that he was expired. When Mr. entered the home to get his driver's license, I observed a small white poodle mix. Mr. informed me that the dog's name was Snoopy and he was 2 years old. Neither dog was current on license or rabies vaccination. I began writing the citations when Mr. approached my vehicle asking if he could relinquish the dog to PACC. I informed him that he could, but that there was a pick up fee and the citations would not be voided. I advised Mr. that he could surrender Lucky at PACC with no fee. He stated that he would just turn him in to be put down. I explained that the shelter staff would evaluate him for adoption first. Mr. then stated that he would take Lucky to his ranch in Mexico to be put down because it was "his dog" and "no one else could have his dog."

I issued citations to Mr. in the County for 2x no license, 2x no rabies vaccination, and 1x neglect- tie out. I explained his court date, time, and location. He stated that he understood, signed, and received his copy.

Officer's Signature: Date: 2/28/15

WC 10

W

INVESTIGATION REPORT

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

SUSPECT	
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS	) E. 3rd St.
ZIP	
CITY	Tucson
STATE	Az.
RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER	
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS	
ZIP	
CITY	
STATE	
BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER	
ACO NAME / BADGE #	Downing#1923
COMPLAINT NUMBER	A15- 166650
BITE ☐ WELFARE ☒ DANGEROUS ☐ OTHER ☐	
CODE IF OTHER :	
CI ☒ CO ☐ OTHER ☐	
DRIVERS LICENSE	

SEX	WEIGHT	HEIGHT	EYES	HAIR COLOR	ORIGIN	DOB	SSN
	170	5"08	Bro.	Blk.	5	)	NG

DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES ☐ NO ☐	
LOCATION OF INCIDENT	) E. 3rd. St.
DATE AND TIME REPORTED	2-25-15 / 1507
DATE AND TIME OCCURRED	2-26-15 / 1600

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

☐ I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case	
☐ I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.	
☐ REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B0 and § 8-286 (B)	
NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)	
☐ ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM	
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM	
PHONE NUMBER	
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS	
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE	

VICTIM/COMPLAINTANT NAME	Officer Downing #1923
DOB	NA
RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	NA
BUSINESS PHONE NO.	742- 5900
VICTIM'S ADDRESS	NA
ZIP	
CITY	
STATE	
VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS	4000 N. Silverbell Rd.
ZIP	85745
CITY	Tuc
STATE	Az

DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED	YES ☐ NO ☒
RESTITUTION REQUESTED	YES ☐ NO ☒
DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	
OTHER AGENCY CASE #	☐ SO ☐ TPD ☐ TFD ☐ OTHER:
FOLLOW UP REQUEST	☐ SO ☐ TPD ☐ OTHER:
☒ VIOLATION	
☐ NON-VIOLATION	
BITE SEVERITY:	
PART OF BODY BITTEN:	
TREATED BY	
PHONE NUMBER	
DATE QUARANTINED	
RELEASE DATE:	
PACC ☐ VET ☐ HOME ☐	
VET CLINIC	
PHONE NUMBER	
OWNER KNOWS OF BITE	YES ☐ NO ☐
FTQ ☐ UTQ ☐	
CLINIC'S ADDRESS	
QUARANTINE	10 ☐ 15 ☐ 45 ☐ 180 ☐
☐ FRA HEAD#	
3RD PARTY CITATIONS	YES ☐ NO ☐
CITING ACO	Downing #1923
PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	YES ☐ NO ☒
PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	
OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS	
CODE/ORD VIOLATED	4-3 (Z) (E) (Z) x 2
REVIEWED BY	2002 KMST 3/2
CITATIONS/NUMBERS	73596 A. B
BOND	YES ☐ NO ☒

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
G. Shepherd	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Django	Blk./Tan	M	A	L14-220770		OK	A473402
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐								
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐								
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐								
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐								
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐								
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐								

WITNESS 1 Officer Windauer # 1984	M ☐ F ☒	DOB	ADDRESS 4000 N. Silverbell Rd	RESIDENCE PHONE # NA / BUSINESS PHONE # 742-5900
WITNESS 2	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE # / BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 3	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE # / BUSINESS PHONE #
WITNESS 4	M ☐ F ☐	DOB	ADDRESS	RESIDENCE PHONE # / BUSINESS PHONE #

WC 10

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-166650

ACO name & Badge: Officer Downing #1923

On February 25,2015 at 1507 hours I arrived at E. 3rd. St. in response to a dog on a tie-out. I received no response at the front door so I went to the alley behind. I observed a cable run draped over the back gate. On the inside of the yard was a G. Shepherd that was on that tie-out. It had minimal movement. I was not able to gain access to inside of the yard at that time so , with the assistance of Officer Windauer #1984,we cut the cable from the outside to free the dog. I posted a notice on the front door advising of the situation and about tie-outs being prohibited. I took photos of the scene.

On February 26,2015 at 1600 hours I returned to check on the status of the dog and to try to make contact with an owner. I noticed that my notice was not on the front door so I again heard the dog barking and went to the alley and again found the dog tied up in a different area of the yard. I briefly waited before entering the yard to remove the dog when the dog owner showed up. I had him remove the dog and then explained the tie-out law to him. I issued citations for the dog on the tie-outs for both days. I also had taken a photo of the dog on the tie-out for today.

Officer's Signature: #1923 **Date:** 2-27-15

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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Kim Janes, Chief of External Operations

FROM: Neil Konst, Animal Care Field Supervisor

DATE: 3/1/15

RE: Dangerous Dog Cases for February 2015

Oro Valley:

1. A15-164275 John F Binnie Jr.: dog named Fritz was declared Dangerous by Investigator Eckelbarger. The dog was moved to Mexico.

City of Tucson:

2. A14-162205 James Eggleston; dog named Sumo was declared Not Dangerous by Investigator Carver.
3. A15-163282 Sandra Johnston; dog named Red and another named Ebony were declared Dangerous by Investigator Carver who was monitoring compliance. On 02/13/15 both dogs were impounded by Investigator Klein when they were observed at large.
4. A14-157399 Maria Isabel Valencia; dog named Rosko was declared Vicious in Tucson City Court by Judge Hale. Investigator Eckelbarger is monitoring compliance.

PIMA COUNTY ANIMAL CARE CENTER
MONTHLY INVESTIGATIONS REPORT
DANGEROUS DOG CASES FOR February 2015

Oro Valley

CASE NUMBER	OWNER'S LAST NAME	NUMBER OF ANIMALS ASSESSED	NUMBER OF ANIMALS DECLARED DANGEROUS	NUMBER OF ANIMALS DECLARED NOT DANGEROUS	NUMBER OF ANIMALS IMPOUNDED	NUMBER OF ANIMALS RELINQUISHED	NUMBER OF ANIMALS PTS	HEARING Y/N	UPHELD	NOT UPHELD
A15-164275	Binnie	1	1					n		

Tucson

CASE NUMBER	OWNER'S LAST NAME	NUMBER OF ANIMALS ASSESSED	NUMBER OF ANIMALS DECLARED DANGEROUS	NUMBER OF ANIMALS DECLARED NOT DANGEROUS	NUMBER OF ANIMALS IMPOUNDED	NUMBER OF ANIMALS RELINQUISHED	NUMBER OF ANIMALS PTS	HEARING Y/N	UPHELD	NOT UPHELD
A14-162205	Eggleston	1		1				n		
A15-163282	Johnston	2	2		2			n		
A14-157399	Valencia	1	1					n		

DD #1

INVESTIGATION REPORT

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

SUSPECT		ACO NAME / BADGE # D. Hinte 2068	COMPLAINT NUMBER A15-164275
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS		BITE ☒ WELFARE ☐ DANGEROUS ☐ OTHER ☐	
ZIP / CITY / STATE / RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER		CODE IF OTHER :	
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS		CI ☐ CO ☐ OTHER ☐	
ZIP / CITY / STATE / BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER		DRIVERS LICENSE	
SEX / WEIGHT / HEIGHT / EYES / HAIR COLOR	ORIGIN 5	DOB	SSN

DOES THIS INCIDENT REQUIRE VICTIM REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF RIGHTS? YES ☒ NO ☐	LOCATION OF INCIDENT	DATE AND TIME REPORTED 01/20/15 / 1822	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 01/20/15 / 1655
	FOOD ☐ WATER ☐ SHELTER ☐ INJURED/ILL ☐ VENTILATION ☐ ABANDONED ☐ TIEOUT ☐ BEATEN ☐ WASTE ☐ OTHER (EXPLAIN) ☐		
☒ I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case	VICTIM/COMPLAINTANT NAME	D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO. / BUSINESS PHONE NO.
☐ I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.	VICTIM'S ADDRESS	ZIP / CITY / STATE	
☐ REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B0 and § 8-286 (B)	VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS	ZIP / CITY / STATE	
NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)	DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES ☒ NO ☐ / RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES ☒ NO ☐ / DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # ☐ SO ☐ TPD ☐ TFD ☒ OTHER:	FOLLOW UP REQUEST ☐ SO ☐ TPD ☐ OTHER:
☒ ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM	☒ VIOLATION / ☐ NON-VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY: 3 / PART OF BODY BITTEN: LEG	TREATED BY / PHONE NUMBER / DATE QUARANTINED 01/20/15 / RELEASE DATE: / PACC ☒ VET ☐ HOME ☐
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM / PHONE NUMBER	VET CLINIC	PHONE NUMBER / OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES ☒ NO ☐	FTQ ☐ UTQ ☐
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS	CLINIC'S ADDRESS	QUARANTINE 10 ☒ 15 ☐ 45 ☐ 180 ☐	☐ FRA HEAD#
	3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES ☒ NO ☐ / CITING ACO D. Hinte 2068	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES ☒ NO ☐ / PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE	CODE/ORD VIOLATED 18-3-1; 18-9-1(A)		REVIEWED BY 2-6-15 DTK 1911
	CITATIONS/NUMBERS		BOND YES ☐ NO ☐

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE		LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
German Shepherd x	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Fritz	Tricolor	M	8 yr			CURRENT	N	
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									

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

DD #1

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-164275

ACO name & Badge: D. Hinte 2068

On January 20, 2015 at 6:22 PM, Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) dispatch received a report of a bite that occurred on the The caller stated that the dog was being walked on leash when the minor victim roller-bladed past. The dog lunged and bit

On January 21, 2015 at 8:30 AM, Officer Haynes 2032 arrived at and met with parents of the bite victim, as he had already left for school. They stated that on 01/20/14 at approximately 4:55 PM, was rollerblading with some friends in the neighborhood when they came upon the dog owner, , and the dog, Fritz, in the . was on the sidewalk with his dog talking to another neighbor. s left the sidewalk and went out into the street to avoid the dog and as he passed, the dog lunged out and bit him on the right upper thigh. The incident did not knock him down and he continued home where he found the bite did break the skin in several places. His father, took photographs of the bite. The dog owner is aware of the bite and did come and speak with the victim and his family. According to the victim's father, they have spoken to the dog owner in the past about the dog's propensity to bite and his aggressiveness towards kids. He also said that this is the third time that this dog has bitten that they are aware of and feel that this dog is a hazard to the kids in the neighborhood. He also stated that said he was going to take the dog to Mexico so it was out of the neighborhood, however, the victim's father doesn't believe that it will be a permanent arrangement for the dog. Oro Valley Police Department (OVPD) was also contacted yesterday and advised the dog owner that the dog must be quarantined prior to the dog being removed from the county. OVPD Officer Boyka V183 provided their case number of

Officer Haynes explained that she would follow up with a supervisor for a possible dangerous dog evaluation. Officer Haynes did a records search and found a report of one other bite involving Fritz: Both bites have been violation bites.

DD #1

The victim's parents did not request citations at the time but Officer Haynes did advise that they had a year from the date of the incident to have citations issued. She provided them a card with the case number and PACC phone number if they had any additional questions.

On February 3, 2015 at 4:15 PM, PACC Supervisor Tenkate 1911 received a call from the bite victim's mother stating that the dog owner had told them he is not going to get rid of Fritz. He will be taking the dog with him to Mexico for vacation for 3 weeks and then returning with the dog. She also provided photographs and a CD of the bite wounds. requested that citations be issued to the dog owner for biting animal and leash law (not under control) and that a dangerous dog evaluation be conducted.

On February 4, 2015 at 3:19 PM, Investigator Klein 1926 and I, Officer Hinte 2068, arrived at and met with dog owner . We explained that we were there to issue citations on behalf of the victim for the bite on 1/20/15. We issued citations in Oro Valley for 1x biting animal and 1x leash law. We explained his court date, time, and location. He stated that he understood, signed, and received his copy. We also informed of the request for a dangerous dog assessment and that he may not move, sell, or dispose of the dog until it is completed. We provided a notice of the dangerous dog assessment and he stated that he understood.

Officer's Signature: Date: 2/06/15

DD #1

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

CASE NO: A15-165342
OWNER: John Binnie Jr.
ANIMAL NAME: Fritz

ADDRESS: [illegible]
SEX: N. BREED: G. Shepx
COLOR: Tri-color DATE: 2-8-15

EVALUATION CRITERIA

REPORTED BITES:

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

SEVERITY OF INJURY TO HUMANS:

(Check One Factor Only Per Victim)

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

Animal Complaints or Violations:

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

SEVERITY OF INJURY TO ANIMALS:

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

CONFINEMENT MEASURES: (Check one factor only)

(Primary Method of Confinement at the time of the incident)

SECURE FENCE/WALL AND GATES	- 5	
~~INADEQUATE FENCING OR GATES~~ Loose control while leashed.	+ 5	+5.

OWNER ACCOUNTABILITY / RESPONSIBILITY:

REPAIRED DEFICIENT CONFINEMENT	- 3	-3
ANIMAL IS NEUTERED / SPAYED	- 1	-1
OWNER AWARE OF ANY AGGRESSION	+ 1	+1
OWNER FAILED TO REPAIR CONFINEMENT	+ 5	
CURRENTLY LICENSED LIC # 14-[illegible]	- 1	-1
NO CURRENT LICENSE	+ 1	
NO CURRENT RABIES VACCINATION	+ 1	

NEIGHBOR COMMENTS (Scored by Majority Opinion):

(Two or More Neighbors Interviewed)

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

DOGS BEHAVIOR: (If Observed by Officer)

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

Confinement / Fencing:

Backyard consists of Block wall approximately 5 feet tall with one padlocked gate. In addition has electric fence 3 ft inside wall.

General Comments:

The dog Fritz scored a +15 4 and is therefore declared dangerous.

OFFICER # 1942 Edelharger

TOTAL SCORE: +15 4

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

PACC-DD1

DD #2

INVESTIGATION REPORT

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

SUSPECT						ACO NAME / BADGE # C. Meek 2015	COMPLAINT NUMBER A14-162205
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS						BITE ☒ WELFARE ☐ DANGEROUS ☐ OTHER ☐	
ZIP	CITY	STATE	RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER			CODE IF OTHER :	
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS						CI ☒ CO ☐ OTHER ☐	
ZIP	CITY	STATE	BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER			DRIVERS LICENSE	
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 12/21/14 / 1933		DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 11/18/14 / 1100	
	FOOD ☐	WATER ☐	SHELTER ☐	INJURED/ILL ☐	VENTILATION ☐	ABANDONED ☐	TIEOUT ☐	BEATEN ☐	WASTE ☐ OTHER (EXPLAIN) ☐
☐ I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case	VICTIM/COMPLAINTANT NAME						RESIDENCE PHONE NO.		BUSINESS PHONE NO.
☐ I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.	VICTIM'S ADDRESS						ZIP	CITY	STATE
☐ REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B0 and § 8-286 (B)	VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS						ZIP	CITY	STATE

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

☐ ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM	☒ VIOLATION ☐ NON-VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY: PART OF BODY BITTEN:	TREATED BY	PHONE NUMBER	DATE QUARANTINED RELEASE DATE:	PACC ☐ VET ☐ HOME ☐
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM PHONE NUMBER	VET CLINIC		PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES ☒ NO ☐		FTQ ☐ UTQ ☒
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS	CLINIC'S ADDRESS		QUARANTINE 10 ☒ 15 ☐ 45 ☐ 180 ☐		☐ FRA HEAD#	
	3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES ☒ NO ☐	CITING ACO C. Meek 2015	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES ☐ NO ☐	PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS	
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE	CODE/ORD VIOLATED 4-97.4-7(2)(B)				REVIEWED BY Konst 2002 1/16	
	CITATIONS/NUMBERS				BOND YES ☐ NO ☒	

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
Pit Bull	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Viscious	Blue	F	4Y				ok	
Pit Bull	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Too Short	Blu/Wht	M	4Y				ok	
Pit Bull	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Sumo	Wht	M	4Y				ok	
Aussie-X	VICTIM ☒ OWNER ☐	Sadie	Tan	F	5Y				ok	
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									

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

DD #2

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-162205

ACO name & Badge: C. Meek 2015

On 12/22/14 Pima Animal Care Center received a call regarding three dogs that escaped from their property, the complainant stated they charged her and ultimately attacked her and her dog. The complainant advised the dispatcher that she did receive bites as a result of the attack but did not know which of the three dogs bit her. The victim was provided with bite case numbers should she need treatment.

On 12/22/14 at 2007 hours I Officer Meek badge number 2015 and Officer Hendrickson badge number 2066 responded to in reference to a bite complaint and to gather the bite victim's statement.
We arrived at the residence and were able to meet with the bite victim advised us that on 11/18/14 at approximately 1100 hours she was walking her dogs on when she and her dogs were attacked. was bitten during the attack and her dog Sadie was injured, other dog Jilly was uninjured. described the dogs as three Pit Bulls; being blue, blue and white, and all white.
was bitten on her hand and finger which was photographed for the complaint. also advised us that she photographed her wound when it was fresh. was provided with my Pima Animal Care Center e-mail address and was asked to forward the photographs as well as Sadie's veterinary expenses. stated she would like citations issued. also stated that the dog that bit was either Sadie or the all white Pit Bull that bit her as the white dog was the most aggressive and was attacking Sadie. provided us with the address of as the dog owner's residence. went on to say that when the attack was over the dog owner took the dogs back inside the residence and never came back out. described the dog owner as black male young in age. We advised that we would attempt to meet with the attacking dog owner and issue the appropriate citations. We concluded our meeting with

DD #2

We then proceeded to to meet with the dog owner. We arrived at the address and knocked at and were able to meet with . I advised of the complaint. was familiar with the bite and what happened. was emphatic that his dogs were not involved in the bite.

went on to state that the day of the bite there was a man walking in the alley next to his residence and two dogs were following him. stated that the two dogs following the unidentified man were both Pit Bulls. stated that when the dogs saw dogs and immediately attacked . stated that when the dogs were attacking he ran out in the street to help her. stated that in helping he to was bitten. stated that he did see the unknown man again walking the alley and asked about his dogs. stated that the man stated that the dogs were not his dogs but that they were following him. stated that he did have a visitor to his house about the incident but advised him that the dogs that attacked were not his. then stated that he himself was injured in the attack. showed us one deep puncture on his forearm and several on his hands that appeared to be consistent with dog bites and the same age as wounds. I photographed punctures. I asked one more time to photograph the dogs and he again declined to have photographs taken of the dogs. I advised that I would not be closing the call and would continue to pursue other avenues in identifying his dogs. stated that would be fine and maybe we could catch him on a walk or call his veterinarian, I advised that I would be doing that as well. We concluded our meeting with

On 12/23/14 at 1602 hours I Officer Meek badge number 2015 and Officer Hinte badge number 2068 responded to the intersection of to wait for TPD. We required assistance from Tucson Police Department to meet with a dog owner, in reference to a bite that his dogs were supposedly involved with.

Tucson Police Department met us and we proceeded to residence When we arrived at the residence we were advised that has a history of being combative with police and aggressive. We knocked at the door of the residence but received no answer. We did however observe what appeared to be a white dog through a small crack in the blinds. A photograph was attempted but due to the glare and position of the dog the photo did not come out. We left the residence and did not post a notice.

DD #2

While en-route to the residence we did find a "lost dog" sign that described a blue and white Pit Bull missing in the area. I took the sign from the telephone pole and proceeded to the victim's residence. I was able to make contact with the bite victim. I showed the sign and asked if it was possible that the Pit Bull in the sign was involved. stated the dog pictured was not there and the dogs involved with the attack all had cropped ears. The dog pictured ears were intact. stated that is usually walking his dogs west bound on between the hours of 1600-1700. We left and patrolled the area but were unable to locate

On 01/13/15 at 1039 hours I Officer Meek 2015 responded to in reference to a bite complaint, to meet with the biting dog owner, and issue citations requested by the victim.

It was requested by Tucson Police Department that we make contact with them, as they would like to respond with the Officer, as the dog owner is known to be combative. We arrived in the area of and made contact with the dispatch department to ask for a response from TPD. I was advised that Tucson Police Department was en-route. I then met with Officer Ross badge number 41945 and the case number

We then knocked at the door at in an effort to meet with the dog owner. the dog owner. advised me that he was innocent of any accusations levied at him. I advised him that there was a victim in the complaint and stated that he and his dogs were responsible for the attack. I advised that the victim requested citations for the incident and the signed copy would not indicate that he was guilty of any charges but a promise to appear. finally stated he would sign citations but would not provide his AZDL. I advised that would be fine.

I then issued the appropriate citations. I advised that with the citations he would need to appear in court and I provided him with the date. stated he understood his need to appear and signed his copy of the citations.

Officer's Signature: Date: 01/19/15

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: A15-164226
OWNER: JAMES EGBLESTON
ANIMAL NAME: SUMO

ADDRESS: 628 E DRACHMAN ST A
SEX: M/N BREED: Pit Bull
COLOR: WHITE BLK DATE: 2-1-15

EVALUATION CRITERIA

REPORTED BITES:

NON-VIOLATION BITE	+ 3	
VIOLATION-BITE	+ 6	

SEVERITY OF INJURY TO HUMANS:

(Check One Factor Only Per Victim)

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

Animal Complaints or Violations:

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

SEVERITY OF INJURY TO ANIMALS:

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

CONFINEMENT MEASURES: (Check one factor only)

(Primary Method of Confinement at the time of the incident)

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

OWNER ACCOUNTABILITY / RESPONSIBILITY:

REPAIRED DEFICIENT CONFINEMENT	- 3	-3
ANIMAL IS NEUTERED / SPAYED	- 1	-1
OWNER AWARE OF ANY AGGRESSION	+ 1	
OWNER FAILED TO REPAIR CONFINEMENT	+ 5	
CURRENTLY LICENSED LIC # 15230700	- 1	-1
NO CURRENT LICENSE	+ 1	
NO CURRENT RABIES VACCINATION	+ 1	

NEIGHBOR COMMENTS (Scored by Majority Opinion):

(Two or More Neighbors Interviewed)

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

DOGS BEHAVIOR: (If Observed by Officer)

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

Confinement / Fencing:

INDOOR DOG WALKED ON LEASH

General Comments:

PACC RECORDS SHOW NO RECORD OF PRIOR INCIDENTS REGARDING THIS ANIMAL OR OWNER. NEIGHBOR STATE THE DOG HAS NEVER BEEN AN ISSUE. THE DOG NEVER SHOWED AGGRESSION DURING OFFICER CONTACT. THE DOG IS DECLARED NOT DANGEROUS.

OFFICER # CARVER 1901

TOTAL SCORE: Ø

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

____ DANGEROUS
X NOT DANGEROUS

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

PACC-DD1

DD #3

INVESTIGATION REPORT

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

SUSPECT		ACO NAME / BADGE # C. Meek 2015	COMPLAINT NUMBER A15-163282
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS		BITE ☐ WELFARE ☐ DANGEROUS ☐ OTHER ☒	
ZIP / CITY / STATE / RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER		CODE IF OTHER :	
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS		CI ☒ CO ☐ OTHER ☐	
ZIP / CITY / STATE / BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER		DRIVERS LICENSE	
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 01/515 / 1844	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED 01/05/15 / 1830
	FOOD ☐ WATER ☐ SHELTER ☐ INJURED/ILL ☐ VENTILATION ☐ ABANDONED ☐ TIEOUT ☐ BEATEN ☐ WASTE ☐ OTHER (EXPLAIN) ☐		
☐ I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case	VICTIM/COMPLAINANT NAME	RESIDENCE PHONE NO.	BUSINESS PHONE NO.
☐ I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.	VICTIM'S ADDRESS	ZIP / CITY / STATE	
☐ REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B0 and § 8-286 (B)	VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS	ZIP / CITY / STATE	
NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)	DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES ☒ NO ☐ / RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES ☐ NO ☒ / DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # ☐ SO ☒ TPD ☐ TFD ☐ OTHER:	FOLLOW UP REQUEST ☐ SO ☐ TPD ☐ OTHER:
☐ ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM	☐ VIOLATION / ☐ NON-VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY: / PART OF BODY BITTEN:	TREATED BY / PHONE NUMBER / DATE QUARANTINED / RELEASE DATE: / PACC ☐ VET ☐ HOME ☐
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM / PHONE NUMBER	VET CLINIC	PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES ☐ NO ☐ / FTQ ☐ UTQ ☐
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS	CLINIC'S ADDRESS	QUARANTINE 10 ☐ 15 ☐ 45 ☐ 180 ☐	☐ FRA HEAD#
	3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES ☒ NO ☐ / CITING ACO C. Meek 2015	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES ☐ NO ☒ / PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE	CODE/ORD VIOLATED 4-97,4-7(2)(B)		REVIEWED BY Kons 2002 1/20
	CITATIONS/NUMBERS		BOND YES ☐ NO ☐

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
Pit Bull	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Red	Red	M	1Y				ok	
Pit Bull	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	Ebony	Blue	F	1Y				ok	
DSH-X	VICTIM ☒ OWNER ☐								doa	
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									

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

DD #3

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A15-163282

ACO name & Badge:C. Meek 2015

On 01/05/15 at 18:44 hours Pima Animal Care Center received a call from Tucson Police Department Officer Santamaria badge number 51935 and case number . Officer Santamaria was on scene for leash law and animal attack resulting in the death of a cat. Officer Santamaria provided the name of the cat owner, of who witnessed the dogs off leash which attacked and killed her cat. Attacking dogs are Red and Ebony, both Pit Bulls, owned by Officer Santamaria stated the cat owner requested to meet with an Animal Care Officer and to pursue third party citations and restitution. Tucson Police Department advised the dispatch department they would photograph scene, victim, and perpetrators. The cat owner requested the cat be picked up.

On 01/12/15 at 0938 hours I Officer Meek badge number 2015 responded to to follow up on a leash law attack complaint.

I arrived at the address and the victim's unit number. I rang the bell but received no answer. I posted a notice on the front security door requesting contact from the dog owner. On 01/12/15 at 1139 hours Pima Animal Care Center received a call from a advising she is home after 1700 hours or the officer can go to her work address which was provided to the dispatcher.

On 01/13/15 at 0812 hours I Officer Meek badge number 2015 responded to to meet with the victim cat owner in reference to a leash law animal attack complaint.

I arrived at the address and was able to make contact with a I asked to recount what happened on 01/05/15 that lead up to her calling Tucson Police Department and discovering her cat was attacked and killed.

advised me that at approximately 1830 hours she was in her residence with her front security door open and locked. advised me that she keeps the door open in that manner regularly as her small breed dog likes to look out the door. also stated that her cat was inside the residence at that time as well. stated that while the door was open the dogs residing in were able to escape their own yard and were running loose within the common area of the complex.

stated the dogs came up to her security door and attempted to fight with her

DD #3

dog. advised me that she shut her door and moved her cat to the rear of the rear bedroom of the house. During this time the dogs were still out running loose and stated she called her next door neighbors to advise them the dogs were loose.

. stated that while on the phone with one of her neighbors she heard a racket described as a banging sound. stated she initially did not give the noise much thought and when she concluded her conversation with her neighbor returned to open the door of her residence where she found her cat deceased. became emotional at that point and found that a backdoor was left open and the cat was able to get out.

After discovering the cat stated she called 911 and was able to get a response from Tucson Police Department. stated that she didn't know what else to do. I asked to describe the dogs involved in the incident. described the dogs as Pit Bull type dogs. stated the dogs reside at and there has been an ongoing issue with the dogs running loose. stated she contacted the management company several times in an effort to have the dogs removed as they are also a restricted breed at the property.

also advised me the dogs typically wear shirts when running loose so their exact coloring was difficult for her.

stated that after the attack it has been extremely difficult for her family to process. stated that she obtained a restraining order as a result of the attack and an interaction with the dogs' owner.

went on to advise me that she would like to have citations issued on her behalf as well as a dangerous dog evaluation completed. I advised I would attempt to meet with her neighbor and issue the citations she requested and then concluded my meeting with her.

I made my way to in an attempt to meet with the offending dog owner. I arrived at the address and knocked at the door and was able to meet with a female occupant briefly. The resident opened the door and identified herself as
stated she did not have to deal with the problem and that her dogs were not on the property and to call CODAC behavioral health and shut the door.

I knocked at the residence again and answered. I again advised that I needed to meet with her regarding her dogs.

again stated she wouldn't deal with the problem and shut the door again. As shut the door again I heard her say "I would rather kill myself than let them take the dogs". I then made contact with the dispatch department and asked for a response from TPD based on what I heard say, while on the radio opened the door again and threw a hand written note with a CODAC case worker's name and telephone number and closed the door again.

I Left residence and met with Tucson Police Department at my truck and advised them of the situation. Tucson Police Department then made contact with and advised her of the situation and what needed to happen to complete the call. I was then able to meet with again at which point she apologized for her behavior stating she was having a difficult week. I asked where the dogs were, stated that both dogs, Red and Ebony were at a friend's residence. did not have the address for the friend available and I advised her that I would need that information as soon as possible. did provide me the name of and a telephone number and stated the dogs

DD #3

were on

I advised in addition to needing the address where the dogs were being kept I had to issue citations on behalf of the cat owner. stated she understood and provided me with her Arizona Identification. I issued the appropriate citations requested by did provide me with license tags still in wrappers for both dogs so she was not cited for license and rabies vaccination. I advised that with the citations she would need to appear in court and I provided her with the date. stated she understood her need to appear and signed her copy of the citations.

Officer's Signature: **Date:** 01/18/15

DD #3

COMPLAINT # 15165047
OFFICER # CARVER 1901
DATE: 2/13/15

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

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 1-5-15 THE DOG RED BELONGING TO SANDRA JOHNSTON WAS AT LARGE AND KILLED A CAT. THE DOG IS DECLARED TO BE DANGEROUS. 1901

OWNER: SANDRA JOHNSTON
ADDRESS:
PHONE:

ANIMAL NAME: RED
ANIMAL ID#: 495380
SEX: N COLOR: SEAL WHT BREED: PITBULL

NOTICE

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

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

DD #3

COMPLAINT # 15165047
OFFICER # CARVER 1901
DATE: 2-13-15

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

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 1-5-15 the DOG EBONY BELONGING to SANDRA JOHNSTON WAS AT LARGE AND KILLED A CAT. THE DOG IS DECLARED TO BE DANGEROUS

1901

OWNER: SANDRA JOHNSTON
ADDRESS:
PHONE:

ANIMAL NAME: EBONY
ANIMAL ID#: 507176
SEX: F COLOR: BLU BREED: PIT BULL

NOTICE

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

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

DD #4

INVESTIGATION REPORT

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

SUSPECT		ACO NAME / BADGE # **D.Robledo #1990**	COMPLAINT NUMBER **A14-157399**
SUSPECT'S ADDRESS		BITE ☒ WELFARE ☐ DANGEROUS ☐ OTHER ☐	
ZIP / CITY / STATE / RESIDENCE PHONE NUMBER		CODE IF OTHER :	
SUSPECT'S BUSINESS ADDRESS		CI ☒ CO ☐ OTHER ☐	
ZIP / CITY / STATE / BUSINESS PHONE NUMBER		DRIVERS LICENSE	
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 **10-7-14 / 0810hrs.**	DATE AND TIME OCCURRED **10-7-14 / 0720hrs.**
	FOOD ☐ WATER ☐ SHELTER ☐ INJURED/ILL ☐ VENTILATION ☐ ABANDONED ☐ TIEOUT ☐ BEATEN ☐ WASTE ☐ OTHER (EXPLAIN) ☒ **bite**		
☒ I CHOOSE "upon request" rights in this case	VICTIM/COMPLAINTANT NAME	D.O.B	RESIDENCE PHONE NO. / BUSINESS PHONE NO.
☐ I WAIVE "upon request" rights in this case.	VICTIM'S ADDRESS	ZIP	CITY / STATE
☐ REQUEST/WAIVER exception per A.R.S. § 13-4405 (B) and § 8-286 (B)	VICTIM'S BUSINESS ADDRESS	ZIP	CITY / STATE
NAME OF LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)	DANGEROUS ASSESSMENT REQUESTED YES ☐ NO ☒ / RESTITUTION REQUESTED YES ☒ NO ☐ / DANGEROUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER AGENCY CASE # ☐ SO ☐ TPD ☒ TFD ☐ OTHER:	FOLLOW UP REQUEST ☐ SO ☐ TPD ☐ OTHER:
☐ ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER SAME AS VICTIM	☒ VIOLATION / ☐ NON-VIOLATION	BITE SEVERITY: **2** / PART OF BODY BITTEN: **arm**	TREATED BY **TFD** / PHONE NUMBER / DATE QUARANTINED **10-7-14** / RELEASE DATE: **10/16/14**	PACC ☒ VET ☐ HOME ☐
RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM / PHONE NUMBER	VET CLINIC	PHONE NUMBER	OWNER KNOWS OF BITE YES ☒ NO ☐	FTQ ☐ UTQ ☐
LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE ADDRESS	CLINIC'S ADDRESS	QUARANTINE 10 ☒ 15 ☐ 45 ☐ 180 ☐	☐ FRA HEAD#	
	3RD PARTY CITATIONS YES ☒ NO ☐	CITING ACO **D.Robledo #1990**	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS YES ☐ NO ☐ / PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER	OTHER ADDITIONAL REPORTS
VICTIM OR LAWFUL REPRESENTATIVE SIGNATURE	CODE/ORD VIOLATED **4-97, 4-7(2)(B)**		REVIEWED BY 10-15-14 DK	
	CITATIONS/NUMBERS		BOND YES ☐ NO ☒	

BREED/DESCRIPTION VICTIM OR OWNER ANIMAL		ANIMAL'S NAME	COLOR	SEX	AGE	TAG COLOR	LICENSE #	VX CERTIFICATE #	COND	ANIMAL ID#
G. Shep	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☒	**Rosko**	**Tri**	**M**	**AD**				**OK**	
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									
	VICTIM ☐ OWNER ☐									

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

DD # 4

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Activity Number: A14-157399

ACO name & Badge: Daniel Robledo #1990

October 07, 2014 at 0922 hours, I Officer Robledo #1990, responded to an emergency bite complaint. Upon my arrival, I met with bite victim whom was standing across the street where dog resides. stated, on October 7, 2014 at 0720 hours, she was on her daily morning walk of the neighborhood. She passed by . on her route and the front gate was wide open. This large German Shepherd mix ran out and attacked. The dog jumped on her and bit her on her right arm elbow. There were 2 people on the property at this time. One of the men got the dog and put the dog back in the yard and he closed the gate. According to they weren't concerned for her injuries. She then called 911 and the fire department showed up and bandaged her wounds. At this time, she wants citations to be issued on her behalf.

I then went to dog owner's address and took a photo of the dog. I saw the 2 gentleman building a wall in back of the property. I called to them and I met with a gentleman named . who works for . I asked him to call the dog owner and he said the home owner is not home. He and the other gentleman were hired to build the wall. I asked him who is dog owner and he gave me a name, , cell number I asked can I speak to him and he called him. I spoke with possible dog owner . He said he is not at home, but at work. I explained why I'm speaking to him and what had happened. said the dog is a stray he found 2 days ago and he just put it in his yard. He also said to take the dog and try and prove that the dog is his. I asked him when can we meet and he said he works a lot and he will see. I told him we will return to speak with him in person instead of on a cell phone. I impounded the biter dog and gave a notice to a worker at this address.

I drove to home and advised her that dog owner was not home, but we have impounded the dog. She was please and stated she is waiting for her daughter to come so she can be taken to the hospital.

DD #4

On October 7, 2014 at 1322 hours, I met with the dog owner's wife at Pima Animal Care Center. I sat her down and explained the bite situation. She stated her and her husband, , just moved in this home and is having work done on the house. She claims that the dog was a stray and they took ownership since last week once they moved in. I asked for her driver's license and I issued citations for biting animal and leash law on their dog named Rosko. I explained the quarantine process and that the dog will be quarantined at the shelter. She received a copy of citations and stated after the quarantine release date, she will redeem their dog.

Officer's Signature: #1890 **Date:** 10-15-14

DD #4

TUCSON CITY COURT
103 E. Alameda Street • P.O. Box 27210 • Tucson, AZ 85725-7210 • Phone (520) 791-4216

Visit us on the web @ www.tucsonaz.gov/courts

State of Arizona Plaintiff vs MARIA VALENCIA Defendant	Docket # CR14123506	Agency # 73508	SENTENCING MINUTE ENTRY ☐ PLEA ☒ TRIAL

DOB: 03/29/1981 INTERPRETER ☐ VICTIM ☐ NOTIFIED ☐ PRESENT PAGE 1 OF 1

PLEA	CITATION	CV	CR	OFFENSE/VIOLATION	OFF DATE	JUDGMENT	DISPOSITION	DISM	W	W/O
NG	A73508		X	Leash Law	10 07 14	Guilty	$100/10cs			
NG	B		X	Biting Animal	10 07 14	Guilty	$365/36cs			

PROBATION 6 TOTAL MONTHS 6 MONTHS OF UNSUPERVISED AND ____ MONTHS OF MONITORED PROBATION

CONDITIONS: ☐ REPORT TO PROBATION OFFICE ☐ TODAY WITHIN ____ HOURS OF JAIL RELEASE

☒ VIOLATE NO LAWS ☐ HAVE NO CONTACT WITH

☐ STAY AWAY FROM ☐ OBTAIN PROOF OF

☒ OTHER: Ms. Valencia must comply with TCC 4-13(e), (f), (g) to allow Pima County Animal Control to inspect dog.

PROOFS: ☐ DRIVERS LICENSE ☐ VEHICLE ☐ 6 MONTHS PAID INSURANCE ☐ REPAIR ☐ DOG LICENSE

☐ OTHER BY OR

FINE TODAY, OR THROUGH SENTENCE ENFORCEMENT OFFICE ☐ TIME PAYMENT FEE OF

☐ INSTALLMENTS ☒ COMMUNITY SERVICE 46 HOURS, PROOF 5/1/2015

ADMINISTRATIVE FEES ☐ WAIVED ☐ FOR COST OF APPOINTED COUNSEL or pay suspended fine + $20

☐ DUI PROCESSING FEES = ☐ JAIL FEE X =. TOTAL $0.00

☐ RESTITUTION IN AMOUNT OF TO

☐ INSTALLMENTS

☐ JAIL ☐ TIME SERVED ☐ DAYS WITH CREDIT FOR DAY ALREADY SERVED

(REFERENCED COMMITMENT ORDER ATTACHED) ☐ SUSPEND DAYS

☐ BOND ☐ CONVERT TO FINE ☐ REFUND ☐ EXONERATE TO SURETY

I AGREE TO THE CONDITIONS OF PROBATION

I have received a copy of this Minute Entry and Notice of Appeal

Maria D. Valencia 3-29-81

Defendant DOB

Address ZIP

☐ QUASH WARRANT

☐ SET ASIDE CIVIL DEFAULT

I certify that the defendant's finger print was affixed on the reverse side of this document upon acceptance of this plea.

GERI HALE Feb 3, 2015

JUDGE DATE

☒ FILE ☒ DEFENDANT ☒ PROSECUTOR ☐ PROBATION ☐ OTHER

(Rev6L6/01)

ROSKO

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 **21**

A12-102940

K14-175847 A247678 DOG SATIVA ROTTWEILER/
11/6/14 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN AGGRESSIVE Activity:A12-102940 **D050** R
Kennel Comment: chip 494D4C3F3D
DO NOT RELEASE!
Bond hold.1926 SAFE LOCK

02/17/2015 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 2/17/15 16:09
2-17-15

Per the county attorney:
We finally obtained a copy of the justice court order that although it was signed by the judge on January 12th, it wasn't scanned into the system until January 23rd and was never sent to Mr. Westfall. Because Mr. Westfall never received a copy of the order, there was no way for him to know about or calculate the appeal deadline, so in an abundance of caution, our office is mailing a copy of the scanned order to Mr. Westfall today and are calendaring an additional 14 days for him to appeal the order. So, please don't take any further action regarding Sativa until we get back to you.

1914

12/17/2014 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 12/17/14 17:42
12-16-14 OSC hearing scheduled for 1-2-15. 1914

11/17/2014 DTENKATE 11/17/14 13:35
11/16/14 The dog owner signed and received a copy of the Bond form and has until 11/26/14 7pm to post the bond amount of $675.00. (for an Order to Show Cause Hearing)

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

11/06/2014 ENFORCEM EKLEIN 11/6/14 20:29
11-6-14, Do not release Sativa. Owner must meet with enforcement.1926

11/10/2014 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 11/10/14 10:14
If Mr Westfall comes to redeem Sativa
(1)serve the premise inspection ordering a wellness exam be done on Patches by a licensed veterinarian to ensure she was not injured on November 3rd,2014. PACC will not be taking possession of her unless it is ordered by a judge because pacc has not received reports of patches displaying any aggression.
(2)Serve the Bond on Sativa.And explain to Mr Westfall that he MUST post all of the bond amount to PACC within 10 days. Not 10 business days but 10 straight days as pacc is open 7 days a week.
(3) issue the following citations regarding Sativa:70757.A,B,C,D,E DD at large,Preventing inspection of a DD,Failure To comply ,No Insurance ,No license and 70758 A,B,C no rabies vaccination,DD attack (attempt on the animals) ,DD attack (Attempt on a human)
(4) issue the following citations regarding Patches : 70759 A,B,C Leash Law, no License and No Rabies vaccination.

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

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

01/08/2015 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 1/8/15 13:00
1-8-15

The OSC hearing was held the Judge took it under advisement and a decision is pending. 1914

03/05/2015 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 3/5/15 11:25
3-5-15

Accordin to PCAO the owner has put in an appeal to superior court the dog will be on hold until further notice. 1914

02/06/2015 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 2/6/15 10:03
2-6-15
The Court has ordered the animal forfeited to PACC on January 12. Now the owner has the right file an appeal to the Superior Courts. The owner has until 2-9-15 to file, until then the animal will be on hold. 1914

12/11/2014 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 12/11/14 10:35
12-4-14 The bond was paid on 11-26-14. The dog will be held further until the Order to Show Cause hearing is set up and conducted. 1914

A14-161432

K15-184237 A512706 DOG AMER BULLDOG/

kennel no

3/5/15 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A14-161432 **U017**
Kennel Comment: unable to scan R

K15-184239 A512707 DOG GERM SHEPHERD/
3/5/15 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A14-161432 **DR013**
Kennel Comment: no chip R

K15-184240 A512709 DOG GERM SHEPHERD/MIX
3/5/15 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A14-161432 **DR013**
Kennel Comment: no chip R

K15-184241 A512710 DOG GERM SHEPHERD/MIX
3/5/15 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A14-161432 **DR013**
Kennel Comment: no chip R

K15-184242 A512711 DOG GERM SHEPHERD/MIX
3/5/15 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A14-161432 **DR013**
Kennel Comment: no chip R

K15-184243 A512712 DOG GERM SHEPHERD/MIX
3/5/15 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A14-161432 **DR013**
Kennel Comment: no chip R

K15-184245 A512714 DOG GERM SHEPHERD/MIX
3/5/15 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A14-161432 **DR013**
Kennel Comment: no chip R

K15-184247 A512715 DOG GERM SHEPHERD/MIX
3/5/15 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A14-161432 **DR013**
Kennel Comment: unable to scan R

A15-163903

K15-180864 A507556 DOG CUTIE GERM SHEPHERD/
1/16/15 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A15-163903 **D061**
Kennel Comment: R
Bond Posted

02/24/2015 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 2/24/15 14:15
2-24-15

We had the Arvizu OSC hearing this morning and the judge ruled that the dog Cutie is to be forfeited to PACC. The Arvizus received their copy of the court's Minute Entry ruling before leaving the courtroom. The Minute Entry Order informs them about their right to appeal the decision of the Justice Court judge by filing a notice of appeal with the court within 14 calendar days. That means that they need to file a notice of appeal at the Justice Court on or before March 10.

If the Arvizus do that, as they claimed they would, I will let you know about the next steps. But for right now, Cutie must be kept at PACC. 1914

02/06/2015 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 2/6/15 10:28
2-6-15

Per the county attorney we need to hold the animals for a longer period of time possibly additional 10days to allow the defense attorney to photograph them. 1914

A15-165081

K15-184128 A423426 DOG MIA AM PIT BULL TER/
3/4/15 STRAY FIELD NORMAL Activity:A15-165081 **D198**
Kennel Comment: **3C see memo. 1942 R

03/04/2015 MECKELBA 3/4/15 12:09
3-4-15 If owner redeems issue 3PC on 1942 behalf for leash law on both dogs "Mia" and "Bella". 1942

K15-184130 A494404 DOG BELLA PIT BULL/
3/4/15 STRAY FIELD AGGRESSIVE Activity:A15-165081 **D216**
Kennel Comment: **3C see memo. 1942
caution-fearful/aggressive

P012043 Heather Rodriguez reserved this dog

R

03/04/2015 MECKELBA 3/4/15 12:54
3-4-15 If owner redeems issue 3PC on 1942 behalf for leash law on both dogs "Mia" and "Bella". 1942

A15-165833

K15-182864 A495380 DOG RED PIT BULL/MIX
2/13/15 STRAY FIELD NORMAL Activity:A15-165833 **D051**
Kennel Comment: DD

R

03/09/2015 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 3/9/15 16:51
3-9-15

The dogs will contine being on hold until contact is made with the owner to address the order of compliance. If the owner is not contacted and the order of compliance is not completed by the deadline 3-13-15 the animal will become the property of PACC and will be removed from the enoforcement hold.
1914

02/13/2015 ENFORCEM DHINTE 2/13/15 18:24
2-13-15.impounded as stray at large. dogs were previously declared dangerous by 1901. 1926

K15-182865 A507176 DOG EBONY PIT BULL/
2/13/15 STRAY FIELD NORMAL Activity:A15-165833 **D051**
Kennel Comment: DD

R

02/13/2015 ENFORCEM DHINTE 2/13/15 18:30
2-13-15, impounded as stray at large.previously declared dangerous by 1901. 1926

03/05/2015 ENFORCEM JCHAVEZ 3/5/15 15:23
3-5-15

The dogs will contine being on hold until contact is made with the owner to address the order of compliance and dangerous dog at large violation. 1914

A15-167244

K15-184303 A512768 DOG AYVA SIBERIAN HUSKY/
3/5/15 CONFISCATE BITE NORMAL Activity:A15-167244 **D044**
Kennel Comment: DD HOLD NO CHIP
3c3c3c3c3cc3c3c3c3c33ccc3c3c3c . IF OWNER FAILS TO REDEEM,
INTERESTED PARTY IS ANGELICA BUDISH, #520-780-2797

R

K15-184458 A512966 DOG YOSHI PIT BULL/
3/7/15 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A15-167244 **D072**
Kennel Comment: DD HOLD OWNER P363765

R

A15-167305

K15-184361 A512857 DOG CHIHUAHUA SH/
3/6/15 QUARANTINE BITE NORMAL Activity:A15-167305 **D074**
Kennel Comment: 3c 3c 3c 3c

R

kennel no

A15-167402

K15-184548 A513018 DOG PIT BULL/MIX

3/8/15 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN NORMAL Activity:A15-167402 **D251** R

Kennel Comment: didnt bite, unable to scan
dog very timid and may not walk on leash
3C3C3C3C

A15-167611

K15-184728 A513256 DOG CHOW CHOW/

3/11/15 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN INJ MINOR Activity:A15-167611 **D060** R

Kennel Comment: no bite/unable to scan field

3c3c3c33c

K15-184735 A513263 DOG CHOW CHOW/

3/11/15 CONFISCATE FIELD OWN INJ MINOR Activity:A15-167611 **U007** R

Kennel Comment: no bite/unable to scan field

3c3c3c33c

A15-167612

K15-184723 A513241 DOG GERM SHEPHERD/MIX

3/11/15 STRAY FIELD LACTATING Activity:A15-167612 **U010** R

Kennel Comment: no chip
3c3c3c3c

03/11/2015 ENFORCEM KWALTON 3/11/15 12:34

3-11-15 Upon arrival to a priority call regarding 3 dogs who had chased a woman,I observed a tan Pit bull mix dog roaming in front of 5585 S.Santa Clara. I then observed the blk/wht Pit bull and th red/wht Shep mix and the tan Pit bull mix coming out of the alley behind their house.
I observed the Shep mix was a female and has had a litter previously unkown time frame. I had my treats with me and after some time I got them all to eatout of my hand. I was able to leash the female and almost had the blk/wht Pit but it got loose. Eventually I put the female in truck and tried catching the males but no luck. Theneighbors stated the dogs are trying to attack people and are deficating on properties.
Issues cites for leash law on all 3 dogs for 1115 hrs 3-11-15 per 1925. Keep in traffic until contact and or dogs are impounded. 1925

PIMA ANIMAL CARE CENTER
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 2015 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	593	531	1,124	5,342	4,849	10,191	5,362	4,665	10,027		
CATS	292	126	418	2,520	1,673	4,193	3,157	2,082	5,239		
OTHERS	15	32	47	203	383	586	210	338	548		
TOTAL ANIMALS HANDLED	900	689	1,589	8,065	6,905	14,970	8,729	7,085	15,814	-844	-5%
Live Animals Handled	733	578	1,311	6,727	5,893	12,620	7,703	6,295	13,998	-1378	-10%
IMPOUNDED ANIMALS											
ADOPTED											
DOGS	185	188	373	1,970	1,879	3,849	1,815	1,541	3,356		
CATS	138	39	177	1,254	910	2,164	789	619	1,408		
OTHER	1	0	1	7	13	20	28	14	42		
TOTAL ADOPTED	324	227	551	3,231	2,802	6,033	2,632	2,174	4,806	1227	26%
RETURNED TO OWNER											
DOGS	94	81	175	717	521	1,238	554	435	989		
CATS	7	3	10	32	42	74	35	43	78		
OTHER	0	0	0	13	7	20	5	11	16		
TOTAL RETURNED	101	84	185	762	570	1,332	594	489	1,083	249	23%
RESCUED											
DOGS	57	80	137	714	828	1,542	841	978	1,819		
CATS	94	43	137	538	392	930	755	508	1,263		
OTHER	0	0	0	11	33	44	49	34	83		
TOTAL RESCUED	151	123	274	1,263	1,253	2,516	1,645	1,520	3,165	-649	-21%
***TOTAL LIVE RELEASES**	576	434	1,010	5,256	4,625	9,881	4,871	4,183	9,054	827	9%
****TOTAL LIVE RELEASE RATE**	87%	87%	87%	83%	84%	83%			76%		
EUTHANIZED											
DOGS	108	76	184	1,216	1,048	2,264	1,328	1,213	2,541		
CATS	19	13	32	260	196	456	1,110	692	1,802		
OTHER	4	7	11	46	63	109	28	58	86		
TOTAL EUTHANIZED	131	96	227	1,522	1,307	2,829	2466	1963	4429	-1600	-36%
(-)Owner Requsted Euthanasia	48	33	81	417	397	814			1495		
Adjusted Total Euthanasia	83	63	146	1,105	910	2,015			2,934		
***EUTHANASIA RATE	13%	13%	13%	17%	16%	17%			24%		
OTHER	180	114	294	1,698	1,265	2,963	1,190	907	2,097	866	41%
ENFORCEMENT OPERATIONS											
Welfare Responses	218	146	364	1654	849	2503	1585	741	2326	177	8%
ENFORCEMENT CALLS FOR SERVICE	1,387	1,053	2,440	11,438	7,320	18,758	11,713	7,593	19,306	-548	-3%
LICENSING OPERATIONS											
ALTERED	3,451	4,964	8,415	26,087	34,135	60,222	27,392	35,106	62,498		
UNALTERED	222	230	452	1,553	1,907	3,460	1,894	2,626	4,520		
OTHER	48	85	133	509	722	1,231	551	750	1,301		
TOTAL SOLD	3,721	5,279	9,000	28,149	36,764	64,913	29,837	38,482	68,319	-3,406	-5%

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

PIMA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
DISTRICT 3
130 WEST CONGRESS STREET, 11TH FLOOR
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701-1317
(520) 724-8051
district3@pima.gov

SHARON BRONSON
CHAIR

February 27, 2015

Jack Peterson, Interim Director
Arizona Department of Agriculture
1688 W. Adams Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Kim Janes, Director
Pima Animal Care Center
4000 N. Silverbell Rd.
Tucson, AZ 85745

Chris Nanos, Chief Deputy
Pima County Sheriff's Department
1750 E. Benson Highway
Tucson, AZ 85714

RE: Castaway Treasures Sanctuary

Dear Directors Peterson and Janes and Chief Deputy Nanos:

We urge you to take immediate action to rescue, impound and permanently remove the horses and dogs from the cruel and long-term situations at Castaway Treasures Sanctuary.

This cruelty has been reported not only recently, but for the past two decades, and yet only superficial, band aid or short term improvements are made. The owners get a veterinarian to come out and assess the situation, only when forced by an inspection, and then soon after the cruel conditions prevail again.

We have recently received reliable eye-witness accounts of horses that cannot eat because of rotting teeth, horses in pain and dying, horses with rotting and overgrown hooves standing in their own manure, dogs permanently kept in kennels and never taken out. This latter point was admitted by the owner in an Arizona Daily Star article of June 11, 2011 (article enclosed).

The owners of Castaway Treasures should be given citations under Pima County Code Title 6-Animals:

6.04.110A.2.a: inflicting of unnecessary cruelty

6.04.110A.2.c: knowingly and willfully permitting suffering or cruelty of any kind (for the permanent confinement of dogs, and the permanent confinement and extreme medical problems of horses)

6.04.110B 1-6: violations of which have been reliably reported to us in relation to neglect.

6.04.130 and 140: Authority to remove and impound and procedures to remove and forfeit animals.

The dogs should be taken to the Pima Animal Care Center; and the horses should be removed to an excellent horse rescue such as Wild Hearts Rescue Ranch, which stands ready, able and competent to remove and care for the horses with several veterinarians to assist in care. These laws provide a due process method for permanently removing animals from bad owners. We believe based on the information that has been brought to our attention Castaway Treasures should be shut down immediately.

Sincerely,

Sharon Bronson
Chair, Pima County Board of Supervisors
District 3

Richard Elías
Vice-Chair, Pima County Board of Supervisors
District 5

cc: Dr. Francisco Garcia, Director, Health Department
Jan Lesher, Deputy County Administrator for Medical and Health Services
Jane Schwerin

PIMA COUNTY
HEALTH DEPARTMENT

MEMORANDUM

Date: March 10, 2015

To: The Honorable Sharon Bronson, Chair,
Pima County Board of Supervisors
&
The Honorable Richard Elias, Vice Chair,
Pima County Board of Supervisors

From: Kristin Barney
PACC Chief of Operations
&
Kim Janes
PACC Chief of External Affairs

Via: Francisco García, Health Department Director

Re: Your Letter dated February 27, 2015 RE: Castaway Treasure Sanctuary

Thank you for your recent letter urging Pima Animal Care Center to take immediate action to rescue, impound and permanently remove the horses and dogs from the Castaway Treasures Sanctuary located at 10905 W. Mars Road in the Picture Rocks area of Supervisor District 3, Pima County Arizona.

As you may be aware, the equine investigation is under the jurisdiction of the Pima County Sheriff's Department and Arizona Department of Agriculture while the Pima Animal Care Center is investigating the dog complaints. The case, to include the most recent information provided by Mr. Keith Bagwell of Supervisor Elias office, remains under investigation and the results of the investigations will be reviewed with the Pima County Attorney's Office for any violations and further action.

Staff will update you as it progresses through the investigation.

Should you or your staff have any questions, please contact Kristin Barney at 724-5908 or Kim Janes at 724-7776 or by return email.

KJ/ms

CC: C.H. Huckelberry, County Administrator
Jan Lesher, Deputy County Administrator, Medical and Health Services
Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Director, Pima County Health Department
Jack Peterson, Interim Director, Arizona Department of Agriculture
Chris Nanos, Chief Deputy, Pima County Sheriff's Department
Jane Schwerin

ORDINANCE 2015- _____

AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA, RELATING TO ANIMALS; AMENDING PIMA COUNTY CODE TITLE 6, CHAPTER 6.04 SECTION 6.04.060 TO ADD AN ANIMAL DROP OFF FEE

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA, FINDS THAT:

1. It is in the best interest of the County to modify Pima County Code Section 6.04.060 to charge a drop off fee for animals turned into the Center to offset the costs of caring for, rehabilitating and rehoming pets turned in to the Pima Animal Care Center.

THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA:

SECTION 1: Pima County Code Title 6, Chapter 6.04, Section 6.04.060 is amended to read as follows:

CHAPTER 6.04

ANIMAL CONTROL REGULATIONS

. . .

6.04.060 - Pound fees.

The Pima Animal Care Center may charge pound fees pursuant to the following schedule:

. . .

OO. ~~Pima Animal Care Center may waive any or all pound fees.~~ Animal surrender with appointment, thirty five dollars.

PP. Animal surrender without appointment, seventy dollars.

QQ. Pima Animal Care Center may waive any or all pound fees.

SECTION 2. This Ordinance is effective 30 days after the date of adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Supervisors, Pima County, Arizona, this _____day of_____, 2015.

_____ _____
Chair, Board of Supervisors Date

ATTEST:

_____
Clerk of the Board

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____
Deputy County Attorney

March 2, 2015

From: Kimberley Walker
President, Pima Paws for Life

2509 W Zinnia Avenue, Tucson AZ 85705

To: Kim Janes
Chief of External Operations

Pima Animal Care Center

3950 S Country Club, Tucson, AZ 85714

Dear Mr. Janes:

As you are aware, FAIR has merged with Pima Paws For Life. At the request of Ms. Barrick, who sat on the Pima Animal Care Center Advisory Committee, you have investigated the validity of her continued seat for FAIR.

Based on your response to her, she and I have discussed this further and determined we do desire to retain a seat on the committee to be held by Tamara Barrick as a Pima Paws For Life Board Member.

Please move forward with this letter of desire to submit a change to the ordinance replacing FAIR with PPFL.

Thank you in advance for your activity and the committee's consideration.

Respectfully,

Kimberley Walker
President, Pima Paws for Life

ORDINANCE 2015- _____

AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA, RELATING TO ANIMALS; AMENDING PIMA COUNTY CODE TITLE 6, CHAPTER 6.04 SECTION 6.04.100 TO REMOVE THE ANIMAL DEFENSE LEAGUE OF ARIZONA POSITION FROM THE PIMA COUNTY ANIMAL CARE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND REPLACE THE FOUNDATION FOR ANIMALS IN RISK WITH PIMA PAWS FOR LIFE ON THE COMMITTEE

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA, FINDS THAT:

1. It is in the best interest of the County to amend Pima County Code Section 6.04.100 to eliminate the Animal Defense League of Arizona (ADLA) position on the Pima County Animal Care Advisory Committee. ADLA has not nominated a representative since the resignation on November 5, 2012 of its previous representative.
2. It is in the best interest of the County to replace Foundation for Animals in Risk with Pima Paws For Life (FAIR). FAIR merged with Pima Paws For Life adopting the new name.

THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA:

SECTION 1: Pima County Code Title 6, Chapter 6.04, Section 6.04.100(B) is amended to read as follows:

CHAPTER 6.04

ANIMAL CONTROL REGULATIONS

6.04.100 - Advisory committee—Established—Powers and duties.

. . .

B. The membership of this committee shall consist of a representative from the Southern Arizona Veterinary Medical Association, the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals of Arizona, Inc., the Humane Society of Southern Arizona, the Tucson Kennel Club, the Animal Welfare Coalition, a public educator, a member of the Pima County board of health, ~~the Animal Defense League, the Foundation for Animals in Risk~~ <u>Pima Paws for Life</u>, the People for Animals in the Prevention of Cruelty and Neglect, Inc., a resident of Pima County who

needs and uses the assistance of a certified service dog as representative of the disabled community, the city of Tucson, and a registered volunteer with the Pima Animal Care Center. The manager of the center shall serve as an ex officio member.

SECTION 2. This Ordinance is effective 30 days after the date of adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Supervisors, Pima County, Arizona, this _____day of_____, 2015.

_____ _____
Chair, Board of Supervisors Date

ATTEST:

_____
Clerk of the Board

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____
Deputy County Attorney

Donation Activity

Period: 2/1/15 To: 2/28/15

Donation Code	Amount
DONATION	$10.00
DONATION ADOP	$200.00
DONATION GEN	$9,930.76
DONATION OUTR	$38.00
DONATION S/N	$13,065.50
DONATION SAMS	$2,023.00
Grand Total	$25,267.26

Donation Activity

Period: 7/1/14 To: 2/28/15

Donation Code	Amount
DONATION	$140.00
DONATION ADOP	$6,163.86
DONATION GEN	$221,159.04
DONATION OUTR	$3,901.00
DONATION S/N	$108,639.96
DONATION SAMS	$50,608.50
DONATION SHEL 0974	$20,585.00
Grand Total	$411,197.36

Complaints and Commendations for the Month of February 2015

2-6-15 E-mail from Department of Environmental Quality
Complaint
Reported dead dog
Course/Action
Picked up same day

Various Complaints
Complaint
Conditions at Castaway Treasures
Course/Action
PACC visit / Under investigation by Sheriff's Dept

Michael Schlueter

From: Kim Janes
Sent: Monday, March 09, 2015 10:55 AM
To: Michael Schlueter
Subject: FW: Complaint Referral PC 1502-027

Kim

PIMA COUNTY
ANIMAL CARE

From: Tina Gonzales
Sent: Friday, February 06, 2015 2:17 PM
To: Robert Hendrix; Jose Chavez
Cc: Kim Janes
Subject: RE: Complaint Referral PC 1502-027

Thanks guys! Have a good weekend.

Tina Gonzales
PDEQ Complaint Coordinator
(520) 724-7432
www.pima.gov

From: Robert Hendrix
Sent: Friday, February 06, 2015 2:13 PM
To: Jose Chavez; Tina Gonzales
Cc: Kim Janes
Subject: RE: Complaint Referral PC 1502-027

A15-165248 picked up today at 11:41

From: Jose Chavez
Sent: Friday, February 06, 2015 1:45 PM
To: Tina Gonzales
Cc: Robert Hendrix; Kim Janes
Subject: RE: Complaint Referral PC 1502-027

Hello Tina,

We will take care of it.

Robert, please set a DOA call to have this dog pick up making it the driver's first call tomorrow morning.

Thanks,

Jose

From: Tina Gonzales
Sent: Friday, February 06, 2015 1:37 PM
To: Kim Janes
Cc: Jose Chavez; Robert Hendrix
Subject: Complaint Referral PC 1502-027

Tina Gonzales
PDEQ Complaint Coordinator
(520) 724-7432
www.pima.gov

ORDINANCE 2015- _____

AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA, RELATING TO ANIMALS; AMENDING PIMA COUNTY CODE TITLE 6, CHAPTER 6.04 SECTION 6.04.060 TO ADD AN ANIMAL SURRENDER FEE FOR ANIMALS FROM A JURISDICTION WITHOUT A CURRENT ANIMAL SHELTER AGREEMENT WITH THE COUNTY AND TO ADD A ONE DOLLAR ANNUAL DOG LICENSING FEE INCREASE FOR FIVE YEARS FOR EACH TYPE OF DOG LICENSE FEE

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA, FINDS THAT:

1. It is in the best interest of the County to modify Pima County Code Section 6.04.060 to charge a drop off fee for animals turned into the Center from jurisdictions that do not have a current full cost recovery based animal sheltering agreement with the County to offset the costs of caring for, rehabilitating and rehoming pets turned in to the Pima Animal Care Center.
2. It is in the best interest of the County to increase dog licensing fees by one dollar per year for five years to offset cost increases associated with operating the licensing program, sheltering unwanted and homeless pets and providing animal welfare and rabies control enforcement service to the community.

THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA:

SECTION 1: Pima County Code Title 6, Chapter 6.04, Section 6.04.060 is amended to read as follows:

CHAPTER 6.04

ANIMAL CONTROL REGULATIONS

. . .

6.04.060 - Pound fees.

The Pima Animal Care Center may charge pound fees pursuant to the following schedule:

. . .

OO. ~~Pima Animal Care Center may waive any or all pound fees.~~ Animal surrendered from jurisdictions that do not have a current full cost recovery based animal sheltering service agreement with the county:

1. With appointment, thirty five dollars.

2. Without appointment, seventy dollars.

QQ. Pima Animal Care Center may waive any or all pound fees.

. . .

6.04.070 - Dog vaccinating, licensing and permitting procedure and fees within county limits.

. . .

B. The licensing fees for dogs three months of age or over which are kept within the boundaries of the county for at least thirty consecutive days are as follows:

1. Regular, unaltered dog—sixty dollars.

2. Regular, altered dog—fifteen dollars.

3. Dogs declared dangerous or vicious—one hundred dollars.

4. Senior/disabled citizen owner, unaltered dog (limit four discounted dog licenses per household)—seventeen dollars.

5. Senior/disabled citizen owner, altered dog (limit four discounted dog licenses per household)—ten dollars.

6. Dogs ten years of age or older—fifteen dollars.

7. A dog owner with a household income below the federal poverty level is eligible for a one time twenty-seven dollar unaltered dog licensing fee per dog.

8. A dog owner with a household income below the federal poverty level is eligible for an eight dollar dog licensing fee per altered dog (limit four discounted dog licenses per household).

9. A guide dog belonging to a blind person who is a resident within Pima County, or a dog certified, in writing, as being trained to the standards of a service animal by a

nationally recognized service dog training agency belonging to a resident within Pima County shall be licensed pursuant to this article without payment of a fee.

10.Processing/Postage fee per license, one dollar.

11. Effective July 1, 2015, fees authorized in subparagraphs B.1. through B.8. of this sub section will increase on July 1 of each year by one dollar per year for five years.

. . .

SECTION 2. This Ordinance is effective 30 days after the date of adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Supervisors, Pima County, Arizona, this _____day of_____, 2015.

_____ _____
Chair, Board of Supervisors Date

ATTEST:

_____
Clerk of the Board

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____
Deputy County Attorney

PIMA COUNTY
HEALTH DEPARTMENT

MEMORANDUM

Date: March 13, 2015

To: Jan Lesher
Deputy County Administrator
Medical and Health Services

From: Kristin Barney KB
Pima Animal Care Center Chief of Operations

Via: Francisco García, Health Department Director

Re: Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) Operations Update

As Pima Animal Care Center Shelter Operations continue to evolve it is important to note the strategic changes in service provision to enhance the quality of care for animals at PACC. As we continue to balance employees, volunteers and the new inmate program to assure the daily duties are being completed in the most efficient and effective manner possible, PACC continues to increase its capacity to provide service, increase adoptions, and operate with the utmost care and compassion for our animals. In January 2015, there were a number of service-related items that were addressed by PACCAC leadership that PACC staff is working to address.

PACC is a complex operation and programmatically it is complex to manage not only the flow of intake of animals but to manage the many moving parts to oversee the housing and husbandry of animals in the shelter. This includes PACC staff, volunteers and the inmate program, all integral to the success of PACC shelter operations, adoptions and community outreach.

Animal Care and Shelter Operations

The new inmate program facilitated and overseen by PACC staff and the Pima County Sheriff's Department, has been a significant improvement from PACC's previous contract with the Arizona Department of Corrections. The new inmate program has showcased a drastic increase of compassion, attention to detail in the care for PACC animals. The inmates are chiefly in charge of feeding the animals and ensuring that proper dietary restrictions are adhered to, animal management and separation during feeding times, cleaning animal areas, specifically meet and greet yards, kennels and food and water bowls.

Feeding the animals at PACC has always been challenging logistically, particularly, in the timing of feeding and separation of animals to mitigate fighting, and increase access of food to animals. Through the inception of the new inmate program, feeding logistics have become increasingly more consistent and considerate of these potential barriers. The inmates have shown increased attention to detail in feeding PACC animals, specifically, ensuring the animals have proper amounts of food, dietary restrictions (particularly with older dogs, mothers, and puppies) and feeding times of feeding are more consistent and accounted for.

The new inmate program is also chiefly in charge of the daily cleaning and sanitizing of kennels, feeding and water bowls, toys and meet and greet areas. There has been significant improvement in the detail lent to the cleaning and sanitizing of PACC facilities with the new inmate program. The aforementioned are cleaned on a specific schedule to ensure that the rotation of cleaning is continuous. There is far more regularity of cleaning, and a distinct increase in attention to detail provided to cleaning detail of the shelter.

PACC and Pima County Sheriff's Department participate in bi-weekly oversight meetings regarding the inmate program. This provides a forum to evaluate the program and enables staff to focus on areas that need improvement or highlight successes leading to far more consistent, detailed and careful care in feeding the animals and cleaning and sanitation of the shelter. This oversight meeting also provides an opportunity to request more inmates to work at the shelter, however, PACC and the Pima County Sheriff's Department are restricted to the amount of inmates available to work at the shelter and parameters set by Pima County Sheriff's Department. As a contingency plan to ensure there is staff on call, PACC has been working with Central Pet on solidifying a contingency plan in the event the inmates have not reported to PACC for work.

Animal Intake and Animal Placement

Animal Intake at PACC is inherently complex as is proper placement of animals within a full shelter. PACC staff works diligently to ensure that animals are properly placed in the shelter to address all considerations associated with the animal. Staff evaluates each animal and places it in the shelter to best match its current needs. Staff works to co-house animals that will get along together and have behavioral temperaments that will ensure safe co-housing. Staff considers a number of factors, such as size, age, temperament, sex, health and behavior, and status (e.g., stray, available for adoption, on hold, enforcement case, biting dog).

When determining whether an animal should be co-housed, there are also bonded pairs, to which there are a myriad of definitions of what is a bonded pair. Staff does their best to keep bonded animals together by housing them in kennels and specifying "bonded with..." on the kennel cards. The reality is that many animals identified as bonded are not, and there are a number of staff, volunteers and inmates involved in the movement of animals within the shelter. PACC staff and leadership look closely at the processes for placement of animals and works diligently to mitigate the careless movement of animals and ensure safe and proper housing of animals throughout the shelter.

PACC Staffing and Supervision

Due to a number of contributing factors, such as increased scope of services, increased capacity needs for the volume of animal intakes, and increased treatment and rehabilitation of animals, staff hours at PACC have seen a significant increase. Recently, PACC has added new positions to help mitigate the impact of increasing volume demands and staff the increased capacity of the tent facility. PACC continues to be understaffed for the magnitude of operational demands on the shelter.

PACC has employed multiple strategies to enhance the service provided with the limited resources, such as cross-training staff, merging the clinics, creating an animal evaluation team, analyze work processes to identify opportunities where staff time can be made more effective. While PACC leadership has been taking steps forward to offset the burden on staff, these changes alone are not enough to significantly decrease the staff time necessary to accomplish the critical tasks mandatory to accomplish the array of service provisions PACC is committed to.

PACC leadership has incurred increased staff movement and reassignment particularly with the advent of increased scope of services and treatment alongside the high volume of animal intakes. This movement of staff contributes to and impacts many of the 22 requests for resolution items posed by PACCAC. PACC and Pima County Health Department are working together with County Administration to analyze staff overtime, available positions and potential to add capacity to PACC shelter operations. While this leadership team continues to analyze options for staffing at the shelter, PACC leadership is working diligently to utilize staff to manage shelter operations in the most effective way possible and to have management more clearly present during operation.

Recently, the successes of PACC have gained interest from a number of donors who have helped the shelter immensely through donations. PACC continues to work closely to cultivate these relationships to help potentially fund new positions, with particular interest in funding positions in the help kiosk, cat care and marketing. Additionally, PACC has been working closely with PetSmart Charities on a grant that would fund an offsite adoption coordinator. This position would be chiefly in charge of offsite adoption, allowing the PACC adoptions coordinator to spend more time at the shelter to help facilitate increased adoptions.

Facility Changes and Process Adjustment to Enhance Service

The PACC facility has a number of barriers to efficient and ideal operations. PACC staff has been analyzing work processes and been changing a number or methods to further the humane treatment of animals. The request for resolution regarding the U-Bay is an example of this. PACC has instituted a new process for ensuring dogs are not housed within the U-Bay for more than one day. However, due to space and structure limitations, some dogs, due to disease will have to be housed there for longer periods.

In trying to maximize the facility capacity and maintain humane and ideal care for the animals, we no longer have the small B kennels due to the space limitations. Likewise, PACC is currently in the process of moving the stray dog population to the tent facility, launched early February 2015. This is to help mitigate disease spread, it is more customer friendly and a more practical use of the facility space, particularly maximizing individual dog space.

PACC is working to transition the old sickbay kennels into an area that will specifically house mothers and puppies and groups of puppies. This will allow for detailed and monitored feeding, increased space and mitigate the noise and flow of traffic around these animals. This will increase the care to this population within the shelter.

Kennel cards and management of animal inventory within the shelter is a process that continues to be addressed. PACC staff is working to find and implement solutions to address the management of kennel cards, inclusive of a bar code inventory system, and added staff to supervise and manage the inventory of animals. PACC has allocated computers specifically for volunteers can readily look up animal information at the shelter. PACC is working with the Health Department and Pima County IT on what type of tailored or partial access volunteers will have to the Chameleon database.

Future Steps for Pima Animal Care Center

As PACC continues to manage the complex operations at the facility, staff, leadership and the Pima County Health Department are working tirelessly to enhance the type of service that PACC, the County and the community are committed to. PACC is working on process and policy planning, identifying opportunities for process enhancement through information technology and facility changes, all to free up significant staff time to better manage the operational demands of the shelter and maintain a greater detail to service provision.

Cc: Jack Neuman, Pima Animal Care Center Advisory Committee Chair
Kim Janes, Pima Animal Care Center Chief of External Affairs