

Animal Control Commission

February 9, 2026, at 5:30pm

**Bloomington Animal Shelter – Hybrid Zoom and In Person Meeting
3410 South Walnut Street, Bloomington, IN 47401**

MEMBERS

Sue Allmon – present in person
Sita Cohen – present in person
Chris Hazel – present in person
Brandt Ludlow – present via zoom
Valerie Pena – present in person
Laura Soto – present via zoom

GUESTS

Pam Davis
James Thomas?
Tosha Hall
Brooke L. Todd
Leroy Rodd
Stacy Herrington

STAFF

Kat Ennis – present in person
Lisa Ritchel – present in person
Virgil Sauder – present in person
Nick Steury – present in person

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Valerie moved to approve the **December 8, 2025**, minutes as written.

Sita seconded.

Roll call vote: Sue, “yes,” Sita, “yes,” Chris, “yes,” Brandt, “yes,” Valerie, “yes.”

Motion passes, 5-0-0.

Laura joined the meeting.

I. NEW BUSINESS

a. Potentially Dangerous, Dangerous, Vicious – Rowdy

Officer Steury explained that he received a call on January 7, 2026, that the Bloomington Police Department was following a dog that attacked someone and they needed assistance. When he arrived on scene the dog was sitting at the front door of 526 W Northlane Drive. BPD stated that they already knocked on doors and windows but there was no answer. The dog was skittish and deep growled. Officer caught the dog and loaded it into the truck. BPD provided pictures of the victim. The dog was scanned but there was no microchip. Officer Steury researched the address and along with Officer Ennis was able to identify this dog to be Rowdy who was known to animal control. Officer Steury returned and knocked again with no answer and on the next day called the victim multiple times with no answer. Officer Steury eventually spoke with the owner and informed them of the quarantine paperwork and the Animal Control Commission. He communicated with the victim on the 8th initially having the incorrect number

for her. The victim statement was that she got off of the bus, came around a corner, and one of the neighbor dogs from the apartment at the end chased and bit her face knocking her down. The dog bit her leg, arm and neck. Officer Steury advised that when he met her, there was no wound on her neck. He explained that English is her second language so communication was difficult. She described the animal as stalking or chasing prey like a tiger. The victim had fifteen stitches on her face and over ten puncture wounds on her body. Photos of the injuries were provided. That same day, the victim came to the shelter to identify the animal to make sure it was safe to leave her apartment. She visually confirmed that Rowdy was the dog that attacked her and Officer Steury witnessed that Rowdy low-growled, barked and slightly lunged towards the victim from inside the kennel. Officer noted that it is stressful for the dogs in the kennels. Officer Steury next spoke with witness Brandi Fields who claimed that she found the victim bleeding in the street. She took off the victim's shirt to apply pressure. Ms. Fields did not see any dog on the scene at that time. Ms. Fields claimed that the victim said the animal was black and white in the moment. The witness stated that Rowdy was gone all night with owner Brooke Todd's mother and could not have been the attacking animal. When asked why he was at large in front of 526 W Northlane she stated that he had gotten loose from Ms. Todd's mother after the attack. Officer continued and explained that he received an update from victim on the 16th who claimed she was suffering from significant psychological trauma from the incident. The updated photos of the healing process are available. On the 20th the dog owner, Brooke Todd, stated that Rowdy could not be the dog that attacked because he was with her mother all night. She did acknowledge that he was loose from her mother the same evening as the attack and in the same area. Officer Steury hand delivered the ACC paperwork to Ms. Todd on the 30th. Rowdy has been housed at the shelter since January 9, 2026.

Sita asked Officer about Rowdy's history. Officer explained that there was a bite case in the past from the same address but they were told it was Buddy who is a similar color. After investigation, it was found that the bite did not actually break skin. Sita asked if when the victim identified the dog she was 100% sure. Officer answered in the affirmative adding that she became very distraught when she recognized the dog. Laura noted some confusion with the description of the color as brown in the police report versus black and white. Officer clarified that the victim told the police brown and the police told the officer brown. The witness stated that the victim said black and white in the moment. Officer added that Rowdy is reddish brown.

Brooke Todd explained that her dog Rowdy is her Emotion Support Animal and he is not aggressive. She stated that he did not do this and has never bitten anyone. He does growl and it sounds vicious, but that is how he talks. He is not fixed and likes to run. She has had to pay to get him out of the shelter in the past. She provided a letter from a security officer who works in the apartments behind her stating that he saw other stray dogs coming from the trailer court that evening. Ms. Todd referred to the victim identifying Rowdy as the dog and noted that she is terrified of dogs no matter what they look like. She repeated that her dog did not do this and was just at the wrong place at the wrong time. Ms. Todd stated that he was wrongly placed in the shelter, he is not vicious or a threat to the community and should be able to come home. Ms. Todd added that she has witnesses present to speak on her behalf. Valerie asked Ms. Todd about the timeline. She explained that her mother had Rowdy in the truck with the window down. She pulled up, saw a commotion and went over to see what was happening. Rowdy jumped out of the car at some point. Ms. Todd said that he probably ran off into the neighborhood like he always does. Ms. Todd next provided some additional documents. She explained that Rowdy lived with her at the Middle Way House. She provided a letter from them which stated that at no time was Rowdy a threat to staff or residents. She advised that a dog who bites would not be allowed to live at that facility. Middle

Way required that he have his shots and he had to be registered in a training class which they paid for. Ms. Todd added that her caseworker is no longer there but she could get records if needed. Valerie asked if the letter was signed by a volunteer and Ms. Todd answered in the affirmative. Ms. Todd added that a resident advocate named Gina also sent her a different letter via email. Ms. Todd showed this email to the Commission using her phone. Ms. Todd advised that she registered Rowdy recently and has his original certificate where she registered him as her service dog. Ms. Todd added that she has several people in the community, friends and family that know Rowdy and have been around him. Sue described the documents provided by Ms. Todd for the members attending on Zoom. Sue added that the letter from the security officer corroborates that Rowdy was with her mom and did jump out of the vehicle. Sita added that according to the document there was a black and white dog and a brown dog running back and forth from the trailer court.

Pam Davis, Brooke Todd's mom, explained that she had been out of town for a day and a half at work and took Rowdy with her. She takes him there a couple of times a month. She came home, pulled in and noticed flashing lights to the left and got out of the car. Ms. Davis then remembered that there were not lights when she pulled in. She continued and explained that she got out of the truck, heard someone holler and headed that way. Rowdy jumped out and went the opposite way. Ms. Davis saw a girl standing there and another girl crying and bleeding in the middle of the road. This girl said that the dog was brown and white and many colors. Ms. Davis was there with her for 20-25 minutes and the police officers had not been there. A white SUV came by and she guesses that they called 911. She then left and hollered for Rowdy who was out running doing what he wanted to do. The next thing she heard was that he was quarantined. Ms. Davis stated that he is not vicious at all. Sue asked if she was able to find Rowdy that evening and Ms. Davis answered in the negative. Ms. Davis then referred to Ethan who works at Aspen Security who she saw that evening. He told her about the two loose dogs that get into the garbage. Ms. Davis added that Rowdy is very verbal and if you did not know him you might think he is a little vicious, but he is not at all. He has been Brooke's support dog for 5-6 years and he is a good dog. Ms. Davis shared that she has been around him since he was a puppy and he would not do something like this. She advised that Rowdy is not brown, brown and white or black, he is a reddish color. Ms. Davis explained that around ten days after the incident she spoke with the mother of the victim who also said that it was a brown dog with many colors. The girl also thanked her for calling 911 and Ms. Davis explained to her that she was not the one who called. The girl told her again it was her and Ms. Davis told her it was the white SUV. Ms. Davis concluded by stating that Rowdy is the wrong dog. Rowdy was with her and she has a witness. She hopes this is resolved so he can come home.

Sita asked Officer Steury for clarification and if Rowdy was picked up because he was at the scene and the victim identified him. Officer responded that control called him stating that BPD had the dog but were not able to apprehend him and needed assistance. When he arrived BPD advised that the dog matched the description of the animal that was described by the victim. The victim had already departed in the ambulance so Officer did not get to speak with her for a day or two. She then came into the shelter and positively identified the dog. Officer added that she described it as a brown dog. He noted that it is a reddish color but that it was night time. Chris asked what time this happened. Virgil responded that the police report states that they responded to the scene at 6:33pm. Chris noted that it would have been dark. Sita asked if it was possible that the brown dog could potentially be the other brown dog that is running around the neighborhood with the other dog referred to in the letter. Officer stated that it was possible. Sita shared that she wants to make sure to not declare the wrong dog. Valerie reviewed the descriptions again noting that the victim said it was a brown dog and the witness Brandi Fields said it was a black

and white dog. Officer advised that Ms. Fields is an acquaintance of Rowdy's owners. Officer also clarified that Ms. Fields claimed that the victim said the animal was black and white. Ms. Fields was not present at the meeting. Virgil then referred to the police report and read that the victim described the dog as smaller in stature, brown in color, unknown breed and it came from the nearby apartment building. A dog matching the description was located sitting on the front porch. The dog did appear to get aggressive and began barking at officers when they got too close. Valerie asked if there was blood on the dog and Officer Steury answered in the negative but explained that in his experience blood is on the animal when it is dog verses dog, not dog versus human.

The Commission discussed. Valerie asked if it was known that the victim would not be attending the meeting. Virgil answered that at last contact, they were hoping to attend. Brandt inquired as to the physical distance from the porch where the dog was sitting to the site where the victim was bitten. Officer answered that he was not shown the location of the bite, but noted that the victim stated that the dog lived on the corner apartment which is where he found the dog. Officer explained that the victim got off the bus at the bottom of the hill and had to walk up a winding hill and she lives a couple doors down from where the dog lives. Virgil referred to the police report and added that she was walking through the parking lot to get to her apartment. Sita shared that this is a difficult case for her due to the amount of ambiguous information. In her opinion, she does not believe they can prove 100% that this was Rowdy. Sita recognizes that the victim was bitten and it was terrible, but noted that one might think a dog is one color when it is a different color in moments of trauma. The timeline also seems odd for it to have been Rowdy. Valerie agreed that the timing was challenging if Rowdy was in the truck when it pulled up and the victim was already bitten when the mother got out to assist, after which the dog got out and took off. Valerie stated that just because there is a loose dog doesn't mean it is the attacking dog, but the victim did go into the shelter and identify the dog. Valerie wished the victim was present so she could ask her more questions. She echoed that this is a horrible situation for the victim and wants to make sure the Commission does the right thing. Valerie continued noting that if Rowdy is the dog, Vicious would apply because the victim is a person, the bite caused severe injury, the wounds are potentially dangerous to health or life and there is permanent scarring or disfigurement. Valerie next reviewed the requirements for this declaration and noted that Rowdy is not currently neutered. Sue stated that she is struggling with the timeline because the accident already happened when Rowdy was in the car and there were other dogs in the area. Virgil clarified that it was alleged that the bite had already happened. Chris added that Rowdy was at large and Valerie agreed that it doesn't help that Rowdy gets out and is not neutered. Sita asked Ms. Todd if there is a reason for this and she answered that she didn't have any issue with him running off until she moved into town. She does plan to have him neutered and will do it now if required. Virgil continued and advised that because the ordinances haven't been updated, the Dangerous declaration is also an option. Sita repeated that she is having a hard time saying 100% that this is Rowdy. Sue stated that she is not having a hard time because the Officers know Rowdy and the victim came in and identified him. Valerie next asked if the letter from the security guard is an affidavit. Sue answered in the negative and Virgil added that the statement indicates that there are some dogs that run but he advised that animal control has not received any calls about this. Chris asked how Rowdy has acted to shelter staff and Virgil responded that his kennel presence has not been great so staff is not pushing it. Laura next shared that she is having a hard time declaring Rowdy because there is too much in question in the order of events and dogs. Sita agreed. Brandt noted that it was unfortunate that the witness was not present and stated that he would be very hesitant to say there is a reasonable certainty that Rowdy is the dog. Alternatively, Rowdy was threatening to both the police and the control officer and neutering may be helpful. Valerie asked if they could choose any level and Virgil noted that Audrey

with Legal was not present and he could reach out to her, but they do have some flexibility in choosing the level. Virgil added that if they want to hear more from the victim, they could also table the discussion with or without releasing the dog. Sita suggested declaring Potentially Dangerous because they are not 100% sure and require him to be neutered before he can be reclaimed. Valerie read the Potentially Dangerous rules and noted that the Commission can include additional requirements. Brandt felt this was the most equitable option based on the knowledge they have at this time. The owners admitted that the dog was running free and this resolution would address that. Sita felt that the PD declaration will do some justice for the victim and neutering will help get him more under control. Virgil asked Sita to include that the motion will go to City Legal for review.

Sita moved to declare Rowdy Potentially Dangerous with the addition of neutering before he is released and that before this is finalized it will go before City Legal for review.

Brandt seconded.

Roll call vote: Sue, "yes," Sita, "yes," Chris, "no", Brandt, "yes," Valerie, "aye," Laura, "yes."

Motion passes, 5-1-0.

Valerie emphasized to Rowdy's owners that they must be in better control of Rowdy. They asked to visit him and Virgil asked that they come tomorrow for more information.

b. Habitual Offender – Herrington

Officer Ennis explained that on 1/9/26 she received a call from Friend's Place asking if she received a bite case and later spoke with the BPD Officer who responded. Oscar, a dog previously declared Potentially Dangerous, was on a bungee leash with his owner Stacy Herrington at the bus stop. When the victim came by with his dog Dalton, Oscar snapped the leash, charged and the dogs got into a scuffle. While breaking them up, he fell. Dalton's only injury was a small scrape on one of his paws and the owner didn't know if it was a bite or a concrete scrap. Officer was unable to locate Ms. Herrington for her statement and noted that there is a lot of moving around when it is this cold. Later there was another call regarding a large brown/white Pitbull running through Willow Town Homes Apartment Complex. The dog was not found. On the 18th there was another call about a large brown/white Pitbull running through these townhomes. Officer Ennis went there and located a camp that was catty corned to the address given. She spoke with someone who said there were no dogs. Officer saw a tie-out and dog toys but no dogs. When Officer left the camp, she asked a person walking into their apartment if they had seen a dog. The individual answered in the affirmative advising that there was a dog regularly running loose. The person stated that the dog had a male and a female owner and they had two dogs, a brown and white larger dog and a smaller tan dog. Officer showed her a lineup and the person picked out Oscar and Tootsie Roll who are owned by Stacy Herrington. Officers never found the dogs at large, but they did have multiple calls from several complainants.

Ms. Herrington explained that a couple weeks prior to this attack, Dalton had attacked Oscar at Shalom Center which is on camera. This is why Oscar got aggressive and snapped the leash. She added that they are siblings and she does not know why they are aggressive with each other. Ms. Herrington explained that now every time they see each other they growl. She stated that she did not report this prior attack because Oscar did not get hurt and they are supposed to be her friends. Sita asked her what type of leash she is using and she responded that they had a rope and tried to leash the two dogs together. Ms. Herrington added that Officer Ennis gave her new leashes. She added that Oscar is at the shelter and is vaccinated and neutered. Valerie advised that the fact that they are siblings can actually make it worse.

The Commission discussed. Virgil clarified that Ms. Herrington is back because she was previously declared a Habitual Offender and she has violated the requirements. Sita stated that Ms. Herrington needs to use a very secure leash and Oscar can never be at large again. If he get picked up, she will lose him. Valerie suggested adding the muzzle. Ms. Herrington requested a muzzle and Virgil responded that they would figure something out if it is required. Sue noted that Oscar has been running loose, but the victim was unsure if there was an actual bite. Brandt felt that Ms. Herrington has run into these problems repeatedly despite advice and warnings. Sita agreed there are repeat issues but noted that the leash broke. Brandt stated that is why a stable leash is needed. Chris noted that she works down town and always sees her dogs on leash.

Valerie moved that if we have another incident where Oscar is out at large in the next two years and is picked up, he becomes the property of the City of Bloomington Animal Shelter.

Sita seconded

Roll call vote: Sue, "yes," Sita, "yes," Chris, "yes," Brandt, "yes," Valerie, "yes," Laura, "yes."

Motion passes, 6-0-0.

c. Ordinance Recommendations to Mayor and Council

Sue asked if everyone had time to look at ordinance recommendations. All nodded in agreement. Virgil shared that the appeals part has been confirmed moving from sixty days to ten for appeals to be filed.

Sita asked the following questions:

1. In 7.32.010 should anything be added about follow-up visits? Virgil leaned toward the negative but noted if it is a chronic issue follow-up can happen on a case by case basis.
2. In 7.32.030 what does *otherwise dispose* of the animal mean? Virgil noted that they debated on this wording but it means any kind of outcome including transfer, rescue, foster, etc. Sita shared that she feels it sounds heartless.
3. In 7.32.040 what examples of proof of ownership are allowed? Virgil explained that information would be in a policy statement rather than an ordinance. Sita also asked if we require someone reclaiming an animal to have a specific address. Virgil responded in the negative but stated we try to get contact information to follow up.
4. In 7.56.060 it says "Outline conditions permitting reconsideration of the habitual offender status." Virgil asked the members how many years are appropriate for reconsideration. Currently it is 1 year for Potentially Dangerous, 3 years for Dangerous and Vicious. Valerie suggested 2.
5. In 7.56.070 Sita prefers the term *euthanize* rather than *destroy*. Virgil offered to ask but noted that *destroy* is a legal term.

Valerie asked about the definition of service animals on page 5 which includes any dog or miniature horse. Virgil explained that the definition mimics the national definition.

Chris moved to accept the updates to the ordinance with noted changes based on Legal's approval.

Valerie seconded.

Roll call vote: Sue, "yes," Sita, "yes," Chris, "yes," Brandt, "yes," Valerie, "yes," Laura, "yes."

Motion passes, 6-0-0.

d. Officer Elections for 2026

The Commission discussed. Laura, Brandt and Chris all declined to be Officers. Sita and Sue agreed to continue.

Chris moved that Officers stay the same for 2026.

Sita seconded.

Roll call vote: Sue, "yes," Sita, "yes," Chris, "yes," Brandt, "yes," Valerie, "yes," Laura, "yes."

Motion passes, 6-0-0.

III. Reports

a. Animal Care and Control Report

Virgil reported that the 2025 year end looked good and adoptions were incredibly strong. Intake was slightly increased in dogs, but considerably decreased in cats. The shelter switched from open hours to scheduled appointments on Sundays due to staffing constraints. There are currently two new animal care technicians in training and one on desk duty.

b. MCHA Update

Sue explained that Tails on the Town is scheduled for 6/12/26 at the Mill. There will be a DJ, live and silent auctions, and snack foods. They have already met their sponsorship goal.

c. AMC Update

Valerie explained that AMC had a very lengthy meeting. They elected new officers but are still looking for new members because there are three open slots.

IV. Animal Control Commission Discussion

No discussion.

V. Public Comment Period

No public comment.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Chris moved to adjourn.

Valerie seconded.

Roll call vote: Sue, "yes," Sita, "yes," Chris, "yes," Brandt, "yes," Valerie, "yes," Laura, "yes."

Motion passes, 6-0-0.

The meeting adjourned at 7:15pm