

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 29, 2013

Item 3, Report No. 1, of the Finance and Administration Committee, which was adopted without amendment by the Council of the City of Vaughan on January 29, 2013.

3 PROGRAM REVIEW FOR ANIMAL AND WILDLIFE SERVICES

The Finance and Administration Committee recommends:

- 1) That the following deputations be received:**
 - 1) Mr. Guido Masutti, Riverview Avenue, Woodbridge; and**
 - 2) Ms. Nathalie Karvonen, Toronto Wildlife Centre, Carl Hall Road, Toronto; and**
- 2) That the recommendation contained in following report of the Acting Commissioner of Legal and Administrative Services, the Commissioner of Strategic & Corporate Services, and the Commissioner of Finance and City Treasurer, dated January 14, 2013, be approved.**

Recommendation

The Acting Commissioner of Legal and Administrative Services, the Commissioner of Strategic & Corporate Services, and the Commissioner of Finance and City Treasurer, recommend:

1. That this report be received for information purposes,
2. That wildlife services not be added to the 2013 budget,
3. That the current service delivery model for animal services be continued, with staff being directed to review opportunities over the next two years to provide services through partial alternative service delivery,
4. That the Animal Control Bylaw be amended to increase licensing fees as set out in this report.

Contribution to Sustainability

Sustainability is a philosophy that involves long term thinking and balanced decision making. The following report provides Council with the requested information pertaining to animal and wildlife services for Vaughan. The information will support Council in its budget deliberations that focus on the long-term viability of such services while managing the financial sustainability of the Corporation.

Council's proactivity on this issue represents a level of interdisciplinary thinking that is vital to tackle the complex and varied challenges facing municipal entities as well as initiate actions to take advantage of opportunities available to Vaughan.

Economic Impact

There are no economic impacts as a result of this report. However, the dialogue resulting from this report may impact the 2013 budget if wildlife services (which are currently not provided by the City) are added to the City services mandate.

The cost associated with enhancing animal services to include wildlife is approximately \$168,000 plus HST and was noted in the December 3, 2012 Finance and Administration Committee Report.

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 29, 2013

Item 3, Finance Report No. 1 – Page 2

Communications Plan

There is not an immediate need for a communications plan. However, depending on the outcomes of the discussion and direction from Council related to animal and wildlife services, a communications plan will be required both internally (various departments) and externally (residents, service providers, etc.).

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide a report pursuant to direction from Council at its December 11, 2012 meeting, whereby staff were directed to expedite the analysis pertaining to wildlife calls and program review for animal services. Council requested the information for the deliberations for the 2013 budget given that there could be cost implications of enhancing animal services to include wildlife.

Background - Analysis and Options

Many municipalities within York Region contracted animal control and shelter services to external vendors, specifically Kennel Inn, which ceased operations in 2009. As a result of the closure of Kennel Inn, its municipal clients were directed by their respective Councils to determine options to replace Kennel Inn to facilitate continuity in animal control services provision.

Vaughan City staff conducted research into the costs and options related to the provision of ongoing animal services for the City of Vaughan. The details of the options and analysis are summarized in the following City of Vaughan reports:

- Item 1, Report 46 of the Committee of the Whole (Working Session) October 2007
- Item 1, Report 54 of the Committee of the Whole (Working Session) November 2007
- Item 1, Report 1 of the Committee of the Whole (Working Session) January 2009; and
- Item 3, Report 31 of the Committee of the Whole (Working Session) May 25 2009.

Given the scarcity of animal service contractors, a decision was made to operate an animal shelter in Vaughan. This included the retrofit of leased space on 70 Tigi Court (unit 47). The gross operating cost of animal services for the City of Vaughan is approximately \$900,000 and does not include wildlife services. The City offsets the operating costs by providing animal services for other municipalities (i.e. King Township and Bradford/West Gwillimbury) resulting in a net operating cost of approximately \$700,000. Operating costs are also offset from licensing revenue which was approximately \$46,000 in 2012.

Earlier in 2012, Council directed staff to identify the costs associated with enhancing animal services to include wildlife. These costs were reported during the Finance and Administration Committee meeting of December 3, 2012. Such cost was noted as approximately \$168,000 plus HST by an external vendor (the Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals – OSPCA).

In parallel, the City completed a program review during the summer of 2012. The outcome (reported in Q4) was the initial identification of 5 programs, (one of which is animal services) for further examination, including a comparison with the levels of service to other municipalities. This report examining service levels for the five programs is scheduled for Q1 2013. The discussion and direction at Council was to expedite the completion of the review for Animal Services along with the feasibility of expanding services to include wildlife prior to the budget deliberation for 2013.

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 29, 2013

Item 3, Finance Report No. 1 – Page 3

Provincial and Municipal Roles with Respect to Animal Control Services and Wildlife Services

Domesticated animals have become pets that provide owners companionship and pleasure. However, from time to time conflicts arise between animal owners and non-owners or between animal owners themselves. Therefore, it is beneficial to develop programs and regulations recognizing that responsibly kept animal companions are a desirable feature of a community.

According to the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources June 8, 2012 Fact Sheet, "Handling Conflicts with Wildlife", landowners are responsible for managing problem animals on their property. The Ministry is mandated to assist landowners and municipalities handle conflicts with wildlife by providing information, agency and animal control services referrals, and details of how to obtain authorizations if required. The Ministry pre-authorizes the following persons who may act as agents to be hired or asked to deal with problem animals on private property:

- Licensed trappers;
- Employees or agents of the OSPCA;
- Members of a landowner's immediate family acting on behalf of the landowner;
- A person whose main business is removing problem wildlife; and
- Municipal employees with specific responsibilities for wildlife control (Animal Services).

The legal actions property owners or their agents can take to deal with the problem wildlife are set out in the *Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act*. In the Southern Region, a person may possess a wild animal for up to 24 hours to transport it to a wildlife rehabilitator or veterinarian. However, there are exceptions related to dealing with white-tailed deer, moose, caribou, elk, black bear, wolf, and coyotes. Additional information related "humans living with wildlife" is available at www.mnr.gov.on.ca.

The Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (OSPCA) is a registered charitable organization with a mission to facilitate and provide for province-wide leadership on matters relating to the prevention of cruelty to animals and the promotion of animal welfare. The following is a list of programs and services provided by the Society:

- Cruelty investigations;
- Sheltering and adoptions;
- Wildlife hotline;
- Government and industry advocacy;
- Humane education;
- Reducing pet overpopulation;
- Emergency rescue and treatment; and
- Reuniting lost pets with their owners.

The Society is mandated by the *Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act* to enforce animal cruelty laws and provide Society Branch and affiliate investigators with police powers to do so.

The primary focus of humane societies is animal welfare. Municipal animal services are focused on public health and safety and include animal control, adoption, education, licensing, sheltering, and enforcement of relevant bylaws. Among various models in which these services are delivered by North American municipalities, the most common models include:

- Delivery of all services by municipality;
- Delivery of all services by a private contractor, and
- Delivery of all services is shared between a municipality and a private contractor.

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 29, 2013

Item 3, Finance Report No. 1 – Page 4

Services related to wildlife are not mandated services for municipalities and are the responsibility of the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. A jurisdictional review of other local municipalities is summarized in Attachment 1. A significant majority do not provide wildlife services. Those that do, currently offer the service through a contracted animal services provider, notably the OSPCA for Richmond Hill, Aurora and Markham.

Table 1 provides the costing information presented earlier in this section as well as includes additional jurisdictions. Net costs are shown on a per resident basis. Overall, Markham has the lowest cost per resident for animal services followed by Newmarket (\$2.14) and Vaughan (\$2.26). Markham's costs are lowest as they outsource animal services and they generate nearly double the licensing revenue of other municipalities to offset costs further. In addition, Markham receives fewer animal and wildlife services related calls as compared to Vaughan. Markham is also modifying its animal services to include a store front type facility to complement and enhance the services provided by the OSPCA. This will increase the net resident costs to approximately \$1.80.

If Vaughan were to cease service provision to any other municipality, the cost per resident would be closer to \$3. It is important to note that costs per resident for Markham, Aurora and Richmond Hill include basic wildlife services. Regardless, on a comparative basis, the \$2.26 per resident cost suggests the City of Vaughan is delivering services efficiently and effectively.

Table 1: Comparison of Animal Services Costs in Other Jurisdictions

MUNICIPALITY	POPULATION 2011*	Animal Services Net Operating Budget 2011	NET COST PER RESIDENT
Markham	301,709	\$400,000 (approximate)	\$1.33
Newmarket	79,978	\$171,168	\$2.14
Vaughan**	288,301	\$652,888***	\$2.26
Richmond Hill	185,541	\$508,797	\$2.74
Mississauga	713,443	\$1.976 M	\$2.77
Toronto	2,615,060	\$7.9 M	\$3.02
Brampton	523,911	\$1.8 M	\$3.44
Aurora	53,203	\$192,000	\$3.61
East Gwillimbury	22,473	\$82,500 – shelter only	\$3.67
Whitchurch-Stouffville	37,628	\$149,898	\$3.98
Pickering	88,721	\$417,842	\$4.71
Whitby	122,022	\$609,100	\$4.99
Georgina	43,517	\$234,940	\$5.40

* Source: 2011 Census, Statistics Canada <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/start-debut-eng.html>

** To ensure consistency in comparisons, 2011 population data was used. The City of Vaughan's population is now over 300,000

*** This amount reflects the net operating cost for animal services. The gross operating amount is approximately \$900,000 which is off-set by revenue received from animal services clients from the Township of King, and Bradford/West Gwillimbury

Current Model for Animal Services in the City of Vaughan

In June 2011, the City of Vaughan opened its animal shelter (for dogs and cats only), which is responsible for adoptions, enforcing animal-related bylaws, animal control services (picking up sick and injured dogs and cats), and licensing of dogs and cats (for Vaughan, and Bradford West Gwillimbury). The 6,700-square-foot facility includes viewing areas and a gymnasium for exercising the animals during inclement weather. The facility is a retrofitted industrial unit with no outdoor exercise areas. Given the limited size of the facility and its current contract with two other municipalities, Vaughan is operating at capacity and therefore unable to provide services to other municipalities as a means of generating additional revenue to offset its operating costs.

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 29, 2013

Item 3, Finance Report No. 1 – Page 5

Vaughan does not provide any wildlife services to its residents or those of King Township and Bradford West Gwillimbury. It currently only accepts cats and dogs. The estimated cost provided to Vaughan by an external provider for such wildlife services was approximately \$168,000 plus HST. If wildlife services were delivered directly by the City, costs were estimated at \$250,000. The current gross operating budget for animal services (excluding wildlife) is approximately \$900,000. The net 2011/2012 operating budget for Animal Control Services is \$652,888 (\$2.26 per resident). The staffing complement is approximately 9 full time positions which include enforcement officers dedicated to King Township and Bradford.

City staff observed a greater demand for animal services in 2012 and it is projected to increase moving forward. In 2012, approximately 1,000 animals passed through the shelter as compared to 800 in 2011. The number of calls for service increased to approximately 5000 in 2012 compared to 2,500 calls in 2011.

Access Vaughan uses a call type tracker report which indicates the call type/reason and any sub-reason. For 2012, 5,172 animal related calls were received. Of this, 1,080 calls were related to wildlife, representing less than 20% of the total number of animal related calls.

The 1,080 wildlife calls can be broken down further:

- Raccoons/other nuisance animals/ alive and in home or on property – approximately 50% (or 540 of the 1,080 wildlife calls);
- Injured wildlife (including geese) – approximately 25% (or 270 of the 1,080 wildlife calls)
- Dead wildlife – approximately 20% (or 216 of the 1,080 wildlife calls); and
- Coyote – approximately 5% (or 54 of the 1,080 wildlife calls).

In May 2012, the Executive Director of the Toronto Wildlife Centre made a deputation to Council urging them to provide a minimum level of wildlife response service to include impound and euthanasia/disposal of sick, injured, or orphaned wildlife animals. In addition, it was recommended to include provisions for public education and a cooperative relationship with a licensed wildlife rehabilitator.

The following wildlife response models were provided to Council:

- Remain with the status quo in response levels, and continue to provide the callers with several wildlife agencies who may assist. This model will include an online wildlife education component.
- Provide a response service to public and private property using City staff. Adoption of this model will require additional costs for staff, training, and equipment.
- Enter into a contract with another service provider to respond to calls on both private and public property.

Staff from the Enforcement Services Department and the Legal Services Department met with the Operations Manager of the OSPCA to discuss the scope and nature of service that the OSPCA could provide to the City. The OSPCA already provides animals services, including wildlife, for Markham, Richmond Hill, and Aurora. Based on call frequency, the size of Vaughan, and their experience with other similarly situated municipalities, the following is an outline of the level of service that the OSPCA could provide to the City:

- One peace officer dedicated to Vaughan who will pick up all sick, injured or dead stock wildlife within the City. This officer will work from 9:00 a.m. to 5 p.m. from Monday to Friday and will be trained in the pertinent legislation and properly equipped.
- 24 hour, 7 day a week on-call services for wildlife calls. A peace officer from a rotation of 12 officers shared with surrounding municipalities will respond outside of the times noted above.

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 29, 2013

Item 3, Finance Report No. 1 – Page 6

- Dispatch Staff to deal with wildlife response calls who answer phones between 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Monday to Friday, and 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturday and Sunday. Outside of these hours, a message for emergency response is on the answering service and the public is given a telephone number which goes directly to the on-call peace officer.
- Up to five education seminars per year provided by the OSPCA to members of the Vaughan public for wildlife education training.
- City of Vaughan decals on OSPCA vehicles
- Rehabilitation of injured or sick wild animals. Animals who are candidates for rehabilitation are transported to a facility that can accept the species.

The estimated cost for the above services would be approximately \$167,920 plus HST per year.

However, of the 1,080 calls associated with wildlife, approximately 45% (or 486 calls) would fall into the services noted above by the OSPCA. This means the cost per call for wildlife related services would be approximately \$345. Cost recovery can be problematic in that when calls are received from identifiable properties, those property owners can be billed for the fee set for removing wildlife. However, generic calls from the public regarding incidents such as animals hit by motor vehicles, cannot be billed to anyone. Also, private companies charge in the range of \$150 to \$250 per visit. Even if the City set its fees in this range, it would not result in full cost recovery of the estimated \$345 per call.

PROGRAM REVIEW RESULTS

Potential Service Delivery Options

It is expected the City's domestic animal population will keep increasing, and if licensing compliance rates remain at the current levels, the cost of running the services will start escalating. Further, the existing animal shelter is working at capacity and will need to be expanded or an alternative site will be required if the City continues with its current service delivery model and levels of service.

The following section presents three main options for the delivery of animal and potentially wildlife services in the City of Vaughan consistent with the Strategic Plan and operating framework. These options include:

- Status Quo (no wildlife)
- Enhances Status Quo with Wildlife, and
- Alternative Service Delivery – Animal and Possible Wildlife services contracted out to a Third party.

OPTION 1 - STATUS QUO

With this option, Vaughan would continue to operate and manage an animal facility, and, as a service provider, be responsible for all aspects of animal service delivery (except wildlife). This option assumes that a new facility would need to be built moving forward to accommodate growing demands and would be on municipally-owned property, which is relatively visible, easily accessible by public transit, and has adequate parking. It is also assumed, the shelter would continue to operate efficiently and with due diligence.

Any newly-built animal services facility should be specifically designed (not retrofitted) as an animal shelter with the potential to accommodate Vaughan's growing needs and potentially the needs of some adjacent municipalities (in case of securing long-term contracts with them). It was anticipated that in the future a new Joint Operations Yard will be required in the north part of the City, and a new facility could be added to this yard. As a result, the lease for the current animal shelter was authorized for only a 5 year term (with options to renew if required).

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 29, 2013

Item 3, Finance Report No. 1 – Page 7

As noted earlier, the City of Vaughan's animal services annual operating costs are \$900,000 and this does not include wildlife services and capital costs. They also operate with a small staff which keeps costs lower. Vaughan also has developed strategic partnerships with select food supply vendors to manage costs and provide resources to pet adopting families.

Through the Program Review and comparison with other municipalities, it has become apparent that Vaughan's licensing fees are below surrounding municipalities' fees and can be increased more than initially shown in the budget user fee review. Also, as demand grows, there may be opportunity to partially outsource some aspects of animal services in advance of the end of the term of the City's lease for the current animal shelter.

Changes to licensing fees and fines are proposed as follows to better align with other jurisdictions:

Type	Current	Proposed
Unaltered Dog	\$20	\$40
Unaltered Cat	\$20	\$30
Spay/neutered Dog	\$10	\$20
Spay/neutered Cat	\$10	\$10
Non-compliance fine	\$105	\$150

There are no proposed changes to pet licensing fees for seniors and they remain at \$10. The City issued 2,193 pet licences in 2012 generating \$45,872 in revenue. Increases to the fees would likely translate into a modest increase in revenue of \$15,000 - \$20,000.

With this option, Vaughan would maintain the greatest control over the quality of the animal services secured over the long-term.

Strengths	Risks
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Option to reduce costs by partnering with other organizations (e.g. OSPCA) for the interim based on opportunities noted in the program review• Greater communication and visibility should lead to increases in adoption rates;• Greater communication and visibility should increase licensing rates;• Located in the City and may be accessible by public transit;• Facility is new, specially-designed and properly equipped, easy-to-find, and has enough space to accommodate animals;• Greatest accountability and transparency in financial and staff management;• Greatest control over the quality of services;• Increased responsiveness to community needs;• Increase licensing fees and non-compliance fines to be more consistent with other municipalities. This will generate additional revenue to offset operating costs as well as facilitate greater licensing compliance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Significant cost and resource implications for implementation – both capital and operating;• Implementation will require the greatest amount of time and process will be the longest;• The overall success of the model might not be known for a long time;• Difficulty in determining the size of the facility and forecasting its future capacity as the traditional formulae used to estimate pet populations will not provide an accurate number for Vaughan. Further, there will be a need to assess desire from other neighbouring municipalities as this will affect capacity and building size

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 29, 2013

Item 3, Finance Report No. 1 – Page 8

OPTION 2 - ENHANCED STATUS QUO TO INCLUDE WILDLIFE

Similar to Option 1, but the mandate would be expanded to include the provision of wildlife services. These services can be contracted out (as noted earlier in the report by the quote provided by the OSPCA for \$168,000 plus HST); or, the services can be provided by the City of Vaughan but this would require additional funding and staff of approximately \$250,000. Staff were requested to look into the potential of wildlife services being provided by other agencies, and contacted the Toronto Wildlife Centre requesting a quote for provision of wildlife services. While the amount quoted was \$139,000 plus HST, staff are seeking further information to clarify inclusion of picking up dead animals. This funding would be in addition to the costs noted in Option 1. There is a company named Procyon Wildlife Veterinary and Rehabilitation Services in Beeton, however they are a drop-off facility that takes donations, and they do not pick up injured or dead wildlife.

Strengths and risks associated with this option are the same as Option 1.

OPTION 3 - ALTERNATIVE SERVICE DELIVERY – CONTRACTING OUT ANIMAL AND POSSIBLE WILDLIFE SERVICES

Under Option 3, the City would revert back to purchasing animal and possibly wildlife services from an external provider on a multi-year basis. The OSPCA offers such services and currently provides animal and wildlife services to Aurora, Richmond Hill and Markham. There may be no additional cost to the City associated with this option as it would only continue on with existing service levels except to include wildlife. However, given current contractual commitments and obligations regarding the lease at 70 Tigi Court (ending June 30, 2016) and service agreements with King Township (ending January 31, 2016) and Bradford/West Gwillimbury (ending March 31, 2014), Option 3 is cost prohibitive for the next three years. The City has the option of extending the lease for two periods of 5 years each. However, should the City wish to exercise its option to extend the lease, notice must be given to the Landlord nine months in advance of the termination date. In early 2015, the City must review alternative service delivery.

Given the observed and anticipated growth and service drivers for animal services, there is also merit in pursuing limited animal services support to manage growth over the next three years provided the cost to out-source is less than managing it internally.

Within this alternative service delivery option, the City of Vaughan could modify its existing animal shelter to operate as a storefront of pet ownership by strengthening the community outreach and public education/awareness component, which has been implemented in other reviewed jurisdictions.

Establishing a place or a store-front-type facility to assist with public education/outreach/awareness programs would be delivered by Vaughan staff and community volunteers with support from the OSPCA. At this pets-dedicated location, residents should be able to purchase licences for their animals, possibly obtain veterinary services, attend special lectures/seminars and exhibitions, arrange pet adoptions, and obtain other services such as pet food, grooming, training, toys, receive stray animals for less than 24 hours before being picked up by external service provider (e.g. OSPCA), etc.

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 29, 2013

Item 3, Finance Report No. 1 – Page 9

Strengths and risks associated with this option are presented in the table below.

Strengths	Risks
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ease of implementation;• Store-front component allows Vaughan to focus on responsible pet ownership as well as act as a drop off location which negates the travel distance issue to the OSPCA facility;• By contracting out the services, the City of Vaughan will be able to offer more services at a lower cost conveying its commitment to innovation, continuous improvement and fiscal responsibility. It also reduces the City's risks and liabilities related to staffing, vehicles, and operations (related to being in the animal control business) as this would devolve to OSPCA;• OSPCA facility is relatively new, specially-designed and properly equipped, easy-to-find, and has enough space to accommodate animals;• Ride-home program and trap/neutered return program are part of the service delivery model;• Spay/neuter clinic;• Cost is reasonable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Difficulty in ensuring long term (i.e. 5 years) competitive pricing and performance standards due to the lack of service providers;• Facility is not accessible by public transit;• Limited hours of operation during evenings and weekends;• Lack of promotional and communications capacity at OSPCA, which might impact adoption rates;• Location of facility is approximately 45 minute drive. However, if a store front aspect is maintained, this will not be an issue;• A store front would result in lease costs and a need to staff the facility, but staffing would be minimal and could be supported by volunteers;• Implementation timing is an issue and cannot be realized for three years.

Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2020/Strategic Plan

The completion of program reviews are a strategic priority of Council and also supports the Corporation's reorganization which includes a strengthened commitment fiscal sustainability and embracing innovation as a mechanism for continuous improvement with respect to service delivery.

This report provides detailed information related to service delivery options, models and costs pertaining to animal and wildlife services for the City of Vaughan based on the premise of financial sustainability and innovation to support the growing services demands of our residents.

The topic of managing animal and wildlife services directly addresses the following objectives under the Strategic goal of service excellence:

- promoting community safety, health and wellness by managing animals, promoting responsible pet ownership, and
- demonstrating excellence in service delivery by assessing service delivery options to ensure animal services (and potentially wildlife services) are being delivered in the most efficient and cost-effective manner

By examining animal services and the potential enhancement to include wildlife, this report also supports the following objectives within the City's strategic goal of service excellence:

- ensuring a high performing organization by determining the most appropriate service levels/standards for animal and wildlife services as well as the most appropriate mechanism for delivery quality services; and

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 29, 2013

Item 3, Finance Report No. 1 – Page 10

- ensuring financial sustainability by assessing the feasibility, viability and appropriateness of enhancing animal services to include wildlife while considering the impact to taxpayers.

Regional Implications

Animal and wildlife service agreements with third parties do not distinguish between local and regional roads. Calls received for dead or injured wildlife on regional roads would be dealt with by the third party.

Conclusion

Under 20% (or 1,080 calls) of all calls received by the City of Vaughan for Animal Services relate to wildlife. Some residents would like the City to pick up sick and injured wildlife, as they believe that such a service promotes their own health and safety as well as the humane treatment of wildlife. The City's current Animal Service model does not have a wildlife component as it is not a municipally mandated service and one that is not generally offered in other municipalities.

Preliminary meetings with the OSPCA show that they could provide wildlife services for the City for approximately \$167,920 plus HST per year. This would entail the pick of sick, injured or dead wildlife. Of the 1,080 wildlife calls currently received, less than 50% (or 486 calls) would fit within the service delivery model noted by the OSPCA which translates to a cost of \$345 plus HST per call. Should Council wish to enhance animal services to include a wildlife component, the associated costs should be included in the Draft 2013 Operating Budget and 2014-2016 Operating Plan, however staff are not recommending the addition of this service at this time.

In the longer term and over the next two years, the City should consider contracting out Animal and possibly wildlife services to an external third party such as the OSPCA, who currently provides such services for Markham, Richmond Hill and Aurora (at approximate costs of \$400,000, \$500,000 and \$200,000 each respectively). Such consideration would support the City's direction of efficiency and cost effectiveness in how it delivers services to citizens.

Attachments

Attachment 1- Jurisdictional Review Summary Table of Animal and Wildlife Services in Select Ontario Municipalities

Respectfully Submitted by:

Heather A. Wilson
Acting Commissioner of Legal & Administrative Services and City Solicitor

Joseph Pittari
Commissioner of Strategic & Corporate Services

Barbara Cribbett, CMA
Commissioner of Finance and City Treasurer

(A copy of the attachments referred to in the foregoing have been forwarded to each Member of Council and a copy thereof is also on file in the office of the City Clerk.)