

The Corporation of the City of Markham

Study of Animal Service Delivery Model

FINAL REPORT



August 2012

Submitted by:



7501 Keele St, Suite 300
Vaughan, ON L4K 1Y2
Tel : 905.660.1060, ext. 230
Fax : 905.660.7812

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | I |
| SUMMARY OF COSTS AND BENEFITS | VII |
| 1 - INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT | 1 |
| 1.2 STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT | 1 |
| 2 – METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH..... | 2 |
| 2.1 FACILITATED APPROACH | 2 |
| 2.2 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT | 3 |
| 2.3 CAVEATS AND DATA LIMITATIONS | 6 |
| 3 - BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT | 8 |
| 3.1 PROVINCIAL AND MUNICIPAL ROLES WITH RESPECT TO ANIMAL CONTROL SERVICES AND WILDLIFE SERVICES | 8 |
| 3.2 ANIMAL CONTROL IN THE CITY OF MARKHAM | 10 |
| 4 – ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS | 17 |
| 4.1 JURISDICTIONAL REVIEW | 17 |
| 4.2 COMPARISON OF ANIMAL SERVICES COSTS IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS | 26 |
| 4.3 COMPARISON OF ANIMAL LICENSING RATES IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS | 26 |
| 5 – POTENTIAL SERVICE DELIVERY OPTIONS | 28 |
| 5.1 OPTION 1 - STATUS QUO..... | 28 |
| 5.2 OPTION 2 - ENHANCED STATUS QUO..... | 29 |
| 5.3 OPTION 3 - OPERATING CITY-OWNED FACILITY | 31 |
| 6 – RECOMMENDATIONS | 36 |
| 6.1 SUMMARY OF COSTS AND BENEFITS | 40 |
| Appendix A – Bibliography | |
| Appendix B – Detailed Jurisdictional Review | |
| Appendix C – Approaches to Estimating Domestic Animal Populations | |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the Markham Study of Animal Services Delivery Model is to support the City's efforts to ensure the cost-effectiveness and long term sustainability of animal services and general process efficiencies. By taking a closer look at the services offered, this study will assist the City to identify and obtain a set of achievable recommendations directed at delivering maximum service efficiency savings in the shortest period of time.

The specific goals for the assignment included:

- Identify and make recommendation on the range of options for service delivery models, including their strengths, benefits, risks, and implications;
- Identify and document service delivery models used in other comparable jurisdictions;
- Identify any service efficiencies that could result from implementing alternative models; and
- Provide advice on the most effective and sustainable longer term delivery model to determine the best balance of animal and wildlife services for Markham.

The scope of work for this assignment included:

- A SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) analysis of the City's current domestic animal and urban wildlife services;
- A comprehensive review of current successful domestic animal and urban wildlife service models relative to the City;
- Input from engagement processes with stakeholders (members of Animal Care Advisory Committee, the current service provider (OSPCA) and residents) to identify needs, services and priorities; and
- Input to the assessment of the performance of Markham's current domestic animal and urban wildlife care service programs.

The outcome of the study includes recommendations on a service model that is more efficient and effective without compromising service quality or continuity in support of the City's mission and mandate. Further the recommendations are framed on the longer term sustainability for the provision of animal services in Markham.

The consulting firm DPRA Canada Inc. was retained in March 2012 to work collaboratively with the City on this initiative yet provide an independent 3rd party review.

The calculations and numbers presented in this report are based on the information and documentation provided to the DPRA consulting team during the study. Limited data were available and accessible for this assignment (in particular from the OSPCA); however, City staff provided what was possible. Hence, some of the analysis is limited and requires further assessment upon the collection of quantitative information by the City.

Key Findings and Recommendations

The following is a summary of the key findings and recommendations emerging from the study. The approaches to animal service delivery were reviewed for numerous jurisdictions including: Calgary, Toronto, Richmond Hill, Mississauga, Oshawa, Pickering, Georgina, Whitchurch-Stouffville, Vaughan, Brampton, Barrie, Brock Township, Whitby, and Hamilton. Calgary is viewed as the “benchmark” for other organizations, hence was reviewed in greater detail than other animal service delivery models from other cities. In contrast to Markham, Calgary is not burdened with mandatory non-revenue producing activities (i.e. wildlife and domestic cadaver removal from public or private property, operating a stray cat pick-up services, cat euthanasia, or after-hours service). Also, the fee for unregistered pets which assists in financing animal services is much higher in Calgary (\$250) than in Markham (\$100). The Calgary approach is characterized by extensive educational and community outreach activities, which can be introduced in Markham.

In Ontario, some municipalities operate animal shelters (i.e. Toronto, Mississauga, Vaughan) while others contract out services to the OSPCA or its affiliates (i.e. Markham, Richmond Hill and Oshawa). Compared to other providers of animal services and historical experiences with previous suppliers in Markham, the OSPCA is performing adequately. An added value from the OSPCA is the provision of limited wildlife services – a service which municipalities are not obligated to provide and are the responsibility of the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources.

Comparison of animal services costs in other jurisdiction revealed that Markham has the lowest cost (at \$1.33 per resident); while Calgary has the highest cost (\$10.58 per resident). Overall, Markham’s animal services program is relatively efficient and extremely cost-effective while offering many comparable services and programs as Calgary (the accepted benchmark). However, as with any efficient and effective program, there are always opportunities for enhancement to strengthen any weaknesses (not matter how minor in nature).

The table below summarizes strengths and weaknesses of the Markham’s current animal service delivery model.

| Strengths | Weaknesses |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In comparison to other jurisdictions, the cost of service per resident is the lowest;• New, specially designed, and spacious OSPCA facility is conveniently located not far from the City;• In comparison to previous service providers, both operational efficiency and level of care for animals are improved via OSPCA;• Volume of complaints received from residents regarding the service provision is relatively low; | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The City pays for wildlife rehabilitation because it is not part of the contract agreement with the OSPCA;• Lack of proper contract reporting mechanism;• Lack of strong enforcement of the Animal Control Bylaw results in relatively low animal licensing rates and impacts revenues;• Facility is not accessible by public transit;• Facility’s hours of operation are limited during evenings and weekends; |

| | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contracting out service delivery enables the City to distance itself on controversial issues; • Long term sustainable solution for animal services; • City has an Animal Services Advisory Committee • City provides minor support for wildlife rehabilitation, while many municipalities do not • Progressive and proactive approach to managing animal services | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In comparison to Calgary, community outreach and public education programs are not as effective as they could be. |
|---|---|

The following observations, considerations and recommendations are cognizant of the efforts and commitment of the Animal Care Advisory Committee, City staff and the OSPCA related efficient and effective operations, pride in what they deliver and how they serve residents of Markham. In total, 7 recommendations are provided with supporting rationale.

RECOMMENDATION 1 – Implement Option 2 – Enhanced Status Quo with strengthened contract language and requirements. Given the current, economic and fiscal realities, balanced with the challenges facing Markham related to animal services, DPRA recommends its Option 2 – Enhanced status quo. When examining historical animal services delivery agents for the City of Markham, each service provider has been better – the best to date being the OSPCA. Many of the key informants from Markham for this project, as well as other jurisdictions who are clients of the OSPCA, noted while there were some challenges and issues with contractual obligations and working relationships, the OSPCA was doing an adequate job of serving the municipalities.

Richmond Hill, Aurora and Markham stakeholders consistently noted a series of items that would improve and enhance the existing contract with the OSPCA. Specifically, items related to strengthened communications between OSPCA and its clients regarding KPI information, as well as regular reporting of relevant information (to improve transparency and QA/QC) on euthanization, adoption, investigations and prosecutions, and outreach/education activities. The strengthened language should include 4 random, unannounced site visits per year. Presuming the relationship between the City and OSPCA continues; it is anticipated the City's legal department will review and significantly revise the existing agreement between the OSPCA and the Corporation of the City of Markham. The enhancements to the agreement primarily affect sections 4.7; 6.5; 9.1; and 9.2, but would also require legal drafting of new sections for the items noted below.

As with any regulator of infield services, there is a need for stronger quality assurance for insurance and liability purposes. This could include the installation of automatic vehicle locator (AVL) devices to OSPCA units patrolling Markham.

Option 2 reflects many of the best practices from other jurisdictions related to improved communications, community education and outreach and online services. As, well it can be implemented quickly so results are achieved in a time sensitive manner. Overall, Option 2 provides the most reasonable cost for value alternative which directly facilitates a long term sustainable partnership solution for animal services in Markham with minimal risk and liability.

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Cost: | <i>Completed within current operating budget. Will likely require minimal capital investment for AVL for two patrol vehicles.</i> |
| Benefit: | <i>Process efficiencies resulting in streamlining fewer hours spent by City staff on data and reporting as this will be provided by OSPCA.</i> |
| Priority: | <i>High</i> |
| Timing: | <i>Fall 2012. Staff to develop report to Council through Summer 2012 and present for consideration by Council in fall.</i> |
| Risk: | <i>Nil - there is a need to continue to provide animal services. Currently, the most appropriate and available provider is the OSPCA. Option 2, enhances the existing service delivery as well as providing the City with a longer term sustainable and viable commitment for Markham at a reasonable cost for services.</i> |

RECOMMENDATION 2 – Create an Oversight Committee for OSPCA municipal clients.

Recommendation #1 would be strengthened by the creation of an Oversight Committee made up of representatives from Markham and other municipalities contracted by the OSPCA (i.e. Richmond Hill and Aurora). The oversight committee would meet with OSPCA on a quarterly basis to assess progress, process, contract management and QA/QC.

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Cost: | <i>No changes to current operating budget but will require additional staff time to attend quarterly meetings. However this is offset by the process efficiencies realized from recommendation #1</i> |
| Benefit: | <i>Strengthened relations and customer service</i> |
| Priority: | <i>High</i> |
| Timing: | <i>Q1 2013. The three municipalities to coordinate with OSPCA to complete planning and logistics during 2012 so the committee is established and operating for the next fiscal year.</i> |
| Risk: | <i>Nil - strengthens the contract management, transparency and accountability.</i> |

RECOMMENDATION 3 – Improve the communications function currently delivered by OSPCA.

The OSPCA is not as effective as it could be regarding communications with the public. As an Agency, it does not have communications as a core function with appropriate oversight. This is an opportunity for Markham to leverage its existing communications and human resources to take over some of these responsibilities from the OSPCA to ensure they are done in a manner that is consistent with other communication protocols for the City (e.g. messaging, forms, templates, tone, layout, tracking software, etc.). This would assist the OSPCA with improving promotional and education/outreach campaigns as well as community information and education; and improve both Markham's Animal Services and the OSPCA's websites to ensure that they will be more up-to-date regarding campaign events and adoption activities.

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Cost: | <i>This could be completed within current program funding presuming the City's communication unit is fully staff with no vacancies. Currently there are vacancies so would likely require a minimum of 0.5 FTE dedicated staffing estimated at \$30,000</i> |
| Benefit: | <i>Ensures communications are a) completed; and b) done in a manner that is consistent with other City communication protocols</i> |
| Priority: | <i>High</i> |
| Timing: | <i>2012</i> |
| Risk: | <i>Nil – This is a significant gap and weakness in the current program delivery.</i> |

RECOMMENDATION 4 – Establish a Community Store Front for Animal Services, Programs and Outreach. To further enhance community satisfaction, as part of Option 2, the City could establish a place or a store-front-type facility to assist with public education/outreach/awareness programs delivered by City staff and volunteers with support from the OSPCA. At this pets-dedicated location, residents should be able to purchase licences for their animals, get 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, etc.

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Cost: | <i>New funding would be required for a lease and lease hold improvements estimated at \$40,000 - \$60,000. It is anticipated the store would be supported by existing Animal Care Advisory Committee members along with the strong core of community volunteers across the City. However, there will be a need for 1 FTE to manage scheduling of volunteers and needed for opening and closing the facility (insurance requirement and risk management). The FTE cost is estimated at \$60,000.</i> |
| Benefit: | <i>Increases public education/outreach/awareness programs. A key finding from Calgary is that animal services is strengthened only by greater community education and outreach regarding the value of spay/neuter and licensing; not enforcement. A store front will be a significant component of this change.</i> |
| Priority: | <i>Medium</i> |
| Timing: | <i>2013. Some preliminary time could be allocated to identifying an appropriate location and space. However, the lease cannot be started until the new fiscal year since these costs are not approved in the 2012 budget.</i> |
| Risk: | <i>Low – taking on additional space carries some risk. However, the expected success of this recommendation significantly outweighs the minimal risk.</i> |

RECOMMENDATION 5 – Strengthen HR at OSPCA. Challenges related to HR issues, recruitment and retention at OSPCA could be managed in part by Markham by stipulating them in the long-term (i.e. 5 years) contract, and providing additional funds in the contract that would go directly to increasing compensation rates for key positions. Further, Markham could request to participate in recruitment and interview screening process for select management positions at OSPCA to ensure a level of comfort with possible candidates.

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Cost: | <i>This will require additional staff time to participate in OSPCA recruitment and retention activities. Further, it is suggested Markham, Aurora and Richmond Hill increase their overall contract amount by \$15,000 each respectively to be used for enhancing compensation packages and more diligent recruitment processes and/or for building in an additional 0.5 FTEs for schedule coverage in the event of sick days and vacation.</i> |
| Benefit: | <i>Enhances QA/QC as well as the long term viability of the OSPCA as a quality service provider to Markham.</i> |
| Priority: | <i>Medium</i> |
| Timing: | <i>As required starting in 2013</i> |
| Risk: | <i>Medium – Likely some push back from OSPCA on such an internal operational task. However, beyond the “pride factor”, such an initiative would strengthen the OSPCA and increase customer satisfaction as well as support the long term consistency and viability of the service delivery model.</i> |

RECOMMENDATION 6 – Increase fine for non-compliance with pet licensing. When compared to Toronto and Calgary, Markham could increase fines for non-compliance as incentive to increase licensing.

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Cost: | <i>Current Program Funding but will require support from legal services and by-law services staff</i> |
| Benefit: | <i>Increase fines from \$100 to \$250 increasing revenue by approximately \$20,000</i> |
| Priority: | <i>Low</i> |
| Timing: | <i>2013</i> |
| Risk: | <i>Medium/High – Likely some public backlash for a 150% increase in fines.</i> |

RECOMMENDATION 7 – OSPCA to consider appointing a municipal representative to its provincial Board of Directors. One municipal representative for all municipal clients of the OSPCA would further facilitate openness and transparency between the OSPCA and its clients. Markham should champion this initiative to ensure municipal needs can be voiced and met.

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Cost: | <i>Current Program Funding (assuming Markham was chosen)</i> |
| Benefit: | <i>Ensures municipal needs can be voiced at the Board level as a means of enhancing service to clients</i> |
| Priority: | <i>Low/Medium</i> |
| Timing: | <i>2013</i> |
| Risk: | <i>Medium/High – Likely some push back from OPSCA</i> |

SUMMARY OF COSTS AND BENEFITS

If all of the DPRA recommendations are fully implemented, the conservative net operating cost is estimated to be approximately \$155,000.

Based on this cost estimate, the cost per resident for animal services would only increase to \$1.73/resident from \$1.33/resident, which is still very affordable compared to other jurisdictions. In fact, Markham would still have the lowest cost per resident for animal services at \$1.73/resident.

This minimal investment will address the minor gaps in Markham's animal services program (e.g. community education, outreach, communications, increase licensing, etc.) and enhance its programming to be more comparable to that of Calgary. Further, the recommendations will also strengthen the quality assurances and controls needed for municipal transparency and accountability to its residents.

1 - INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

This study has been undertaken to review the current animal services delivery model and develop recommended options for the short and long term delivery of domestic and urban wildlife care service that will meet the needs of the City of Markham.

The City of Markham currently contracts for the provision of animal and wildlife services to the Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (OSPCA). The three year term expired in June 2011, and the contract has been operating since then on a month to month basis. Members of the Animal Care Advisory Committee expressed some concerns regarding the quality of animal care (including wildlife) provided by the OSPCA; in particular, euthanasia rates for domestic animals brought to the animal shelter. Hence, prior to determining the next steps with the OSPCA, the City retained the services of an independent consultant to conduct an animal services delivery model review.

A Request for Proposal was issued in September 2011. DPRA was retained by the City in March 2012 to complete an independent 3rd party review. The scope of the work included:

- A SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) analysis of the City's current domestic animal and urban wildlife services;
- A review of current domestic animal and urban wildlife service models relative to Markham;
- Input from various engagement activities with stakeholders (members of Animal Care Advisory Committee, the current service provider and residents) to identify needs, services and priorities;
- Input to the assessment of the performance of Markham's current domestic animal and urban wildlife care service programs; and
- Identify any observations, considerations and recommendations to improve the City animal services programming.

1.2 STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

Sections 1 and 2 consist of an introduction and review of project approach and methodology. Section 3 presents background and context for the study. Section 4 includes the analysis and findings including relevant findings from the jurisdictional review and consultations with key stakeholders. Potential service delivery options are discussed in Section 5. The last section of the report presents recommendations based on the results of the analysis.

2 – METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH

This section briefly outlines consulting team's methodology/approach to study and describes the key characteristics or guiding principles of the approach.

The following methods were employed to solicit data and information to guide this assignment:

- A review of the City of Markham documents – a copy of the current service agreement with the OSPCA, animal care control program results, previous studies, organizational charts, and applicable bylaws;
- A review of best practices and lessons learned in comparable service provision in other Canadian jurisdictions similar to Markham (including but not limited to) Calgary, Toronto, Richmond Hill, Mississauga, Oshawa, Pickering, Georgina, Whitchurch-Stouffville, and Vaughan;
- Interviews with internal and external stakeholders;
- Community survey (completed by the City);
- Visit the OSPCA facility in Newmarket;
- Focus group discussion with the Animal Care Advisory Committee; and
- Identification of potential service delivery models.

Note: The discussion that follows is an interpretation by the consultants of what was read in the document review including the jurisdictional scan and heard in the interviews and focus group. The information gathering task of the study is not intended to be a comprehensive record of all comments, nor is it to be used as a program audit, competency study, assessment of personnel or a performance measurement study. Any attempt to use this report in this way would be a misuse of the information and the intent of the study. The purpose was to provide the consultant team with an understanding of the service delivery model. All information provided by respondents is treated as confidential and no specific comment is attributable to any one person.

2.1 FACILITATED APPROACH

For this assignment, DPRA implemented a facilitated approach. It is the purpose of the facilitated approach to mine this corporate knowledge by directly involving the management and the staff of the organization and service provider in assessing and defining the future service delivery model and organizational needs.

The approach used a combination of proven tools to gather and analyse the required information in order to:

- Assess what works, what does not and why;
- Discover opportunities for more effective organizational structures, business processes and governance frameworks;
- Identify best practices from other comparable agencies;
- Identify baseline business metrics and performance measurement systems to evaluate the effectiveness of changes;
- Identify implementation requirements including costs, risks, and other factors based on findings; and
- Provide strategic advice throughout the project to client and staff as appropriate.

DPRA's work was guided by the following principles, outlined in more detail below:

- (a) Collaboration** - In understanding the needs and in designing and delivering the assignment, DPRA worked collaboratively with the City of Markham Working Group, which, as a client, possesses understanding of what is required and has clear expectations for the outcome. As a partner, we worked with the City to ensure that we developed a common understanding and that our efforts in carrying out the assignment support project specific objectives. This was achieved through face-to-face meetings, regular project updates and review of/discussion on project deliverables.
- (b) Responsiveness and Relevance** - The assignment must provide value – this means that the changes that may be proposed for service delivery must be responsive to the City's needs and relevant to its business objectives. In designing and delivering the project, we ensured that the developed materials clearly and effectively address the issues, challenges and opportunities facing the City.
- (c) Testing and Validating** - To accomplish this, we employed a combination of methods used to fully understand the Corporation's issues, challenges, opportunities and strengths such as interviews, working sessions, and meetings.
- (d) Flexibility** - We did not come to this assignment with fixed views and a prescription; one size does not fit all. Recognizing the uniqueness of each organization's goals, we incorporated our experience and lessons learned from other assignments and discussed potential applications to this study.

2.2 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

The consulting team's role was to develop and guide a process that was designed to facilitate the active engagement of key stakeholders who have an interest in the specific areas of focus of this study. The role of those with an interest in the project was to provide their insight and opinion into the current operational flow, issues and challenges, and the suggestions for enhancing service delivery.

Interviews

Both internal and external stakeholders were interviewed during the data collection phase of the project. Interviews were semi-structured, open-ended, in-person, and lasted approximately 60 minutes. The purpose of the interviews was to explore:

- Roles and duties of the staff responsible for provision of the specified services;
- Any operational and reporting aspects of service provision;
- Successes and challenges with respect to delivery of services;
- Solutions to the perceived challenges or gaps;
- Tendencies (demographics, value streams, demand for programs and services, etc.); and
- Suggested changes to service delivery related to the specific focus areas.

Animal Care Advisory Committee Focus Group

For this assignment, a focus group was held with members of the City's Animal Care Advisory Committee. The focus group discussion involved bringing the committee together for a free flowing discussion around the select research topics. Participants were asked to explore an

issue, sometimes loosely, sometimes through responding to more focussed questions. The advantage of this approach is that it allows the consulting team to generate rich, detailed information that is set in a particular context. Committee members were sent copies of the questions in advance of the focus group to assist with preparing for the discussion.

The objectives for the focus group were:

- To engage the participants in the process and obtain their direct and relevant perspectives on the animal service delivery
- To determine to what extent the current Animal Care and Control Services meet the needs of the City and its residents
- To discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the current service delivery model
- To determine if there any gaps (i.e. lack of comprehensive urban wildlife management) in the current services
- To discuss opportunities and options of the current and alternative service delivery models, and
- To explore animal service delivery models in other jurisdictions and determine the applicability of those models to the City of Markham.

The consultant team facilitated a meeting with the members of the City's Animal Care Advisory Committee on April 25, 2012. Analysis of the feedback provided by participants is provided below.

Weaknesses

- Participants were very concerned about the current contract with the OSPCA, particularly the lack of transparency and details (i.e. contingency measures, number of cages designated to Markham), as well as absence of reporting mechanism (including financial reporting), staffing requirements, business processes, and job descriptions.
- Issues related to the OSPCA staff were considered unsatisfactory by some committee members. For example, high staff turnover, and low level of experience with wildlife and training (i.e. knowledge of breeds).
- Comment received regarding the OSPCA's website being difficult to navigate, and the number of animals available for adoption is not updated regularly to show all available animals for adoption.
- There was a concern that since the ringworm episode the OSPCA's reputation remains poor, and as a result, there is a perception the OSPCA cannot properly communicate its efforts in an open and transparent manner.
- Some noted the OSPCA facility is not accessible by transit, and limited hours of operation during evenings and weekends do not reflect community needs.

Strengths

- Focus group participants agreed that proximity to Markham, easy-to-find, and spaciousness are positive aspects of the OSPCA facility.
- Existence of the ride-home program and trap/neutered return program were strengths of the OSPCA service provision.

- Availability of veterinary staff and spay/neutering services were also considered as strengths as well.
- OSPCA is a better serve provider than previous ones.

Opportunities and Options

- Committee members were of the opinion that many issues related to the contract with the OSPCA will be reduced if City staff can negotiate strong terms and conditions related to contract management effectiveness. It was also suggested that identification of reporting standards and issues related to the breach of contract would function as a protection measure for the City.
- Participants considered expansion of current wildlife services as an option, especially, offering wildlife training to City staff, hiring a wildlife officer, or finding another wildlife service provider (i.e. Toronto Wildlife Centre).
- Focus group participants noted that in order to improve quality of animal services, the OSPCA should improve communications with the City, enhance working relationships/partnerships with local rescue groups, and put more effort in to education/awareness activities and promotion of the adoption program by partnering with colleges and schools and improving their Animal Services website.
- Another option considered by focus group participants included building an animal facility on Markham-owned land, and then either operate or contract out operations.
- If it were to build a Markham owned and operated facility suggestions were provided to make the facility a destination by including leasing space to community groups, pet stores and clinics for the purpose of provision of the following services/activities:
 - Dog training
 - Boarding
 - Dog daycare
 - Grooming
 - Veterinarian services
 - Pet licensing
 - Public-Private Partnerships
 - Retail (i.e. pet food)
 - Off-leash dog park.

Animal Services Survey

In addition to the lines of evidence discussed above, the City administered an online survey of Markham residents on domestic animal and urban wildlife services. During the 26-day period the *Animal Services Survey* was posted, 378 completed responses were submitted. The following section presents a high-level analysis of the results of the *Animal Services Survey* conducted by the City of Markham.

This survey was not based on randomly generalized sample of all residents. It was open to any person (not necessarily Markham resident) who wanted to participate and was not limited to one submission. Therefore, a majority of respondents were pet owners (85.3%). Many of their pets had at least one form of ID (38.9% had City licences, 52.4% were micro-chipped, and 14% were tattooed), and were either spayed or neutered (81.7%).

A majority of respondents noted the value in pet licensing (64.4%) and wanted it to be available online (67.2%). However, respondents did not consider it as a service cost recovery strategy for the City (64.4% wanted annual licensing fee to be between \$5 and \$20 – the lowest amount among provided choices). Respondents noted a preference to fund enhanced animal care services by annual property tax increases (62.2% agreed to the \$4 - \$6 increase – the highest amount among provided choices).

When asked what type of animal services they see value in the City providing (multiple responses were allowed), respondents considered the most valuable shelter services (88.9%) and wildlife services for sick/injured animals (85.7%). Animal education (60.3%) and enforcement of animal control bylaws (52.6%) were considered the least valuable services besides the “Other” category (6.9%).

Respondents were also asked to identify the “greatest problems” with animal services: specifically they were:

- poop and scoop - 40.2%,
- wildlife - 35.7%, and
- feral or stray cats - 34.1%

However, respondents were asked if they ever called in a complaint related to a challenge - 81.1% never called in an animal complaint to the City.

Regardless, these problems (or perceptions thereof) resulted in low satisfaction levels (as indicated below) with the City’s animal services:

- Extremely Satisfied – 5.3%
- Very Satisfied – 5.0%
- Satisfied – 22.1%
- Not Very Satisfied – 33.0%
- Not Satisfied At All – 34.6%.

Given that 8 out of 10 respondents never called in a complaint, the survey data cannot be mined to identify the rationale for low satisfaction levels. Also, recall, this is not a scientific representative survey of all Markham residents; hence the data should be used with discretion.

2.3 CAVEATS AND DATA LIMITATIONS

There were limits to the amount of available data and details required for completing thorough analysis. Not all information requested from the OSPCA was available for the consulting team – specifically financial and costing data; and, operational data related to officer/staff business processes (i.e. how much time was spent on various tasks for Markham).

Further, difficulties also existed when obtaining quality data related to the review of best practices in other municipalities. For example, financial records and staff allocations were often combined with other services provided within the department responsible for the delivery of

animal services. Also, the output of jurisdictional comparison was limited due to variations among reviewed municipalities in local policies and legislations, as well as mandatory/discretionary service delivery activities, their standards and associated costs. For example, Calgary is typically viewed as a “best in class” model. However, it is not fully applicable to other jurisdictions and the provincial powers granted to officers in Alberta are greater and more flexible than those in Ontario. Further, costs and perceived best practices were affected by significant variations in wildlife services delivered across examined Ontario jurisdictions.

3 - BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Markham is the most diverse municipality in the country.¹ Approximately 57% of its residents were born abroad. Of that number, 83.4% came from Asia, South Asia or the Middle East – regions where cultural and religious traditions have shaped attitudes towards domestic animals as pets in ways which may vary from indifference to disgust of certain types of animals. These attitudes are different from emotional attachment to pets and their importance typical to the descendants of European immigrants and western cultures.

It is projected that by 2031 Markham's total population will reach 423,500 people with greater proportional increases to Asian, South Asian or the Middle Eastern countries and cultures.² The greatest proportionally growing populations of Markham may not be as inclined to have pets, yet logic dictates animal populations will increase in Markham albeit at a lesser degree than calculated using traditional North American animal population projection algorithms. At the same time, consideration should be given to issues related to assimilation and gradual adoption of cultural norms typical to majority of the Canadian population. Therefore, a possibility that some of the second and third generation immigrants become pet owners will be another factor contributing to an increase of the domestic animal population in the City.

Hence, the need for animal services in Markham will continue to increase in the coming years requiring a longer term sustainable framework.

3.1 PROVINCIAL AND MUNICIPAL ROLES WITH RESPECT TO ANIMAL CONTROL SERVICES AND WILDLIFE SERVICES

Historically, domesticated animals have served some utilitarian purposes. Gradually, in particular in urban environments, where demand for their work skills was lower than in farms, 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, as well as that it is usually an animal's owner and not the animal itself which causes problems.

"In North America we do not have a problem with pet overpopulation, stray animals, nuisance or vicious animals – we have a problem with responsible pet ownership. Virtually every animal that ends up in a shelter or on the street is there because a human relationship failed them."

Bill Bruce, Director of Calgary Animal and Bylaw Services.

According to the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, landowners are responsible for managing problem animals on their property.³ The Ministry is mandated to assist landowners

¹ City of Markham. Everyone Welcome – Markham Diversity Action Plan. 2008

² City of Markham Population, Household and Employment Forecasts, 2006-2031.

http://www2.markham.ca/Markham/Departments/Planning/PopStats_PopFore.htm Accessed in June 2012.

³ Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. Fact Sheet. Handling Conflicts with Wildlife. June 8, 2012,

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*. Typically, these actions include capturing, killing, or harassing problem wildlife in order to prevent damage to landowners' property. 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.⁴ However, there are important exceptions related to dealing with white-tailed deer, moose, caribou, elk, black bear, wolf, and coyote. In addition, any animal listed as threatened or endangered under the *Endangered Species Act* cannot be captured, killed or harassed in protection of property without authorization from the Ministry.

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.⁵

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.⁶ At the same time, the Act stipulates that "in any part of Ontario in which the Society or an affiliated society does not function, any police officer having jurisdiction in that part has and may exercise any of the powers of an inspector or agent of the Society."⁷

⁴ Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. Fact Sheet. What to Do if You Find a Sick, Injured or Orphaned Wild Animal. June 8, 2012.

<http://www.mnr.gov.on.ca/stdprodconsume/groups/lr/@mnr/@fw/documents/document/274374.pdf>

⁵ Ontario SPCA. Background. <http://www.ontariospca.ca/inside-the-ospca/background.html>

⁶ OSPCA Act. R.S.O. 1990, CHAPTER O.36, Section 11(1). "For the purposes of the enforcement of this Act or any other law in force in Ontario pertaining to the welfare of or the prevention of cruelty to animals, every inspector and agent of the Society has and may exercise any of the powers of a police officer."

⁷ OSPCA Act. R.S.O. 1990, CHAPTER O.36, Section 11(3).

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.

Since each model has its advantages and disadvantages, a municipality choosing the most appropriate model should consider available resources, political realities, and public needs.

3.2 ANIMAL CONTROL IN THE CITY OF MARKHAM


In Markham, Animal Care and Control Service program is focused on animal control for the purpose of protecting the public. The program is regulated by the *Animal Control By-Law 2005-254*. Residents are permitted to keep up to two dogs and four cats (in cases where both dogs and cats are kept, the maximum number of animals permitted is four). Animal licences can be purchased at the City's Contact Centre, OSPCA, and at off-site locations (pet stores, veterinary clinics, and animal hospitals). The cost to license a cat or dog in the City of Markham for one year is as follows:

| CATEGORY | FEE |
|------------------------------------|------|
| Unaltered dog/cat over 3 months | \$45 |
| Unaltered dog/cat under 3 months | \$28 |
| Sterilized dog/cat | \$28 |
| Micro-chipped dog/cat | \$28 |
| Sterilized & micro-chipped dog/cat | \$13 |

Seniors pay half of above fees. There is no charge for licensing personal assistance or law enforcement working dogs. Replacement of lost tag costs \$6.

The City's domestic animal service process is mapped on the diagram below.

MARKHAM'S DOMESTIC ANIMAL SERVICE PROCESS



Since the 1970s, the City has contracted the provision of animal services with external vendors. Since 2008, these services have been provided by the York Region Branch of the OSPCA – a non-profit charity.

Revenues generated from animal licensing on average cover 20% of the City's annual animal control costs (approximately \$77,000 of the \$385,000 provided to the OSPCA). The City also provides donations and in-kind services valued at approximately \$5,000.00 for wildlife rehabilitation and other services not covered under the agreement between the City and the OSPCA. Further, the City employs two full-time staff (Supervisor and By-law Officer) overseeing proper service delivery. However, these two Full-time Equivalents (FTEs) are not fully dedicated to business processes and functions related to animal services but do include contract management, bylaw compliance, licensing, community education and programs (including trap-neuter-return) and adoption days. In addition, staff at the City's Contact Centre receives calls from residents regarding animal services. These calls are routed to City staff or to the OSPCA, depending on the nature of the call.

The OSPCA is responsible for the provision of the following services to the City:


- City-wide patrols of public places, streets and parks;
- Animal cruelty investigations;
- Pet surrenders and adoptions;
- Sells City pet licences;
- Complaint investigation (dog bites, animals at large, keeping of prohibited animals);
- Dealing with problem wildlife (WILD Home Audit Program);
- Lost pets services ("Free Ride Home" for licensed animals);
- Spay/neuter clinic; and
- Wildlife services.⁸

OSPCA staff respond to the calls from residents regarding orphaned and/or injured wildlife which are taken to the OSPCA shelter where they can only be kept for a maximum of 24 hours (in accordance with Provincial Regulations). After that, if the animal is not returned to the wild, it is either taken to a Wildlife Custodian/Rehabilitator approved by the City and licensed by the Province, or transported to the Procyon Wildlife Veterinary and Rehabilitation Services. These services are funded by the City on an honorarium basis because they are not part of the contract with the OSPCA. The diagram below illustrates the City's wildlife service response process.


The City does not consider relocation and "pest" control as the most appropriate methods of dealing with wildlife, and, therefore is working with the OSPCA, homeowners, and businesses on resolving conflicts between humans and wildlife by developing effective programs and education seminars on how to live in harmony with urban wildlife (for example, how to "wild proof" a home).

⁸http://www.markham.ca/wps/portal/Markham/Residents/PetAnimalCare/AnimalControl/!ut/p/c5/dY3LboMwFES_hR_gXvOyWToYhFvsJBgo8SaiVVSRlgSJKGn89Y3adWaks5kjDVh49DRcx8_hMp5Pwzf0YJN9xGqeFRq3BQtiGpTNJKEJF0hvMEue8D-aWtaB1UbKi5eOcqWx1hWWYA0-d_xStjCDix9drMxMTTQY7Q3x_ss3Zerj9Sgye-ohLwPkZMGi0CLbq1Fi8ap0ODycxHcaddVuKSkK7Y5591Yr6QHL2DH98m_fUw--pQyEiZRSgmLGMEegG6PE8HmKfrXLreHbjn_QI9hnXt/dl3/d3/L2dBISEvZ0FBIS9nQSEh/?pcid=98aa8200457fc153a516f76fd186756b&digest=ISYnXIBLC7DXo35ZLckvvg. Accessed on May 2012.


MARKHAM'S WILDLIFE SERVICE RESPONSE PROCESS



From 2009 - 2011, the City's Contact Centre has received a consistent number of animal related calls – approximately 252 per year. From January to June of 2012, the number of calls received has been 147. Based on the call volume for 2012, the 12-month estimate is 294, 16% higher than 2011.



The OSPCA receives less call than the City's Contact Centre. Also, the number of calls to the OSPCA is not consistent. As the diagram below illustrates, from 2009 to 2010 the number of calls dropped almost by half, then increased in again in 2011.



Listed below are the reasons why the OSPCA is the only viable alternative for the delivery of animal services in the City:

- Considering the pressure to maintain current spending levels and tendency to zero or minimal tax increases, contracting out services at the lowest cost per resident is a relevant option;
- In comparison to previous service providers, both operational efficiency and level of care for animals have been improved;
- The pool of service providers meeting the City's requirements is very limited;
- Services include response to some wildlife calls and transportation to wildlife rehabilitation centres when and as required – which is more than other service providers;
- This is the long-term sustainable solution for the animal service delivery; and
- The facility is new, specially-equipped, and conveniently located.

In order to support and act as a resource to Legislative Services Department staff for the efficient and compassionate care of animals, the City of Markham established the Animal Care Advisory Committee mandated to improve animal welfare within the City. The Committee's goals include engaging the community; animal licensing and other fees; public education and awareness programs; controlling pet overpopulation; as well as fundraising. Participating in regular local adoption days (one per quarter) in community centres is one of the Committee's high priority goals for 2012.⁹ It should be noted that Markham is the only municipality in the Region with a committee totally devoted to domestic animal and wildlife issues.

As a part of the Feral Cat Project, Markham operates Trap, Neuter & Return (TNR) Program to help manage stray and feral cat colonies. According to the Toronto Feral Cat TNR Coalition, this program is supported by almost all major animal welfare organizations. TNR is the only humane and effective long term strategy to stabilize or modestly reduce feral cat overpopulation. Under the program, homeless outdoor cats will be live-trapped and transported to a veterinarian, registered with the City, sterilized, vaccinated, ear tipped and micro-chipped, fostered for a short period, and then returned to their colony. Kittens as well as tame and socialized cats are available for adoption. Traps can be borrowed from the City. A training workshop for feral cat caretakers was held in the City Civic Centre in February 2012.

In Markham, all dogs must be kept on a leash and the owner must have physical control of the leashed dog until inside the Off-Leash Area. An umbrella volunteer group Leash Free Markham Committee is responsible for establishing, organizing, and maintaining all Dog Off-Leash Areas within the City's borders. The committee reports to Council through an assigned City staff member.

To further supplement its online licensing, Markham has also implementing a customer loyalty card initiative which builds on this best practice from Calgary.

⁹ City of Markham 2012 Animal Care Committee Business Plan.

The table below summarizes strengths and weaknesses of the City's current animal service delivery model.

| Strengths | Weaknesses |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In comparison to other jurisdictions, the cost of service per resident is the lowest; • New, specially designed, and spacious facility is conveniently located not far from the City; • In comparison to previous service providers, both operational efficiency and level of care for animals are improved; • Volume of complaints received from residents regarding the service provision is relatively low; • Contracting out service delivery enables the City to distance itself on controversial issues; • Long term sustainable solution for animal services; • City has an Animal Services Advisory Committee • City provides minor support for wildlife rehabilitation, while many municipalities do not • Progressive and proactive approach to managing animal services | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City pays for wildlife rehabilitation because it is not part of the contract agreement with the OSPCA; • Lack of proper contract reporting mechanism; • Lack of strong enforcement of the Animal Control Bylaw results in relatively low animal licensing rates and impacts revenues; • Facility is not accessible by public transit; • Facility's hours of operation are limited during evenings and weekends; • In comparison to Calgary, community outreach and public education programs are not as effective as they could be. |

4 – ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

The following section presents the analysis of the data collected from the research on approaches to animal services delivery in other jurisdictions as well as from feedback obtained from consultations with the current service provider, and other internal and external stakeholders.

4.1 JURISDICTIONAL REVIEW

Approaches to animal service delivery were reviewed for numerous jurisdictions including: Calgary, Toronto, Richmond Hill, Mississauga, Oshawa, Pickering, Georgina, Whitchurch-Stouffville, Vaughan, Brampton, Barrie, Brock Township, Whitby, and Hamilton. Since Calgary is viewed as the “benchmark” for other organizations, the following section provides a detailed review of the animal service delivery in Calgary, for comparison to Markham. Details regarding the other jurisdictions reviewed (and noted above), are summarized in tabular format for reference purposes. More detailed information from other jurisdictions is provided in Appendix B.

Calgary

Across North America, the City of Calgary’s Animal Control Program is considered as a best practice model by municipal sector practitioners.¹⁰ As a part of the City’s Community Services & Protective Services Department, the Animal & Bylaw Services Business Unit is responsible for the enforcement of applicable municipal bylaws. Enforcement of provincial legislation related to animals (i.e. *Animal Protection Act*) is a responsibility of the Calgary Humane Society, which also investigates issues related to animal cruelty and accepts surrendered animals. Both organizations shelter animals, operate volunteer programs and arrange adoptions for impounded cats and dogs that have not been claimed by their owners.

To be responsive to the community and its needs, Calgary developed a service delivery model based on compliance to animal control laws.¹¹ The model incorporates licensing with enforcement and public education and media campaigns sending the message that “My licence is my ticket home.” It is considered that pets that are licensed, spayed or neutered, taken proper care of, and not aggressive do not cause problems to citizens’ health and safety. The model stresses that the poor animal behavior results from a failed relationship between pet and its owner, and therefore promotes responsible pet ownership concept based on the following principles:

- License and provide permanent identification for cats and dogs,
- Spray or neuter pets,
- Provide training, physical care, socialization and medical attention for pets, and
- Do not allow pets to become a threat or nuisance in the community.

¹⁰ According to the Animal & Bylaw Services 2010 Annual Report, the City of Calgary’s animal service programs were recognized with two awards at the 5th Annual International Summit for Urban Animal Strategies in the fall of 2010 for their licensing programs and Responsible Pet Ownership philosophy.

¹¹ “We stress compliance over enforcement.” – Bill Bruce, Director and Chief Bylaw Enforcement Officer. City of Calgary, Animal & Bylaw Services. 2010 Annual Report, p. 6.

All cats and dogs over three months of age residing in the City must have a licence. There is a \$250 fine for not licensing a pet. It costs \$31 to license a neutered dog, \$53 for an unaltered one; \$10 to license a neutered cat, \$30 if not altered. There is no limit on the number of cats and dogs allowed per household. One of the characteristics of the Calgary Animal Control model is a consistently high licensing rate in dog and cat populations (See sub-sections 4.3 and 4.4 for additional information)¹². For dogs, the licensing compliance rate is 92%, and a return to owner rate of 85%, and euthanasia is at only 6%. For cats, the rates are 54%, 56% and 18% each respectively. The majority of the animals are put down only for health reasons or issues that make them unadoptable. The return to owner and euthanasia rates are the lowest in North America. The citizen satisfaction rate with the program is 91%, second only to the Fire Department.

The 21,000 square feet Animal Services facility is housed in an award-winning architectural building on 2.5 acres of land. It was built in 2000 for \$3.5 million. The 2011 net cost of operating the shelter was \$2.0 million (\$1.82 per capita). There are 22 full-time staff responsible for shelter operations. The 2011 net operating budget for the Calgary Animal and Bylaw Services Business Unit was \$11.6 million (\$10.58 per capita).¹³

Accounting and human resources costs estimated to be about 5% of the budget are funded by tax dollars. Services and programs are funded by fines as well as fees from pet licences which can be conveniently obtained online, by phone, mail, or in-person at banks, through bylaw officers or directly at the Animal Services Centre or the Municipal Building.

Animal control officers provide to Calgarians the following animal-related programs and services:

- Reunification of lost cats and dogs with their owners;
- Operating the Pet Drive Home program;
- Educating cat and dog owners about responsible pet ownership;
- Enforcing the *Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw*;
- Sheltering and feeding lost cats and dogs in a vet-operated facility;
- Managing animal adoption program;
- Offering school programs at no charge;
- Delivering public education programs;
- Running volunteer animal socialization programs;
- Helping neighbours resolve their animal related conflicts;
- Providing funding to veterinary clinics for emergency medical care for injured stray cats and dogs;
- Providing medical care for adoptable cats and dogs, and
- Operating the No Cost Spay/Neuter Program (funded entirely using revenues from cat licensing) for the cats and dogs owned by low-income Calgarians.¹⁴

¹² In Calgary, dog licensing rates are typically above 90% and cat licensing rates are above 40%. In comparison, it is estimated that in 2009 only 16% of dogs and 3% of cats were licensed in Markham.

¹³ City of Calgary. Community Services & Protective Services. Business Plans and Budgets. 2012

¹⁴ City of Calgary, Animal & Bylaw Services – FAQ: <http://www.calgary.ca/CSPS/ABS/Pages/Frequently-asked-questions/Animal-Bylaw-Services.aspx> Accessed in May 2012.

Provision of wildlife rescue and rehabilitation in the City of Calgary and surrounding areas is a responsibility of the Calgary Wildlife Rehabilitation Society (CWRS) - a registered non-profit charitable organization. In addition, Alberta Fish and Wildlife and the Alberta Institute for Wildlife Conservation deal with large animals.

To ensure that residents are aware of responsible pet ownership philosophy and understand it, strong emphasis is made on the importance of community outreach and public education programs which include the Pawsitive Times newsletter, the Drive Home program, the Feline Frenzy media blitz, and Pet of the Week video spotlights. Licensing campaigns may include time-limited incentives for new licences, such as prize draws, promotional give-aways or discounts that promote purchasing of a licence or its renewal. These incentive programs reward owners of licensed animals with coupons and credits toward discounts at participating retail outlets including restaurants, hotels, and clothing stores. One full-time animal control officer is dedicated exclusively to developing and delivering public education programs. Significant decline in the number of reported aggressive dog incidents is attributed primarily to robust public education programming as well as zero tolerance approach to unleashed and uncontrolled dogs. During the last 18 years, aggressive animal incidents in the city have dropped by more than 50% (considering that human and dog populations have doubled during these years).

In terms of applicability of the Calgary model to Markham, it should be acknowledged that in contrast to Ontario municipalities, Calgary is not burdened with mandatory non-revenue producing activities (i.e. wildlife and domestic cadaver removal from public or private property, operating a stray cat pick-up services, cat euthanasia, or after-hours service). With or without a municipal animal services facility, the educational and community outreach (including awareness and incentive strategies such as *I Heart My Pet* rewards card which recovers the cost of licensing through discounts on products and services offered by more than 60 participating vendors) components of the Calgary approach can be introduced to Markham. Increasing the fee for unregistered pets from current \$100 in Markham to Calgary's rate (\$250) will assist in financing animal services. In addition, offering new convenient options for pet licensing (i.e. online) will improve service accessibility and result in increasing licensing rates (the City of Markham is introducing this option in the summer 2012).

Comparison of the major aspects of the service delivery models in Calgary and Markham is provided in the summary table below.

| Calgary's Model | Markham's Model |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong emphasis on compliance with licensing requirements results in very high compliance rates; • Importance of community outreach – one full-time animal control officer is dedicated exclusively to developing and delivering public education campaigns; • Services and programs are funded entirely | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Animal control bylaws are not enforced effectively, and therefore licensing compliance rates are low; • Revenues generated from animal licensing cover 20% of the City's annual animal control costs • The cost of services per resident is \$1.33; • Fine for unlicensed pet is \$100; |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>by revenue generated from animal licensing and fines;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cost of services per resident is \$10.58; • Fine for unlicensed pet is \$250; • It costs \$31 to license a neutered dog, \$53 for an unaltered one; \$10 to license a neutered cat, and \$30 if not altered; • There is no limit on the number of cats and dogs allowed per household; • Provision of wildlife rescue and rehabilitation in the City of Calgary and surrounding areas is a responsibility of the Calgary Wildlife Rehabilitation Society; • Animal licensing incentive programs. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It costs \$28 to license sterilized dog or cat, \$45 for unaltered dog or cat over 3 months, and \$28 for unaltered dog or cat under 3 month old; • Residents are permitted to keep up to two dogs and four cats; • Except rehabilitation, wildlife services are provided by the OSPCA; • Customer loyalty card initiative. |
|--|--|

Highlights of Jurisdictional Review

The table below provides a summary of review of animal services delivery approaches in selected Ontario jurisdictions.

| Municipality | Total Population | Costs of Service Delivery per resident | Licensing | Wildlife | Service Levels |
|---------------|------------------|--|---|--|--|
| Toronto | 2,615,060 | \$3.02 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Online, by mail, or by visiting one of the City's animal shelters and head office Unaltered dog - \$60 Unaltered cat - \$50 Spayed/neutered dog (\$25), cat (\$15) Seniors – 50% off Fine is \$240 | Toronto Animal Services provides pick up of sick and/or injured wildlife, and removal of dead animals – which is similar to the level of service the OSPCA provides for Markham. The wildlife rescue, veterinary care, rehabilitation, and education are responsibilities of the Toronto Wildlife Centre. The City of Toronto does not cover the cost of these services. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Licensing 4 animal centres Adoptions 2 spay/neuter clinics 24-hour emergency response Call centre pick up of sick and/or injured wildlife, and removal of dead animals |
| Richmond Hill | 185,541 | \$2.74 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Licences can be purchased in municipal office and animal clinics, hospitals, pet shops, and from approved door-to-door vendors Unaltered first dog (\$25), second and each additional dog (\$40) Spayed/neutered first dog (\$10), second and | Wildlife services are provided by the OSPCA (hence the Town covers the cost of these services). | OSPCA York Region Branch is contracted for enforcing the provisions of the Town's Animal Control bylaw, as well as ensuring that all owners of dogs have licensed their dogs. OSPCA also deals with all calls related to wildlife, and enforces the poop and scoop provisions, dogs running at large and animal trespassing regulations of the by-law. |

| Municipality | Total Population | Costs of Service Delivery per resident | Licensing | Wildlife | Service Levels |
|--------------|------------------|--|---|---|---|
| | | | <p>each additional one (\$20)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seniors pay \$5 per licence | | |
| Mississauga | 713,443 | \$2.77 | <p>Licences can be obtained in person at the animal shelter, by mail, by telephone, online (only a renewal licence can be purchased online), and at the local community centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unaltered dog or cat (\$45), for seniors (\$20) Spayed/neutered dog or cat (\$20), for seniors (\$10) Service dog – no fee Fine is \$125 | <p>Residents who have issues related to wildlife are advised to contact Toronto Wildlife Centre or any other professional wildlife removal service. The City does not cover the cost of these services. Wildlife issues in garages and attics are dealt with by the private contractor. The City picks up deceased wildlife from private property for a \$50 fee. Distressed animals that can be reached by municipal animal control officers are removed at no charge.</p> | <p>Mississauga Animal Services is responsible for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operating the Animal Pound/Shelter; Issuing dog and cat licences; Providing adoption for stray animals; Keeping communities safe through education and enforcement; Reuniting lost dogs and cats with their owners through a 24 hour database for licensed pets; Responding to citizen and emergency complaints 24/7; Rescuing and caring for lost pets; and Investigating reported dog bites/attacks. <p>There is no veterinarian at the shelter; therefore, spaying, neutering, and other medical services cannot be provided to the public.</p> |
| Oshawa | 149,607 | \$2.40 | <p>Licences can be obtained online, in person (including veterinary offices), and by phone. “Special Needs Dogs” are exempted from licensing fees with proof of certification from either the Canadian National Institute for the Blind or the Hearing</p> | <p>Residents with issues related to urban wildlife are advised to contact Toronto Wildlife Centre, Ontario Wildlife Rescue, OSPCA, or the Ministry of Natural Resources. The City does not cover the</p> | <p>Oshawa Animal Services manages adoption program, after-hours emergencies, reunification of pets with their owners, and licensing programs. The Animal Centre has certified health technicians who can evaluate health of inbound stray animals; however, there is no veterinarian on staff.</p> <p>Animal Services Centre is responsible for enforcing municipal <i>Responsible Pet Owners By-law</i> and provincial</p> |

| Municipality | Total Population | Costs of Service Delivery per resident | Licensing | Wildlife | Service Levels |
|--------------|------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>Ear Dog of Canada.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dog, cat or ferret with proof of spay/neuter, annual rabies vaccine and microchip (\$40 for lifetime) • Dog, cat or ferret with proof of spay/neuter and annual rabies vaccine (\$25 per year) • Dog, cat or ferret unaltered with proof of annual rabies vaccine and microchip (\$60 for lifetime) • Dog, cat or ferret unaltered with proof of annual rabies vaccine (\$50 per year) • Special Needs Dogs – no charge | cost of these services. | <p><i>Dog Owners Liability Act.</i> The Humane Society of Durham Region, an affiliate of the OSPCA, operates a shelter for abused and distressed animals, and accepts pets (when space permits) that can no longer be cared for by Oshawa residents. An Animal Services Centre is responsible for taking strays. After the maximum term at the Centre, particularly friendly stray animals could be transferred to the Society for adoption.</p> |
| Pickering | 88,721 | \$4.71 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unaltered dog/cat \$50.00 (1 year) • Unaltered dog/cat with microchip* \$40.00 (1 year) • Spayed/neutered dog or cat* \$20.00 (1 year) • Spayed/neutered dog/cat with microchip* \$15.00 (1 year) • Replacement tag \$5.00 | Residents who have issues related to sick, injured or orphaned wildlife that may require medical treatment are advised to contact Toronto Wildlife Centre, OSPCA Wildlife Rehabilitation Centre, or Procyon Wildlife Veterinary and Rehabilitation Services. Residents who have a | <p>Responsibilities of the Animal Services include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pet adoption, • emergency 24/7 services, including holidays, • picking up and disposing of all dead animals, • temporary care of domestic animals, • enforcing animal related bylaws, • reuniting lost pets with their owners, • picking up of dogs running at large and sick or injured animals, • providing emergency medical care for injured and ill stray domestic animals, • public inquiries on animal issues, • investigating animal threats to public safety (bites, |

| Municipality | Total Population | Costs of Service Delivery per resident | Licensing | Wildlife | Service Levels |
|------------------------|------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | | | | situation involving nuisance wildlife are provided with assistance in choosing a reputable wildlife control company. The City does not cover the cost of these services. | <p>attacks, disease),</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> investigating animal at large, barking dog, and other complaints regarding animal care, licensing of dogs and cats, licensing of animal businesses, and promoting responsible pet ownership through public education. |
| Whitchurch-Stouffville | 37,628 | \$3.98 | Whitchurch-Stouffville - dog licence (\$37 per year if purchased in person or by mail, or \$42 if purchased from the door-to-door seller), fine for not purchasing dog tag is \$135 | Issues related to wildlife are not part of the contract it has with Georgina shelter and are the responsibility of the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and the OSPCA. "P.A.W.S" of Georgina – charitable organizations, also provides public education and assistance for sick or injured local wildlife. The Town does not cover the cost of these services. | Amalgamated animal service delivery model requires each municipality to be responsible for its own licensing and enforcement issues, but patrol services are performed under one contract and all animals are impounded at the Municipal Animal Control & Adoption Centre in Georgina. The patrol looks for stray animals, enforces requirements of animal control bylaws, sells dog tags door-to-door, and issues muzzling of vicious dog orders. The patrol services also include emergency response on a 24 hour basis. |
| Vaughan | 288,301 | \$2.26 | N/A | The City does not provide any wildlife services to its residents or those of King Township and Bradford West Gwillimbury. Residents pay for | Temporary animal (dogs and cats only) shelter operated by the City is responsible for adoptions, enforcing animal-related bylaws, animal control services (picking up stray, sick and injured dogs and cats), and licensing of dogs and cats (for Vaughan, King Township and Bradford West Gwillimbury). The shelter is at capacity and does not accept surrenders. |

| Municipality | Total Population | Costs of Service Delivery per resident | Licensing | Wildlife | Service Levels |
|--------------|------------------|--|-----------|--|----------------|
| | | | | wildlife services provided by private companies. | |

4.2 COMPARISON OF ANIMAL SERVICES COSTS IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS

The following table synthesizes the costing information presented earlier in this section as well as includes additional jurisdictions. Costs are shown on a per resident basis. Overall, Markham has a very low cost per resident for animal services.

| MUNICIPALITY | POPULATION 2011 | Animal Services Net Operating Budget 2011 | COST PER RESIDENT |
|------------------------|--------------------|---|----------------------|
| Calgary | 1,096,833 | Animal Services ¹⁵ & Bylaw Enforcement - \$11.6 M | \$10.58 |
| | | Animal Shelter Only- \$2.0 M | \$1.82 |
| Markham | 301,709 | \$400,000 (approximate) | \$1.33 |
| Toronto | 2,615,060 | \$7.9 M | \$3.02 |
| Richmond Hill | 185,541 | \$508,797 | \$2.74 |
| Mississauga | 713,443 | \$1.976 M | \$2.77 |
| Vaughan | 288,301 | \$652,888 | \$2.26 |
| Brampton | 523,911 | \$1.8 M | \$3.44 |
| Pickering | 88,721 | \$417,842 | \$4.71 |
| Whitby | 122,022 | \$609,100 | \$4.99 |
| Aurora | 53,203 | \$192,000 | \$3.61 |
| Georgina | 43,517 | \$234,940 | \$5.40 |
| Newmarket | 79,978 | \$171,168 | \$2.14 |
| Whitchurch-Stouffville | 37,628 | \$149,898 | \$3.98 |
| East Gwillimbury | 22,473 | \$82,500 – shelter only | \$3.67 |

4.3 COMPARISON OF ANIMAL LICENSING RATES IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS

In order to determine animal licensing rates in a municipality there is a need to estimate a total animal population in that municipality and then divide this figure by total number of registered animals. Since, the total number of registered animals is not an estimate and is always available as an exact number; the licensing rate may vary depending on the accuracy of the estimate of the total animal population. This estimate is also very important when a municipality considers building an animal facility and projects its size and capacity¹⁶.

There are several approaches/methods to estimating the total animal population in a municipality. Brief descriptions of some approaches are provided in Appendix C. Since there is no simple way of determining which approach provides the most accurate estimate, an explanation of the method used or the reasons for its selection as a preferred one should be provided. It is obvious from the results displayed in the table that follows, that there is a great margin of error in determining total urban animal populations.

¹⁵ The city does not differentiate costs for animal services and bylaw enforcement. It only splits out the animal shelter costs. So this must be considered when comparing to others.

¹⁶ A Resource Guide for the Planning and Design of Animal Shelters
<http://www.planningyouranimalshelter.com/estimates.htm>

This, in turn, suggests estimates of domestic animal populations and corresponding actual compliance for licensing rates could be drastically different. As demonstrated in the table below, depending on the method, the licensing rates for dogs can vary from 42% to 92% and for cats from 85% to 22%. The compliance rates for Calgary (which is viewed as an industry leader in this area) are still better than in other jurisdictions including Markham but not as significantly as suggested by the background documentation – hence Markham is performing at a level that is comparable to Calgary.

| Calgary | Dog population using Calgary Approach | Dog population using AVMA Approach | Dog population using Ipsos-Reid Approach |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| | 115,496 | 281,776 | 249,675 |
| Licensing Rate | 92% | 38% | 42% |

| Calgary | Cat population using Calgary Approach | Cat population using AVMA Approach | Cat population using Ipsos-Reid Approach |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| | 115,496 | 317,890 | 454,765 |
| Licensing Rate | 85% | 31% | 22% |

From a municipal animal services perspective, the importance of licensing compliance rates is obvious – higher rates correspond to greater revenues that can be used to offset operating costs for delivering programs and services. However, success and efficiency of a service delivery model should not be determined by licensing compliance rates only which can vary greatly depending on the method used to calculate them.

In the case of Calgary Animal Services, a combination of factors such as greater fees charged for non-compliance, effectiveness of bylaw enforcement, and community outreach and education campaigns have generated enough revenue to offset its operating budget.

5 – 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 low levels, the cost of running the services will start escalating. Other program weaknesses (as it pertains to the OSPCA and the City) such as a lack of proper contract reporting mechanism; QA/QC; limited OSPCA hours of operation during evenings and weekends; and in comparison to Calgary, community outreach and public education programs are not as effective as they could be.

The following section presents three main options for the delivery of animal services in the City of Markham which attempt to address the existing weaknesses and gaps in current service program delivery. These options include:

- Status Quo,
- *Enhanced* Status Quo, and
- Operating City-Owned Facility.

5.1 OPTION 1 - STATUS QUO

Under the existing service delivery model, the City purchases animal services from an external provider on a multi-year basis. The first option is to continue to contract the OSPCA. The current level of service is reasonable and is better than previous service providers for a reasonable cost. Further, there are no other reasonable external service provider alternatives to the OSPCA. Based on the research and conducted consultations, it is very unlikely that at the present time any other providers are willing to negotiate a contract and able to deliver services that will meet Markham's requirements. However, it is possible that they exist, and issuance of the RFP prior to negotiating new contract with the OSPCA would determine this. There is no additional cost to the City associated with this option as it would only continue on with existing service levels. Strengths and risks associated with this option are presented in the table below.

| Strengths | Risks |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ease of implementation (no additional staffing or resources are required – beyond staff time to draft and review a new agreement);• Timing of implementation is fastest amongst options;• Contractor may enable Markham to distance itself on controversial issues;• Proximity of the OSPCA to Markham;• Facility is 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 | <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;• For some residents, reputation of the current service provider remains poor after the ringworm episode;• Facility is not accessible by public transit;• Limited hours of operation during evenings and weekends;• Lack of promotional and communications capacity, which might increase adoption rates;• Concerns about OSPCA staff training and |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>delivery model;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spay/neuter clinic; • Cost is reasonable. | <p>level of expertise (in particular with wildlife);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about transparency, reporting and Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) capabilities of the OSPCA; • Limited level of accountability and transparency in financial management. |
|---|---|

5.2 OPTION 2 - ENHANCED STATUS QUO

In this option, the animal services for Markham will still be delivered by a contracted provider (most likely OSPCA as there are no other viable alternatives); however, the level of service, and QA/QC would be enhanced by addressing some of concerns raised by stakeholders. This option would be more aligned with the Calgary model of responsible pet ownership by strengthening the community outreach and public education/awareness component, which has been implemented in other reviewed jurisdictions.

Further, Option 2 is consistent with the operating context and framework noted in the independent review of the OSPCA following the 2010 “ringworm outbreak” causing “mass euthanasia” of animals in the OSPCA York Region shelter. The report released by reviewers outlined a number of recommendations for the OSPCA, including the appointment of a chief veterinarian, a comprehensive review of all policies and procedures, the creation of an occupational health and safety liaison and restructured record-keeping. It also urged the province to consider legislative amendments to provide for more funding and greater oversight of the Society.¹⁷

The current level of wildlife services available through the OSPCA is appropriate, in particular when coupled with the \$5,000 of donations and in-kind services provided by Markham for wildlife rehabilitation. Further, given that the municipality is not mandated to provide wildlife services, there is no need to increase it further. As discussed in previous sections, many municipalities do not provide similar levels of wildlife services.

Recommended enhancements to the Status Quo model include:

- Establishing a place or a store-front-type facility to assist with public education/outreach/awareness programs delivered by Markham staff and community volunteers with support from the OSPCA. At this pets-dedicated location, residents should be able to purchase licences for their animals, could 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.
- Assist OSPCA to improve promotional and education/outreach campaigns as well as community information and education;

¹⁷ Meek, A. H. and P. J. LeSage. *Independent Review of Events in May 2010 at the York Region Branch of the Ontario Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals*. April 2011.

- Improve both the Markham's Animal Services and the OSPCA's websites so that they will be more up-to-date regarding campaign events and adoption activities;
- Improve communications with and on behalf of the OSPCA;
- Strengthen contract reporting (including financial) requirements and make reporting more frequent and transparent;
- As a client, ensure that education, qualifications and professionalism of the OSPCA staff are improved;
- Establish an oversight committee of municipal clients of the OSPCA who meet on a quarterly basis to discuss progress, issues, and solutions (i.e. QA/QC);
- Coordinate training opportunities across municipal clients and OSPCA staff; and
- Installation of automatic vehicle location (AVL) on OSPCA vehicles for designated officers patrolling the City.

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

| Strengths | Risks |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to increase revenue to assist in offsetting the cost of services – and could leverage the Animal Care Advisory Committee funding for the store-front facility; • Greater communication and visibility should lead to increases in adoption rates; • Greater communication and visibility should increase licensing rates; • Reputation of the service provider will be improved; • Contractor may enable Markham to distance itself on controversial issues; • Proximity of the OSPCA to Markham; • Facility is 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; • Facilitates the recruitment and retention of better/more qualified staff for external service provider; • Timing of implementation is relatively fast, with some enhancements being implemented quickly while others will require more time; | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires a minor increase in annual costs – but could be offset by greater revenues from licensing and those of the Animal Care Advisory Committee; • Implementation will require some time and effort from the City staff but not as significant as Option 3; • Difficulty in ensuring 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. |

| | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitates a longer term sustainable solution for animal services for Markham (i.e. 5 years) competitive pricing and performance standards • Mitigates concerns about OSPCA staff training and level of expertise (in particular with wildlife); • Much improved QA/QC through strengthened contract and establishment of oversight committee; and • Greater accountability for the time spent by OSPCA staff patrolling Markham through installation of AVL. | |
|---|--|

5.3 OPTION 3 - OPERATING CITY-OWNED FACILITY

With this option, Markham would build, operate, and manage an animal facility, and, as a service provider, be responsible for all aspects of animal service delivery. This option assumes that a new facility would be built on municipally-owned land (e.g. Markham Fairground), which is relatively visible, easily accessible by public transit, and has adequate parking. It is also assumed, the shelter would operate efficiently and with due diligence with respect to rehabilitation and euthanization – that is, sound judgement will be used when determining how to best manage public resources against the best interests of animals/wildlife (i.e., it would not be a “no kill” shelter). While many member of the Animal Care Advisory Committee expressed a desire for a “no kill” shelter; this is not realistic given that other jurisdictions do not operate such facilities. As noted above, many facilities use sound judgement in determining the best interests of animals/wildlife.

It is assumed that the newly-built facility will be specifically designed (not retrofitted) as an animal shelter with the potential to accommodate Markham’s future needs and potentially the needs of some adjacent municipalities (in case of securing long-term contracts with them). As part of the assignment, DPRA held discussions with both Richmond Hill and Aurora to discuss their satisfaction with the services provided by the OSPCA and to assess their interest in being serviced by Markham if it built a facility. Both Aurora and Richmond Hill were somewhat satisfied with the services being provided by the OSPCA. However, both acknowledged similar challenges as Markham (e.g. minimal reporting, inadequate communications, QA/QC, limited transparency and accountability). Aurora and Richmond Hill both noted a willingness to support Markham (via capital and operating costs) for a regional facility that could be located in Markham.

The implementation of Option 3 would result in a facility being operated and managed by City staff; who report to a Commissioner, who reports directly to City Council. Hence there will be a need to re-examine the roles and responsibilities of the Animal Care Advisory Committee and City staff moving forward under Option 3. Given that Markham may provide services to other

municipalities, there may be a need to expand the committee to include members from clients (e.g. Aurora and Richmond Hill).

As discussed in the previous section, estimates of urban animal population can vary significantly. According to *A Resource Guide for the Planning and Design of Animal Shelters*, “estimating the number of pets in your community is a critical first step in determining the optimal size of your shelter.”¹⁸ Projected space requirement for dogs assumes 90-100 square feet per housed dog. For each housed cat this requirement is 45-50 square feet. According to another source, these estimates should be as high as 150 square feet per dog and 75 square feet per cat.¹⁹ Average associated costs are approximately \$250 per square foot, with additional 40% allocated to soft costs (equipment, fees, etc.). In addition to significant financial investments, operating a facility would require additional staff – approximately 12 FTEs (supervisory, technical, administrative, and community outreach positions), as well as vehicles (3 to 4), furniture, equipment, and supplies (food, medications, etc.).

Staffing costs, which are typically the largest budget component, would likely be as follows:

- 4 FTE at a total compensation of \$60,000 = \$240,000
- 6 FTE at a total compensation of \$75,000 = \$450,000
- 2 FTE at a total compensation of \$100,000 = \$200,000

Total labour costs would be \$890,000. This does not include the hard and soft costs related to recruitment which would be in the range of \$250,000.

For example, in 2011, the Town of Richmond Hill (2011 population of 185,541) evaluated an option of building a 12,000 square foot animal facility that would meet the Town’s needs to 2026. It was concluded that the facility could be built in thirty six months at the capital cost of \$5.2 million. Annual operating costs were estimated to reach from \$1.16 million to \$1.62 million.

As noted earlier, Vaughan’s annual operating costs are \$900,000 and this does not include wildlife services and capital costs. They also operate with a skeleton 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. Further, these costs are based on a temporary facility and therefore less than actual costs once a longer term facility is developed.

With this option, Markham would receive the greatest control over the quality of the animal services secured over the long-term. Similarly to Option 2, leasing some space in the facility to various animal service providers and special interest groups will assist in offsetting operational costs. Strengths and risks associated with this option are presented in the table below.

¹⁸ Planning Your Animal Shelter. *A Resource Guide for the Planning and Design of Animal Shelter*. <http://www.planningyouranimalshelter.com/estimates.htm> Accessed in June 2012.

¹⁹ Webinar “The Future of Animal Sheltering” hosted by PetSmart Charities. Attended on April 4, 2012.

| Strengths | Risks |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to increase revenue to assist in offsetting the cost of services; • 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 HR management; • Greatest control over the quality of services • Increased responsiveness to community needs; • Greater ability to clearly define Roles and responsibilities including that of Animal Care Advisory Committee moving forward; • Direct accountability to Council; • Potential cost savings related to the elimination of the Advisory Committee. | <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; • Implementation process will be the longest; • The overall success of the model might not be known for a long time; • High risk and liability - as a service provider, the City will not be able to distance itself on controversial issues; • 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 Markham. Further, there will be a need to assess desire from other neighbouring municipalities as this will affect capacity and building size • Potential of politicizing of services (animal rights activists and special interest groups may lobby councilors); • Implementation will require support from the constituency, not only from the special interest groups. |

Summary of Current Service Delivery Gaps and How They Are Addressed in Each Service Delivery Option

| Gaps in Current Service Delivery | Option 1 | Option 2 | Option 3 |
|--|-----------------|--|---|
| REPORTING ISSUES Contract with OSPCA lacks transparency, details (staffing requirements, business processes, and job descriptions), and strong reporting mechanism including financial reporting | No change | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving and enhancing the existing contract with the OSPCA on items related to strengthened communications between OSPCA and its clients regarding KPI information, as well as regular reporting of relevant information (to improve transparency and QA/QC) on euthanization, adoption, investigations and prosecutions, and outreach/education activities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greatest accountability and transparency in financial management; |
| HR REQUIREMENTS OSPCA 's HR issues (high staff turnover, lack of specific training) | No change | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitates the recruitment and retention of better/more qualified staff for external service provider. Challenges related to HR issues, recruitment and retention at OSPCA could be managed in part by Markham by stipulating them in the long-term (i.e. 5 years) contract, and providing additional funds in the contract that would go directly to increasing compensation rates for key positions Long-term contact with the OSPCA will offer their staff confidence in the future job security | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greatest accountability and transparency HR management; |
| OPERATING PROCEDURES OSPCA's website is difficult to navigate and is not regularly updated to show new animals available for adoption OSPCA facility is not accessible by public transit, and limited hours of operation during evenings and weekends do not reflect needs of Markham residents Lack of communication among the OSPCA and the City, local rescue groups Inadequate education/awareness activities | No change | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater communication and visibility should lead to increases in adoption rates: Greater communication and visibility should increase licensing rates; The City will leverage some of its existing communications and HR resources to take over some of public communication responsibilities from the OSPCA to ensure they are done in a manner that is consistent with other communication protocols for the City | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 control over the quality of services Increased responsiveness to |

| Gaps in Current Service Delivery | Option 1 | Option 2 | Option 3 |
|--|-----------|--|---|
| and adoption promotion efforts | | | <p>community needs;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater communication and visibility should lead to increases in adoption rates; • Greater communication and visibility should increase licensing rates; |
| <p>GOVERNANCE</p> <p>OSPCA reputation as a trustworthy organization is still suffering after the ringworm episode</p> | No change | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of an Oversight Committee made up of representatives from Markham and other municipalities contracted by the OSPCA will increase control over governance • Reputation of the service provider will be improved; • Appointment of a representative from Markham to the Board of Directors of the OSPCA will promote City's needs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater ability to clearly define Roles and responsibilities including that of Animal Care Advisory Committee moving forward; • Direct accountability to Council; • Potential to increase revenue to assist in offsetting the cost of services; |

6 – RECOMMENDATIONS

The following observations, considerations and recommendations are based upon the consulting team's analysis and triangulation across the various lines of evidence. These lines of evidence included background documentation, jurisdictional comparisons and interviews, site tour, discussions (interviews and focus group discussions) with internal and external stakeholders, community survey, and other data sources provided to DPRA. Based on the analysis, the following are the consulting team's observations and considerations to facilitate City staff and Council decision-making related to the future of animal service delivery options, process efficiencies, and effectiveness.

This report documents both the study process and study results based on a limited scope and timeline: this is not an in depth comprehensive assessment. The observations, findings and recommendations are approximations and meant to guide City staff to complete further evaluations, assessments and planning initiatives.

The calculations and numbers presented in this report are based on the information and documentation provided to DPRA during the study. Limited data was available and accessible for this assignment, however City staff provided what was possible, while data remained outstanding from the OSPCA. Further, the community survey included minimal controls to provide an accurate and statistically representative view of animal services by Markham residents. Hence, some of the analysis is limited and requires further assessment by the City.

Each specific recommendation includes a description/rationale; the estimated cost implication of the recommendation – or potential cost savings/revenue generation to the City of Markham; the priority compared to other recommendations with respect to implementation (low, medium or high); the estimated timing for implementation; and the identification of points to consider with respect to implementation (i.e. risks and benefits).

The following is a summary of the key findings and recommendations emerging from the review. The following observations, considerations and recommendations are cognizant of the efforts and commitment of the Animal Care Advisory Committee, City staff and the OSPCA related efficient and effective operations, pride in what they deliver and how they serve residents of Markham.

RECOMMENDATION 1 – Implement Option 2 – Enhanced Status Quo with strengthened contract language and requirements. Given the current, economic and fiscal realities, balanced with the challenges facing Markham related to animal services, DPRA recommends its Option 2 – Enhanced status quo. When examining historical animal services delivery agents for the City of Markham, each service provider has been better – the best to date being the OSPCA. Many of the key informants from Markham for this project, as well as other jurisdictions who are clients of the OSPCA, noted while there were some challenges and issues with contractual obligations and working relationships, the OSPCA was doing an adequate job of serving the municipalities.

Richmond Hill, Aurora and Markham stakeholders consistently noted a series of items that would improve and enhance the existing contract with the OSPCA. Specifically, items related to strengthened communications between OSPCA and its clients regarding KPI information, as well as regular reporting of relevant information (to improve transparency and QA/QC) on euthanization, adoption, investigations and prosecutions, and outreach/education activities. The strengthened language should include 4 random, unannounced site visits per year. Presuming the relationship between the City and OSPCA continues; it is anticipated the City's legal department will review and significantly revise the existing agreement between the OSPCA and the Corporation of the City of Markham. The enhancements to the agreement primarily affect sections 4.7; 6.5; 9.1; and 9.2, but would also require legal drafting of new sections for the items noted below.

As with any regulator of infield services, there is a need for stronger quality assurance for insurance and liability purposes. This could include the installation of automatic vehicle locator (AVL) devices to OSPCA units patrolling Markham.

Option 2 reflects many of the best practices from other jurisdictions related to improved communications, community education and outreach and online services. As, well it can be implemented quickly so results are achieved in a time sensitive manner. Overall, Option 2 provides the most reasonable cost for value alternative which directly facilitates a long term sustainable partnership solution for animal services in Markham with minimal risk and liability.

| | |
|------------------|---|
| <i>Cost:</i> | <i>Completed within current operating budget. Will likely require minimal capital investment for AVL for two patrol vehicles.</i> |
| <i>Benefit:</i> | <i>Process efficiencies resulting in streamlining fewer hours spent by City staff on data and reporting as this will be provided by OSPCA.</i> |
| <i>Priority:</i> | <i>High</i> |
| <i>Timing:</i> | <i>Fall 2012. Staff to develop report to Council through Summer 2012 and present for consideration by Council in fall.</i> |
| <i>Risk:</i> | <i>Nil - there is a need to continue to provide animal services. Currently, the most appropriate and available provider is the OSPCA. Option 2, enhances the existing service delivery as well as providing the City with a longer term sustainable and viable commitment for Markham at a reasonable cost for services.</i> |

RECOMMENDATION 2 – Create an Oversight Committee for OSPCA municipal clients.

Recommendation #1 would be strengthened by the creation of an Oversight Committee made up of representatives from Markham and other municipalities contracted by the OSPCA (i.e. Richmond Hill and Aurora). The oversight committee would meet with OSPCA on a quarterly basis to assess progress, process, contract management and QA/QC.

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Cost: | <i>No changes to current operating budget but will require additional staff time to attend quarterly meetings. However this is offset by the process efficiencies realized from recommendation #1</i> |
| Benefit: | <i>Strengthened relations and customer service</i> |
| Priority: | <i>High</i> |
| Timing: | <i>Q1 2013. The three municipalities to coordinate with OSPCA to complete planning and logistics during 2012 so the committee is established and operating for the next fiscal year.</i> |
| Risk: | <i>Nil - strengthens the contract management, transparency and accountability.</i> |

RECOMMENDATION 3 – Improve the communications function currently delivered by OSPCA.

The OSPCA is not as effective as it could be regarding communications with the public. As an Agency, it does not have communications as a core function with appropriate oversight. This is an opportunity for Markham to leverage its existing communications and human resources to take over some of these responsibilities from the OSPCA to ensure they are done in a manner that is consistent with other communication protocols for the City (e.g. messaging, forms, templates, tone, layout, tracking software, etc.). This would assist the OSPCA with improving promotional and education/outreach campaigns as well as community information and education; and improve both Markham's Animal Services and the OSPCA's websites to ensure that they will be more up-to-date regarding campaign events and adoption activities.

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Cost: | <i>This could be completed within current program funding presuming the City's communication unit is fully staff with no vacancies. Currently there are vacancies so would likely require a minimum of 0.5 FTE dedicated staffing estimated at \$30,000</i> |
| Benefit: | <i>Ensures communications are a) completed; and b) done in a manner that is consistent with other City communication protocols</i> |
| Priority: | <i>High</i> |
| Timing: | <i>2012</i> |
| Risk: | <i>Nil – This is a significant gap and weakness in the current program delivery.</i> |

RECOMMENDATION 4 – Establish a Community Store Front for Animal Services, Programs and Outreach.

To further enhance community satisfaction, as part of Option 2, the City could establish a place or a store-front-type facility to assist with public education/outreach/awareness programs delivered by City staff and volunteers with support from the OSPCA. At this pets-dedicated location, residents should be able to purchase licences for their animals, get 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, etc.

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Cost: | <i>New funding would be required for a lease and lease hold improvements estimated at \$40,000 - \$60,000. It is anticipated the store would be supported by existing Animal Care Advisory Committee members along with the strong core of community volunteers across the City. However, there will be a need for 1 FTE to manage scheduling of volunteers and needed for opening and closing the facility (insurance requirement and risk management). The FTE cost is estimated at \$60,000.</i> |
| Benefit: | <i>Increases public education/outreach/awareness programs. A key finding from Calgary is that animal services is strengthened only by greater community education and outreach regarding the value of spay/neuter and licensing; not enforcement. A store front will be a significant component of this change.</i> |
| Priority: | <i>Medium</i> |
| Timing: | <i>2013. Some preliminary time could be allocated to identifying an appropriate location and space. However, the lease cannot be started until the new fiscal year since these costs are not approved in the 2012 budget.</i> |
| Risk: | <i>Low – taking on additional space carries some risk. However, the expected success of this recommendation significantly outweighs the minimal risk.</i> |

RECOMMENDATION 5 – Strengthen HR at OSPCA. Challenges related to HR issues, recruitment and retention at OSPCA could be managed in part by Markham by stipulating them in the long-term (i.e. 5 years) contract, and providing additional funds in the contract that would go directly to increasing compensation rates for key positions. Further, Markham could request to participate in recruitment and interview screening process for select management positions at OSPCA to ensure a level of comfort with possible candidates.

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Cost: | <i>This will require additional staff time to participate in OSPCA recruitment and retention activities. Further, it is suggested Markham, Aurora and Richmond Hill increase their overall contract amount by \$15,000 each respectively to be used for enhancing compensation packages and more diligent recruitment processes and/or for building in an additional 0.5 FTEs for schedule coverage in the event of sick days and vacation.</i> |
| Benefit: | <i>Enhances QA/QC as well as the long term viability of the OSPCA as a quality service provider to Markham.</i> |
| Priority: | <i>Medium</i> |
| Timing: | <i>As required starting in 2013</i> |
| Risk: | <i>Medium – Likely some push back from OSPCA on such an internal operational task. However, beyond the “pride factor”, such an initiative would strengthen the OSPCA and increase customer satisfaction as well as support the long term consistency and viability of the service delivery model.</i> |

RECOMMENDATION 6 – Increase fine for non-compliance with pet licensing. When compared to Toronto and Calgary, Markham could increase fines for non-compliance as incentive to increase licensing.

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Cost: | <i>Current Program Funding but will require support from legal services and by-law services staff</i> |
| Benefit: | <i>Increase fines from \$100 to \$250 increasing revenue by approximately \$20,000</i> |
| Priority: | <i>Low</i> |
| Timing: | <i>2013</i> |
| Risk: | <i>Medium/High – Likely some public backlash for a 150% increase in fines.</i> |

RECOMMENDATION 7 – OSPCA to consider appointing a municipal representative to its provincial Board of Directors. One municipal representative for all municipal clients of the OSPCA would further facilitate openness and transparency between the OSPCA and its clients. Markham should champion this initiative to ensure municipal needs can be voiced and met.

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Cost: | <i>Current Program Funding (assuming Markham was chosen)</i> |
| Benefit: | <i>Ensures municipal needs can be voiced at the Board level as a means of enhancing service to clients</i> |
| Priority: | <i>Low/Medium</i> |
| Timing: | <i>2013</i> |
| Risk: | <i>Medium/High – Likely some push back from OPSCA</i> |

6.1 SUMMARY OF COSTS AND BENEFITS

If all of the DPRA recommendations are fully implemented, the conservative net operating cost is estimated to be approximately \$155,000.

Based on this cost estimate, the cost per resident for animal services would only increase to \$1.73/resident from \$1.33/resident, which is still very affordable compared to other jurisdictions. In fact, Markham would still have the lowest cost per resident for animal services at \$1.73/resident.

This minimal investment will address the minor gaps in Markham's animal services program (e.g. community education, outreach, communications, increase licensing, etc.) and enhance its programming to be more comparable to that of Calgary. Further, the recommendations will also strengthen the quality assurances and controls needed for municipal transparency and accountability to its residents.

Appendix A: Bibliography

WORKS CITED

American Veterinary Medical Association. Formulas for estimating percentage of pet-owning households and pet population in your community.

<http://www.avma.org/reference/marketstats/ownership.asp> June 2012

City of Brampton. Report to Committee of Council. *Leasing, Licensing and the Control of Cats*. September 16, 2011

City of Calgary, Animal & Bylaw Services. 2010 Annual Report

City of Hamilton. Planning and Economic Development Department. General Manager's Office. *Operational Review of Animal Control Services*. June 11, 2008

City of Hamilton. *An Operational Review of City Animal Control Services. Final Report and Recommendations*. Prepared by Performance Concepts Consulting. September 2007

City of Markham. Parks Department. Guidelines for Permanent Dog Off Leash Areas

City of Markham. Everyone Welcome – Markham Diversity Action Plan. 2008

City of Markham. Population, Household and Employment Forecasts, 2006-2031
http://www2.markham.ca/Markham/Departments/Planning/PopStats_PopFore.htm. June 2012.

City of Markham. 2012 Animal Care Committee Business Plan

City of Markham. Corporate Services Commission. Briefing Note. Calgary Animal Control Model

City of Markham. *Animal Control Services Agreement between the Corporation of the Town of Markham and Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals*. March 31, 2008

City of Markham. *Animal Control By-Law 2005-254*

City of Markham. Population, Household and Employment Forecasts, 2006-2031

City of Markham. Survey Results & Analysis for Animal Services Survey. May 14, 2012

City of Markham. Recommendations for Delivery of Animal Services in the Town of Markham, Ontario. Project Report. Prepared by James H. Bandow & Associates. November 01, 2004

City of Mississauga. Corporate Report. *New Initiatives for Animal Licensing*. April 20, 2011

City of Mississauga. City Manager's Office. Corporate Strategy & Innovation Division. *Animal Services e3 Review. Cost Recovery Strategies*. Prepared by Management Consulting. March 31, 2011

City of Mississauga. Regulatory Services. *Business Plan 2012 – 2014 Update*
http://www.mississauga.ca/file/COM/L_Regulatory_Services.pdf. Accessed June 2012

City of Oshawa. Corporate Services Department. Animal Services

City of Pickering. 2011 Approved Budget. Animal Services

City of Toronto. Auditor's General Office. *Toronto Animal Services - Licence Compliance Targets Need to be More Aggressive*. October 5, 2011

City of Toronto. Budget Committee. City Budget 2012. Municipal Licensing & Standards. Operating Budget Analyst Briefing Notes. November 28, 2011

City of Toronto. Toronto Animal Services. Sheltering Data 2006-2011

City of Vaughan. Finance and Administration Committee. Animal Control Services – Bradford West Gwillimbury Agreement. March 28, 2011.
http://city.vaughan.on.ca/vaughan/council/minutes_agendas/committee_2011/pdf/Finance0328_3.pdf Accessed in June 2012

City of Vaughan. Finance and Administration Committee. Draft 2012 Budget and 2013-14 Operating Plan. November 21, 2011

City of Vaughan. Memorandum to Mayor and Members of Council. Additional Information – Toronto Wildlife Deputation – April 24, 2012

City of Vaughan. 2012-14 Business Plan. Enforcement Services.
Government of Ontario. *Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act*. R.S.O. 1990, CHAPTER O.36

Ipsos-Reid. 2001. Paws and claws pet ownership study.
http://www.ctv.ca/generic/WebSpecials/pdf/Paws_and_Claws.pdf

KPMG. City of Toronto Core Services Review. Standing Committee Summary. Licensing and Standards. 2011

Meek, A. H. and P. J. LeSage. *Independent Review of Events in May 2010 at the York Region Branch of the Ontario Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals*. April 2011

Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. Fact Sheet. Handling Conflicts with Wildlife. June 8, 2012

Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. Fact Sheet. What to Do if You Find a Sick, Injured or Orphaned Wild Animal. June 8, 2012

Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. *Strategy for Preventing and Managing Human-Wildlife Conflicts in Ontario*. 2008

Ontario SPCA. Backgrounder. <http://www.ontariospca.ca/inside-the-ospca/backgrounder.html>
P.A.W.S of Georgina. <http://www.pawsofgeorgina.com/>

Planning Your Animal Shelter. *A Resource Guide for the Planning and Design of Animal Shelter*.
<http://www.planningyouranimalshelter.com/estimates.htm> Accessed in June 2012

The Toronto Star. *Fetch a licence, get a treat: Toronto ponders new strategies to get people to register their pets*. By Paul Moloney. Published on May 24, 2012

Toronto Feral Cat TNR Coalition. Trap-Neuter-Return: How to Manage a Feral Cat Colony.
<http://torontoferalcatcoalition.weebly.com/>. Accessed in June 2012.

Town of Clarington. Animal Services. Background Information

Town of Georgina. Municipal Animal Control & Adoption Centre. Background Information

Town of Richmond Hill. Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, Strategic Initiatives Division.
Animal Services Update and Options. February 14, 2012

Town of Richmond Hill. *Animal Control Shelter Feasibility Study*. Prepared by PathWise Group.
April 23, 2007

Town of Richmond Hill. Animal Services Facility Study. Prepared by cm2r consulting inc.
February 25, 2008

Town of Whitby. 2012 Budget by Division.

Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville. Council in Committee Report. Animal Control Services (P14).
December 13, 2011

Appendix B: Detailed Jurisdictional Review

Toronto

The Municipal Code Chapter 349 requires that dog and cat owners in Toronto obtain an annual licence for their animals. The primary reason for licensing animals is to identify animal owners when animals are lost. The revenue generated from licensing helps feed, shelter and care for pets at the four animal shelters operated by Toronto Animal Services. Licences can be purchased online, by mail, or by visiting one of the City's animal shelters and head office.

Toronto Animal Services Division consists of four units:

- Cat and dog licensing,
- Animal bylaw enforcement and mobile response,
- Veterinary care, and
- Animal sheltering and adoption.

The Division is responsible for:

- Issuing licences and tags for dogs and cats residing in Toronto;
- Operating four animal centres (which also deal with wildlife);
- Facilitating animal adoptions and sheltering animals which were lost or surrendered by their owners;
- Operating two spay/neuter clinics;
- Providing 24-hour emergency response for animals requiring immediate medical assistance or are a danger to the public, and
- Operating a call centre and dispatching service to the public and officers, seven days a week.

The Animal Services provides pick up of sick and/or injured wildlife, and removal of dead animals. The wildlife rescue, veterinary care, rehabilitation, and education are responsibilities of the Toronto Wildlife Centre – a charitable organization which works in cooperation with numerous agencies including the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, the Canadian Cooperative Wildlife Health Centre, the Toronto Zoo, the Ontario Veterinary College, many branches of the OSPCA, local animal services agencies, the municipal police and the OPP, as well as other non-profit organizations such as the Owl Foundation, the Canadian Peregrine Foundation, Animal Alliance of Canada and Fatal Light Awareness Program.

The 2012 net operating budget of the Animal Services is \$7.57 million – a decrease in comparison to \$7.9 million in 2011 (\$3.02 per resident). The savings were the result of deleting seven vacant positions (five Animal Care & Control Officers in Licensing Enforcement & Mobile Response Unit, as well as one Supervisor and one Support Assistant A positions) and adjustment of unrealized revenues for Cat & Dog Licensing Unit. Positions were deleted due to the introduction of shifts, and contracting out cremation operations in 2012. The revenues were unrealized because the actual numbers of dog and cat licences issued for the past four years were lower than projected. The City's current licence compliance rates have been stable since 2009 (30% for dogs and 10% for cats). By 2013, they are expected to increase by 2%, which is still much lower than projected in 2005 report to the Board of Health (60% for dogs and 18% for cats).

By the end of 2012, the Division will review and determine the appropriateness of the following options and opportunities for service improvements recommended by KPMG, as a part of the City's Core Service Review:

- Viability of the Dog & Cat Licensing and Enforcement (the program covers its cost; however, the licensing rates are consistently low, and animal identification solutions could be provided by pet stores and other private commercial organizations);
- Outsourcing some or all of animal care and enforcement delivery (i.e. collection of dead animals as well as response to wildlife calls – an area with low level of expertise) to private or community shelters may reduce costs, but also gives less direct control over service delivery;
- Reducing service level (response time) for Emergency Animal Rescue and Care calls by increasing service response time (the current standard is two hours) could result in low potential savings and significant negative public reaction;
- Delivering of services city-wide (instead of district-wide basis) could allow for an increased span of control and more consistent service delivery, which in turn could result in better processes and reduced cost; and
- Elimination of animal pick-up and delivery of owner-surrendered animals to shelters with emergency pick-up only for persons unable to do so may result in up to 20% savings, but at the same time lead to a situation where some animals become strays rather than being surrendered.

In October 2011, the Auditor General's Office conducted a review of Toronto Animal Services. The objective of the review was to assess the effectiveness of certain administrative practices with particular emphasis on the processes relating to Animal Licences. Contrary to KPMG, the auditors did not question the value of Dog & Cat Licensing Program, but made recommendations aimed to improve the overall effectiveness of the program. Some of these recommendations included:

- Establishing realistic but aggressive licence compliance targets for 2012 and onwards;
- Reviewing best practices (particularly the practices currently used by the City of Calgary) in order to evaluate the options available to increase the rate of compliance for dog and cat licensing (considering the possibility of introducing a rewards incentive program in order to encourage compliance);
- Reviewing options to expand animal licence sales City-wide including developing partnerships with the Toronto Humane Society, veterinary clinics and pet supply stores;
- Formalizing a plan to expand Toronto Animal Services' ability to provide animal adoption services by increasing the number of partnerships with veterinary clinics and pet supply stores;
- Expediting the expansion of 311 services to Toronto Animal Services (this integration will affect staffing resources at the divisional call centre);
- Reviewing the current practice of each shelter having staff pick up dead animals in assigned area, and assessing the possibility of assigning designated staff and vehicles to pick up and transfer dead animals City-wide.

On May 24, 2012 a broad outline of the new licensing strategy which incorporates above listed recommendations was presented to Toronto's Council's Licensing and Standards Committee.

The proposed strategy under development is due to be presented to the Committee at its October 19 meeting.

The direction chosen by Toronto Animal Services towards increasing licence compliance rates by introducing Calgary-style education/awareness campaigns and incentive programs is applicable to Markham. Also, forming partnerships with veterinary clinics, animal hospitals, and pet supply stores for provision of adoptions and issuing licences will lower euthanasia rates and assist in generating new revenue.

Richmond Hill

Residents of the Town of Richmond Hill are permitted to keep up to four dogs and maximum of six cats on their premises, unless the property is being used as licensed kennel. Similarly to Markham, dog licences can be purchased at pet stores, animal hospitals/clinics, municipal offices, and from approved door-to-door vendors.

The OSPCA York Region Branch is contracted by Richmond Hill for enforcing the provisions of the Town's Animal Control bylaw, as well as ensuring that all owners of dogs have licensed their dogs. OSPCA also deals with all calls related to wildlife, and enforces the poop and scoop provisions, dogs running at large and animal trespassing regulations of the by-law. Recommendation to contract the OSPCA for three years was made after rejecting the option of building a Town owned and operated facility. Analysis of the options revealed that contracting the services of the OSPCA can provide a much more affordable solution that still meets the community's overall animal service needs. For the first year, the cost of the services was \$490,200. It was \$499,310 plus Cost of Living Adjustment for the second year, and \$508,797 plus Cost of Living Adjustment for the final year. For 2012 the cost of service delivery is budgeted at \$519,000 (approximately \$2.8 per resident). From an enforcement perspective, staff considers their experience with the service provider as positive; however, the community and Council have expressed concerns about the OSPCA given events in 2011 at its York Region Branch.

Since the current contract with the OSPCA is expiring in June 2012, the staff reviewed and presented to Council the following three options for the provision of animal services in the future.

- Option A – continue with the existing level of service through a contracted provider. No new staffing or additional resources would be required for implementation of this option; however, given Council and community concerns with the OSPCA, and the fact that City of Vaughan's new animal facility is at full capacity and is not expected to be expanded, it might be difficult to find a different service provider that can meet the Town's needs.
- Option B – increase the level of service by adopting a responsible pet ownership philosophy, adding a community outreach/public education component, have Town staff deliver patrol, pickup and drop off services, and continue to have animals sheltered by the OSPCA. In addition to the cost of animal services contract (\$519,000) required until this option is implemented, additional resources would include the annual operating cost of \$700,000 (staffing, a public information campaign, and contract with a veterinarian), the one-time capital cost of \$100,000 (furniture, computers, vehicles and

specialized equipment), and \$120,000 for a contract with a shelter provider. It is expected that these additional resources can be offset by increased licence revenues. For this option to be feasible, new staff will be required as well. They would be responsible for provision of patrol, pick up and animal drop off, the public education and community outreach programs, and for administrative support to assist with an increase in animal licensing. Implementation of this option could take two to three years.

- Option C - increase the level of service by adopting a responsible pet ownership philosophy, adding a community outreach/public education component, and build a Town owned and operated shelter, where patrol/pickup, drop off and sheltering are the responsibility of the Town. As in the case with Option B, an animal services contract (\$519,000) will be required until this option is implemented. The annual operating costs of the facility (staffing, a public information program, a contract with a veterinarian, office furniture and equipment and specialized equipment for patrol/pick up) would be between \$1.16 million to \$1.62 million. The capital cost estimate for a 12,000 square foot facility and 18,000 square foot outdoor area required for meeting the Town's needs to 2026 was \$5.2 million. Both benefits and challenges of this option are similar to the ones of the Option B – improved customer service, increased licence revenues, delayed implementation, as well as significant cost implications and additional resources. However, Option C secures animal services for the longer term.

At its March 26, 2012 meeting, Richmond Hill Council voted to approve the following option for the delivery of animal services:

- *Continue with the existing level of service from June 2012 to June 2015. Beginning in mid-2012, increase the level of service by adopting a responsible pet ownership philosophy, add a community outreach/public education component and staff meet with stakeholders and report back to Council on the option of operating the services in the Town's own facility.*

For the City of Markham, its neighbour's approach to animal services delivery has the following implications:

- The likelihood of finding a new service provider that can meet the Town's needs is low;
- Building and operating Town's own facility will provide long-term solution; however, it requires time and significant capital and HR investments;
- Following Calgary's responsible pet ownership philosophy and introducing community outreach and public education campaigns will increase animal licensing rates and help in offsetting costs of service delivery;
- Council decided to maintain existing level of service and not to burden municipal staff with non-revenue generating activities.

Mississauga

As part of the Enforcement Division of the Transportation and Works Department, Mississauga Animal Services unit is responsible for the provision of the following services.

- Operating the Animal Pound/Shelter;
- Issuing dog and cat licences;
- Providing adoption for stray animals;
- Keeping communities safe through education and enforcement;
- Reuniting lost dogs and cats with their owners through a 24 hour database for licensed pets;
- Responding to citizen and emergency complaints 24/7;
- Rescuing and caring for lost pets; and
- Investigating reported dog bites/attacks.

There is no veterinarian at the shelter; therefore, spaying, neutering, and other medical services cannot be provided to the public. Also, residents who have issues related to wildlife are advised to contact Toronto Wildlife Centre or any other professional wildlife removal service. The City of Mississauga does not cover the cost of these services.

Licences for the pets can be obtained in person at the animal shelter, by mail, by telephone, online (only a renewal licence can be purchased online), and at the local community centre. Two full-time officers are responsible for cat and dog door-to-door licensing program. In 2010, 10% of the estimated dogs and cats in the city were registered. Lack of compliance with licensing requirements results in the low return-to-owner rates, which in turn lead to increased length of stay in the shelter.²⁰ In 2009, animal care in the shelter cost the city \$1.1 million.

Out of the 31 staff at Animal Services, 13 work to maintain the shelter and care for the animals (every year, approximately 3,400 lost or stray dogs and cats are accepted at the shelter), manage adoption and foster care programs, and donation program. Other 10-officers (each of them has a vehicle) patrol the City on a daily basis from 7:30 AM to 9:30 PM and respond to emergency calls after hours and on holidays. Mississauga Animal Services responds to approximately 8,000 public calls every year.²¹

In 2010, the gross operating cost for Animal Services was approximately \$2.4 million (85 percent of total expenditures for labour, 10 percent for building and vehicle expenses, and the remaining 5 percent for materials and supplies). Since 2004, this figure has increased by 42 percent (it was a 25 percent increase in 2008 due to the addition of door-to-door licensing officer, a shelter officer, and new animal service officers, as well as increased fuel costs). Approximately \$2 million of the gross cost is funded through general tax revenues.

In contrast to the cost, the total revenue has declined by almost 15 percent since 2004. This gradual decline is attributed primarily to the issuance of dog and cat “lifetime licences.”²² In 2010, Animal Services generated \$426,000 in revenues (74 percent from the sale of licences, 23% from shelter fees for impounded animals, and another 3% from adoption fees).

²⁰ Before being claimed by their owners, unregistered pets can spend as long as forty days in the shelter.

²¹ City of Mississauga. Corporate Report. New Initiatives for Animal Licensing. April 20, 2011

²² The Animal Services has discontinued issuing dog lifetime licences in January 2010.

In 2011, an independent consulting firm undertook a review of the City's Animal Services and recommended the following initiatives that ensure best value for money from this service for the municipality:

- Neighbourhood Outreach Licensing Campaign,
- Enforcement Program,
- Community Awareness and Incentive Strategies,
- 311 and e-City Licensing Options,
- Neighbourhood Outreach Licence Renewal Campaign, and
- Partnerships with Veterinarians and Pet Stores.

It was expected that full implementation of these strategies would result in a licence compliance rate of 50 – 75% for dogs and 30 – 40% for cats, as well as a revenue-to-cost ratio of 50 – 75% in five years. To support the successful achievement of these targets it was proposed to add the following resources to the Animal Services:

- Project Leader - temporary (3 year contract)
- Community Awareness Officer – permanent
- New Call Centre Agent – permanent.

Many of the services offered in Mississauga (patrol officers duties) are non-revenue producing and are not part of the responsibilities of the “best practice” approach to animal services in Calgary. At the same time, Calgary provides spay/neuter services which play significant role in managing stray animal populations and provide a chance for owners to register their pets. Similar to other municipalities, Mississauga's Animal Services decided to increase service cost recovery rates by introducing new educational campaigns and investing in their implementation. This strategy will be applicable to Markham and will not require building and managing a municipally-owned facility.

Oshawa

The City of Oshawa Animal Services Centre is part of the Municipal Law Enforcement and Licensing Division of the Corporate Services Department. Animal Services is responsible for enforcing municipal *Responsible Pet Owners By-law* and provincial *Dog Owners Liability Act*. The Humane Society of Durham Region, an affiliate of the OSPCA, operates a shelter for abused and distressed animals, and accepts pets (when space permits) that can no longer be cared for by Oshawa residents. An Animal Services Centre is responsible for taking strays. After the maximum term at the Centre, particularly friendly stray animals could be transferred to the Society for adoption. Residents with issues related to urban wildlife are advised to contact Toronto Wildlife Centre, Ontario Wildlife Rescue, OSPCA, or the Ministry of Natural Resources.

Oshawa Animal Services manages adoption program, after-hours emergencies, reunification of pets with their owners, and licensing programs. The Animal Centre has certified health technicians who can evaluate health of inbound stray animals; however, there is no veterinarian on staff.

Purchasing a licence for a pet gives an owner a one free ride home each year for an escaped pet if it is retrieved by Animal Services. Licences can be obtained online, in person (including

veterinary offices), and by phone. “Special Needs Dogs” are exempted from licensing fees with proof of certification from either the Canadian National Institute for the Blind or the Hearing Ear Dog of Canada.

If adopted by Markham, option of purchasing animal licences online will likely increase compliance with licensing requirements and in turn will assist the City in recovering the cost of these services.

Pickering

The City of Pickering Animal Services is with Legal and Legislative Services Division of the Administration Department. Responsibilities of the Animal Services include:

- pet adoption,
- emergency 24/7 services, including holidays,
- picking up and disposing of all dead animals,
- temporary care of domestic animals,
- enforcing animal related bylaws,
- reuniting lost pets with their owners,
- picking up of dogs running at large and sick or injured animals,
- providing emergency medical care for injured and ill stray domestic animals,
- public inquiries on animal issues,
- investigating animal threats to public safety (bites, attacks, disease),
- investigating animal at large, barking dog, and other complaints regarding animal care,
- licensing of dogs and cats,
- licensing of animal businesses, and
- promoting responsible pet ownership through public education.

The Licence Application form can be printed through the online link or picked up from the Clerk’s Office. The tags can be purchased in the pet store or in any of the five animal hospitals/veterinary clinics.

According to Animal Services website, they “will respond to calls for sick or injured wildlife on City Streets or City Property”. Most likely this response will include advice or referral since the wildlife section of the Animal Services recommends residents who have issues related to sick, injured or orphaned wildlife that may require medical treatment to contact Toronto Wildlife Centre, OSPCA Wildlife Rehabilitation Centre, or Procyon Wildlife Veterinary and Rehabilitation Services. Residents who have a situation involving nuisance wildlife are provided with assistance in choosing a reputable wildlife control company.

Based on the available information, the approach to animal services in the City of Pickering has limited applicability to the City of Markham, and offers to its residents more options for purchasing licences for their pets.

Whitchurch-Stouffville (and Georgina Shelter)

Since 2002, the Towns of Georgina, Newmarket, Whitchurch-Stouffville, and East Gwillimbury amalgamated their animal control services. Under this model, each municipality is responsible for its own licensing and enforcement issues, but patrol services are performed under one

contract and all animals are impounded at the Municipal Animal Control & Adoption Centre in Georgina. The patrol looks for stray animals, enforces requirements of animal control bylaws, sells dog tags door-to-door, and issues muzzling of vicious dog orders. The patrol services also include emergency response on a 24 hour basis. Issues related to wildlife are not part of the contract and are the responsibility of the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and the OSPCA.²³ The Centre provides shelter for impounded cats and dogs for a minimum of five days. If animals are not returned to their owners during this period, they are offered for adoption or transferred to a fostering facility. Only non-adoptable animals are euthanized.

Through the partnership with the Town of Georgina and the charitable organization “P.A.W.S.” of Georgina, any person who adopts a cat or dog from the Centre is entitled to a voucher for a community spay/neutering program administered by the P.A.W.S. for Georgina residents. “P.A.W.S.” also provides public education and assistance for sick or injured local wildlife.²⁴

In 2011, Council of the Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville requested staff to review costs related to the potential of expanding animal services to include cat licensing. The review revealed that Aurora, Newmarket, Markham and Vaughan were the only municipalities in York Region licensing domestic cats. Based on the cost analysis performed by Whitchurch-Stouffville staff, it was recommended not to pursue cat licensing, since administering the licensing process for cats, including education and enforcement, would out-weigh the potential revenue generated from the sale of cat tags.

The Georgina Model for delivery of animal services has limited applicability to Markham as an alternative service provider to the OSPCA. The Georgina shelter is significantly further away, and the shelter has limited capacity at present time (i.e. likely not enough to support Markham).

Rewards program (like spay/neuter vouchers offered for animal adoption) can be applied as an incentive for licensing in Markham.

Vaughan

Much like Markham, Vaughan faced a similar issue related to animal services. Prior to 2011, Vaughan’s animal services were contracted out to Kennel Inn – a firm which has since gone bankrupt and there were many issues raised regarding its performance for the City of Vaughan. Given the limited options, Council approved an interim solution for animal services – but a temporary facility. During the tenure of the temporary facility, Vaughan would examine its options to find a suitable service provider, or build a more appropriate longer term shelter. Shortly after building its own facility, Vaughan was approached by King Township and Bradford West Gwillimbury to deliver animal services on their behalf for a set contract fee.

In summer 2011, the City opened its temporary animal (dogs and cats only) shelter, which is responsible for adoptions, enforcing animal-related bylaws, animal control services (picking up stray, sick and injured dogs and cats), and licensing of dogs and cats (for Vaughan, King Township and Bradford West Gwillimbury). The 6,700-square-foot facility includes viewing

²³ Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville. Council in Committee Report. Animal Control Services (P14). December 13, 2011.

²⁴ P.A.W.S of Georgina. <http://www.pawsofgeorgina.com/>

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 temporary facility and its current contract with two other municipalities, Vaughan is operating at capacity and therefore unable to provide services to other municipalities, such as Markham.

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 – no chickens, ducks, snakes, exotics, or wild animals. However, Vaughan Council has recently directed staff to determine the cost for expanding services to include wildlife. The estimated cost provided to Vaughan by an external provider for such wildlife services was approximately \$250,000. The current gross²⁵ 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).²⁶ The staffing complement is approximately 9 FTEs which includes enforcement officers dedicated to King Township and Bradford.

It is projected by the City of Vaughan that in 2012 the demand for animal services will increase. It will be reflected in a greater number of animals passing through the shelter (1,000 animals in comparison to 800 in 2011). It is also expected that the number of calls for service will increase to 3,000 in 2012 (increase from 2,500 calls from the year before).²⁷

In May 2012, Vaughan Council discussed the possibility to enhance the Animal Services to include a wildlife component. The Executive Director of the Toronto Wildlife Centre made a deputation to Members of Council in Vaughan and urged 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 for those animals that would not be euthanized.

The following wildlife response models were considered as options by the City:

- 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, equipment and HR.
- Attempt to enter into a contract with another service provider to respond to calls on both private and public property.

The table below provides results of the evaluation of costs and service levels of several potential service providers considered by the City for wildlife:

| Agency | Costs | Service Level |
|--------|----------|---------------------------------------|
| OSPCA | \$75,000 | Business hours only, sick and injured |

²⁵ gross – without factoring out revenue from contracts with King Township and Bradford

²⁶ City of Vaughan. Finance and Administration Committee. Animal Control Services – Bradford West Gwillimbury Agreement. March 28, 2011. http://city.vaughan.on.ca/vaughan/council/minutes_agendas/committee_2011/pdf/Finance0328_3.pdf Accessed in June 2012.

²⁷ City of Vaughan. Finance and Administration Committee. Draft 2012 Budget and 2013-14 Operating Plan. November 21, 2011.

| | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| | | animals only, private and public property on the ground |
| Gates AAA Wildlife | \$275,000 | 24/7 service, all wildlife, private and public property |
| Critter Control – Toronto | \$285,000 | 24/7 service, all wildlife, private and public property |
| City of Vaughan Animal Services | \$250,000 (estimate) | 24/7 service, all wildlife, private and public property |

Source: City of Vaughan. Memorandum to Mayor and Members of Council. Additional Information – Toronto Wildlife Deputation – April 24, 2012.

Appendix C: Approaches to Estimating Domestic Animal Populations

Calgary Approach – both total dog and cat populations are estimated using a rate of 0.1053 animals per capita. When Management Consulting conducted an Animal Service e3 Review for the City of Mississauga in 2010, they used this rate and explained that it was developed based on research conducted by the City of Calgary and has been adopted within the industry as a standard for estimating the resident dog and cat populations in urban areas.

American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) Approach²⁸ – number of dogs in community equals 0.632 times total number of households in that community. Alternatively, total number of dogs equals 1.7 times number of dog-owning households (equals 0.372 times total number of households) in that community. Total number of cats is estimated by multiplying 0.713 on total number of households in community, or by multiplying 2.2 on number of cat-owning households (0.324 times total number of households). These formulae were developed based on US Census of Population and on a National Pet Owners Survey conducted by the American Pet Products Manufacturers Association.

Ipsos-Reid Approach²⁹ - In 2001, Ipsos-Reid conducted a random sample telephone interviews with pet owners residing in cities with a population of 50,000 households or more across Canada. The survey was conducted with 1,500 households. According to this study, on average each urban Canadian household owns 0.4 dogs per household (1.4 dogs per each dog-owning household) and 0.6 cats (1.7 cats per each cat owning household).

Comparison of Total Dog Population in Calgary and Markham Using Various Estimation Approaches

| Municipality | Total Urban Population 2011 | Total Households 2011 | Dog population using Calgary Approach | Dog population using AVMA Approach | Dog population using Ipsos-Reid Approach |
|--------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Calgary | 1,096,833 | 445,848 | 115,496 | 281,776 | 249,675 |
| Markham | 301,709 | 93,202 | 31,770 | 58,903 | 52,193 |

Comparison of Total Cat Population in Calgary and Markham Using Various Estimation Approaches

| Municipality | Total Urban Population 2011 | Total Households 2011 | Cat population using Calgary Approach | Cat population using AVMA Approach | Cat population using Ipsos-Reid Approach |
|--------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Calgary | 1,096,833 | 445,848 | 115,496 | 317,890 | 454,765 |
| Markham | 301,709 | 93,202 | 31,770 | 66,453 | 95,066 |

²⁸ NCPPSP Formula (National Council on Pet Population Study & Policy)
<http://www.petpopulation.org/faq.html> and AVMA Formula (American Veterinary Medical Association)
<http://www.avma.org/reference/marketstats/ownership.asp>

²⁹ Ipsos-Reid. 2001. Paws and claws pet ownership study
http://www.ctv.ca/generic/WebSpecials/pdf/Paws_and_Claws.pdf
On average, each urban Canadian household owns 0.6 cats (1.7 cats per each cat-owning household) and 0.4 dogs per household (1.4 dogs per each dog-owning household).