The Corporation of the City of Markham

Study of Animal Services Delivery Model

September 24, 2012



Overview

- Project Briefing
- Approach & Methods
- Caveats & Data Limitations
- Key Findings
- Service Delivery Options
- Recommendations
- Questions & Comments



PROJECT BRIEFING

• **PROJECT PURPOSE:**

To support the City's efforts to ensure the cost-effectiveness and long-term sustainability of animal services and general process efficiencies.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES/OUTCOMES

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.



APPROACHES AND METHODS

- Review of the City of Markham's documents;
- Jurisdictional review;
- Interviews with internal and external stakeholders;
- Community Survey (completed by the City);
- Visit of the OSPCA facility in Newmarket;
- Focus group discussion with the Animal Care Advisory Committee;
- Identification of potential service delivery models.



APPROACH AND METHODS (CONT'D)

Jurisdictions Reviewed:

- Calgary
- Toronto
- Richmond Hill
- Vaughan
- Brampton
- Mississauga
- Oshawa
- Clarington

- Aurora
- Pickering
- Georgina
- Barrie
- Whitchurch-Stouffville
- Brock Township
- Whitby
- Hamilton



CAVEATS AND DATA LIMITATIONS

- Not all information requested from the OSPCA was available financial and costing data, and operational data related to officer/staff business processes.
- For the jurisdictions reviewed, financial records and staff allocations were often combined with other services provided within the department responsible for the delivery of animal services.
- Jurisdictional comparison output is also limited given variations in local policies and legislation, as well as mandatory/discretionary service delivery activities (including wildlife services), their standards and associated costs.
- Animal Services Survey was not based on randomly generalized sample of all Markham residents.



Key Findings

Strengths of the Current Service Delivery Model

- Lowest cost/resident among reviewed jurisdictions;
- OSPCA convenient, new, specially designed facility;
- In comparison to previous service providers, both operational efficiency and level of care for animals has improved;
- Low volume of complaints from residents;
- Contracting out service delivery enables the City to distance itself on controversial issues;



Strengths of the Current Service Delivery Model

- 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.



Weaknesses of the Current Service Delivery Model

- Need for enhanced enforcement of the Animal Control Bylaw to increase the relatively low animal licensing rates and increase revenues;
- In comparison to Calgary, community outreach and public education programs are not as effective as they could be;
- Lack of communication among the OSPCA, the City, and local rescue groups regarding information on Key Performance Indicators;
- Lack of transparency in the contract regarding staffing requirements, business processes, and job descriptions;



Weaknesses of the Current Service Delivery Model

- Current contract with the OSPCA lacks proper reporting mechanism, specifically regarding the following information:
 - financial issues,
 - euthanasia and adoption rates,
 - investigations and prosecutions, and
 - outreach/education activities;
- OSPCA facility is not accessible by public transit;
- Facility's hours of operation are limited during evenings and weekends.



<u>Service Delivery Model in Calgary – "benchmark"</u>

- Not delivering non-revenue producing activities (e.g. Wildlife and domestic cadaver removal from public or private property; operating a stray-cat pick-up services; and after-hours services).
- Services/programs are funded entirely by revenue generated from animal licensing and fees;
- Extensive educational/outreach activities; and
- Bylaw enforcement and compliance fee for unregistered pet is \$250 (it is \$100 in Markham).



SERVICE DELIVERY OPTIONS

- Option 1: Status Quo
- Option 2: Enhanced Status Quo
 - OSPCA with level of service and QA/QC enhanced by addressing some of concerns raised by stakeholders;
 - Strengthening community outreach and public education/awareness.
- Option 3: *Operating City-Owned Facility*
 - Greatest control, accountability and transparency
 - Significant cost and resource implications for implementation both capital and operating; and
 - High risk and liability.



RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. Implement Option 2 *Enhanced Status Quo* with strengthened contract language and requirements
 - Improved communication between the City and the OSPCA on KPI information, as well as euthanasia and adoption rates, investigations and prosecutions;
 - Improved reporting on outreach and education activities;
 - Stronger QA/QC for insurance and liability purposes (i.e. by inclusion of the installation of Automatic Vehicle Locator devices to OSPCA units patrolling Markham, as well as four random, unannounced site visits per year).



RECOMMENDATIONS (CONT'D)

- 2. Create an Oversight Committee for OSPCA municipal clients
 - Meetings on a quarterly basis will increase control over governance, and assess progress, process, contract management and QA/QC.
- 3. Improve the communications function currently delivered by OSPCA
 - Leveraging some of the City's existing communication and HR resources to take over some of public communications responsibilities from the OSPCA will assist them with improving promotional and education/outreach campaigns as well as community information and education.



RECOMMENDATIONS (CONT'D)

- 4. Establish a Community Store Front for Animal Services, Programs and Outreach
 - Assist with public education/outreach/awareness programs delivered by City staff and volunteers with support from the OSPCA.
- 5. Strengthen HR at OSPCA
 - Managing challenges related to OSPCA's HR issues by stipulating them in the long-term (i.e. 5 years) contract along with the provision of additional funds that would go directly to increasing compensation rates for key positions;
 - Requesting participation in recruitment and interview screening process for select management position at OSPCA.
- 6. Increase fine for non-compliance with pet licensing



Questions/Comments

Thank You

