THE BUILDING AND LICENSING DIVISION OPERATIONAL REVIEW SUB-COMMITTEE PRESENTS REPORT 08-002 AND RESPECTFULLY RECOMMENDS:

1. Operational Review of Animal Control Services (PED08147) (City Wide) (Item 4.1)

   (a) That the Operational Review of the Animal Control Section of the Parking and By-law Services Division of the Planning and Economic Development Department, submitted by Performance Concepts Consulting, September 2007, attached as Appendix “A” to Report 08-002, be received.

   (b) That the proposed Operational Review Work Plan, attached as Appendix “B” to Report 08-002, be received.
(c) That all of the staff recommendations, except Nos. 4, 6 and 8, as listed in the Operational Review Work Plan (attached as Appendix ‘B’ to Report 08-002), be approved.

(d) That, with respect to Recommendation No. 6 of the Operational Review Work Plan (attached as Appendix ‘B’ to Report 08-002), staff be directed to focus on developing a comprehensive Licensing Education Program.

(e) That additional funding, in the amount of $75,751, which is required to hire 1.0 FTE (Animal Control Community Relations Officer), be referred to the 2009 Budget process for consideration.

(f) That staff be directed to undertake a Business Process Review with respect to the streamlining of other Animal Control business functions, such as on-line dog licence and renewal, and report back to the Building and Licensing Division Operational Review Sub-committee.

(g) That staff be directed to prepare a comprehensive Animal Control By-law, to be developed with input from the Animal Control Stakeholders’ Advisory Committee, for presentation to the Economic Development & Planning Committee.

(h) That staff be directed to submit an enhancement to the 2009 Budget process, in the amount of $101,200, to hire an additional 1.5 FTE, as an Animal Control Clerk who would provide extended customer service hours and administrative support at the Animal Control Shelter.

(i) That staff be directed to undertake a feasibility study, with respect to hiring a full-time Veterinarian and report back to the 2009 budget process with recommended options.

(j) That staff be directed to explore the feasibility of undertaking an overall Technology Review for the Parking and By-law Services Division, to explore the capability of HANSEN, AMANDA or other alternative Corporate systems; in order to provide necessary performance, business and customer service information, report back to the Building and Licensing Division Operational Review Sub-committee.

(k) That staff be directed to investigate the costs associated with the implementation of mobile access for Animal Control Officers in the field and report back to the Building and Licensing Division Operational Review Sub-committee.

(l) That staff be directed to undertake an Equipment, Fleet and Facility Review of the Animal Control Section and report back to the Building and Licensing Division Operational Review Sub-committee.
FOR THE INFORMATION OF COMMITTEE:

(a) **CHANGES TO THE AGENDA (Item 1)**

There were no changes to the agenda.

(b) **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 2)**

None were declared.

(c) **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item 3)**

The Minutes of the February 13, 2008 meeting of the Building and Licensing Division Operational Review Sub-committee were approved, as presented.

(e) **Operational Review of Animal Control Services (PED08147) (City Wide) (Item 4.1)**

Tim McCabe, General Manager, Planning and Economic Development Department briefly addressed Committee and introduced Todd MacDonald of Performance Concepts Consulting Ltd.


In conclusion, Joe Xamin, Senior Project Manager, Implementation of Operational Reviews, and Paul Buckle, Manager of Animal Control, provided an overview of Report PED080147 and responded to Committee questions.

Staff was directed to investigate the feasibility of regulating the sale of cats and to report back to the Building and Licensing Division Operational Review Sub-committee.

Staff was directed to prepare a Terms of Reference for an Animal Control Stakeholder Advisory Committee and report back to the Building and Licensing Division Operational Review Sub-committee.

Although recommendation (e) above, respecting $75,751 in funding to hire 1.0 FTE as an Animal Control Community Relations Officer, is being referred to the 2009 budget process for discussion, staff was requested to determine if the proposed position could be filled by utilizing existing staff resources; rather than hiring new staff. Staff was directed to include this information in the Business Process Review
The following matters be referred back to staff for additional information, and staff was directed to report back, as part of the Business Process Review, to the Building and Licensing Division Operational Review Sub-committee, with respect to these matters:

(i) That the Animal Control Section discontinue pick-up calls for non-feral, uninjured stray cats and that stray cats be accepted only by drop-off at the Animal Control Facility.

(ii) That the freed-up Animal Control Officer front-line staff capacity be redeployed (budgeted) on a service-hour basis to high value-added licensing “base” maintenance, proactive park patrol, and the execution of public education programming. (An equivalent of 3-4 front-line FTE resources can be redeployed without incurring any new costs.)

(iii) That staff be directed to report back, to the 2009 budget process, respecting the redeployment of service hours for licensing, park patrol and public education respecting accountable/measurable service delivery targets.

Councillor Bratina wished to be recorded as OPPOSED to recommendation No. 11 respecting higher household animal limits, as shown on Appendix “B” to the Building and Licensing Division Operational Review Sub-committee Report 08-002.

(f) ADJOURNMENT (Item 8)

There being no further business, the Building and Licensing Division Operational Review Sub-committee adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

CARRIED

Respectfully submitted,

Councillor T. Whitehead, Chair
Building and Licensing Division
Operational Review Sub-committee

Stephanie Paparella
Legislative Assistant
July 3, 2008
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1. INTRODUCTION TO ANIMAL CONTROL OPERATIONAL REVIEW
1. INTRODUCTION TO ANIMAL CONTROL OPERATIONAL REVIEW

On January 1st 2003 the City of Hamilton Council in-sourced its legislated Animal Control services that were formerly delivered by the Hamilton-Burlington SPCA. Originally situated in Finance & Parking, the City’s new Animal Control business unit was subsequently relocated within the Building & Licensing Division in 2004. In 2005, Animal Control staff engaged in an internal strategic planning process - a “Who Does What” examination of the still-evolving Animal Control service delivery model. Mission, Vision and Value statements were developed in order to generate consensus around desired results, required resources, revenue streams and service levels. Municipal service delivery models in other Canadian jurisdictions were investigated. The characteristics of a “Best Practices” service delivery model suitable for Hamilton were identified, debated and assessed. The current 2007 service delivery model features a mix of direct and contracted resources in the urban area, and contracted service delivery in rural/suburban areas.

In early 2007 Performance Concepts Consulting Ltd. initiated an operational review of the City’s Animal Control service delivery model. The purpose of the operational review was to identify/confirm the characteristics of a “Best Practices” municipal service delivery model, evaluate the performance of the City’s current service delivery model, and develop service improvement (i.e. re-engineering) recommendations for staff and Council. A number of specific service delivery issues/decision points were specifically identified for review by the City at the beginning of the project. Other service level, process improvement, and management issues arose during the course of the four month review. The review process itself has involved numerous staff interviews, group brainstorming sessions, external qualitative and quantitative benchmarking, and third party technical evaluation of performance data and processes.

Chapter 2 of this report sets out a proposed “Best Practices” service delivery model for Animal Control. Chapter 3 evaluates the performance of the City’s current service delivery model. Specific service delivery and management improvement recommendations are made in Chapter 4 of this report in order to progress towards the “Best Practices” model. A specific implementation oriented critical path for achieving the “Best Practices” model is set out in Chapter 5.
2. CHARACTERISTICS OF “BEST PRACTICES”
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2. CHARACTERISTICS OF “BEST PRACTICES” ANIMAL CONTROL SERVICE MODEL

In order to evaluate Hamilton’s operational performance, it is necessary to identify a “Best Practices” Animal Control service delivery model that can act as a benchmark for comparing results, and help set realistic targets for continuous improvement. Across North America, the City of Calgary’s Animal Control service is acknowledged as a “Best Practices” model by municipal sector practitioners. Calgary’s status was confirmed by a random phone survey of Animal Control staff in a number of Canadian cities, conducted in March 2007 by Performance Concepts Consulting. The Calgary model is now being widely studied and emulated by both Canadian and American cities. The characteristics of the Calgary “Best Practices” model are illustrated in Figure 2.1 below.

Figure 2-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of “Best Practices” Animal Control Service Delivery Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Licensing Rate in Dog/Cat Population</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low/Declining Euthanasia Rates &amp; High/Increasing Dog/Cat Save Rates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Declining Rate of Public Safety Incidents (e.g. Bites) via Robust Public Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fee Structures Leveraging Desired Owner Behaviors &amp; Aggressive Cost Recovery</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transition from Low Value-added Activities to High Value-Added Activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Best Practices” Municipal Service Delivery Model</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. **High Licensing Rate in Dog/Cat Population**

Statistics Canada estimates a dog/cat population equivalent to approximately 10% of the human census population. Armed with this information about the size of the pet population, it is possible to establish pet licensing penetration rates. After 20 years of
continuous improvement, the Calgary model consistently achieves dog licensing rates above 90% of the pet population. Cat licensing is also in place and, while more difficult to measure, these rates are steadily improving. The performance benefits of high licensing rates are significant. High licensing rates correlate directly with high dog return rates and low euthanasia rates. In this sense, licensing is a performance “enabler” that can leverage other important service delivery outcomes. High licensing rates also generate an ongoing revenue stream that minimizes property tax subsidization of Animal Control services, and allows for property tax funding for other important non-revenue generating municipal services. The entire “Best Practices” model rests on the foundation of aggressive licensing rates and zero tolerance for unlicensed animals.

ii. **Low/Declining Euthanasia Rates and High/Increasing Animal Save Rates**

The Calgary “Best Practices” model is characterized by a high animal save rate (return/adoption/rescue) after impounding. High save rates are possible, in part, because owners are easily identified via near-universal licensing data. Save rates are further supported by “first ride home for free” policies for stray dogs. Combined with adoption programs, the consistently achieved “save” rate for dogs is 95%. For cats the Calgary SPCA save rate is 55%. Both dog and cat save rates are unmatched in the Canadian municipal community.

Calgary also features very low dog euthanasia rates because of the ability to “match” stray dogs and cats with licensed owners or adoptive homes. Calgary’s reported dog euthanasia rates run at 2-4% of impounded animals. The Calgary SPCA has been contracted by the City to pick up and euthanize stray cats. Their euthanasia rate is 38%. These low dog and cat euthanasia rates are unmatched in the Canadian municipal community.

iii. **Declining Rate of Serious Incidents (e.g. Bites) via Robust Public Education Programming**

Twenty years ago (1986) Calgary had 500,000 people and 2,000 reported aggressive dog incidents. In 2006 Calgary had 1,000,000 people and 400 aggressive dog incidents. The performance improvement is attributable to a robust public education program and zero tolerance for unleashed/uncontrolled dogs.
iv. **Fee Structures Leveraging Desired Owner Behaviors & Aggressive Cost Recovery**

The City of Calgary recovers 100% of Animal Control operating costs from a dedicated stream of fine and licensing revenues. Property tax subsidization does not occur. Fees are set to leverage positive pet owner behaviors – such as encouraging animal surrender to service providers like veterinarians by avoiding below market fee pricing. It should be acknowledged that Calgary’s mix of services does not include as many non-revenue generating activities as Ontario municipalities.

v. **Transition from Low Value-added Activities to High Value-Added Activities**

Calgary focuses its resources on delivering core services/activities such as licensing, dogs at large or off leash, park enforcement, barking dogs and feces, aggressive dogs, cat by-law enforcement. Calgary does not offer wildlife and domestic cadaver removal from public or private property, or operate a stray cat pick-up service. Calgary’s staffing capacity is therefore highly utilized in revenue producing, higher value-added activities.

The above note characteristics of the “Best Practices” Animal Control service delivery model will serve as important analytic tools in the following chapters assessing Hamilton’s current operational performance, and recommending service improvement strategies. However, there are some important differences in the two models that need to be understood. Differences are summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hamilton (Ontario Model)</th>
<th>Calgary (Best Practice) Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost Recovery</td>
<td>Mandatory non-revenue producing activities limits cost recovery performance from dog revenue stream (e.g. wildlife)</td>
<td>Calgary not burdened with mandatory non-revenue producing activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat Euthanasia</td>
<td>Direct delivery of cat intake, care, euthanasia and cadaver disposal services</td>
<td>SPCA delivery not reflected in direct statistics reported by City on website etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Hours Service</td>
<td>Animal Control direct delivery</td>
<td>Police delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3. CURRENT HAMILTON SERVICE DELIVERY MODEL: PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS & OPERATIONAL ISSUES

3.1 Performance Analysis of Current Hamilton Animal Control Service Delivery Model

The current performance of the City’s Animal Control service delivery model can be evaluated from two complementary perspectives:

i. Hamilton key performance outcomes versus “Best Practices” outcomes for a given fiscal year;
   
   ii. Hamilton key performance outcomes (trend line) measured over time.

Figure 3-1 (a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>Best Practice Model (Calgary)</th>
<th>Hamilton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Dog Licensing Rate</td>
<td>90-95%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Euthanasia Rate</td>
<td>2-4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Save Rate</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat Euthanasia Rate</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat Save Rate</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tax Cost Recovery Rate</td>
<td>100% actual</td>
<td>75% target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Education Programming</td>
<td>Yes - Extensive</td>
<td>Under Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As illustrated in Figure 3-1 (a), the Calgary “Best Practice” outcomes are superior to Hamilton’s in all performance categories. Calgary licenses virtually all of its dog population while Hamilton licenses approximately 70% of its dog population. Hamilton euthanizes more than a quarter of its impounded dogs, while Calgary euthanizes less than 5 percent. Hamilton euthanizes six out of ten impounded cats while the Calgary SPCA euthanizes 4 out of 10 impounded cats. Animal save rates reflect the flip-side of
the euthanasia data – Calgary has significantly higher proportions of impounded animals returned, adopted or rescued. Calgary taxpayers are not required to subsidize Animal Control services in Calgary, while the Hamilton taxpayer subsidy continues to be significant due to mandatory non-revenue generating activities and the absence of a cat licensing revenue stream. Hamilton’s 75% cost recovery target is simply not realistic, within the context of the current business model.

This performance data requires context for proper evaluation. The Hamilton Animal Control business unit is only four years old. It still has not become stable, as seemingly continuous organizational restructuring compromises attempts towards strategic management (9 year plan). For its part Calgary has been progressing towards its current service delivery model for twenty years.

Even considering the differing context for Hamilton versus Calgary, it is evident that considerable opportunities for improved performance outcomes exist for Hamilton Animal control (by emulating the key characteristics of the Best Practices model).

Benchmarking data (2006) for some peer Ontario jurisdictions has also been reviewed and appears below in Figure 3-1(b). Significant performance gaps (versus the Calgary model) exist in all benchmarked peer jurisdictions.

**Figure 3-1 (b)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hamilton</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>Windsor</th>
<th>Mississauga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated License Rate</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Save Rate</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat Save Rate</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3-2 provides insights into performance outcomes associated with the transition period culminating in the City's current service delivery model. Clearly, some performance outcomes have improved over the 2003-06 period. Dog save rates have improved significantly, while euthanasia rates have declined moderately. Both of these outcomes correlate with the 43% increase in licensed dogs during 2003-2006.

Of note is the dismal performance outcomes associated with cats. Social attitudes around cats as disposable commodities are part of the problem. However, a significant part of the problem is the absence of cat licensing in the Hamilton service delivery model. A cat licensing revenue stream could fund aggressive public education, adoption and neutering programs. Cat licensing would also enable the return of wanted stray animals to owners. In 2006 approximately 6,300 cats entered into Hamilton Animal Control's care – only 197 were claimed/returned to owners. Existing City procedures also contribute to the negative performance outcomes associated with cats (yet to be discussed). Cat performance data is consistently poor across Ontario peer jurisdictions.

The 2003 performance outcomes are the baseline used to evaluate service delivery outcomes over the 2003-06 period. Performance data prior to this period is not
available. It is not entirely clear whether the sub-par performance data across all outcome categories (during 2003) was a result of a poorly executed transition process to City in-sourcing, or was actually indicative of HBSPCA historical performance.

### 3.2 Current Relationship Between Low Value-added Service Activities versus High Value-added Service Activities

City Animal Control staff execute a wide range of mandatory/discretionary service delivery activities, in support of various pieces of Provincial legislation and City By-laws. These service delivery activities can be categorized as “high value added” or “low value added” depending upon their relevance/alignment with the characteristics of the “Best Practices” model. Figure 3-3 below approximates the relative type/number of calls associated with high value-added and low-value-added calls. Calls are an admittedly imperfect proxy for understanding relative amounts of staff capacity (available effort) consumed – therefore they should be interpreted cautiously. For instance, other high value-added activities that consume staff effort (but do not qualify as calls) are animal licensing and public education. These activities do not appear as call volumes, although licenses are often sold during calls.

Figure 3-3

**Current Situation: High Value-added Calls versus Low Value-added Calls**

- **Priority Calls (30%)** consist of:
  - DOLA
  - Loose Dogs
  - Injured Animals
  - Confined Dogs
  - Bites
  - Police/Fire Assist

- **Non-Priority calls (70%)** consist of:
  - Stray Cat Pick-up
  - Non-injured Wildlife
  - Animal Carcass Pick-up
High value-added Animal Control service activities (30% of calls) consist of the following:

- DOLA calls
- Confined dogs & at large dogs
- Bites
- Police/Fire assist

The average high value-added call is significantly longer in duration than low value-added calls.

Low value-added Animal Control service activities (70% of calls with lower time expended per call) consist of the following:

- Non-injured wildlife
- Animal carcass pick-up on public & private property
- Stray cat pick-up

Discussion of Lower Value-Added Service Activities

Figure 3-4 below estimates the front-line staff capacity consumed by lower value-added service delivery activities.

Figure 3-4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Value-Added Activities: Estimated Staff Capacity Consumed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006 Animal Control Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stray Cat Pick-ups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carcass Removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff have supplied call volumes and estimated service hours consumed per call. In total an estimated 4,724 “front line” service hours are consumed by lower value-added activities. This equates to the call response capacity of an estimated 3-4 full time Officers, factoring in other non-call related duties. This service delivery capacity is not currently available for higher value-added public safety activities or licensing/public education.

**Discussion of Higher Value-Added Service Activities**

**Dog Licensing**

Licensing is a key high-value service activity. High licensing rates enable lower euthanasia rates, higher save rates. Licensing revenue streams also fund public education programming. Without high licensing rates as its foundation, the “Best Practice” model cannot be built or sustained. Currently new licenses are secured by the City via a “door to door” fee-for-service contract and by Animal Control staff during the execution of other calls. As the City’s volume of licensed animals has increased from approximately 24,000 in 2003 to 35,000 in 2006, retention of previously licensed dogs becomes critical – otherwise euthanasia rates will begin to creep upwards, save rates will decline, and revenue streams required to fund public education will erode. Significant and growing staff capacity is now required to manage the larger licensing “base” of dogs. Staff capacity is required because the “door to door” contract only applies to growing new licenses, not retention of existing licenses. Animal Control staff is of the view that existing service call volumes are “crowding out” the significant staff capacity required to manage the “base” of existing licenses. To further complicate the licensing situation, the existing “door to door” contractor has just ended the current fee-for-service arrangement, citing inadequate revenue generation potential. Licensing is at a critical junction. Staff resources must be freed up to “play defense” on the existing license base, while new resources must be secured to “play offence” on growing the existing license base of 35,000 to meet staff’s mature system of 42,000 licenses.

**Public Safety Dog Calls**

Existing service levels for safety related dog calls are high. Response times are immediate, upon receipt of these calls. Immediate response time driven service levels
are justified, and should not be subject to erosion. In 2006 approximately 2,200 service hours of public safety driven dog service activity was delivered.

**Park Patrol**

Park patrol activity is provided on an ad-hoc basis, once complaints in a specific area materialize. In this sense, existing service levels are reactive, rather than proactive. In 2006, only 117 service hours of Park Patrol activity were delivered.

**Public Education Programming**

Public education programming is central to the “Best Practices” model. Calgary has demonstrated its value in reducing aggressive dog incidents, bites and dog at large problems in public parks.

Hamilton Animal control staff has researched appropriate bite prevention educational programs targeted at school age children. As well messages around the “stoop and scoop” by-law, rabies vaccination requirements, and the benefits of spaying/neutering have been worked into the program. These programs have not yet been delivered to date because the allocated staff capacity has been crowded-out by lower value-added call volumes.

**3.3 Cat & Dog Euthanasia Processes**

Euthanizing animals is not considered a core service delivery activity in the “Best Practices” Animal Control model. High rates of licensing in the dog population, combined with an effective adoption program, can result in high save rates and very low euthanasia rates, as demonstrated in Calgary. In Hamilton, in 2006, 573 dogs and 3,730 cats were euthanized. The euthanasia process in Animal Control appears to be administered in a humane and legislatively compliant fashion. This being said, most animals deemed not appropriate for adoption by the HBSPCA or rescued, are euthanized relatively quickly upon being impounded. Cats are euthanized on an average cycle of 4-5 days from entry into the Dartnall Road facility. Dogs are euthanized on an average cycle of 10 days. No licensed stray dog is euthanized. Instead it receives a first-time “free ride home”, thereby rewarding its owner for having the animal licensed. The relatively
quick euthanasia cycle is driven, in part, by the limited storage capacity for dogs and cats at the crowded half of the Dartnall Road facility currently occupied/operated by the City.

The scope and extent of cat euthanasia is both operationally effort-intensive and arguably not consistent with current prevailing societal values. Animal control policies and procedures exacerbate the problem. Currently Animal Control staff will come and pick-up an allegedly stray cat upon request (i.e. not just feral cat public safety calls), and hold the animal pending adoption, rescue, return or disposal. Of course, with no licensing program, owner identification and subsequent return of the animal is a remote and rare occurrence. By agreeing to pick-up allegedly stray cats upon resident request, and then euthanizing these animals in an average 4 day cycle, the City is effectively subsidizing the current “six-in-ten cats” euthanasia rate. In 2006 Animal Control responded to 2,142 stray cat calls. The City’s unique and largely unenforceable “cats at large” by-law is the source of the procedural “euthanasia production process” currently in place – cats must be picked up but nobody knows where to return them. The absence of “supply side solutions” in the form of community based spay/neutering programs is also a significant concern.

Figure 3-5

Cat Euthanasia Process

Cat Pick-up (55%)  Animal Care & Shelter  Vet Administered Euthanasia (Day 4-5)  Contracted Off-site Disposal (Incineration)

Cat Drop-off (45%)  On-site Carcass Storage  Rescue Assessment  Adoption Assessment

6 of 10 cats

4 of 10 cats
### 3.4 Fee-for-Service Contracts in Glanbrook and Flamborough

Animal Control currently employs two distinct service models:

1. An urban service model delivered primarily by City staff;
2. A rural/sub-urban service model delivered by service contracts.

Glanbrook and Flamborough feature a combined population of approximately 54,000 people, served by the rural/sub-urban model. The remainder of Hamilton featured a population of 450,000 served by the urban model. Currently Animal Control deploys 12 FTE Officers to deliver frontline service activities in the urban service area. This results in an estimated urban model “population served ratio” of 37,500 residents per frontline Officer FTE – if significant growth occurs within the urban model boundary future officer staffing may need to be adjusted to maintain this ratio. The rural/sub-urban model features a ratio of 27,000 residents per “one man operation” contracted service provider. This difference is service level ratios speaks to the appropriateness of two distinct service delivery models - at the present time. By 2010 the Glanbrook/Flamborough ratio will likely exceed 30,000 residents per “one man operation” provider – a ratio approaching the de facto urban service level for frontline services. At this time, significant portions of these communities will have transitioned from rural to urban/suburban and will feature service demand consistent with the rest of the City. A distinctive rural component will also remain intact.

Figure 3-6

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th align="left">Service Level Snapshot in Flamborough/Glanbrook</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td align="left">2006 Census</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td align="left"><strong>Ratio (Animal Control Officer to Population Served)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ratio (Animal Control Officer to Population Served)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td align="left"><strong>Glanbrook &amp; Flamborough</strong></td>
<td>Estimated 30,000+ residents per “one Man” Contracted Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td align="left">27,000 residents per “One Man” Contracted Service Provider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td align="left"><strong>Urban Hamilton</strong></td>
<td>Estimated 37,000 residents per Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td align="left">37,000 residents per Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Animal Surrender Fee Structures & Overall Cost Recovery Performance

Animal Control fee structures should deliver two distinct results:

- An ongoing revenue stream designed to recover targeted/appropriate operating costs;
- Avoid influencing public decisions about using Animal Control as a provider of unhealthy animal surrender services.

Staff has raised the need for setting overall cost recovery targets for Animal Control services by generating a sustainable mix of the following three ongoing revenue sources:

- Dog license revenues;
- Fine revenues;
- Property tax revenues.

Figure 3-7 below documents actual cost recovery performance by Animal Control for 2003-06. Gross expenditures have increased by approximately 20% over the period. Licensing and fee revenues have grown even more significantly over the period – up 44% from the 2003 base year. The required property tax support has grown by 12% over the period. Overall, property taxes supported 67% of expenditures in 2006 – down from 73% in 2003.

In reports to Council staff have made reference to a 75% cost recovery target and an ongoing 25% property tax “subsidy” for Animal Control services. The Animal Control Sub-Committee non-tax cost recovery target of 75% (February 2006 Council Report) is simply not realistic given the current reality of 33% non-tax cost recovery. Animal Control will continue to rely on property tax funding as its primary revenue source for the foreseeable future. A future cat licensing revenue stream will moderate, but not eliminate, reliance on property tax revenues.
Animal Control Services: Cost Recovery Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$2,919,557</td>
<td>$3,159,759</td>
<td>$3,311,132</td>
<td>$3,524,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License Revenues</td>
<td>$678,666</td>
<td>$753,691</td>
<td>$752,277</td>
<td>$962,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Revenues</td>
<td>$115,018</td>
<td>$209,290</td>
<td>$169,674</td>
<td>$183,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Subsidy</td>
<td>$2,125,873</td>
<td>$2,196,778</td>
<td>$2,389,181</td>
<td>$2,379,035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike the Calgary “Best Practices” model that requires no property tax subsidy, it is not realistic to expect Hamilton’s dog generated licensing and fine revenue streams to recover unrelated costs associated with animal carcass removal, stray cat pick-ups, or wildlife calls. Calgary does not deal with these non-core service activities. Staff’s current non-property tax cost recovery performance is reasonable and displays steady, if unspectacular, improvement. Cat licensing revenues are also absent from the Hamilton revenue stream, despite significant cat related expenditures and call volumes.

Animal surrender fees have been carefully reviewed against veterinary market comparators by staff. New fees were put into place in 2006. Staff has correctly noted that surrender fee structures for unhealthy animals should not provide any market discount. Animal Control should not function as a “bargain basement” supplier for euthanizing unhealthy animals. Surrender fees for healthy animals should remain below those for unhealthy animals in order to facilitate adoption and rescue opportunities. Fees slightly below market rates may reflect the reality of not having to generate a profit, as is the case for a private operator. Continued market surveys of veterinary market comparators can be used to ensure fees remain “neutral” in terms of leveraging animal owner behaviors around animal surrender.
3.6 Data Management, Call Intake & Performance Measurement Issues

The evolving Hamilton Animal Control service faces significant data management issues. Since 2003 the Animal Control unit has already migrated through at least two distinct information management systems – SMS (shelter management system) and Hansen. The rest of the current Building & Licensing Division uses AMANDA. This multi-application approach to Division-wide data management has been problematic – it has created redundancies in report design and IT support. Animal Control staff report ongoing difficulties generating meaningful management reports from Hansen. Regardless of current organization re-structuring, there is a clear need for ongoing, consistent performance reporting from Hansen so staff and Council can set performance based service delivery targets and manage to these targets.

In terms of financial management, the current budget and accounting cost centre structure for the City combines Animal Control and MLEO. Gathering Animal Control specific financial data (costs and revenue) for this operational review proved to be an effort intensive exercise in manual financial analysis. A specific cost centre for Animal Control would allow for ongoing performance evaluation against cost recovery targets. Timing for such a financial restructuring is opportune given the current organization re-design underway.

Performance measurement indicators exist in the Animal Control sector (i.e. Save Rates, Euthanasia Rates, License Rates). However, performance indicators do not appear to drive operational or budget decision-making in Animal Control. Regular performance reports are not produced by Hansen for staff to set measurable service delivery targets. Results based benchmarking versus other peer jurisdictions is also difficult and impractical without regular performance indicator reporting and data management.

In many municipalities, frontline staff can generate significant productivity gains by directly entering service delivery data into mainframe systems using laptops in the field. This eliminates redundant entry of data into paper and electronic files. Staff can also access information in “real time” thereby reducing risk on calls and improving the quality of responses. The reality of wireless laptop technology linking to headquarters databases – once considered cutting edge – is fast becoming a municipal industry standard. There
is no “unproven technology” driven reason why such a tool cannot be expeditiously implemented.

The City is currently in the process of centralizing the intake of all non-emergency public requests for service. Historically, Animal Control has handled its own call intake and dispatch of Animal Control officers to respond. There are two distinct issues the City must address in its transition to centralized intake:

1. Animal Control staff involved in call intake staff also execute a significant amount of work not related to calls (e.g. License renewals database entry). The ongoing resource “hole” left behind needs to be recognized and addressed corporately. The precise size of this hole is a matter for Animal Control staff to document and communicate.

2. Animal Control calls are safety related and can constitute virtual emergencies. Animal calls should all be routed to the existing experienced staff once they function in the new corporate call intake unit. The experienced Animal Control call intake/dispatch staff recognize/obtain important call details (obtained at the point of contact with the public) that could impact frontline staff safety.

3.7 Public Consultation & Stakeholder Relations

On May 28th a public consultation session was held to solicit input into this operational review from interested residents and community stakeholders. Performance Concepts Consulting Principal Todd MacDonald and City staff managed the session. A number of stakeholder communication issues emerged from the session, and a number of substantive issues received thoughtful treatment. Observations are as follows:

⇒ A significant gap in understanding, trust and regular communication currently exists between Animal Control and the responsible and thoughtful members of the “animal rights” community;
⇒ Both Animal Control staff and these responsible stakeholders are committed to reducing euthanasia and promoting animal wellness through higher animal save rates;
During the public consultation session, it became clear that stakeholders have accurately identified ill-advised City business rules/policies that contribute to higher-than-necessary euthanasia rates. This operational review has arrived at similar conclusions independently. An important example is the current by-law limit of two animals per residential household. In an effort to avoid animal hoarding, this restrictive two animal limit effectively prohibits the legal functioning of community based rescue organizations. Staff cannot offer any compelling rationale for the current per animal limit. These rescue organizations should be functioning as allies, not adversaries, in a program to reduce euthanasia rates via rescue and low-cost spay/neuter programs. The City’s current animal limit is clearly an obstacle to community based solutions.

Animal limits are still a common feature of the service delivery by-law/business model in many jurisdictions. In Toronto’s by-law six animals are permitted. Prior to amalgamation, in Stoney Creek the animal limit was four animals. The City of Kingston has removed pet limits all-together – without negative impacts. Clearly, a variety of options beyond the current two animal per household limit can be implemented without creating or condoning animal hoarding.

Developing ongoing stakeholder partnerships, based on an improved degree of understanding, needs to be an Animal Control priority.
4. CONCLUSIONS & SERVICE IMPROVEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS
4. CONCLUSIONS & SERVICE DELIVERY IMPROVEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

The performance analysis described in the previous chapter yields a number of positive conclusions concerning Hamilton's relatively new Animal Control service model:

- Dog licensing, save rates and euthanasia rates are all trending towards more positive outcomes;
- Cat save rates and euthanasia rates, while still very problematic, have also trended towards more positive outcomes;
- Public safety related calls feature excellent response times;
- Reliance on property tax funding (as a % of overall revenues) has been reduced during 2003-06.

The performance analysis has also identified opportunities for significant improvement.

4.1 Transition into Higher Value-Added Service Activities

Maintaining and improving current licensing penetration rates in the dog population (70%) is going to be a key priority for Animal Control. As the licensing “base” has been built up, a greater share of staff effort/capacity will be required to maintain performance and minimize lapsed licenses. Licensing performance is the platform upon which the “Best Practices” model can be built in Hamilton.

The required staff capacity should be freed-up from current lower-value added service activities – carcass removal, stray cat pick-up, and uninjured wildlife calls. The performance analysis identified the equivalent of 3-4 frontline officers being consumed by these activities. This staff capacity (almost 5,000 service hours) can be re-deployed to meet the requirements of maintaining the licensing base, initiating more frequent proactive parks patrol, and implementing public education programming.

Stray cat pick-up by the City promotes the unnecessary euthanizing of animals – often responding to low impact nuisance complaints with no public safety impacts. If non-feral cats pose an ongoing persistent problem, such cats can still be collected by residents and
accepted at the Dartnall Road facility for drop-off. Wildlife calls do not typically involve any public safety impacts, and staff is severely limited by statute when re-locating wild animals such as raccoons. These calls can be assigned to a lower priority “when time permits” service level/response time. Carcass removal can be accomplished using other City or private sector resources.

RECOMMENDATION Bundle #1

Hamilton Animal Control should explicitly commit to a five year plan to implement the key components of the “Best Practices” model typified by Calgary Animal Control.

The following measures should be undertaken to free-up the existing frontline staff capacity required for high value-added service activities:

i. Animal Control should discontinue pick-up calls for non-feral, uninjured stray cats. Stray cats would continue to be accepted by drop-off at the Animal Control facility.

ii. Wildlife call service levels should be amended to “low priority response as workload permits” in order to prevent the crowding out of high value-added service activities as Officers focus on delivering high-value-added service activities.

iii. Responsibility for public and private property animal carcass removal should be i) carried out by Public Works road maintenance staff as is the case in most municipal organizations, or ii) contracted to a private service provider via a multi-year tendered service contract featuring measurable turnaround time performance standards. Discussion should be initiated immediately with Public Works to explore the first option as a preferred course of action.

iv. Freed-up Animal Control Officer front-line staff capacity (from the measures noted above) should be re-deployed (budgeted) on a service hour basis to high value-added licensing “base” maintenance, proactive
park patrol, and execution of public education programming. An equivalent of 3-4 front-line FTE resources can be re-deployed without incurring any new costs.

v) The public education program should feature annual measurable target coverage rates for all publicly funded elementary students/schools in the City.

vi) The re-deployed service hours for licensing, park patrol, and public education should be reported to Council/Committee during the 2008 budget process, as accountable/measurable service delivery targets.

4.2 Adjusting the Mix of Contracted versus Direct Service Delivery

Animal Control has recently received notice that its contracted “door to door” licensing service provider has withdrawn services. The growth in the licensing “base” to 35,000 dogs suggests a declining marginal rate of return in the contractor’s efforts to continue growing the licensed dog population. It is unlikely that another contractor will expend the increased effort required to capture the remaining estimated 7,000-10,000 hard-to-license dogs.

RECOMMENDATION Bundle #2

i) Animal Control should abandon the current commission based service contract model for growing new licenses.

ii) Animal Control should immediately hire and train seasonal/student resources (as an interim measure) to continue efforts to grow the dog license “base”. A licensing amnesty should be implemented this summer for one month, and then followed up by a renewed zero tolerance approach (no warnings) to unlicensed dogs.

iii) An historic geographic analysis of licensing growth patterns in 2004-06 should be undertaken by Animal Control to identify target areas for deploying seasonal/student resources in 2007-08.
iv) Animal Control should investigate and report to Council on the feasibility of life-time dog licensing and automated payment options/incentives – an important emerging “Best Practice” that will ease administrative burden around license renewals while contributing to revenue stream certainty.

Animal Control service contracts in Glanbrook/Flamborough have been appropriate service delivery tools during the rural/early sub-urban phase of development in these communities. While the traditional rural development pattern is changing and the urban area is steadily growing, the current contracted service delivery model still remains relevant. Once overall population totals in Glanbrook/Flamborough (including frontline staff/population ratios) approach the existing Hamilton urban standard, integration of this new urbanizing area into the larger urban service model is probably appropriate. Current projections suggest this new urban “critical mass” will not occur before 2010.

RECOMMENDATION Bundle #3

i) New Glanbrook and Flamborough fee for service contracts, featuring mandatory performance reporting requirements, should be re-tendered in the Fall 2007 and should be structured to terminate at the end of 2010 (with an optional two year renewal).

ii) Approaching the end of 2010, the contracted service delivery model should be re-examined and the in-sourcing of call response and licensing services into the urban area should be seriously considered.

4.3 Cat Licensing

Current cat euthanasia and save rates are not consistent with the “Best Practices” service delivery model, the operational priorities of Animal Control, or the values of Council and the community. While the elimination of stray cat pick-ups will impact euthanasia rates, further decisive actions are required.

Calgary features significantly lower cat euthanasia rates (and higher save rates) for similar volumes of cats in care. The driving factor is the new cat licensing program. In its relative
infancy, the program is already making steady progress in terms of growing a new license “base”. Returns to owners are already 4-5 times higher than in Hamilton. Stakeholders like the Calgary SPCA are supportive. A new cat revenue stream is being created to minimize dog revenue subsidization of cat programs. Hamilton cannot avoid addressing its unacceptably high rate of cat euthanasia without adopting some form of comprehensive cat identification program.

**RECOMMENDATION Bundle #4**

i) **Animal Control should develop a detailed Cat Licensing/Identification business plan/implementation schedule, after completing a detailed Calgary case study in the Fall of 2007.** The case study and resulting business plan should incorporate forecast cat licensing projections, a financial framework, a public communications plan, a staffing and operational assessment, and implementation critical path.

ii) **Implementation should be phased-in over 3-5 years, after recommended service improvements dealing with dog programs/operations are in place.**

**4.4 Stakeholder Relations**

Reduction in euthanasia rates will require community based partnerships to improve adoption and rescue performance (i.e. higher save rates). Given high animal birth rates, supply-side solutions such as low cost spay and neutering programs can be effectively partnered with responsible animal rights community organizations. The current state of the Animal Control/community stakeholder relationship requires significant management/coordination.

**RECOMMENDATION Bundle #5**

i) **An Animal Control Stakeholder Advisory Council should be created and staffed by the City.** Membership should include an appointed City Councillor, the Manager of Animal Control, a new staff position of Animal Control Community Partnerships Officer, a representative of the SPCA, and at least three public representatives selected from other community based animal rescue organizations.
ii) The Advisory Council should consider the existing “per household animal limit” as its first issue for review. New alternatives for consideration should include a) higher per animal limits linked to specific residential built forms and lot sizes (i.e. single family versus townhouse versus apartment versus rural estate) and b) no limits at all as per Kingston.

iii) The Advisory Council should be created by year-end 2007 and its “per household animal limit” recommendation should be reported to Council during the first quarter of 2008.

4.5 Towards a Results Based Management Toolkit

In order to achieve a “Best Practices” service delivery model, Animal Control will need to emphasize a management culture based on results/outcomes. This will require a Results Management toolkit consisting of:

- Selection of a set of key performance indicators populated on an ongoing basis with actual performance data;
- A Results Based Business Plan (RBBP) featuring annual and 4 year Term of Council performance targets (derived from efficiency and effectiveness indicators). The business plan should also feature the key work initiatives required to achieve the targets. Integration of the results based business plan with the annual budget process is desirable;
- An annual/quarterly performance reporting framework that compares actual performance indicator results against business plan targets.

RECOMMENDATION Bundle #6

i) Animal Control should design and implement a performance measurement and business planning framework featuring efficiency and effectiveness indicators and targets, as described in this operational review. This framework should become fully operational by fiscal year 2009.
5. IMPLEMENTATION CRITICAL PATH
5.0 IMPLEMENTATION CRITICAL PATH

Implementation of recommended service delivery improvements must strike an important balance between timeliness and phasing. It is important to move expeditiously without overburdening Animal Control staff and risking the quality of implementation. Figure 5-1 sets out a recommended critical path for implementation across the remainder of the 2007-10 term of Council. This implementation critical path can be achieved by leveraging the combined resources of Animal Control staff, contacted service providers and limited but strategic use of consulting expertise (e.g. Cat Licensing Plan & Calgary Case Study).

Figure 5-1
### Recommendation Bundle 1 - Transition into Higher Value-Added Service Activities

1. Wildlife call service levels should be amended to “low priority response as workload permits” in order to prevent the crowding out of high value-added service activities as Officers focus on delivering high value-added service activities.

**Consultant’s Recommendations**
1. Wildlife call service levels should be amended to “low priority response as workload permits” in order to prevent the crowding out of high value-added service activities as Officers focus on delivering high value-added service activities.

**Responsibility**
Manager, Animal Control

**Management Response/Implementation Plan & Staff Recommendations**
**Agree** – Need to review the process where public safety is at risk. Requires some consultation with Public Health Services regarding any related health issues. Requires further consultation with Public Works with respect to birds in regular waste stream. There may be a public outcry if this recommendation is implemented. Requires further responsibility on the homeowner to manage wildlife issues.

**Staff Recommendation:**
That staff be directed review the process of prioritizing Wildlife service calls and report back to the Building and Licensing Division Operational Review Sub-committee.

**Additional Comments/Implications**
Need to prioritize our calls. Need to educate the public regarding the changes.

**Proposed Implementation Date**
Q2 of 2009

2. Responsibility for public and private property animal carcass removal should be i) carried out by Public Works Road Maintenance staff as is the case in most municipal organizations, or ii) contracted to a private service provider via a multi-year tendered service contract featuring measurable turnaround time performance standards. Discussion should be initiated immediately with Public Works to explore the first option as a preferred course of action.

**Responsibility**
Manager, Animal Control

**Management Response/Implementation Plan & Staff Recommendations**
**Agree** – Need to review in detail with the Public Works Department. If Public Works is unable or unwilling to provide the service, need to contract the service out as recommended. Will need to conduct an RFP to identify a potential contractor.

Need to consult with other municipalities and regions regarding their handling of carcass removal.

**Staff Recommendation:**
That staff be directed to review the following two (2) options, with respect to how/where the responsibility for public and private animal carcass removal would be

**Additional Comments/Implications**
Can tender it out from April to December, as this is when higher call volumes are received for this service.

**Proposed Implementation Date**
Q2 of 2009
### ANIMAL CONTROL SECTION OPERATIONAL REVIEW WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant’s Recommendations</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Management Response/Implementation Plan &amp; Staff Recommendations</th>
<th>Additional Comments/Implications</th>
<th>Proposed Implementation Date (Subject to Budget and Detailed Work Program)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. The Public Education Program should feature annual measurable target coverage rates for all publicly funded elementary students / schools in the City.</td>
<td>Manager, Animal Control</td>
<td><strong>Agree</strong> – Need to develop a comprehensive Education Program and Plan with identified resources and materials. May be subject to Budget enhancement but difficult to predict until a plan is developed.</td>
<td>Some work has commenced on this initiative; however, staff cannot move it forward due to lack of resources and time commitment.</td>
<td>Education Plan Q3 of 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff Recommendation:**
That staff be directed to develop a proposed Comprehensive Education Program and report back to the Building and Licensing Division Operational Review Sub-committee.

### Recommendation Bundle 2 - Adjusting the Mix of Contracted versus Direct Service Delivery

| 4. Animal Control should abandon the current commission-based service contract model for growing new licenses. | Manager, Animal Control | **Agree** - This decision has been made. The contract has expired and has not been renewed. (COMPLETE) | Completed – June 2007 |
### ANIMAL CONTROL SECTION OPERATIONAL REVIEW WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant’s Recommendations</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Management Response/ Implementation Plan &amp; Staff Recommendations</th>
<th>Additional Comments/ Implications</th>
<th>Proposed Implementation Date (Subject to Budget and Detailed Work Program)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Animal Control should immediately hire and train seasonal / student resources (as an interim measure) to continue efforts to grow the dog license “base”. A licensing amnesty should be implemented this summer for one month, and then followed up by a renewed zero tolerance approach (no warnings) to unlicensed dogs.</td>
<td>Manager, Animal Control</td>
<td>Agree – Would prefer to use a seasonal employee as opposed to a student; however, additional staffing may not be required. This recommendation has been partially implemented as staffing resources allow. Amnesty was implemented last Summer (2007). Implementation of the renewed zero tolerance approach (no warnings) to unlicensed dogs has already commenced. <strong>Staff Recommendation:</strong> That staff be directed to: Immediately hire and train seasonal staff resources (as an interim measure) to continue efforts to grow the dog license “base”.</td>
<td>Will consider examining whether or not it would be more advantageous to conduct advertising / education program as opposed to hiring student / seasonal employee. It cost $15,000.00 from September 2006 to September 2007 for the contractor to sell tags. However, sold 1,700 tags and collected $50,000.00.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A historic geographic analysis of licensing growth patterns in 2004-06 should be undertaken by Animal Control to identify target areas for deploying seasonal / student resources in 2008-09.</td>
<td>Manager, Animal Control</td>
<td>Partially Agree – It may be more advantageous to conduct advertising and / or develop an education program. Also, the preference is to use a seasonal employee as opposed to a student. Work with GIS services to conduct geographical analysis. <strong>Staff Recommendation:</strong> See recommendation (d) of Building and Licensing Division Operational Review Sub-committee Report 08-002.</td>
<td>Examine whether or not it would be more advantageous to conduct advertising / education program as opposed to hiring student / seasonal employee.</td>
<td>Q1 of 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANIMAL CONTROL SECTION OPERATIONAL REVIEW WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant’s Recommendations</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Management Response/ Implementation Plan &amp; Staff Recommendations</th>
<th>Additional Comments/ Implications</th>
<th>Proposed Implementation Date (Subject to Budget and Detailed Work Program)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7. Animal Control should investigate and report to Council on the feasibility of life-time dog licensing and automated payment options / incentives - an important emerging “Best Practice” that will ease administrative burden around license renewals while contributing to revenue stream certainty. | Manager, Animal Control | **Agree** – Need to further explore this option as it requires consultation with Finance. Need to further explore the merits of a lifetime dog licensing. Some research has been conducted regarding the issue of lifetime licensing. **Staff Recommendation:** That staff be directed to further investigate the following and report back to the Building and Licensing Division Operational Review Sub-committee:  
(a) The feasibility of lifetime dog licensing; and,  
(b) The feasibility of automated payment options and incentives for dog licensing. | Currently working with the City’s Information Technology Services (ITS) Division in order to address issues with our current online purchase and renewal of dog licences. There have been several issues related to the functionality of the online purchase and renewal of dog licences. | Q2 of 2009 |

**Recommendation Bundle 3 - Adjusting the Mix of Contracted versus Direct Service Delivery – Rural Setting (Glanbrook and Flamborough)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Management Response</th>
<th>Additional Comments</th>
<th>Proposed Implementation Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. New Glanbrook and Flamborough fee for service contracts, featuring mandatory performance reporting requirements, should be re-tendered in the Fall 2007 and should be structured to terminate at the end of 2010 (with an optional two-year renewal).</td>
<td>Manager, Animal Control</td>
<td><strong>Agree</strong> – Both Contracts have been renewed for one year, commencing April 1st (Glanbrook) and May 1st (Flamborough) with the option to renew, at the City’s sole discretion for up to two additional terms of one year. <strong>(COMPLETE)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q4 of 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Approaching the end of 2010, the contracted service delivery model should be re-examined and the in-sourcing of call response and licensing services into the urban area should be seriously considered.</td>
<td>Manager, Animal Control</td>
<td><strong>Agree</strong> – To review the service delivery model and conduct a detailed cost benefit analysis. <strong>Staff Recommendation:</strong> That staff be directed to review the service delivery model, in the rural</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q2 of 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANIMAL CONTROL SECTION OPERATIONAL REVIEW WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant’s Recommendations</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Management Response/ Implementation Plan &amp; Staff Recommendations</th>
<th>Additional Comments/ Implications</th>
<th>Proposed Implementation Date (Subject to Budget and Detailed Work Program)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>settings, and report back with a detailed cost benefit analysis to the Building and Licensing Division Operational Review Sub-committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendation Bundle 4 – Cat Licensing

10. Animal Control should develop a detailed Cat Licensing / Identification Business Plan / Implementation Schedule, after completing a detailed Calgary Case Study in the Fall of 2008. The Case Study and resulting Business Plan should incorporate forecast cat licensing projections, a financial framework, a public communications plan, a staffing and operational assessment, and implementation critical path.

- **Manager, Animal Control**: **Agree** – To develop a detailed Business Plan and to conduct an extensive review of the “Calgary model” and consider other potential options. Staff will need to consult with the Animal Control Advisory Committee with respect to this matter.

  The review and Business Plan will need to be complete, prior to the comprehensive revision of the Animal Control By-law, in order to include the licensing or identification of cats.

  Report back to Committee / Council once Business Plan / Case Study is completed and a recommended plan and options are identified.

**Staff Recommendation:**

That staff be directed to carry out the following and report back to the Building and Licensing Division Operational Review Sub-committee:

(a) To conduct an extensive review of the model for cat licensing in other municipalities such as Calgary, Halifax, Regina, Markham, London, Oshawa, Toronto, Ottawa, and Kingston.

- Need to explore other options in the Business Plan – such as a Cat Registration Program as opposed to the Cat Licensing. It may be difficult to enforce a Cat Licensing Program.

  The Consultant recommends Calgary as a best practice model. It should be noted that the following Canadian municipalities have cat licensing type programs: Halifax, Regina, Markham, London, Oshawa, Toronto, Ottawa, and Kingston. These municipalities will be consulted in the Case Study.

- Q4 of 2009
### ANIMAL CONTROL SECTION OPERATIONAL REVIEW WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant’s Recommendations</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Management Response/ Implementation Plan &amp; Staff Recommendations</th>
<th>Additional Comments/ Implications</th>
<th>Proposed Implementation Date (Subject to Budget and Detailed Work Program)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) To Prepare a detailed Business Plan, and recommended options, respecting the licensing or identification of cats.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendation Bundle 5 – Stakeholder Relations

11. The Animal Control Advisory Committee should consider the existing “per household animal limit” as its first issue for review. New alternatives for consideration should include a) higher per animal limits linked to specific residential built forms and lot sizes (i.e. single family versus townhouse versus apartment versus real estate) and b) no limits at all as per Kingston.

Manager of Animal Control

**Agree** – That this recommendation will be considered by the Advisory group. A mandate will be developed for the Advisory group.

This item will need to be completed, prior to the comprehensive Animal Control By-law revisions, in order to include the issue of household animal limits.

**Staff Recommendation:**

That, pending staff’s report back to Committee respecting the Terms of Reference for an Animal Control Advisory Committee and Council’s approval of same, staff be directed to put the following item before the Advisory Committee for discussion:

(i) The existing “per household animal limit” for review; considering new alternatives such as (a) higher per household animal limits linked to specific residential built forms and lot sizes (i.e. single family versus townhouse versus apartment versus real estate); and, (b) no limits at all.

Need to establish Mandate / Terms of Reference for Committee.

Q4 of 2008
### ANIMAL CONTROL SECTION OPERATIONAL REVIEW WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant’s Recommendations</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Management Response/ Implementation Plan &amp; Staff Recommendations</th>
<th>Additional Comments/ Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation Bundle 6 - Towards a Results Based Management Toolkit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Animal Control should design and implement a performance measurement and business planning framework featuring efficiency and effectiveness indicators and targets, as described in this Operational Review. This framework should become fully operational by fiscal year 2009.</td>
<td>Director, Parking and By-Law Services and Manager, Animal Control</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Staff Recommendation:</strong> That staff be directed to design a performance measurement and business planning framework; featuring efficiency and effectiveness indicators and targets, and report back to the Building and Licensing Division Operational Review Sub-committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staffing/Financial Implications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. To hire and additional 1.5 FTE Animal Control Clerk to provide customer service support at the Animal Control facility and to assist with the processing of increased licenses and renewals.</td>
<td>Manager, Animal Control</td>
<td>A. Salary and benefits for 1.5 FTE Animal Control Clerk will cost $101,200.00 and will be a direct impact on the City’s net levy. This will be referred to the 2009 Budget process.</td>
<td>There will be an initial minor one-time costs associated with the staff hire such as a personal computer, software licence, office equipment (desk and chair) with an approximate cost of $2,500.00, which will be absorbed into the current budget.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2 of 2009

Q1 of 2009