

Request for Decision

Animal Control Contract

| | |
|---------------|-------------------------|
| Presented To: | City Council |
| Presented: | Tuesday, Feb 09, 2016 |
| Report Date | Wednesday, Jan 27, 2016 |
| Type: | Managers' Reports |

Resolution

Resolution One:

THAT the City of Greater Sudbury receives the report from Matrix Consulting entitled "Evaluation of the City of Greater Sudbury's Animal Control Services: Final Report Summary".

Resolution Two:

THAT the City of Greater Sudbury conduct animal services by-law enforcement through the use of City of Greater Sudbury Employees beginning in the fall of 2016 when the current contract expires.

Resolution Three:

THAT the City of Greater Sudbury continue to contract out for pound services And that to increase competition and the potential for a larger number of qualified bidders, staff be directed to prepare an RFP for pound services with options to provide service for the entire City of Greater Sudbury or one of three smaller service areas.

Resolution Four:

THAT the City of Greater Sudbury formally adopt a Low Kill Service philosophy with a 90%+ adoption rate based upon the 11 core tenants, generally recognized as being: Trap-Neuter-Release (TNR); High-Volume, Low-Cost Spay/Neuter Programs; Rescue Group Partnerships; Foster Care; Comprehensive Adoption Programs; Pet Retention; Medical & Behavior Programs; Public Relations / Community Development; Volunteers; Proactive Redemptions; and Compassionate / Accountable Management.

Finance Implications

If approved, the 2016 implementation costs are expected to be funded within existing Administrative Services operating budgets. The 2017 operating budget impact, including staffing will be presented to Council following the award of the RFP for Pound Services.

Signed By

Report Prepared By

Brendan Adair
Manager of Security, By-Law and Court
Services
Digitally Signed Jan 27, 16

Recommended by the Department

Caroline Hallsworth
Executive Director, Administrative
Services/City Clerk
Digitally Signed Jan 27, 16

Recommended by the C.A.O.

Kevin Fowke
Acting Chief Administrative Officer
Digitally Signed Jan 27, 16

APPENDIX 1: ANIMAL CONTROL REPORT TO COUNCIL

Council will be asked to make three fundamental decisions about the future direction of Animal Control based on the report from Matrix Consulting entitled "Evaluation of the City of Greater Sudbury's Animal Control Services: Final Report Summary." The report is attached as Appendix Two. Once these decisions have been made by Council, staff will move forward immediately to prepare and implement the new service model as selected by Council, so as to ensure an orderly transition in October 2016.

In order to move forward, Council is asked to respond to the three questions posed by Mr. Pennington in his presentation of January 26, 2016 a copy of which is attached as Appendix Three. Those questions are:

- ◆ Who provides enforcement services to the community?
- ◆ Who provides pound services to the community?
- ◆ What service level is to be adopted by the City related to the animal care provided?

The recommendations from Matrix Consulting are summarized on pages four through seven of the report and each is explained in more detail in the corresponding sections of the report. Matrix's recommendations for each of the questions are as follows:

- ◆ Who provides enforcement services to the community?
 - ➔ **4.2 The City of Greater Sudbury should conduct animal services by-law enforcement through the use of City of Greater Sudbury Employees.**
- ◆ Who provides pound services to the community?
 - ➔ **4.3 The City of Greater Sudbury should continue to contract out for pound services, rather than bring these services in house.**
 - ➔ **To increase competition and the potential for a larger number of qualified bidders, the City of Greater Sudbury should bid pound services with options to provide for the entire City of Greater Sudbury or one of three smaller service areas.**
- ◆ What service level is to be adopted by the City related to the animal care provided?
 - ➔ **5.1 to 5.10 Formally adopt a Low Kill Service philosophy with a 90%+ adoption rate based upon the 11 core tenets as generally recognized below:**

- ◆ Trap-Neuter-Release (TNR)
- ◆ High-Volume, Low-Cost Spay/Neuter Programs
- ◆ Rescue Group Partnerships
- ◆ Foster Care
- ◆ Comprehensive Adoption Programs
- ◆ Pet Retention
- ◆ Medical & Behavior Programs
- ◆ Public Relations / Community Development
- ◆ Volunteers
- ◆ Proactive Redemptions
- ◆ Compassionate / Accountable Management

Matrix has prepared a preliminary cost analysis which suggests cost range for the new service model as follows. Once the RFP has been issued and awarded, a more firm budget number will be used in the 2017 budget to accurately reflect the costs of the service. Costs of the new service level, through November and December 2016 including a small amount for equipment, should be able to be absorbed within the existing Administrative Services budgets.

| Current Cost | | Proposed Cost | |
|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| AS Contract | \$599,999 | Pound Contract | \$200,000 - \$450,000 |
| | | Service Enhancement | \$35,000 |
| | | <u>3 FTEs w/ veh/equip.</u> | <u>\$285,000</u> |
| Total Cost | \$599,000 | Total Cost | \$520,000 - \$770,000 |
| | | Revenue Increase 1st Yr | \$150,000 |
| Net Cost | \$599,000 | Net Cost | \$370,000 - \$620,000 |

Staff are committed to working with existing resources as much as possible to minimize costs, as for example working within the number of fleet vehicles currently assigned to Compliance and Enforcement to ensure that two of those vehicles are equipped for Animal Control Enforcements. Further, the new model of by-law officers who are trained in animal control enforcement will provide evening and weekend response for all by-law matters.

Once Council has established the framework for Animal Control Services effective in the fall of 2016, next steps will include working with Matrix to draft an RFP for pound services and a new Animal Control By-Law, which By-Law will be presented to Council for discussion in late spring or early summer 2016. Staff will also work to implement the new enforcement model, including hiring, training and equipping of staff.

A staff member from Matrix Consulting will be available (either in person or electronically) at the meeting of February 9, 2016 should Council have further questions regarding their report.

Evaluation of the City of Greater Sudbury's Animal Control Services

City of Greater Sudbury, Ontario

FINAL REPORT SUMMARY



101 Southpointe Drive, Suite E
Edwardsville, Illinois 62025
v.618.692.9085 f.618.692.9086

January 26, 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|----|--|----|
| 1. | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND TABLE OF RECOMMENDATIONS | 1 |
| 2. | OVERVIEW OF EXISTING OPERATIONS | 8 |
| 3. | COMMUNITY SURVEY SUMMARY | 17 |
| 4. | ANALYSIS OF SERVICE DELIVERY STRUCTURE | 30 |
| 5. | ANALYSIS OF SERVICE ALTERNATIVES | 42 |
| 6. | ANALYSIS OF THE RFP PROCESS | 61 |

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND LISTING OF RECOMMENDATIONS

This initial chapter of the report introduces the approaches utilized in this study and summarizes key findings, conclusions and recommendations to be found in this report.

1. INTRODUCTION TO THE REPORT.

The Matrix Consulting Group was retained by the City of Greater Sudbury to conduct an evaluation of the Animal Services operations. In reaching the conclusion of the study, the project team has assembled this final report summarizing our major findings, conclusions and recommendations. As part of this study, the Matrix Consulting Group analyzed the following specific areas, as well as other related topics:

- Review of the City of Greater Sudbury's animal control model and comparison to other successful models.
- Review and analyze service options and alternatives.
- Analysis of the challenges and opportunities related to the City of Greater Sudbury's domestic animal care services.
- Evaluation and recommendation of options, both short and long term, for the operation of a domestic animal shelter facility under various alternatives.
- Opportunities to enhance services through alternative approach

The overall goal of this study was to develop an assessment of alternatives, and cost implications, for a new animal services model for the City of Greater Sudbury.

2. DESCRIPTION OF STUDY METHODOLOGY.

As part of this study of the City of Greater Sudbury's Animal Services, the project team conducted the following activities:

- Interviews with key stakeholders were conducted including:
 - City of Greater Sudbury staff charged with oversight of Animal Services
 - Representatives of key stakeholders including rescue groups
 - Key staff of the current vendor
- Community Survey and Public Forum to gather input from the public and interested parties.
- Compared the current service levels of the City of Greater Sudbury against best practices in animal control and care.
- Analyzed data regarding current operation including policies, **procedures**, workload and staffing.
- Analysis of service enhancements to be considered by the City of Greater Sudbury.

These activities enabled the project team to analyze the existing model of animal services against alternative models and best practices to develop a recommended approach for the City of Greater Sudbury. The analysis conducted led to the recommendations that are contained in the later chapters of this report.

3. KEY THEMES THAT EMERGED DURING THE EVALUATION.

In conducting interviews and the public meeting, there were several key themes that emerged that the project team took into consideration during the evaluation. These included the following:

- There was a strong public perception that the last contracting effort did not result in the best financial outcome for the City of Greater Sudbury.
- Concerns have been identified regarding whether the current level of expenditure is appropriate for the City of Greater Sudbury.
- Many stakeholders believe the existing level of services provided are not at the appropriate level and should be expanded.
- Desire for greater oversight of the Animal Service program and increased accountability for performance and operations.

- More responsive, consistent and accountable field enforcement of Animal Control by-laws.

These concerns were considered when developing the recommendations and a final recommended animal services model. Where possible, the recommendations are addressed in the analysis and alternatives were designed to address or mitigate these concerns in the future.

3. OVERVIEW OF THE RECOMMENDED MODEL AND APPROACH TO REACHING DECISIONS REGARDING THE FUTURE MODEL.

In moving forward with the policy decisions; that the City of Greater Sudbury should undertake in addressing the animal service model, it is recommended that the following approach and timeframe be utilized for a systematic approach.

- Policy decisions regarding the level and type of animal care services to be provided should be undertaken. This would include determination of whether or not to adopt a “No Kill” philosophy and/or implementation of all or some of the recommendations outlined based upon those tenets. (early Spring 2016)
- Determine the service model the City of Greater Sudbury wishes to adopt. The recommended approach is bringing by-law services in house with pound services contacted out. Additionally, pound services are recommended to be bid in an alternative model providing options for serving segments of the community. (early Spring 2016)
- Draft RFP consistent with the major policy decisions reached above (early Spring 2016).
- Review draft RFP with potential vendors during a pre-bid meeting (early Spring 2016).
- Issue RFP and evaluate responses (early Summer 2016).
- Issue award, as appropriate, based upon responses (mid-Summer 2016).

The most critical aspect of this timeframe and approach, is reaching a consensus on the service levels and service delivery model to be employed. As these drive significantly the development of the RFP document.

4. SUMMARY OF KEY RECOMMENDATIONS.

The following table provides a comprehensive listing of the key findings and recommendations contained within this report. Recommendations are listed in the order that they appear in the report. For each recommendation, a relative priority (in relation to other recommendations in the report) is provided.

Where applicable, we have also provided an indication of the fiscal impact of the recommendation to the City of Greater Sudbury. Most of the recommendations do not require direct outlay of financial support to implement – but will require staff time and effort be allocated to implement the recommendation.

| Section | Recommendation | Priority | Estimated Fiscal Impact |
|----------------|---|-----------------|--|
| 4.2 | The City of Greater Sudbury should conduct animal services by-law enforcement through the use of City of Greater Sudbury employees. | High | \$135,000 |
| 4.3 | The City of Greater Sudbury should continue to contract out for pound services rather than bring these services in-house. | High | n/a |
| 4.3 | To increase competition and the potential for a larger number of qualified bidders, the City of Greater Sudbury should bid pound services with options to provide for the entire City of Greater Sudbury or one (1) of three (3) smaller service areas. | High | There is potential for increased cost under this approach. |
| 4.4 | The City of Greater Sudbury should dedicate a management position full-time to overseeing, administering and developing the Animal Services Program. | High | \$85,000 |

| Section | Recommendation | Priority | Estimated Fiscal Impact |
|----------------|---|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| 5.1 | The City of Greater Sudbury should allocate \$15,000 to conduct a comprehensive pilot-program to support implementation of a TNR program. This funding should be distributed through a competitive process. | Medium | \$15,000 |
| 5.1 | The City of Greater Sudbury and the Service Provider should actively promote the benefits of a trap and release program to educate the public about the merits of the initiative. | Medium | n/a |
| 5.1 | Continued funding of the program after the pilot-program should be based upon performance of the participating groups, and the impact on reducing the feral cat population. Grants and fundraising should be developed as a primary funding mechanism. | Medium | Unknown |
| 5.2 | The City of Greater Sudbury should allocate \$20,000 annually to support implementation of an expanded spay and neuter program and explore additional partnerships including rescue groups and veterinarians. | High | \$20,000 |
| 5.2 | The City of Greater Sudbury should highly publicize available spay and neutering programs through public education events, proactive media initiatives, its website and social media channels. | Medium | Minimal cost impact. |
| 5.3 | The City of Greater Sudbury must strengthen the working relationships with all rescue groups. A quarterly co-ordination meeting should be held between the City of Greater Sudbury and representatives of each rescue group to develop strategies for working together, increasing dialogue, and addressing issues that arise in a timely manner. | High | n/a |
| 5.4 | The City of Greater Sudbury should work in collaboration with the rescue groups to develop a foster care program to provide an additional avenue for placement of animals, on a temporary basis during times of overcrowding at the pound or to socialize animals back to a home environment after extended periods of time at the pound. | High | n/a |
| 5.5 | The City of Greater Sudbury should continue its focus on adoption programs. | High | n/a |

| Section | Recommendation | Priority | Estimated Fiscal Impact |
|----------------|--|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| 5.5 | The City of Greater Sudbury and the current and future contractors should employ various adoption incentive events throughout the year and innovative partnerships. | Medium | Minor revenue reduction |
| 5.5 | The City of Greater Sudbury should consider extending evening hours for adoptions at least one (1) night per week at the shelter. | Medium | Unknown |
| 5.6 | Staff should create an enhanced sensitivity training instructions and training for all staff concerning how to appropriately discuss pet surrender with individuals bringing animals to the shelter. | Medium | n/a |
| 5.6 | The City of Greater Sudbury should develop a resource handbook that outlines community resources available to individuals who may need temporary assistance to support their ability to maintain their pet rather than choosing relinquishment. | Medium | n/a |
| 5.7 | All animals should be assessed in a timely manner for preexisting medical conditions and behavioral problems upon intake. | High | n/a |
| 5.8 | A strategic communications plan should be developed by the City of Greater Sudbury that identifies initiatives to increase transparency, promote animals that are available for adoption and enhance public awareness. This should include development of periodic newsletters, community meetings and a redesign of the website. Further, the City of Greater Sudbury is in a great position to help promote the adoption of animals through its social media channels. | Medium | n/a |
| 5.9 | Develop a volunteer program to ensure there is a coordinated effort to improve recruitment, training, and utilization of volunteers to support pound operations, animal care, and adoption events. | Medium | n/a |
| 5.10 | A proactive field canvassing program should be instituted for Animal Control Officers and volunteers to identify unlicensed pets. | Medium | n/a |
| 6.1 | The City of Greater Sudbury should make minor modifications to the bidding process to increase the potential for increasing the number of potential bidders. | High | n/a |

| Section | Recommendation | Priority | Estimated Fiscal Impact |
|----------------|---|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| 6.1 | The City of Greater Sudbury should consider compensating pound vendors entirely upon a set bid price. All revenues received related to licencing fees, adoptions, redemptions, etc. should be remitted to the City of Greater Sudbury. | High | Unknown |
| 6.2 | The City of Greater Sudbury should modify the RFP process to provide an additional step in the process where the draft RFP is reviewed with interested vendors while in 'draft' format. Potential vendors should be encouraged to provide input to the City of Greater Sudbury regarding terms, conditions or requirements contained in the draft RFP where it may be difficult to achieve compliance | Medium | n/a |
| 6.2 | The City of Greater Sudbury should review all input and feedback received, and finalize the RFP based upon balancing the desire to increase competition while protecting the City of Greater Sudbury's financial interest and liability. | Medium | n/a |
| 6.2 | The City of Greater Sudbury should consider establishing an initial term of service at five (5) years for a new contract with options to renew for an additional three (3) years based upon either a cost of living adjustment, or a new negotiated rate. | High | n/a |

The following chapters provide background materials developed by the project team and supporting narrative and analysis leading to the recommendation.

2. OVERVIEW OF EXISTING OPERATIONS

This overview of existing operations is designed to provide a summary of the current operational model utilized by the City of Greater Sudbury in providing Animal Control Services. This summary was developed based on data collection and analysis, interviews with staff, and site visits to the Rainbow District Animal Control Shelter.

1. Overview of the City of Greater Sudbury Animal Control Services.

In 2003, The City of Greater Sudbury began outsourcing animal control and pound services with a private company. The first contract was awarded to Rainbow District Animal Control and Shelter Services (RDAC) operating as Wenrick Kennels, Inc. Subsequent contracts have all been awarded to RDAC as well.

More recently, RDAC was awarded a five-year contract commencing in 2009. This contract expired on March 31, 2014, and then was extended to July 1, 2014 to allow time for the results of a public consultation process to be incorporated into a new Request for Proposal (RFP). The City of Greater Sudbury reviewed public comments regarding suggested improvements to services and the legislative by-law along with issues raised including the following: the method and quality of administering euthanasia; the quality of animal care; and public interactions and enforcement procedures.

As a result of the public review, on March 18, 2014, the City of Greater Sudbury issued a RFP in two parts. The first part related to current levels of animal control and shelter services and administrative service enhancements for reporting requirements and public interaction. The second one requested a separate bid on certain service

level enhancements including for euthanasia performed by veterinarians, extended operating hours at the shelter, and an increase to the current three-day redemption period for impounded dogs and cats and fee adoption from the shelter. Only RDAC bid on the RFP and at a significantly higher price from the prior contract. In June, 2014, an extension of the contract was authorized until November 2014 to allow for additional time to initiate a second process. This request separated opportunities to bid on either control and enforcement or pound services, or both. This RFP was issued on July 18, 2014 and again, only RDAC submitted a formal proposal. Based on the lack of any other competitors, the Council authorized a two-year contract through October 31, 2016 at an annual cost of \$599,999, an increase from the prior contract amount of \$442,892. No additional service level enhancements were included in the new contract.

2. Overview of Relevant Animal Control Regulations and By-Laws.

RDAC provides animal control and pound services to the City of Greater Sudbury through enforcement of the Animal Control By-law 2002-285 as amended, *The Pounds Act* (R.S.O. 1990, c. P.17), *The Animals for Research Act* (R.S.O. 1990, c. A.22) and the *Dog Owner's Liability Act*. In addition, RDAC must adhere by the *Ontario Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act* (R.S.O. 1990, c. O.36).

Per the agreement with the The City of Greater Sudbury, RDAC provides the following major services:

- **Pound and Shelter Services** including regulations regarding facility usage and hours of operation; humane care and treatment of animals placed in care; adoption services; proper methods of euthanasia; and burial or cremation of dead animals.
- **Website** for residents outlining the policies and procedures for animal control and pound/shelter operations as well as information for adoption, lost and found, and educational material.

- **Licensing** – RDAC makes available and sells animal registrations to owners of cats and dogs.
- **Animal Control Services** including enforcement of the City of Greater Sudbury by-law. RDAC will dedicate three Animal Control Officers on duty for the City of Greater Sudbury during its hours of operations who will conduct proactive patrols, impound dogs or cats found at large, aid injured dogs and cats, issue Provincial Offences Notices and Summons regarding violations and appear in Provincial Court to give evidence regarding infractions.
- **Emergency service responses** for injured dogs and cats that require emergency treatment or for animals that pose a threat to public safety.
- **Reporting** – RDAC will provide detailed monthly activity reports to the City of Greater Sudbury regarding the calls for service as well as an annual financial report summarizing fees collected for impound, boarding and registrations.

RDAC is located at 411 St. Agnes Street, Azilda. Hours of operation are typically from 8:30am – 6pm, seven days a week. Staffing levels include the following:

| Day of the Week | Assigned Staff |
|-----------------|------------------------------|
| Sunday | 3 FT Animal Control Officers |
| | 1 FT Kennel Duty |
| Monday | 4 FT Animal Control Officers |
| | 1 FT Kennel Duty |
| Tuesday | 4 FT Animal Control Officers |
| | 1 FT Kennel Duty |
| | 1 PT Kennel Duty |
| Wednesday | 6 FT Animal Control Officers |
| | 1 FT Kennel Duty |
| Thursday | 3 FT Animal Control Officers |
| | 1 FT Kennel Duty |
| | 1 PT Kennel Duty |
| Friday | 3 FT Animal Control Officers |
| | 1 FT Kennel Duty |
| | 1 PT Kennel Duty |
| Saturday | 3 FT Animal Control Officers |
| | 1 FT Kennel Duty |

In addition to the staffing levels above, two (2) administrators also perform Animal Control duties as required and rotate covering after hours' service requests as

well. On Statutory Holidays, minimum staffing includes two (2) employees for Kennel Duty and one (1) Animal Control Officer. Please note that RDAC contracts with other municipalities. Per the contract, three (3) Animal Control Officers are dedicated to the City of Greater Sudbury.

3. Summary of Workload Data.

The following tables provide summary information regarding key workload and animal services control performance data. This information is provided to place the workload into context as consideration is given to differing alternative approaches in the future.

(1) Calls for Service

The following table outlines the number of calls, by location, for 2014 and 2015 YTD (at the time of collection and on-site visits data was available only through August / September).

| Calls for Service by Jurisdiction | 2014 | 2015 YTD* |
|--|-------------|------------------|
| Azilda | 84 | 58 |
| Blezard Valley | 3 | 3 |
| Capreol | 67 | 34 |
| Chelmsford | 137 | 88 |
| Coniston | 31 | 17 |
| Copper Cliff | 32 | 36 |
| Dowling | 19 | 17 |
| Falconbridge | 17 | 3 |
| Garson | 101 | 94 |
| Hanmer | 170 | 143 |
| Levack | 46 | 30 |
| Lively | 105 | 55 |
| McCrea Heights | 3 | 1 |
| Naughton | 7 | 5 |
| Onaping | 26 | 14 |
| Skead | 6 | 10 |

| Calls for Service by Jurisdiction | 2014 | 2015 YTD* |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Sudbury | 1,736 | 1,156 |
| Val Caron | 86 | 85 |
| Val Therese | 24 | 15 |
| Wahnapiatae | 38 | 47 |
| Wanup | 7 | 4 |
| Whitefish | 13 | 8 |
| Worthington | 3 | 3 |
| Total | 2,761 | 1,926 |

(2) Calls for Service By Day of Week:

The following table outlines the number of calls, by day of the week, for 2014 and 2015 YTD.

| Calls by Day of Week | Total calls 2014-2015 YTD |
|----------------------|---------------------------|
| Sunday | 337 |
| Monday | 771 |
| Tuesday | 820 |
| Wednesday | 745 |
| Thursday | 841 |
| Friday | 760 |
| Saturday | 413 |
| Total | 4,687 |

(3) Calls for Service By Type of Call:

The following table outlines the number of calls, by call type, for 2014 and 2015 YTD.

| Call Type | Number of Calls 2014 - 2015 YTD |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Other | 10 |
| After Hours - Emergency Services Assistance | 31 |
| After Hours - Injured animal | 11 |
| After Hours - Threat to public safety | 4 |
| Animal for protective custody | 40 |
| Animal Mistreated | 27 |
| Animal trapping violation | 1 |
| Cat at large | 170 |
| Cat bite | 10 |
| Cat found | 241 |
| Cat in trap for pick up | 98 |

| Call Type | Number of Calls 2014 - 2015 YTD |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Cat injured | 22 |
| Cat Lost | 1 |
| Cat mistreated | 4 |
| Cat to release | 33 |
| Cat trap request | 35 |
| Dead animal | 270 |
| Dog at large | 1,502 |
| Dog attack (other domestic animal) | 113 |
| Dog barking | 810 |
| Dog bite | 105 |
| Dog found | 469 |
| Dog injured | 28 |
| Dog Lost | 23 |
| Dog mistreated | 13 |
| Dog Park regulations violation | 9 |
| Dog to release | 22 |
| Dog to release for Quarantine | 4 |
| Dogs in prohibited area | 3 |
| Dogs off leash | 4 |
| Dogs swimming at beach | 2 |
| Fail to stoop and scoop | 349 |
| Feeding Wildlife/Strays | 31 |
| Keep animal other than a dog or cat | 3 |
| Keep Exotic or other animals | 8 |
| Keep too many animals | 33 |
| Licence Follow Up | 1 |
| License requested | 40 |
| Livestock at large | 10 |
| Livestock in unzoned area | 5 |
| Miscellaneous | 40 |
| Potentially dangerous dog | 40 |
| Problems with wildlife | 2 |
| Requesting cat trap | 1 |
| Shelter inquiry | 6 |
| Wants to surrender animal | 3 |
| Total | 4,687 |

(4) Calls for Service By Month:

The following table outlines the number of calls, by month, for 2014.

| Month | 2014 Calls |
|-----------|------------|
| January | 180 |
| February | 150 |
| March | 204 |
| April | 271 |
| May | 295 |
| June | 262 |
| July | 298 |
| August | 256 |
| September | 295 |
| October | 175 |
| November | 182 |
| December | 193 |
| Total | 2,761 |

(5) Intakes per Month:

The following table summarizes various the intake reason / method during 2014.

| Intake | 2014 Total |
|------------------------------------|------------|
| Impound | 1,035 |
| Owner/guardian surrender | 344 |
| Protective custody | 19 |
| Quarantine | 8 |
| Return | 38 |
| Transfer from another organization | 6 |
| Total | 1,450 |

(6) Outcomes:

The following table outlines the number of various outcomes for 2014.

| Outcome Type | Female | Male | Unknown | Total |
|----------------------------------|--------|------|---------|-------|
| Adoption | 263 | 283 | 4 | 550 |
| Died | 12 | 12 | 0 | 24 |
| DOA | 26 | 28 | 9 | 63 |
| Euthanasia | 261 | 197 | 8 | 466 |
| Redemption | 111 | 198 | 1 | 310 |
| Transfer to another organization | 14 | 22 | 1 | 37 |
| Total | 687 | 740 | 23 | 1,450 |

The following table shows the outcomes for dogs from 2011-2013.

| Dogs | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Average |
|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| Impounded | 575 | 715 | 605 | 632 |
| Redeemed | 363 | 440 | 319 | 374 |
| Adopted | 161 | 193 | 160 | 171 |
| Euthanized | 52 | 100 | 53 | 68 |
| Dog Free Rides | 104 | 111 | 58 | 91 |
| DOA | 20 | 25 | 15 | 20 |
| Total | 1,275 | 1,584 | 1,210 | 1356 |

The following table shows the outcomes for cats from 2011-2013.

| Cats | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | Average |
|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| Impounded | 857 | 876 | 941 | 891 |
| Redeemed | 32 | 55 | 60 | 49 |
| Adopted | 286 | 345 | 347 | 326 |
| Euthanized | 531 | 465 | 441 | 479 |
| Dog Free Rides | 9 | 15 | 4 | 9 |
| DOA | 37 | 44 | 89 | 57 |
| Total | 1,752 | 1,800 | 1,882 | 1811 |

(7) Calls for Service Per Month By Municipality for 2014:

The following chart shows the number of calls by municipality, by month, for 2014.

| Municipality-2014 | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Total Calls |
|-------------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| Azilda | 9 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 12 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 14 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 84 |
| Bleazard Valley | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Capreol | 1 | 2 | 13 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 2 | 13 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 67 |
| Chelmsford | 9 | 7 | 6 | 10 | 18 | 13 | 18 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 16 | 13 | 137 |
| Coniston | 0 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 31 |
| Copper Cliff | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 32 |
| Dowling | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 19 |
| Falconbridge | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 |
| Garson | 11 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 14 | 9 | 9 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 101 |
| Hanmer | 12 | 17 | 6 | 10 | 17 | 16 | 16 | 12 | 23 | 18 | 12 | 11 | 170 |
| Levack | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 46 |
| Lively | 3 | 5 | 10 | 9 | 15 | 13 | 13 | 5 | 11 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 105 |
| Mc Crea Heights | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Naughton | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Onaping | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 26 |
| Skead | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Sudbury | 115 | 99 | 127 | 180 | 184 | 166 | 191 | 162 | 190 | 104 | 105 | 113 | 1,736 |

| Municipality-2014 | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Total Calls |
|-------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| Val Caron | 5 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 11 | 12 | 9 | 4 | 5 | 12 | 86 |
| Val Therese | 3 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 24 |
| Wahnapitae | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 38 |
| Wanup | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 |
| Whitefish | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 13 |
| Worthington | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Total | 180 | 150 | 204 | 271 | 295 | 262 | 298 | 256 | 295 | 175 | 182 | 193 | 2,761 |

(9) Listing of Revenues:

The following chart shows revenue amounts generated by various fees in 2014 and 2015 YTD (again, at the time this was compiled full data for 2015 was not available). 2015 YTD information was through August / September.

| Fee | 2014 | 2015 YTD |
|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Impound Fee | \$13,400.00 | \$6,450.00 |
| Boarding-Shelter | 5,550.00 | 2,355.00 |
| Surrender Dog | 22,560.00 | 9,960.00 |
| Surrender Cat | 14,220.00 | 7,380.00 |
| Adoption Fee | 65,267.50 | 27,327.00 |
| Miscellaneous | 1,952.50 | 800.00 |
| Licenses | 11,800.00 | 4,131.48 |
| Pick Up & Delivery | 2,116.25 | 920.00 |
| Sales Tax | 13,130.17 | 6,114.16 |
| Total | \$149,996.42 | \$65,437.64 |

This background information regarding workloads, revenue sources, and other characteristics of the current service levels may be beneficial during discussion regarding service options and alternatives. Additionally, this type of information will be useful for future vendors regarding the historical work volumes associated with the animal services contract.

3. COMMUNITY SURVEY SUMMARY

The Matrix Consulting Group conducted a survey of City of Greater Sudbury stakeholders in order to receive their feedback regarding various aspects of Animal Control Services in their community. This survey was active from September 10th through September 20, 2015 and was distributed both in electronic and paper format. The survey, which was available in English and French, had 825 completed responses.

1. INTRODUCTION TO THE PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE OF THE SURVEY

The survey consisted of three sections. The first section consisted of 34 positively-phrased statements about Animal Control Services to which respondents were asked to select from one of the following responses: “strongly agree”, “agree”, “neutral”, “disagree”, “strongly disagree”, and “N/A”. For purposes of this analysis, strongly agreeing and agreeing responses have been grouped together in some places (such as tables) in this document, as have disagreeing and strongly disagreeing. The last two sections included open-ended prompts providing stakeholders the ability to list their three most important changes that should be made in Animal Control Services in Greater Sudbury as well as the opportunity to give their opinions and thoughts on any issues related to Animal Control Services.

While responses to the survey are confidential, respondents were asked at the beginning of the survey to provide some information about themselves. This included the length of time that residents lived in the City of Greater Sudbury, whether they lived in an urban or rural part of Sudbury, and if they have had contact with Animal Control

Services in the last year and, if so, in what capacity. The following tables breakdown their responses.

| How long have you lived in the City of Greater Sudbury? | |
|--|-------------------------|
| Length of Residence | % of Respondents |
| < 5 years | 4.7 |
| 5-9 years | 5.3 |
| 10-14 years | 4.9 |
| 15-19 years | 5.7 |
| > 20 years | 79.4 |
| Total | 100.0 |

| Do you live in an urban or rural part of the City of Greater Sudbury? | |
|--|-------------------------|
| Residence | % of Respondents |
| Urban | 69.1 |
| Rural | 30.9 |
| Total | 100.0 |

| In the past year have you had any contact with the Animal Services? | |
|--|-------------------------|
| Response | % of Respondents |
| Yes | 47.0 |
| No | 53.0 |
| Total | 100.0 |

| If you have had contact with Animal Services, in what capacity has it been? | |
|--|-------------------------|
| Type of Interaction | % of Respondents |
| Field Enforcement | 27.0 |
| Shelter Services | 27.6 |
| Both Enforcement & Shelter Services | 18.9 |
| Other | 26.5 |
| Total | 100.0 |

2. MULTIPLE CHOICE STATEMENT RESPONSES

The first group of statements in this section had to do with the degree to which Animal Services meets the expectations of residents of the City of Greater Sudbury. The following table provides responses to those statements.

(1) Residents do not feel that Animal Control Services meets their expectations, especially in relation to Adoptions and Registration of dogs and cats.

As the chart below indicates, over 58 percent of respondents disagreed and/or strongly disagreed that Animal Control Services meets their expectations with less than one quarter of respondents stating that they agree and/or strongly agree that their expectations for such services were being met, in particular regarding adoptions and registrations of dogs and cats.

| Statement | Agree & Strongly Agree | Neutral | Disagree & Strongly Disagree | N/A |
|---|------------------------|---------|------------------------------|------|
| 6. In general, City of Greater Sudbury's Animal Services meets my expectations. | 23.6% | 14.3% | 58.7% | 3.4% |

Most residents feel strongly that Animal Services is not meeting their expectations in many of the service areas as the following chart shows. Of particular dissatisfaction are the public education component, field services including enforcement and animal care in the shelter. Urban resident's dissatisfaction with the adoption process were 17% higher than rural residents. Urban residents also were approximately 15% more dissatisfied with animal care in the shelter services than those who lived in a rural part of Greater Sudbury.

| Statement | Satisfied & Highly Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied & Highly Dissatisfied | N/A |
|--|------------------------------|---------|------------------------------------|-------|
| 7a. Field Services (enforcement activities such as response to calls, stray animals, etc.) | 23.1% | 18.4% | 49.5% | 9.0% |
| 7b. Animal Care in the Shelter (including redemptions) | 21.2% | 15.9% | 53.5% | 9.4% |
| 7c. Adoptions | 26.6% | 22.8% | 38.2% | 12.4% |
| 7d. Public Education | 18.1% | 14.4% | 60.4% | 7.1% |
| 7e. Registration of Dogs and Cats | 25.6% | 28.3% | 36.0% | 10.1% |

The points below explore the differences in responses based on resident's experience with Animal Control Services.

Statement #6 – “In general, Greater Sudbury's animal services meets my expectations”.

Respondents who had interaction within the last year were 13% more likely to agree with this statement. Only 17% of those who did not interact with Animal Services in the last year agreed with this statement. Both groups however had an unfavorable view of approximately 58%. Approximately 22% of residents agreed with this statement versus 47% for non-residents. 65% of those who used field enforcement disagreed with this statement.

Statement #7a – “Animal Services meets my expectations for field services”.

Overall, 23% of respondents were satisfied with 49% dissatisfied. Those who had interaction in the last year agreed with this statement 18% more than those who did not have any interaction. Urban and rural responses were both around 49% in disagreement whereas rural residents were 5% more likely to agree with this statement. 65% of those who used field enforcement disagreed with this statement compared to 37% from those who used shelter services.

Statement #7b – “Animal Service meets my expectations for animal care in the shelter”.

Generally, 21% are satisfied and 54% are dissatisfied with this statement. Urban and rural residents had similar response levels regarding their level of dissatisfaction while rural respondents were 5% more favorable towards this service. Those who used Animal Services in the past year however had a much more favorable view and agreed at 28% versus non-users who agreed at only 13.5%. Only 20.6% of field enforcement users agreed with 29.8% of shelter service users agreeing.

Statement #7c – “Animal Service meets my expectations for adoptions”.

Of the total responses, 27% were satisfied while 38% were dissatisfied. Those who had interaction within the past year were twice as satisfied than those who did not. Over 34% of users agreed with this statement compared with 17.8% for non-users. Urban residents disagreed at a much higher rate (50.5%) than rural residents (33%) with this statement.

Statement #7d – “Animal Service meets my expectations for public education”.

The overwhelming majority (61%) of all respondents were dissatisfied while only 27% were satisfied. Both urban and rural residents level of disagreement were similar whereas the level of agreement was 8% higher for rural residents. Those using services within the last year were twice as likely to agree with this statement, however the level of satisfaction was only 23%.

Statement #7e – “Animal Service meets my expectations for registration of dogs and cats”.

Overall, 26% of respondents were satisfied with 36% dissatisfied. Users of animal services within the past year were 7.5% more satisfied as well as dissatisfied than non-users. Urban residents disagreed with this statement at 37.5% versus 32.7% for rural ones. Rural residents were 4% more likely to agree with this statement. Shelter service users were satisfied 34.9% of the time versus 20.6% for field enforcement.

A review of the survey results indicates that those respondents who had interaction with Animal Services within the past year were generally more satisfied with all areas of service than those who did not have any interaction. In many service areas, the level of satisfaction for users was double the percentage of non-users with Field Services 18% higher, adoptions approximately 17% higher and animal care 15% higher. The level of dissatisfaction with non-users were generally 8% higher compared with those who used Animal Services within the past year. The differences between urban and rural residents was not as dramatic in most areas except for adoptions, which urban residents were 17% more likely to be dissatisfied with this service.

(2) Residents believe that the current approach to Animal Services needs to be a high priority and that Greater Sudbury should have a “No Kill” policy. The majority of residents do not have a high opinion on the current program.

This section of statements focused on how the current level of services are viewed, whether there should be a “No Kill” policy and gauging the support for partnering with a private contractor or having the City of Greater Sudbury take over responsibility. Recent users of Animal Services tend to have a much more favorable impression than those who have not utilized services within the past year. The following table outlines the responses to these statements and shows that the services listed in this section are not viewed favorably.

| Statement | Agree & Strongly Agree | Neutral | Disagree & Strongly Disagree | N/A |
|--|------------------------|---------|------------------------------|-------|
| 8a. I view animal services as a high priority for the City of Greater Sudbury. | 80.0% | 5.8% | 13.8% | 0.4% |
| 8b. I have a high opinion of the current Animal Services Program. | 37.3% | 19.1% | 41.2% | 2.4% |
| 8c. Animal Services is prompt in responding to problems raised by the community. | 20.2% | 20.1% | 51.0% | 8.7% |
| 8d. Animal Services makes effective use of partnerships with community groups and rescue organizations. | 23.8% | 19.0% | 49.4% | 7.8% |
| 8e. The licencing process for dogs/cats is fair and reasonable. | 34.0% | 22.3% | 36.3% | 7.4% |
| 8f. Animal Services is responsive to law enforcement needs. | 21.1% | 27.7% | 35.4% | 15.8% |
| 8g. Animal Services does a good job promoting adoption services. | 24.1% | 15.9% | 55.7% | 4.3% |
| 8h. The City of Greater Sudbury should have a formal "No Kill" policy. | 76.5% | 7.1% | 15.7% | 0.7% |
| 8i. I support partnering with a private contractor for animal services. | 56.8% | 18.7% | 19.9% | 4.6% |
| 8j. I believe that the City of Greater Sudbury should directly provide Animal Services through City of Greater Sudbury employees even if there is a cost increase. | 51.3% | 17.6% | 25.5% | 5.6% |

Statement #8a – “I view Animal Services as a high priority for the City of Greater Sudbury”.

Just over 80% of respondents agree with this statement with only 13.8% disagreeing. As is evident, residents strongly believe the City of Greater Sudbury should have a great focus on Animal Services. Urban (81%) and rural (76.4%) resident's responses to this statement were representative of the overall feedback. Those with recent contact and as well as those without contact showed similar feedback.

Statement #8b – “I have a high opinion of the current Animal Services Program”.

Overall, 37.3% of respondents agree with this statement while 41.2% did not. Users of the service had a more favorable reaction (44.2%) versus non-users (30%). There was not a discernable difference in responses from urban and rural participants. Users of shelter services agreed at 49% compared with only 38.5% for field enforcement.

Statement #8c – “Animal Services is prompt in responding to problems raised by the community”.

Just over half of respondents did not agree with this statement. Agreeing and no opinion were the same at 20.1%. Recent users again were more pleased with

services in general and were 18% more favorable than non-users. Rural residents were 5.5% higher than urban residents regarding agreement with this statement. 57% of those who used field enforcement disagree with the statement whereas 44.5% of shelter were disagreeable.

Statement #8d – “Animal Services makes effective use of partnerships with community groups and rescue organizations”.

Only 23.7% of all respondents agreed with this statement with roughly half of all responses not believing this area is focused on enough. Recent user's positive reaction to this statement was double that on non-users (30.7% compared with 15.7%).

Statement #8e – “The licencing process for dogs/cats is fair and reasonable”.

Overall, this statement resulted in an almost even split regarding agreeing (34.1%) and disagreeing (36.2%). Recent users and non-users alike had similar responses as well as urban and rural residents.

Statement #8f – “Animal Services is responsive to law enforcement needs”.

Only 21.1% of all respondents agreed with this statement with 27.7% remaining neutral and 35.4% disagreeing. For recent users, 28% of respondents agreed whereas non-users had only a 11.4% positive response. Disagreement between these two groups were separated by only three percentage points. Field enforcement users disagreed 39% of their responses compare to 30.6% for shelter users.

Statement #8g – “Animal Services does a good job promoting adoption services”.

Overall, this statement drew the largest negative response to all the statements in this section (55.7%) with only 24.2 agreeing. Recent users however had a favorable response (32.3%) compared to non-users (15%). Recent users also disagreed with this statement at 48.4% compared to 64.2% for non-users. Urban residents were more likely to disagree with this statement by an additional 8%. 34% of shelter users agree with this statement while 46.4% disagree.

Statement #8h – “City of Greater Sudbury should have a formal “No Kill” policy”.

Although this statement received significant agreement (76.6%), recent users represented 70.6% versus 82.9% for non-users. Only 15.7% disagreed with this statement. This statement generated strong reaction with only 7.1% of respondents remaining neutral whereas this response to other statements in this section tended to have percentages in the high teens to low 20's. Urban responses were in line with the 76.6% agreement level whereas rural responses were closer to 72.9%.

Statement #8i – “I support partnering with a private contractor for animal services”.

More than half of all responses (56.6%) agreed with this statement. Disagreeing and remaining neutral split the remaining responses, roughly 19% each. Regarding recent users versus non-users, the responses were fairly consistent with the overall totals. 56.5% of field enforcement users agree and 59.6% of shelter users agree.

Statement #8j – “I believe that the City of Greater Sudbury should directly provide Animal Services through City of Greater Sudbury employees even if there is a cost increase”.

Overall responses generally fell in line with the statement regarding partnering with a private contractor for animal services. Recent and non-user responses were consistent with the overall responses.

(3) Residents believe there are a number of potential enhancements to improve Animal Control Services in the City of Greater Sudbury.

This group of statements within this section focused on the current operations and practices of Animal Services. Clearly, the vast majority responses believe that there are a number of areas that can be improved upon particularly with requiring all animals that are adopted through animal service having the requirement to be spayed or neutered as well as increasing programs to address feral cats, having alternative adoption sites, and establishing response time standards for responding to calls for injured or stray dogs and cats. The following table outlines residents' responses to each of the statements.

| Statement | Agree & Strongly Agree | Neutral | Disagree & Strongly Disagree | N/A |
|--|------------------------|---------|------------------------------|------|
| 9a. Implementation of a "No Kill" policy for all dogs entering the pound. | 79.9% | 5.0% | 15.0% | 0.1% |
| 9b. Implementation of a "No Kill" policy for all cats entering the pound. | 74.9% | 7.3% | 17.7% | 0.1% |
| 9c. Increased programs to address feral cat populations. | 87.0% | 4.7% | 8.0% | 0.3% |
| 9d. Requiring all euthanasia to be conducted by a veterinarian. | 80.0% | 3.8% | 15.6% | 0.6% |
| 9e. Establishing response time standards for responding to calls for service (i.e. - stray or injured dogs / cats). | 85.7% | 6.0% | 7.4% | 0.9% |
| 9f. Extending the holding period for dogs and cats taken into the pound to provide a longer time for owner redemption prior to making the animal available for adoption. | 75.1% | 8.8% | 14.9% | 1.2% |
| 9g. Providing alternative adoption sites in the community in addition to the current location (for example, a satellite adoption center). | 88.1% | 5.9% | 5.6% | 0.4% |

| | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|------|------|
| 9h. Requiring all animals adopted through Animal Services to be spayed or neutered. | 90.7% | 3.1% | 6.0% | 0.2% |
| 9i. Animal behavioral evaluation upon impound to determine adaptability of the animal. | 76.5% | 12.2% | 9.8% | 1.5% |

Statement #9a – “Implementation of a “No Kill” policy for all dogs entering the pound”.

Almost 80% of all respondents agreed with this statement. For recent users, 74.7% agreed with 85.4% of non-users agreeing. The disagreement for recent users was 19.8% compared to 9.2% for non-users. 82% of urban residents agreed with 74% of rural ones agreeing. Rural resident's negative responses were more than double urban ones.

Statement #9b – “Implementation of a “No Kill” policy for all cats entering the pound”.

Responses for “No Kill” policy for cats were very similar to those for dogs. Agreement with this statement was about 5% lower than the percentage for dogs. Rural residents tended to disagree at a much higher rate (23.6%) versus urban (15.1%). Recent users were more than 10% lower (70%) than non-users (80.6%) in agreeing with this statement and had a much higher level of disagreement (24% to 11.6%).

Statement #9c – “Increased programs to address feral cat populations”.

The over-whelming majority of respondents (87%) would agree with increasing programs for feral cats. Urban and rural responses were very similar and in line with the overall response totals. Recent users disagreed at a higher rate (11.7% to 3.3%) than those who have not used services within the past year.

Statement #9d – “Requiring all euthanasia to be conducted by a veterinarian”.

Almost 80% agreed with this statement with 15.8% disagreeing. 74.6% of recent users agreed while non-users agreed with 86.5%. Urban users followed the trend of recent users and rural responses were in line with non-users.

Statement #9e – “Establishing response time standards for responding to calls for service (i.e. –stray or injured dogs/cats”.

More than 85% agreed with this statement. There was some wide discrepancy with agreement between recent users (79.3%) and non-users (92.5%). The level of disagreement was substantial as well with recent users at 13.2% versus 1.5% for non-users. Urban and rural responses were very similar and reflected the overall totals.

Statement #9f – “Extending the holding period for dogs and cats taken into the pound to provide a longer time for owner redemption prior to making the animal available for adoption”.

75% felt this was a good idea while about 15% disagreed. Non recent users agreed with this (84.2%) far greater than recent users (67.3%). 72% of field enforcement users agreed with this statement versus 64.8% for shelter services.

Statement #9g – “Providing alternative adoption sites in the community in addition to the current location (for example, a satellite adoption center)”.

87.5% of all respondents agreed with this statement. Overall, responses were very consistent with various respondent groups.

Statement #9h – “Requiring all animals adopted through Animal Services to be spayed or neutered”.

This statement received the largest positive response with more than 90% agreeing. Only 5.9% disagreed with this statement. As with the previous statement, responses were very consistent with various respondent groups.

Statement #9i – “Animal behavioral evaluation upon impound to determine adaptability of the animal”.

More than 76% of respondents agreed with this statement. This statement also had the most neutral responses in this section (11.9%). Recent users were 11% less agreeable than non recent ones (71.4% versus 82.3%) and 10% higher is disagreement (14.2% versus 4.5%).

(4) This section related to funding issues/options of potential enhancements to Animal Services.

Roughly 50% of respondents felt that a combination of licencing fees and property taxes were agreeable. However, between one quarter and one third of responses felt that services should not be added if overall costs increase. The following table outlines residents' responses to each of the statements.

| Statement | Increased Licencing Fees | Increased Property Taxes | Combination of Licencing Fees & Property Taxes | Increased Costs Should Not Be Funded |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| 9a. Implementation of a "No Kill" policy for all dogs entering the pound. | 20.2% | 9.6% | 49.2% | 21.0% |
| 9b. Implementation of a "No Kill" policy for all cats entering the pound. | 19.4% | 9.4% | 46.3% | 24.9% |
| 9c. Increased programs to address feral cat populations. | 17.3% | 14.6% | 45.7% | 22.4% |
| 9d. Requiring all euthanasia to be conducted by a veterinarian. | 16.5% | 11.1% | 48.1% | 24.3% |
| 9e. Establishing response time standards for responding to calls for service (i.e. - stray or injured dogs / cats). | 16.1% | 11.8% | 45.9% | 26.2% |

| | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 9f. Extending the holding period for dogs and cats taken into the pound to provide a longer time for owner redemption prior to making the animal available for adoption. | 18.7% | 9.7% | 43.3% | 28.3% |
| 9g. Providing alternative adoption sites in the community in addition to the current location (for example, a satellite adoption center). | 14.5% | 13.1% | 44.5% | 27.9% |
| 9h. Requiring all animals adopted through Animal Services to be spayed or neutered. | 22.2% | 12.2% | 45.8% | 19.8% |
| 9i. Animal behavioral evaluation upon impound to determine adaptability of the animal. | 18.6% | 8.7% | 41.5% | 31.2% |

Statement #10a – “Implementation of a “No Kill” policy for all dogs entering the pound”.

49.2% of respondents selected funding this statement with a combination of licencing fees and property taxes while 20.2% would like it funded through licencing only and another 21.1% not wanting to fund any increase cost. Urban residents were less receptive to paying through any combination of increased fees and taxes (73.2%) versus rural who were at 80.4% willingness to fund.

Statement #10b – “Implementation of a “No Kill” policy for all cats entering the pound”.

Overall, responses to funding this enhancement was very similar to that for dogs. Residential responses were about three percent lower for willingness to fund compared with that for dogs.

Statement #10c – “Increased programs to address feral cat populations”.

About 78% of respondents were in favor of funding this program. As with every enhancement listed in this section, the majority of responses (44% to 49.2%) would fund them with a combination of increased licencing and property taxes. 32.1% of shelter users do not support funding this initiative.

Statement #10d – “Requiring all euthanasia to be conducted by a veterinarian”.

Just over 75% would agree to additional cost charges to fund this idea. Non recent users agreed with this statement at a much higher rate (81.8%) than recent users (74%).

Statement #10e – “Establishing response time standards for responding to calls for service (i.e. –stray or injured dogs/cats”.

Keeping in line with other potential enhanced services in this section, about 74% were willing to fund it, again with about 46% suggesting through a combination of licencing and property taxes. Rural residents were willing to fund this at a much higher level than urban ones (80.4% to 70%). For those who used both services, roughly 40% would not support funding increased costs.

Statement #10f – “Extending the holding period for dogs and cats taken into the pound to provide a longer time for owner redemption prior to making the animal available for adoption”.

This statement was the second least favorite in this section with 28.4% stating that this service should not be funded if there are increased costs to bear by residents. Recent users agreed at 66% whereas non recent users agreed at 77.8%. 28.2% of field enforcement users agree whereas only 29.7% of shelter users agree.

Statement #10g – “Providing alternative adoption sites in the community in addition to the current location (for example, a satellite adoption center)”.

This enhancement was favored for funding by 72%, leaving 28% feeling that they should not cover increased costs associated with this option.

Statement #10h – “Requiring all animals adopted through Animal Services to be spayed or neutered”.

Over 80% of all respondents were willing to pay for this enhancement which is the highest in this section. Urban residents however were less likely to agree to fund this with about 23.2% against the proposal.

Statement #10i – “Animal behavioral evaluation upon impound to determine adaptability of the animal”.

31.1% of respondents were not in favor of being responsible for funding this enhancement. Rural residents were opposed by 36% compared to 29% for urban citizens.

3. RESIDENTS ARE LOOKING FOR A NUMBER OF CHANGES TO THE CURRENT ANIMAL CONTROL SERVICES THEY CURRENTLY RECEIVE.

The last two sections of the survey asked respondents what are the three most important changes that should be made in Animal Control Services in the City of Greater Sudbury and to provide any additional comments that they would like to share with the project team. The following summaries the most common themes of residents' responses.

- A “No Kill” policy should be implemented.
- Euthanasia should be more humane and performed by a veterinarian.
- Field enforcement needs to improve regarding responsiveness and effectiveness.
- More emphasis/requirement should be in place for spay/neutering.

- Adoption efforts could be improved.
- Need to address feral cat issue.

These issues listed above were indicative of the many responses provided. The “No Kill” policy resonated with the majority of responders to this survey. In addition, residents strongly believe in addressing the following areas: spaying and neutering (along with assisting with cost); increasing public education; and increasing enforcement and response times. They are also concerned that if an animal is to be put down, that a veterinarian be utilized. While the survey showed many residents believe there are areas of Animal Services that could be improved, they have also show a willingness to fund enhancements via licencing, property taxes or a combination of both to pay for the increased cost associated with doing so.

4. ANALYSIS OF SERVICE DELIVERY STRUCTURE

This chapter outlines how the existing service delivery structure of animal service care compares to other municipalities, summarizes the cost of providing services, and recommends the future structure of Animal Services.

1. A COMPARISON TO OTHER ANIMAL SERVICES PROGRAMS SUPPORTS A CHANGE IN THE SERVICES CONTRACTED.

In our review of Animal Control Services for the City of Greater Sudbury, we reached out to other municipalities to inquire as to how they provide animal control services to its' citizenry, whether through in-house staff, contracted services with a third party or, a combination of both. The municipalities surveyed included the following:

- Timmins, Ontario
- Chatham-Kent, Ontario
- Cape Breton, Nova Scotia
- Halifax, Nova Scotia
- Kawartha Lakes, Ontario
- Hamilton, Ontario
- Ottawa, Ontario
- Saanich, British Columbia
- Burlington, Ontario
- Richmond, British Columbia
- St. John's, Newfoundland

A wide range of municipalities were reviewed with regard of various population size and geographic area, in order to have comparison cost information for Animal Services. We found that all but St. John's utilizes a third party for shelter services, typically through the local Humane Society. Three of the cities in our survey group, Chatham-Kent, Timmins, and Cape Breton contracted all animal control and shelter service functions with a third party, similar to the City of Greater Sudbury. As such,

these municipalities provide the closest cost comparison for the City of Greater Sudbury. The following chart shows the cost per capita for all costs associated with animal control for the three cities noted above as well as for the City of Greater Sudbury:

| Municipality | Population | Size (km) | Contract Cost | Cost Per Capita |
|------------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| Greater Sudbury | 160,274 | 3,227 | \$599,999 | \$3.74 |
| Chatham-Kent | 103,671 | 2,458 | \$539,626 * | \$5.20 |
| Timmins | 43,165 | 2,979 | \$175,000 | \$4.05 |
| Cape Breton | 97,398 | 2,433 | \$386,625 * | \$3.97 |

* Contracted costs for Chatham-Kent and Cape Breton are shown at 2014 levels.

As the table above shows, the City of Greater Sudbury's cost per capita is actually the lowest of the three comparable cities that fully contract all animal control related expenses. The average of the other communities is \$4.41 cost per capita. At this rate, the City of Greater Sudbury would expend approximately \$707,000 annually for services. While it is difficult to control for all variations on the level of service provided, it is fair to say that the City of Greater Sudbury's current service levels – while strong – are not deemed best in class and that to achieve this will require additional resources. However, it is important to note that the City of Greater Sudbury's cost per capita compares extremely favorably to these other communities.

Of the remaining eight cities in our survey group, all provided non-shelter services through in-house employees. Of the eight, five cities have dedicated staff for animal control enforcement whereas three cities have staff who perform additional by-law duties, such as parking violation enforcement. The following chart summarizes the

number of employees participating in animal control enforcement along with an indication if they have additional duties:

| Municipality | Population | Size (km) | Animal Control Employees (FTE) | Comments Regarding Animal Control Services |
|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Halifax | 390,096 | 5,490 | 7 | Dedicated animal control staff. |
| Kawartha Lakes | 73,214 | 3,083 | 8 | Municipal law enforcement officers also perform other by-law duties. |
| Hamilton | 519,949 | 1,117 | 33.6 | Dedicated animal control staff. |
| Ottawa | 883,391 | 2,790 | 40 | Municipal law enforcement officers also perform other by-law duties. |
| Saanich | 109,752 | 103 | 2 | Pound Inspectors also perform other by-law duties. |
| Burlington | 175,779 | 185 | 8.7 | Dedicated animal control staff. |
| Richmond | 190,473 | 129 | 1 | In addition to one (1) dedicated animal control employee, the City contracts for two (2) others through the Richmond Animal Protections Society. |
| St. John's | 106,172 | 446 | 12 | Dedicated animal control staff. |

Because costs for these communities are not maintained by Animal Control expenditures specifically, it was not possible to get reliable figures from all communities on the annual expenditure for the provision of Animal Control Services - only Burlington has budget details solely representing animal control expenditures. The remaining seven have budget information that is combined into a larger budget (i.e. – By-Law Operations), and therefore cannot be used for direct expenditure comparisons.

For example, while Hamilton has dedicated animal control staff, their related costs are combined in the City's Emergency and Protective Services budget and are not broken down for use in our cost analysis. As mentioned, Burlington does have a dedicated animal control budget showing costs related to its 8.7 FTE's and is highlighted in the chart below:

| Municipality | Population | Size (km) | Budgeted Expenses | Cost Per Capita |
|--------------|------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Burlington | 175,559 | 185 | \$888,209 | \$5.05 |

As shown, Burlington – most comparable in population to the City of Greater Sudbury than the other comparative entities shows a per capita cost of \$5.05 or \$1.31 per capita higher than the City of Greater Sudbury. If the City of Greater Sudbury allocated this level of resource to its animal control programs, the annual budget would be approximately \$809,000. Consistent with highlighted costs throughout, expenses are shown at the gross amount and do not reflect any potential offsetting revenue enhancements.

This comparative survey shows that at the present time, the City of Greater Sudbury appears to be funding animal services at a level below that of other comparable communities. While increased funding is always difficult to allocate, it does demonstrate – by one measure – that the total annual expenditures is excessive in comparison to costs incurred by other jurisdictions; though, again, it is important to note that not all service levels are consistent across these jurisdictions.

Finding: The City of Greater Sudbury spends a lower per capita annual expenditure for animal control services than comparable jurisdictions.

2. THE CITY OF GREATER SUDBURY HAS AN OPPORTUNITY TO INCREASE THE REVENUES RECEIVED THROUGH LICENCING FEES.

To estimate the level of potential revenue that the City of Greater Sudbury can achieve from pet licencing, it is necessary to estimate the actual dog and cat population within the City of Greater Sudbury. According to a report by Alberta Agriculture and Forestry, 57 percent of the 7.5 million Canadian Households own pets. Cats are more popular pets than dogs with 37 percent of Canadian households owning one (1) or more

cats and 32 percent owning one (1) or more dogs. Overall Canada is home to roughly 5.9 million dogs and 7.9 million cats. This data was developed from a long term market research project which included the use of various survey techniques.

For our projections on the number of dogs and cats in the City of Greater Sudbury, we utilized a formula developed by the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) – one that is routinely utilized in the industry - that estimates the number of animals in a given community based on its' population. AVMA created a formula that projects the number of households that own dogs and cats and then translates that information into the estimated overall pet population. The City of Greater Sudbury's population based on the 2011 census of 160,274.

Applying the AVMA formula, 14% of City of Greater Sudbury's population, or 22,500 will be dog owners. Of that amount, each will own on average 1.6 dogs for a total of 36,000 dogs in the community. For cats, approximately 11.7% of the City of Greater Sudbury's population or 18,740 will be cat owners. Of that amount, each will own on average about 2.1 cats for a total of 39,329 in the community. Based on the AVMA formula, the total pet population of City of Greater Sudbury is estimated at 75,329 as the following chart shows:

| Animal | Percent of Population (160,274) Owning Pet | Number of Pet Owning Households | Average Number of Pets Per Household | Estimated Pet Population |
|---------------|---|--|---|---|
| Dogs | 14.0% | 22,500 | 1.6 | 36,000 |
| Cats | 11.7% | 18,740 | 2.1 | 39,329 |
| Total | | 41,240 | 1.8 | 75,329 |

Utilizing the estimated pet population figures shown above, the following chart highlights projected pet registration revenue based on varying levels of collection. The

current annual registration fee is \$30 for each dog and cat. However, this fee is reduced to \$15 per animals for the following: animals that are spayed/neutered; senior discount; and for animals registering after October 31st of the given year. For estimated revenues, this analysis assumes that 50% of dog and cat registrations will pay \$30 and 50% will pay \$15 per animals as illustrated in the chart that follows:

| Animal | Registration Fee | Number of Animals | 100% Collection | 85% Collection | 65% Collection | 50% Collection |
|--------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Dog | \$30 | 18,000 | \$540,000 | \$459,000 | \$351,000 | \$270,000 |
| Dog | \$15 | 18,000 | \$270,000 | \$229,500 | \$175,500 | \$135,000 |
| Cat | \$30 | 19,665 | \$589,935 | \$501,445 | \$383,458 | \$294,968 |
| Cat | \$15 | 19,665 | \$294,968 | \$250,722 | \$191,729 | \$147,484 |
| Total | | | \$1,694,903 | \$1,440,667 | \$1,101,687 | \$857,452 |

For 2014, annual revenues collected by the City of Greater Sudbury and RDAS for dog and cat registrations totaled approximately \$148,000. As shown in the above projections, greater compliance with registration would have a significant impact on potential revenues, which would offset costs associated with the animal control services program. Using the estimated dog and cat population figures in the community, even at a 50% compliance level with registering these animals would result in an annual increase in revenue from \$148,000 to more than \$857,000.

This is a major unrealized revenue stream that can off-set the costs of providing services within the City of Greater Sudbury. Since the pet population is estimated, and not based upon any quantifiable objective census, the City of Greater Sudbury should be conservative in future revenue projections. However, there is undoubtedly extensive room for growth in revenue realization.

The City of Greater Sudbury should implement a much stronger effort to register pets within the City of Greater Sudbury's boundaries to provide a dedicated revenue stream to support the provision of services. Since most of the revenue received will be "new funds" not previously received by the City of Greater Sudbury, some portion of these could be utilized for enhanced services or incentives to increase registration such as the provision of a lifetime registration at a reduced fee. For example, there are limited examples of communities that will provide a lifetime registration for a fee comparable to 10 year of registration. For pets registered under this program that are owned longer than 10 years, the City of Greater Sudbury may not realize the same revenue amount as would be achieved through annual registrations, the benefits of increased registration and compliance with the registration requirement has other benefits worth considering.

Recommendation: The City of Greater Sudbury should place the highest priority on pet registrations to provide a dedicated revenue stream to support the provision of its Animal Services programs.

2. THE CITY OF GREATER SUDBURY SHOULD PROVIDE ANIMAL CONTROL BY-LAW ENFORCEMENT AND GREATER ANIMAL SERVICES PROGRAM OVERSIGHT BY CITY OF GREATER SUDBURY EMPLOYEES.

As previously noted, the majority of communities surveyed shows that a more common practice is to provide animal control by-law enforcement by City of Greater Sudbury employees. While it is feasible to contract this out (as other communities including the City of Greater Sudbury have done), the enforcement of municipal by-laws is best accomplished with city staff who are well-trained, accountable to City of Greater Sudbury officials, and have greater experience in dealing with the public, interpreting and enforcing by-laws, and have no conflicts of interest (real or perceived) related to the

enforcement. The current practice of contracting this out to the same provider that performs pound services can create a perception issue regarding preferential enforcement of a focus on revenue generation.

After consideration of all alternatives, and the work loads historically seen for field enforcement activities, the project team recommends that the City of Greater Sudbury bring this enforcement action in-house and that by-law officers be cross utilized, as is done in most other communities, to provide animal services by-law enforcement.

This will require additional by-law Officers, estimated at three full-time positions – though this number may increase based upon the actual service levels to be provided, as determined through policy decisions, related to service enhancements outlined later in the report. For estimation purposes, the annual salary and benefits cost per position was estimated at \$81,250.

The following table summarizes the estimated costs associated costs with bringing this function in-house.

| Cost Element | Estimated Annual Cost |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 3 By-Law Officer (Salary / Benefits) | \$243,750 |
| Annual Vehicle / Equipment Expenses | \$27,000 |
| Training / Clothing | \$4,000 |
| Field Computer / Software Access | \$10,000 |
| TOTAL | \$284,750 |

The most difficult component to estimate is the reduction in the current costs associated with the contract expenditures from bringing this component of service in-house. The current contract does not segregate all services by field or pound services and therefore makes a reliable estimate difficult. It is clear that the cost of salaries and benefits will be greater for City of Greater Sudbury employees than contracted services.

Based upon prior experience, the project team estimates that the City of Greater Sudbury may see a reduction in the contracted service amount of approximately \$150,000 to \$175,000 for a net cost increase of approximately \$110,000 to \$135,000. It should be noted, that if revenue increases are realized, all of this amount could be offset through increased revenues.

Recommendation: The City of Greater Sudbury should conduct animal services by-law enforcement through the use of City of Greater Sudbury employees.

3. THE CITY OF GREATER SUDBURY SHOULD CONTINUE TO CONTRACT FOR POUND SERVICES.

While pound services could also be brought in-house, as in done in some selected other cities, the analysis conducted by the project team on the costs of doing so, indicate that this appears to be cost-prohibitive. Since the City of Greater Sudbury does not have a current pound that can be utilized, it would either need to retrofit an existing facility is has, lease a space, or construct a new facility. Leasing and/or retrofitting an existing space will vary in case depending upon location, but estimated costs of doing this could range from a low of \$75,000 to retrofit an existing space owned by the City of Greater Sudbury to over a \$1,000,000 if a new state-of-the art Animal Shelter with veterinarian facilities and adoption center are desired.

Additionally, the cost of providing this service with City of Greater Sudbury staff would increase compared to the costs of providing the service through contracted vendors. As shown in the by-law analysis above, this would increase personnel costs by up to 45% of existing costs of service provision. This would increase the total annual expenditures on Animal Control Services (field operations and pound services) from around \$600,000 to almost \$900,000.

After review of the existing service provided, and the expressed interest and availability of other pound service providers in the area, this is an option that should only be considered during the next round of the RFP if insufficient interest is not identified in the community. While this could delay the ultimate decision on provision of pound services, the benefits versus costs do not favor bringing this service in-house. If increased revenues can be achieved, then in the future, this is an option that may be more cost effective for the City of Greater Sudbury to consider.

However, there is the potential to increase the level of competition in the bidding of pound services to increase competition, reduce overall cost, and provide more than one (1) service vendor – reducing the City of Greater Sudbury's risk of having only one (1) pound service provider. While not utilized by other communities, it is a realistic alternative for use in the next bidding process. The City of Greater Sudbury should allow future bidders on pound services, to bid to provide them to either the entire City of Greater Sudbury geographic area, or a smaller service area. It is recommended that no more than three service areas be defined. Based upon the City of Greater Sudbury's geography and layout, reasonable alternatives would be: Service Area 1 – Northeastern City of Greater Sudbury, Service Area 2 – Western and Southwestern City of Greater Sudbury, and Service Area 3 – densely incorporated greater downtown area of the City of Greater Sudbury. Vendors should be allowed to bid to provide services in one, two or all three of these areas. Under this approach, the City of Greater Sudbury would be responsible for establishing standards regarding the software to be utilized by vendors for managing animal populations under their control and providing a consolidated webpage for the pounds to ensure that the public has a single place to visit to seek

adoptions, view animals available for reclaiming, and getting information regarding services. The provision of a consolidated software system, available for use by all vendors, should not exceed \$50,000 in one (1) time costs.

Recommendation: The City of Greater Sudbury should continue to contract out for pound services rather than bring these services in-house.

Recommendation: To increase competition and the potential for a larger number of qualified bidders, the City of Greater Sudbury should bid pound services with options to provide for the entire City of Greater Sudbury or one (1) of three (3) smaller service areas.

4. AN ADDITIONAL MANAGERIAL POSITION IS NEEDED TO PROVIDE THE NECESSARY TIME TO EFFECTIVELY OVERSEE ANIMAL SERVICES.

The provision of animal services to a community, requires an individual who can dedicate his/her entire time and effort to overseeing the program, ensuring accountability for consistent and timely services, and develop the programs and community relationships necessary for a well-functioning program. This is not a part-time or additional duty that can be accomplished along with substantial other duties. To this end, the project team recommends that the City of Greater Sudbury implement an additional managerial position that can develop and administer the animal service program on a full-time basis in accordance with the future service levels adopted by the City of Greater Sudbury's Council. This position is especially critical if the City of Greater Sudbury brings by-law enforcement in-house and has multiple pound vendors. Coordination and establishment of the animal services protocols and developing relationships with rescue and volunteer groups will take dedicated time and effort to enhance the services to the public.

It is estimated that this position would cost approximately \$85,000 in salary and benefits.

Recommendation: The City of Greater Sudbury should dedicate a management position full-time to overseeing, administering and developing the Animal Services Program.

5. ANALYSIS OF SERVICE ALTERNATIVES

During the review and evaluation of the current operational practices of the Rainbow District Animal Control and Shelter Service (RDAC), several improvement opportunities were identified that would improve the efficiency and effectiveness of staff, the care of animals under control of RDAC, and improve the general level of services provided to customers. It is important to keep in mind, in reviewing these recommendations, several key issues that impact the operations of RDAC. These include:

- **RDAC operates under an “open admission” approach.** All animals acquired through field pick-ups and those brought to the shelter for surrender by owners are accepted without regard to current animal populations, space limitations, or staffing impacts. This service delivery approach provides greater challenges to managing animal populations at the shelter than organizations operating under a “limited admission” methodology.
- **The industry standard for “no-kill” animal service providers is a save rate above 90%.** According to RDAC, they currently reach a save rate of 90% for dogs and 56% for cats.
- **The Service Provider should work better to cooperate with other animal care providers in the region.**

In developing the recommendations contained in this report, the project team used the eleven core requirements of the no-kill philosophy as its strategic guide.

These are summarized in the following table (Source:

<http://www.nokilladvocacycenter.org/shelter-reform/no-kill-equation/>):

The 11 Tenets of the No-Kill Philosophy

| Tenet | Description | Status/Comment |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| Trap-Neuter-Release (TNR) | Trap-Neuter-Release (TNR) programs for free-living cats allow shelters to reduce death rates. | Currently, the City of Greater Sudbury does not have any TNR program in place. Effective implementation is typically conducted through partnerships with community organizations and rescue groups. |
| High-Volume, Low-Cost Spay/Neuter | No-and low-cost, high-volume spay/neuter reduces the number of animals entering the shelter system, allowing more resources to be allocated toward saving lives. | An allocation of additional funding to support the implementation of a subsidized spay and neuter program can assist in increasing compliance from those who are non-compliant due to financial constraints. There are many models available for consideration including the program implemented by Thunder Bay. Veterinarian's associations can be an important partner in effective implementation. |
| Rescue Groups | An adoption or transfer to a rescue group frees up scarce cage and kennel space, reduces expenses for feeding, cleaning, and killing, and improves a community's rate of lifesaving. | Currently, RDAC has indicated they do or have worked with a variety of rescue groups that operate in and around the City of Greater Sudbury area including: <i>Small Things CATS</i> , <i>Pets Need Love Too</i> , and transfers of dogs also transfers dogs through <i>Province of Ontario Breed Specific</i> and <i>All Breed Rescue Directory</i> . Some limitations on the use of rescue groups has occurred in the recent past due to some rescue groups lack of interest in working with the current vendor. A highly coordinated rescue group partnership managed by the City of Greater Sudbury is needed to achieve maximum save rates. |
| Foster Care | Volunteer foster care is a low-cost, and often no-cost way of increasing a shelter's capacity, caring for sick and injured or behaviorally challenged animals, and thus saving more lives. | No formal foster care program is currently in place. On an ad hoc basis, some fostering activities occur. A strong foster program is beneficial for communities that have adopted a no kill philosophy to deal with animals that need different socialization than can occur in the shelter, or where long-term pound habitation is causing behavioral issues. |

| Tenet | Description | Status/Comment |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| Comprehensive Adoption Programs | <p>Adoptions are vital to an agency's lifesaving mission. The quantity and quality of shelter adoptions is in shelter management's hands, making lifesaving a direct function of shelter policies and practice. If shelters better promoted their animals and had adoption programs responsive to community needs, including public access hours for working people, offsite adoptions, adoption incentives, and effective marketing, they could increase the number of homes available and replace killing with adoptions. Contrary to conventional wisdom, shelters can adopt their way out of killing.</p> | <p>All animals adopted from the Shelter are spayed or neutered. RDAC rates include \$130 for cats that need to be spayed or neutered and \$295 for dogs that need to be spayed or neutered. Dogs and cats that are already spayed or neutered are offered at the discounted rate of \$35 for cats and only \$70 for dogs.</p> <p>All pet owners are still required to purchase a license, which varies between \$10 and \$30 (for altered newly acquired pets) depending on the age of the applicant and where you live.</p> <p>All animals deemed suitable for adoption are vaccinated at the end of the redemption period.</p> <p>Overall, RDAC saw 550 adoptions in 2014 versus 465 kills and 310 redemptions. RDAC saw a 56% save rate for cats and 90% save rate for dogs.</p> <p>Adoption programs are promoted on the website and social media. Some events are hosted to promote adoptions but no set incentives are in place. Some of the partner groups do have reduced rates for adoptions funded through local fundraising.</p> |

| Tenet | Description | Status/Comment |
|--|--|--|
| Pet Retention | While some surrenders of animals to shelters are unavoidable, others can be prevented—but only if shelters work with people to help them solve their problems. Saving animals requires shelters to develop innovative strategies for keeping people and their companion animals together. And the more a community sees its shelters as a place to turn for advice and assistance, the easier this job will be. | <p>Efforts are made to make sure potential owners are prepared for the responsibilities of pet ownership. No formal retention programs are in place. RDAC does informal discussions with animal owners who are surrendering their animals based on their experience.</p> <p>No resource handbook is in place to guide animal owners on available support options, nor are there any programs to provide specific financial assistance to those in need. These programs are generally funded by non-profits (not the City of Greater Sudbury) and cover medical care or temporary sustenance support for those with temporary financial difficulties.</p> |
| Medical & Behavior Programs | To meet its commitment to a lifesaving guarantee for all savable animals, shelters need to keep animals happy and healthy and keep animals moving efficiently through the system. To do this, shelters must put in place comprehensive vaccination, handling, cleaning, socialization, and care policies before animals get sick and rehabilitative efforts for those who come in sick, injured, unweaned, or traumatized. | <p>According to the organization's policies and procedures manual, all treatments, vaccinations and medicine information are to be documented and noted on kennel cards and adoption materials.</p> <p>Owners are to be provided with all medical records upon adoption and informed about the animal's health information.</p> <p>No formal behavior programs are in place.</p> |
| Public Relations/Community Development | Increasing adoptions, maximizing donations, recruiting volunteers and partnering with community agencies comes down to increasing the shelter's public exposure. And that means consistent marketing and public relations. Public relations and marketing are the foundation of a shelter's activities and success. | <p>Adoptions are advertised through social media, the organization's website and public events.</p> <p>The website and social media also ask for donations and volunteers with applications forms online.</p> <p>No other forms of donations, or volunteer recruitment is immediately present.</p> |

| Tenet | Description | Status/Comment |
|------------------------|--|---|
| Volunteers | Volunteers are a dedicated "army of compassion" and the backbone of a successful no-kill effort. There is never enough staff, never enough dollars to hire more staff, and always more needs than paid human resources. That is where volunteers make the difference between success and failure and, for the animals, life and death. | <p>A limited volunteer program is currently in place. The organization also uses a co-op student program to assist with operations. More volunteer use could benefit the organization.</p> <p>The organization's animal care partners appear to utilize volunteers to a greater extent. Volunteer programs are generally a critical component of providing a comprehensive animal care service in communities as it is cost-prohibitive to staff at a level sufficient to meet all needs (especially those, such as daily walks, interactive play time, socialization, behavior modification - that go beyond basic care).</p> |
| Proactive Redemptions | One of the most overlooked areas for reducing killing in animal control shelters are lost animal reclaims. Shifting from a passive to a more proactive approach has allowed shelters to return a large percentage of lost animals to their families. | <p>The redemption period is 72 hours. Rules are in place regarding the showing of animals during the redemption period. During redemption period, animals can't be placed into foster care or adoption.</p> <p>People calling to adopt animals can be added as a "wants" on the animal record. However, no guarantees are made that they will be able to adopt.</p> <p>A strongly enforced licensing program designed to increase the percentage that are licenced increases the ability of Animal Control Officers to be more proactive in tracking down owners. Additionally, ACOs while in the field should canvas the neighborhood where animals are found to see if ownership can be determined.</p> |
| Compassionate Director | A hard-working, compassionate animal control or shelter director not content to continue killing, while regurgitating tired clichés about "public irresponsibility" or hiding behind the myth of "too many animals, not enough homes." | This tenet is less quantifiable and objective. However, moving forward, there is no doubt that the City of Greater Sudbury's representative allocated to oversee Animal Services (whether performed in-house or contracted) is engaged in ensuring high levels of service, advocating for animal services, and providing frequent oversight to all contractors, rescue groups and volunteers that participate in service provision. |

If the City of Greater Sudbury desired to move to a “No Kill” status, as many in the community appear to desire, a comprehensive effort that addresses each of these tenets should be developed. This approach can be adopted without regard to the decision reached by the City of Greater Sudbury regarding whether City staff provide services, it remains completely contract out, or a hybrid approach is utilized.

The following sections address, for each of these tenets, a brief summary of the project team's assessment of where the City of Greater Sudbury stands at the current time in addressing each tenet. Additionally, where applicable, further improvement opportunities are noted that will improve the shelter's ability to strengthen their focus and further implement each tenet to continue their achievement as a no-kill community.

1. FERAL CAT TRAP-NEUTER-RELEASE (TNR) ASSESSMENT.

This initiative should be a high priority for the region. The City of Greater Sudbury could partner with rescue groups to implement an enhanced feral cat trap and release program. This program essentially traps feral cats, neuters them, and returns them to their original location. To minimize the negative public perception that sometimes arises from feral cat trap and release programs (where residents do not want the animals returned), continued public education regarding the purpose and benefits should occur. This humane and effective method to manage feral cat colonies is widely accepted and has been successful in other Ontario municipalities such as Toronto, London, Windsor and Chatham-Kent and is popular worldwide.

As one example of a TNR program implemented in the greater regions is an example of a program implemented in Thunder Bay. Superior Street Cats was created in early 2015 as a sub-committee of the Friends of the Animals Group in the City of

Thunder Bay. Superior Street Cats is working in partnership with the City's Animal Services Department to establish a six-month pilot project to Trap, Neuter and Return feral cats within Thunder Bay. The primary goal of Superior Street Cats is to reduce both the number of free-roaming cats in the community and the number of cats impounded and euthanized by Animal Services. TNR also costs less than sheltering and euthanizing cats and the program principally on donation and grant money.

Thunder Bay Animal Services, in partnership with Superior Street Cats (a sub-committee of the Friends of the Animals Group) received approval from City Council on Aug.31, 2015 to establish a six-month pilot project to Trap, Neuter and Return (TNR) feral cats within the City. The Pilot Project will be funded from the Animal Services Donation Reserve Fund at a cost of \$8,000, and Animal Services has applied for a \$5,000 grant through PetSmart Charities of Canada.

Recommendation: The City of Greater Sudbury should allocate \$15,000 to conduct a comprehensive pilot-program to support implementation of a TNR program. This funding should be distributed through a competitive process.

Recommendation: The City of Greater Sudbury and the Service Provider should actively promote the benefits of a trap and release program to educate the public about the merits of the initiative.

Recommendation: Continued funding of the program after the pilot-program should be based upon performance of the participating groups, and the impact on reducing the feral cat population. Grant and fundraising should be developed as a primary funding mechanism.

2. HIGH-VOLUME, LOW-COST SPAY AND NEUTER PROGRAM ASSESSMENT.

All animals adopted from RDAC have been either spayed or neutered and limited programs are available to assist residents who have a need for financial assistance in spaying or neutering pets.

The City of Greater Sudbury should consider partnerships with rescue groups to develop a more comprehensive and expanded program. The City of Greater Sudbury should increase efforts to proactively promote a low-cost spay and neuter options on their website; including information on other community resources that are available to residents to spay or neuter their pets. Additional community support and funding should be sought to ensure that all responsible pet owners seeking to have their pets spayed or neutered, but are without financial means to accomplish this, have financial support to do so.

The City of Greater Sudbury should hold periodic public events and proactive earned media initiatives to educate the public on the benefits and availability of, support for spaying and neutering pets. Many effective low cost spay and neuter programs are developed in partnerships with veterinarians and their professional associations to service those who qualify (who may not have a regular veterinarian). Additionally, some veterinarians will provide reduced fees for those participating through the program.

To maximize the impact of the available funding, the City of Greater Sudbury should implement a means based test to determine participant qualification with free or reduced cost vouchers provided to those who qualify. Providing vouchers on a means basis will maximize the number of animals that may be served through the City of Greater Sudbury's investment.

Recommendation: The City of Greater Sudbury should allocate \$20,000 annually to support implementation of an expanded spay and neuter program and explore additional partnerships including rescue groups and veterinarians.

Recommendation: The City of Greater Sudbury should highly publicize available spay and neutering programs through public education events, proactive media initiatives, its website and social media channels.

3. RESCUE GROUP PARTNERSHIPS ASSESSMENT.

Currently, the City of Greater Sudbury's vendor has a strong working relationship with several rescue groups. Additionally, there are some strained relationships with other rescue groups for a variety of reasons.

While it's positive that RDAC has relationships with a number of animal rescue groups in the City of Greater Sudbury area, working relationships are fractured with some other animal care groups and should be improved. A concerted effort must be made to rebuild these relationships to ensure a better-coordinated service is provided for local area residents and to meet the no-kill objective.

One approach for coordinating the efforts of the City of Greater Sudbury area's no-kill community would be for the City of Greater Sudbury to hold a quarterly meeting with other interested parties. Such meetings could focus on opportunities for cooperation, strategies for improving communication when shelters are nearing capacity and other emerging issues that impact the no-kill community. This partnership is one of the most critical elements that must be in place to achieve the City of Greater Sudbury's desired goal.

This review presents an opportune time for all parties to step back and reflect on their common goal and develop the working relationship necessary to achieve this goal.

Recommendation: The City of Greater Sudbury must strengthen the working relationships with all rescue groups. A quarterly coordination meeting should be held between the City of Greater Sudbury and representatives of each rescue group to develop strategies for working together, increasing dialogue, and addressing issues that arise in a timely manner.

4. FOSTER CARE ASSESSMENT.

As the City of Greater Sudbury seeks to increase the save rate for animals within the pound (most particularly for dogs) the utilization of a well-developed foster program is important. Foster programs can increase the number of animals it can provide assistance to especially those that are not suitable for long-term care in a pound. In addition to providing relief during periods of overcrowding, foster programs in other jurisdictions have demonstrated many other benefits; including the opportunity for fostered animals to develop better socialization skills through increased interaction with humans than they would have received at the shelter. Many dogs develop minor behavioral problems if they are housed at a pound operation for extended period of time. If these behavioral issues are not address, they may become less suitable for placement.

As part of future efforts, to increase services and partnerships with the community and rescue groups, the City of Greater Sudbury should create a foster program for appropriate animals at the shelter. This initiative should include a database of suitable people for providing foster homes, provide training and education to these individuals regarding their roles, and place animals waiting for adoption with these individuals. This initiative could provide relief for pound operations during times of peak capacity at the pound. There are extensive models available on developing such programs and many rescue groups are familiar with this approach as it is one they often utilize to manage and care for animals under their care. They would be a good resource to assist in developing this program for the City of Greater Sudbury. Volunteers – many who are looking for alternative ways to assist the City of Greater

Sudbury, other than walking dogs or through fundraising may be suitable candidates for this program.

Recommendation: The City of Greater Sudbury should work in collaboration with the rescue groups to develop a foster care program to provide an additional avenue for placement of animals, on a temporary basis during times of overcrowding at the pound or to socialize animals back to a home environment after extended periods of time at the pound.

5. COMPREHENSIVE ADOPTION PROGRAMS ASSESSMENT.

In order to raise awareness pound animals as a source for future pets, and to promote animals currently available for adoption, the City of Greater Sudbury should coordinate a comprehensive adoption outreach and education effort throughout the year. If, as recommended, the City of Greater Sudbury continues to contract out pound operations, the City of Greater Sudbury should require as part of the RFP responses, a level of proactive adoption effort from each vendor selected. The City of Greater Sudbury should consider, within available financial resources, the creation of adoption incentives; including reduced or no cost adoptions during specific periods of time (often associated with high pound volumes). Many shelters in North America use these incentive programs to place animals in permanent homes. While this approach reduces revenues from adoption fees, it also reduces the cost of care for animals (food, medical, etc.). Ultimately this approach can help shelters reach their no-kill goal. If the City of Greater Sudbury were to adopt a no-kill philosophy, the cost of care of animals should be considered relative to the minor revenue received from adoptions.

RDAC provides access to shelter services seven days a week (Monday through Sunday) and enforcement by Animal Control Officers Monday through Sunday. Animal

Control Officers are on call evenings and weekends to address emergency situations.

The following table outlines the specific service hours by function:

| Center Location / Function | Operating Hours |
|--|--|
| Rainbow District Animal Control and Shelter Services | Monday – Sunday: 8:30 a.m. - 6:00 p.m. |
| Animal Control Field Services | Monday – Sunday: (Staff conduct after hours pick-ups as needed) |

RDAC is providing a high level of access to service by operating seven days a week and providing services on weekends. Providing variety in operating hours provides greater access for residents of the City of Greater Sudbury to take advantage of the services available at a time convenient to their personal schedules.

The contractor is currently meeting most of the operating guidelines regarding hours of operation and access to services. Due to individual work schedules, some residents may not be able to easily access services during the current operating hours. The Service Provider may find it beneficial to decrease Sunday hours (e.g. reduce operations to 12:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.) and increase hours during one (1) week night (e.g. Wednesday from 8:30 a.m. – 9:00 p.m.) to improve convenience for citizens.

The Service Provider may also find it beneficial to partner with other organizations in the community to showcase pets for adoption. For example, a cat café in Vancouver (Café) has partnered with the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals to introduce cats to potential owners. During the first three weeks of the partnership, 11 cats were adopted after owners met the animals at the café. The City of Sudbury may not be a large enough market for a Cat Café, however, other innovative partnerships may be available to showcase the animals.

Recommendation: The City of Greater Sudbury and the Service Provider should continue its focus on adoption programs.

Recommendation: The City of Greater Sudbury and the Service Provider should employ various adoption incentive events throughout the year and innovative partnerships.

Recommendation: The City of Greater Sudbury should consider requiring evening hours for adoptions at least one (1) night per week at the shelter.

Recommendation: The City of Greater Sudbury should consider innovative partnerships with organizations in the City of Greater Sudbury area to showcase animals available for adoption.

6. PET RETENTION ASSESSMENT.

Gaining a good understanding of why individuals are surrendering their pets can help staff determine if there are addressable issues that would result in the owner not seeking to surrender the animal. For example, there are times where individuals are facing medical issues, financial difficulties or lifestyle changes that have resulted in them being temporarily unable to maintain their companion animal. A formal pet retention policy should be developed and all Service Provider staff should have enhanced training on how to discuss pet surrender – in a sensitive manner – with clients. Staff should also learn to accurately discern the reason individuals are relinquishing their pet and how to present alternatives. These sensitive conversations require staff to be well trained in conversing with the public in a professional and caring manner. The surrender of a family pet can be quite an emotional decision for individuals and families.

If contractor staff are well trained to identify addressable and have appropriate resources available, they may be able to work with pet owners to prevent some instances of surrender from occurring. However, this requires staff to have resources to

draw upon; such as donations to provide food or medical care the owner is unable to provide or temporary fostering for owners with temporary medical issues that prevent them from providing appropriate care. Rescue groups, animal care charities and volunteers are key components for providing support and resources in this area.

Recommendation: Staff should create an enhanced sensitivity training instructions and training for all staff concerning how to appropriately discuss pet surrender with individuals bringing animals to the shelter.

Recommendation: The City of Greater Sudbury should develop a resource handbook that outlines community resources available to individuals who may need temporary assistance to support their ability to maintain their pet rather than choosing relinquishment.

7. MEDICAL AND BEHAVIOR PROGRAM ASSESSMENT.

A well-documented policy and procedure manual on medical and behavior programs is integral to providing quality care for animals and ensuring that suitable animals are placed for adoption rather than euthanized due to misdiagnosed behavioral issues.

(a) Medical Program.

In evaluating the medical protocols, shelter cleaning protocols, and similar policies and procedures related to animal care, disease management, and infection control, RDAC is generally compliant with recognized industry practices in these areas and have passed inspection standards in recent visitations. The medical protocols provide comprehensive guidance to staff in handling animals that do not require veterinarian intervention.

According to the organization's policies and procedures manual, all treatments, vaccinations and medicine information are to be documented and noted on kennel

cards and adoption materials. Owners are to be provided with all medical records upon adoption and informed about the animal's health history.

Training on animal behavior approaches for staff is also an important component of the overall skills necessary to operate an effective animal control operation. RDAC does not currently have a formal process in place. The following elements are important in the development of an effective behavior program:

(b) Behavior Program.

Integral parts of a comprehensive shelter behavior program, should include:

- Behavioral assessment test upon intake,
- Behavioral history / relinquishment questionnaire,
- A behavioral guideline or plan for the shelter,
- Trained professional behaviorist on staff (or available on contract),
- Foundation behavior and training program,
- Behavioral problem modification program,
- Screening during the adoption stage,
- Behavioral counseling (pre and post adoption), and
- Follow-up after adoption.

The City of Greater of Sudbury and the Service Provider should develop a comprehensive animal behavioral program. The most critical and immediate short-term component is the behavioral assessment test and relinquishment questionnaire. These two components will enable staff to assess an animal's behavioral temperament quickly and identify issues that will impact the animal's adoption. This initiative will require staff to receive additional training on how to conduct such assessments.

Recommendation: All animals should be assessed in a timely manner for pre-existing medical conditions and behavioral problems upon intake.

8. PUBLIC RELATIONS / COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT.

A key feature of communities that achieve no-kill status is an effective and sustained public awareness campaign. Such an initiative must ensure the public is aware of City of Greater Sudbury's services it provides. Further, the public must also understand how and where to access services and view animals available for redemption and adoption. RDAC has several key components of this program in place, such as a website, Facebook presence, and utilization of press releases and other public education campaigns.

For instance, Burbank, California's Pet Animal Service's division has partnered with the Burbank Leader Newspaper to tweet out a "Pet of the Day" that is available for adoption. Official Twitter accounts for the City of Vancouver, Winnipeg and Brampton will also regularly highlight pets that are available for adoption or pet-related events.

The City of Greater Sudbury and the Service Provider must develop a plan to increase public awareness about the benefits and improvements in the save rate that have been achieved, and other accomplishments and activities. The City of Greater Sudbury can more effectively distribute information through the website with a redesign of its current approach. While there is an appropriate amount of information available on the website, it is not always well laid out or easy to find. Additionally, the City of Greater Sudbury should hold regular community meetings, in conjunction with local animal service providers, to publicize the achievements that have been made; for

example, the 90% save rate for dogs. Such meetings should also solicit public input and support for reaching other goals.

Recommendation: A strategic communications plan should be developed by the City of Greater Sudbury that identifies initiatives to increase transparency, promote animals that are available for adoption and enhance public awareness. This should include development of periodic newsletters, community meetings and a redesign of the website. Further, the City of Greater Sudbury is in a great position to help promote the adoption of animals through its social media channels.

9. VOLUNTEER PROGRAM ASSESSMENT.

One critical component to providing animal control services in a cost effectively manner for municipalities, is the utilization of volunteers to supplement municipal (or contractual staff). At the present time, there is a small component of approximately a dozen volunteers who regularly walk dogs at the Shelter. For communities of this size, the volunteer base typically numbers between Forty (40) to eighty (80) in number – though activity and participation levels vary. In addition to volunteers, RDAC also benefits from co-op students who help out weekly. Other organizations that help out with animal care in the area also utilize volunteers. For example, Small Things Cats uses approximately thirty (30) volunteers on an annual basis.

Based upon experience and discussions with other shelters, the City of Greater Sudbury should seek to increase its volunteer base. The majority of work currently tasked to volunteers is related to walking dogs. However, volunteers could be utilized in a number of additional activities, including:

- Providing administration assistance at adoption centers to support full-time staff.
- Cleaning the facility,

- Animal Socialization,
- Animal Screenings (with some restrictions),
- Public Education Support and Event Attendance, and
- Fundraising

There are many other avenues to further utilize volunteers to supplement the time and efforts of City of Greater Sudbury or contracted staff, and improve the well-being of animals under care. It is important that there is well-defined volunteer program including orientation and training. Typically, the greatest challenge has been the involvement of volunteers in providing services, matching their interests and skills with the needs of the animal services program, and clearly defining the role of volunteers.

This has been an extremely underutilized resource with further potential for enhancement and cost avoidance for the City of Greater Sudbury.

Recommendation: Develop a volunteer program to ensure there is a coordinated effort to improve recruitment, training, and utilization of volunteers to support pound operations, animal care, and adoption events.

10. PROACTIVE REDEMPTION ASSESSMENT.

Currently RDAC places all animals received on their website upon intake to make the public aware of animals at the shelter. However, this approach requires owners to search the website to determine if their pet is at the shelter.

The City of Greater Sudbury and its Service Provider(s) could benefit from a more aggressive strategy to canvass the community to determine unlicensed pets within the community to increase the percentage of animals licenced as this is the easiest way to return animals to their rightful owners. While the shelter has educational information

on its website and provides multiple methods for acquiring licenses, there will always remain a segment of the population that does not comply voluntarily. Animal Control Officers should increase their effort at proactive canvassing to identify unlicensed animals. A typical goal is three hours per week for community canvassing per Animal Control Officer. Ultimately, this activity will lead to an increase in the percentage of licensed pets in the community and the likelihood that pets will be reunited with their owners.

Recommendation: A proactive field canvassing program should be instituted for Animal Control Officers and volunteers to identify unlicensed pets.

6. ANALYSIS OF KEY RFP REQUIREMENTS

The prior RFP document utilized by the City of Greater Sudbury to solicit proposals for the provision of Animal Care Services was evaluated to identify potential barriers to the submission of proposals from viable vendors. It is critical, if any component of the Animal Services function remains contracted out, that the City of Greater Sudbury is able to receive as many viable responses to gain the most cost effective responses.

1. A REVIEW OF RFP REQUIREMENTS IDENTIFIED SOME MODIFICATIONS THAT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED TO INCREASE COMPETITION AND THE POTENTIAL NUMBER OF BIDDERS.

The project team reviewed several other RFP's for similar animal control services issued by other communities over the last several years. There are some requirements, required by the City of Greater Sudbury, that were more stringent than the other surveyed cities, and which may limit the number of responses received. The key issues identified are highlighted in the chart below:

| City of Greater Sudbury RFP Requirement | Halifax, NS | Richmond, BC | Cowichan Valley Regional District, BC | Erin, ON |
|--|----------------------|--|--|----------------------|
| Bid Deposit of \$17,500 for each of options A & B totaling \$35,000. No bid bond is accepted as an alternative. | No deposit required. | \$20,000 letter of credit security deposit, no cash. | No deposit required. | No deposit required. |
| Deposit is retained for duration of contract as performance guarantee. | N/A | Letter of credit through contract. | N/A | N/A |
| Deposit forfeited if awarded contractor not complying with agreement conditions within 14 days of notice of award. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| City of Greater Sudbury RFP Requirement | Halifax, NS | Richmond, BC | Cowichan Valley Regional District, BC | Erin, ON |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| General Liability insurance requirement of \$5 million. | \$2 million | \$5 million | \$5 million | \$2 million |
| Automobile Liability insurance requirement of \$2 million. | \$2 million | \$5 million | \$5 million | \$2 million |
| Non-compliance of contract areas equates to reduction in payments to vendor (similar to a fine) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Reference letter from proponents bank manager attesting to proponents financial capability to complete contract. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Reference letter from insurance company addressed to the City of Greater Sudbury attesting proponents ability to have insurance coverage required by City of Greater Sudbury. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Three years experience in care and keeping of companion animals. | Required personnel and management with expertise. | Required listing of personnel with animal experience. | General statement based on experience. | General statement based on experience. |

In an effort to potentially increase competition along with increasing service levels, accountability in the provision of services, and achieving a better price, we are suggesting minor modifications to language that has been included in the City of Greater Sudbury's prior RFP for animal control services. The modifications should expand the amount of competition available in the provision of services. The key changes are outlined in the following points:

- No longer require cash deposits that must be retained for the duration of the contract. A letter of credit, similar to Richmond's requirement should suffice. While many other communities did not require a letter of credit, or other means of ensuring performance, this is a reasonable requirement given the potential to select a vendor that has not provided services to the City of Greater Sudbury in the past.
- While most other communities did not include provisions that reduced payments to the vendor based upon non-compliance, some payment penalty should be imposed. Otherwise, the City of Greater Sudbury's only recourse is to cancel the contract and, in most cases, this is not the most appropriate initial response for non-compliance.
 - However, the basis for reductions in the payments should be revisited, refined and modified to be more meaningful.
- No longer require letter from proponent's bank manager attesting to proponent's financial capability to complete contract. For new potential vendors, who have not previously provided this service for a municipality, it may be difficult – if not impossible, for the vendor to secure this attestation. In lieu, the City of Greater Sudbury should consider requiring both a financial plan, and financial statements from the submitting vendor and conduct its own financial viability review.
- The City of Greater Sudbury should continue to require vendor to provide evidence that they will be able to acquire the required insurance coverage if awarded a contract for service.
 - The City of Greater Sudbury should consider a reduction in the insurance coverage levels to \$2 million in general liability coverage. While the amounts required by other municipalities is generally either at the \$2 million or \$5 million level, acquisition of coverage at the higher level may be a barrier for a new enterprise bidding on providing service to the City.
- The City of Greater Sudbury should list as a preferred requirement, that vendor's demonstrate three years' experience in care and keeping of companion animals. However, the City of Greater Sudbury should enable bidders to provide evidence of comparable or alternative experience that would substantially meet this requirement.
 - For example, should the City of Greater Sudbury choose to provide all field services with City of Greater Sudbury staff and contract only pound services, prior experience running a rescue operation, a private boarding operation, or other animal care service would be appropriate alternative experience.
 - However, if the City of Greater Sudbury determines to continue to contract all services, responding bidders who have not previously provided comparable services should be required to demonstrate how

they will acquire and train employees appropriately in by-law enforcement.

We believe these changes could increase the bid pool and provide the City of Greater Sudbury with additional qualified vendors for the delivery of animal control services either as currently contracted, or under alternative service delivery options (i.e. – provision of pound services only).

Finally, the City of Greater Sudbury should strongly consider modification to the approach to funding pound operations. At the present time, the vendor receives additional revenues (other than the cost paid by the City of Greater Sudbury directly) relative to various fees paid for adoption, a percentage of licencing fees paid to them, etc. In the future, it is suggested that all revenues received from adoptions, redemptions, licensing fees, etc. be submitted in totality to the City of Greater Sudbury and the pound Service Provider be compensated entirely based upon their bid to the City of Greater Sudbury. This will increase the transparency of operations, increase accountability, and provide a more precise approach to compensation. This approach may have increased variability than currently exists, as the amount paid may be established as a base fee for up to a set number of animals, with an increase for each additional animal maintained at the pound.

Recommendation: The City of Greater Sudbury should make minor modifications to the bidding process to increase the potential for increasing the number of potential bidders.

Recommendation: The City of Greater Sudbury should consider compensating pound vendors entirely upon a set bid price. All revenues received related to licencing fees, adoptions, redemptions, etc. should be remitted to the City.

2. MINOR MODIFICATIONS TO THE RFP PROCESS SHOULD BE INSTITUTED TO INCREASE THE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS.

Because of the City of Greater Sudbury's desire to maximize responses to the next RFP, several minor modifications should be implemented regarding the approach utilized in developing and issuing the RFP to maximize potential responses. Once policy decisions are reached regarding the level of service desired, the City of Greater Sudbury should develop a draft RFP outlining the service delivery approach desired (i.e. – contract all services, or contract only pound service) and the alternatives that it is willing to consider (i.e. – more than one (1) provider of pound services).

Once the draft RFP is developed, the City of Greater Sudbury should hold a public information session as part of the RFP educational process, to enable potential vendors to review the draft document, meet with staff to discuss the proposed terms and conditions, and provide input into additional potential modifications. This is essentially comparable to having a “pre-bid” conference, but would be completed earlier in the process to enable modifications to the RFP document prior to formal issuance. This provides potential vendors an opportunity to identify to the City of Greater Sudbury any terms or conditions that may be difficult to comply with, limit competition, or create an unfair bidding advantage to one (1) vendor or entity. The City of Greater Sudbury should review and consider all input received prior to finalization of the RFP document for issuance.

While, the project team strongly recommends that the City of Greater Sudbury seek input from potential vendors in developing an appropriate set of terms, conditions and requirements for RFP responses, we are in no manner suggesting that the City of Greater Sudbury eliminate all requirements that may limit responses. For example,

some entities, though well intentioned and who would provide a high level of service, may have issues complying with select insurance requirements in a cost-effective manner. However, since the City of Greater Sudbury has a legitimate business interest in managing risk and ensuring residents and others are adequately protected, the requirement for some level of general liability insurance is necessary – however, the specific amount required may be open for discussion.

Another key consideration is the term of the agreement. Short duration contracts tend to have higher costs than contracts with longer term – even without any change in the service provided. Vendors are reluctant to invest in new infrastructure, technology, or other service enhancements when they are not ensured of maintaining the contract in the future. The City of Greater Sudbury is highly likely to get most cost effective responses on a longer term contract. The City of Greater Sudbury should consider a contract term of at least 5 years, with options to renew for one (1) or two (2) three (3) year period if performance is satisfactory. Increases in the contract term can be done through a cost-of-living adjustment, or a negotiating period that occurs prior to contract termination. This discussion would need to occur sufficiently in advance of contract termination in order to enable the City of Greater Sudbury to go out to bid if necessary.

Finally, the City of Greater Sudbury should undertake, in advance of the potential bidders meeting, a comprehensive outreach effort to make all potential bidders aware of the upcoming contract opportunity. In addition to typical public outreach efforts undertaken (such as newspaper advertisements, and publication on the City of Greater Sudbury's website), the City of Greater Sudbury should consider directly notifying area

groups including veterinarians, rescue groups, doggie day-care providers, and similar entities about the opportunity and encourage their consideration of the RFP and attendance at the bidder's meetings.

Recommendation: The City of Greater Sudbury should modify the RFP process to provide an additional step in the process where the draft RFP is reviewed with interested vendors while in draft format. Potential vendors should be encouraged to provide input to the City regarding terms, conditions or requirements contained in the draft RFP where it may be difficult to achieve compliance.

Recommendation: The City of Greater Sudbury should review all input and feedback received, and finalize the RFP based upon balancing the desire to increase competition while protecting the City's financial interest and liability.

Recommendation: The City of Greater Sudbury should consider establishing an initial term of service at five years for a new contract with options to renew for an additional three years based upon either a cost of living adjustment, or a new negotiated rate.

Final Report Presentation – Evaluation of Animal Services

City of Greater Sudbury, Ontario



matrix 
consulting group

January 26, 2016

Key Decisions to be Made:

- ◆ Who provides services to the community:
 - ➔ A) Enforcement
 - ➔ B) Pound
- ◆ What service level is to be adopted by the City related to the animal care provided?
- ◆ Council will be provided with a decision based report in February.

Service Delivery Evaluation:

- ◆ The cost of providing Animal Services is comparable, and slightly less, than that of other jurisdictions.
 - ➔ Bringing all services in-house would increase costs anywhere between 1.25 to over 2 times existing costs, depending upon the infrastructure costs required for acquiring and managing a pound.
- ◆ Implementation of service enhancements, or a new service delivery structure, are likely to increase the cost of providing services.
- ◆ There is unrealized revenue potential from licencing that the City should pursue to offset the cost of providing animal control services.
 - ➔ Longer-term the City should adopt a cost recovery policy for animal services. Typically, this is well below 100% as few communities can achieve full cost recovery for this service.

Service Delivery Evaluation:

- ◆ The City should transition to providing Animal Services by-law enforcement in-house.
 - ➔ A majority of communities surveyed use by-law Officers for this purpose.
 - ➔ Blended By-Law / Animal Control Officers offer greater flexibility / service.
 - ➔ Three FTEs recommended to provide this service in-house (weekend and evening coverage)
- ◆ Given the infrastructure costs that would be incurred, the City should continue to contract out pound services, although alternatives should be considered:
 - ➔ Options should be allowed to bid on providing pound services for the entire City or smaller geographic areas (maximum of three recommended)
- ◆ Under this approach, the City should add a dedicated position to oversee Animal Services and develop new programs / services.
- ◆ Net total cost of implementation of this element is \$135,000 plus redeployed staff.

Key Principles of Low Kill Approach

The eleven core tenets of the Low Kill philosophy (90%+ adoption rate) are generally recognized as those below.

- ◆ Trap-Neuter-Release (TNR)
- ◆ High-Volume, Low-Cost Spay/Neuter Programs
- ◆ Rescue Group Partnerships
- ◆ Foster Care
- ◆ Comprehensive Adoption Programs
- ◆ Pet Retention
- ◆ Medical & Behavior Programs
- ◆ Public Relations / Community Development
- ◆ Volunteers
- ◆ Proactive Redemptions
- ◆ Compassionate / Accountable Management

Service Enhancement Alternatives:

- ◆ Trap-Neuter-Release (TNR)
 - ➔ The City should allocate \$15,000 to support a pilot TNR program.
- ◆ High-Volume, Low-Cost Spay/Neuter Programs
 - ➔ The City should allocate \$20,000 to support low cost spay/neuter program.
 - ➔ Participants should be selected based upon financial need.
- ◆ Rescue Group Partnerships
 - ➔ City should strengthen partnerships with rescue groups through a quarterly coordinating meeting of an Advisory Group.
- ◆ Foster Care
 - ➔ Collaborate with rescue groups to develop foster program.
- ◆ Comprehensive Adoption Programs
 - ➔ Maintain strong focus on adoption programs including special events.

Service Enhancement Alternatives:

◆ Pet Retention

- Encourage all vendors to develop staff training dealing with pet relinquishment including discussions with owner.
- Develop a resource handbook to assist owners with maintaining pets.

◆ Medical & Behavior Programs

- Full and timely assessments for medical and behavioral condition upon intake.
- The City should require all future vendors to develop and implement a behavior assessment program (with focus on long term sheltered animals and animals where behavior modification needed to increase adoptability).

◆ Public Relations / Community Development

- ◆ A strategic communications plan should be developed to increase transparency; enhance public awareness of programs, progress, and successes; and promote animals for adoption.

Service Enhancement Alternatives:

◆ Volunteers

- Volunteer program currently underutilized.
- In future years, the City should develop a coordinated volunteer program to support Animal Services.

◆ Proactive Redemptions

- Need to implement a field canvassing program by Animal Control Officers and volunteers to identify unlicensed pets.
- Animal Control Officers should spend time when picking up a stray animal canvassing the area to gain leads regarding animal ownership.

◆ Compassionate / Accountable Management

- The City should have a dedicated position to overseeing Animal Services operations and developing the relationships necessary to implement the service approach and programs adopted by the City Council.

◆ Total cost of implementation of this element is \$35,000 plus staff time.

RFP Process Modifications:

- ◆ Prior to reissuance, several RFP requirements should be considered for modification, including:
 - ➔ Review of general liability insurance levels.
 - ➔ Modification of experience requirement.

- ◆ The RFP Process should include the following actions to improve the number of potential bidders:
 - ➔ Conduct a pre-bidders meeting prior to issuance of RFP to enable interested parties to identify potential requirements or provisions that would inhibit their participation.
 - ➔ Conduct outreach to ensure wide-spread knowledge of the RFP process.
 - ➔ Target 5 year initial term with options for 3 year renewals.

Financing:

◆ Overall Service Delivery Costs:

| Current Cost | | Proposed Cost | |
|--------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| AS Contract | \$599,999 | Pound Contract | \$200,000 - \$450,000 |
| | | Service Enhancement | \$35,000 |
| | | 3 FTEs w/ veh/equip. | \$285,000 |
| Total Cost | \$599,000 | Total Cost | \$520,000 - \$770,000 |
| | | | |
| | | Revenue Increase 1st Yr | \$150,000 |
| Net Cost | \$599,000 | Net Cost | \$370,000 - \$620,000 |

Conclusion :

- ◆ The City is unlikely to provide Animal Control Services at an annual cost below that which is currently expended.
 - ➔ Service enhancements can be implemented for moderate costs.
 - ➔ Longer-term, potential to offset larger percentage of cost with new revenues.
 - ➔ Improved by-law enforcement and animal services.
 - ➔ Stronger community partnerships.

Recommendation:

- ◆ Who provides services to the community:
 - ➔ A) Enforcement – **Provide Animal Control By-law Enforcement by City Employees.**
 - ➔ B) Pound – **Continue contracting for pound services but with options for smaller geographic service areas.**
- ◆ What service level is to be adopted by the City related to the animal care provided?
 - ➔ **Formally adopt a Low Kill Service philosophy with a 90%+ adoption rate based upon the 11 recommendations (5.1 through 5.10)**