

Date: 03/11/2021

To: Chair and Directors, Committee of the Whole

And To: John MacLean, Chief Administrative Officer

From: Stuart Larson, Manager of Protective Services

Date of Meeting: Committee of the Whole_Nov18_2021

File: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Short Summary:

Animal Control Bylaw

Background:

As per direction from the Board that staff investigate expanded/expedited bylaw enforcement regarding animal control and dangerous dogs, staff looked into what was being done in other regional districts to provide a fair comparison of service level(s) with a focus on animal control. Out of all neighbouring regional districts, the Thompson Nicola Regional District was the only organization who even references animal control within their bylaws but is specific only to dangerous dogs. With that bylaw it should be noted that the service is not performed by bylaw staff but is contracted out for six of the ten electoral areas. It should also be noted that if a Dangerous Dog Bylaw is enacted, the RCMP can action complaints on behalf of the Regional District, but they would not be considered a priority call.

Municipal modeling was also explored to find a cost estimate for providing animal control. Outside of staffing for the service, having a dedicated kennel for seized animals would be the largest net impact to budget. Using an established organization such as the SPCA will require a contract to be put in place and average base contract pricing would be in excess of twenty thousand dollars per location plus incidentals such as veterinarian costs (where applicable) and euthanization. Personal protective equipment and training for staff would be marginal and generally a onetime cost.

With the provision of animal control, it should be noted that while it would provide a value-added service to those living in higher population areas such as the unincorporated communities, it would be difficult to provide timely service for remote areas of the Cariboo Regional District. Additionally, animal control is generally time consuming for regular bylaw staff depending on resources and travel time to approved kennel facilities. If it is the goal of the Board to put an animal control bylaw in place, it would be in the best interests of the bylaw department to seek additional staffing to ensure continuity of regular operations and in some cases, working alone would not be an option based on the level of risk to staff.

Based on the information provided to staff during this investigation, it would be recommended that animal control in general would not be an economically feasible service to provide either in the entirety of the CRD, or in selected electoral areas. It would, however, be recommended that a dangerous dog bylaw be explored and implemented as an additional safety mechanism for residents and a means of recourse for bylaw enforcement to deal with dangerous dogs. With several options for delivery, there would be reduced impacts to the current level of bylaw service, and it would be a minimal administrative burden.

Attachments:

n/a