

## Bylaw No. 7860, The Animal Control Bylaw, 1999 Proposed Amendments

The following amendments to The Animal Control Bylaw, 1999 (the “Bylaw”) are proposed:

1. Revise the prohibited animals list to permit specific snakes from the Boidae and Pythonidae families

Justification: The Province of Saskatchewan’s (The Province) Captive Wildlife Allowed Species List was updated in June 2021. The Province engaged with an expert panel and stakeholder groups on revisions to The Captive Wildlife Regulations, 2021, in order to modernize various aspects of the legislation including the list of species that can be held without licensing and the licensing requirements for people or facilities to hold restricted wildlife in captivity.

The captive wildlife expert panel developed and used risk criteria and considerations, such as risk to public health and safety or invasiveness, to evaluate the appropriateness of species of wildlife to be kept in captivity. In particular, the following list of particular types of snakes in the Boidae and Pythonidae families are now able to be kept in captivity in Saskatchewan.

<b>Family Boidae (common names)</b>	<b>Family Pythonidae (common names)</b>
Kenyan Sand Boa	Children’s Python
Rough-scaled Sand Boa	Spotted Python
Red Sand Boa	Black-headed Python
Rosy Boa	Woma Python
	Darwin Carpet Python
	Jungle Carpet Python
	Green Tree Python
	Ball Python

Following the June 2021 provincial announcement of the updated Captive Wildlife Allowed Species List, Administration received inquiries and requests from the public to consider changing local bylaws to coincide with the new provincial laws, specifically in the laws on ownership of pythons and boas within city limits. The information was reviewed at the Animal Services Working Group in June 2021 and was recommended to be brought forward in a bylaw amendment report. Allowing the above-mentioned snakes, would better align the Bylaw with the Province in this regard and address the requests from members of the public.

2. Change definitions and references from “Animal Protection Officer” to “designated officer”

Justification: The Animal Protection Act defines “animal protection officers” and the term is used differently in the Bylaw than in the Act. It is preferable to use a term that distinguishes the officers under the Bylaw from the Act-defined animal protection officers. The Dangerous Animals Bylaw, 2003, currently uses the term “designated officers” and it is recommended that the same term be defined and used in the Bylaw.

3. Broaden an officer’s authority to demand identification

Justification: The Bylaw currently only allows officers to require identification from persons “to whom a Notice of Violation is being issued”. There are, however, other situations where an officer may require a person’s identification.

Officers may, for example require identification to determine whether a person is the person to whom a notice of violation should be issued. Similarly, officers may require identification to determine whether issuing a notice of violation or merely a warning is appropriate.

The proposed amendment would authorize officers to demand a person’s identification for investigative purposes similar to [Bylaw No. 9746, The Business Licence Bylaw, 2021](#).

4. Enable ticketing for “nuisances” in places other than off-leash areas

Justification: Currently “nuisance” offences apply only within an off-leash area. Adding a general nuisance offence would assist with addressing situations where a dog is problematic outside of an off-leash area, but a dangerous animal order is not warranted.

The bylaw currently states that a nuisance in an off-leash area includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- i) running at such a distance from its owner so as to be incapable of responding to voice or sight commands;
- ii) doing any act that injures a person or another animal;
- iii) chasing or otherwise threatening a person or another animal;
- iv) biting, barking at, or chasing livestock, bicycles or motor vehicles;
- v) excessive barking or howling or otherwise disturbing any person or other animal; or
- vi) causing damage to property.

The new nuisance charge will be modelled after the existing nuisance charge but modified to remove the behaviours related to being off-leash (at large), as that is a separate offence. Adding a general nuisance offence would give officers

discretion to either ticket for a nuisance or proceed with a dangerous animal order, as appropriate.

5. Remove references to Subsection 22(1) from Section 23

Justification: Subsection 22(1) does not exist and should instead refer to Section 22.

6. Add a provision clarifying that visitors from outside of Saskatoon who own a dog and utilize the off-leash areas must have a valid pet license from their place of residency

Justification: Allowing visitors with dogs that have a valid pet license, in their place of residence, supports the welcoming aspect the City of Saskatoon (City) wants for visitors experiencing the city.

Visitors who do not have a valid pet license, regardless of whether their place of residence has a licensing program, would be required to purchase a City animal license to utilize the off-leash areas. Visitors are not exempt from other rules applicable in off-leash areas, including Sections 5, 6 and 13 in respect of displaying a valid license tag or microchipping and removal of defecation.

If a visitor was to be stopped by a designated officer, the visitor would be required to show proof of a valid pet license for their dog.