Dr. Cheryl Yuill
c/o Blue Cross Animal Hospital
734 Frederick Street
Kitchener, ON N2B 2B2

Mr. Chris Ginty and Ms. Heather Chapman
The Corporation of the City of London
300 Dufferin Ave
London ON N6A 4A9

Re: RFP12-28, Animal Welfare Services

February 10, 2013

I have provided you with evaluations of the proposals for RFP12-28, namely Animal Welfare Services for the City of London. According to the original proposal the scope of the proposal is to include the following:

- Education & Awareness Services for Responsible Pet Ownership (Adults and Children);
- Coordination of Community-based Animal Welfare Initiatives (including trap, neuter, return program for cats, volunteer coordination);
- Fostering & Adoption Facility(ies) and Program for Stray Cats;
- Fostering & Adoption Facility(ies) and Program for Stray Dogs;
- Pet Identification (Licensing) System;
- Animal Services Community Patrol;
- By-law Enforcement; and
- Shelter Facility for Stray and Impounded Animals

Accordingly, I reviewed both of the proposals (from UAM and PAWS) with the above criteria in mind, alnd also considered any enhancement of services to the proposals that would further the City of London's Vision and Mission with respect to Animal Services.

Both proposals appear to have a functional shelter design, based on models developed in other jurisdictions. Both appear to address issues such as precautions against disease outbreaks. However, the proposal from PAWS does not appear to contain sufficient space to accommodate the animals that they estimate will be entering the facility on a monthly basis (see my evaluation form for further details).

When considering the criteria laid out in the RFP, I feel that the proposal by UAM is the stronger of the two for several reasons. The primary reason is that UAM has a proven track record with the City of London for providing the services, and has a strong network of contacts that would be available to assist them in enhancing and improving the current services to meet the goal of bringing the City of London to the forefront in animal sheltering. In particular, UAM appears to be very cognizant of issues surrounding the entire animal shelter industry and shelter medicine, and appears to be very involved in humane organizations throughout North America.

In addition, UAM has a strong team that is currently trained, with specific experience in shelter management of the scope that would be required for the City of London, and has premises that currently meet the standards and would allow them to 'hit the ground running'.

The shelter design that UAM has proposed appears to be functional on its face, and appears to provide sufficient space for by-law enforcement, quarantine, lost and found, adoption, shelter medicine and basic veterinary care. Their design proposal includes two options, with the second option including enhanced veterinary care through a companion animal hospital.

With respect to the Acts, regulations and criteria that were cited for my reference (namely the OSPCA Act, regulations from OMAFRA and the ARA, and recommendations from the ASPCA and the Five Freedoms for Animals), UAM specifically mentions and/or addresses details of these criteria in their submission. Based on my knowledge of the above criteria, as well as my knowledge of other regulations including DOLA, the Pounds Act, the CVO regulations, etc., the proposal by both parties would meet the regulations. However, UAM appears to have direct working knowledge of the regulations that would be particularly relevant to this particular RFP.

For the reasons outlined above, at this point in time I am of the opinion that the proposal from UAM is more viable for the City of London's purposes. However, I recognize that I am only one of a group of evaluators and am eagerly awaiting input from those evaluators, as well as direct interviews with both UAM and PAWS before giving a final recommendation.

Yours respectfully

Dr. Cheryl Yuill