

This policy is primary written to
address beavers in storm sewer
infrastructure

Because it only applies to city owned
lands which are generally
infrastructure and public spaces.

- **Most of the property in the city is privately owned, and most human / wildlife conflicts occur on private property or public roads and are a direct result of decisions made by council regarding development.**

- This policy is a response to the beavers that were killed this summer at Stoney Creek

- We learned about the lethal control of the Stoney Creek beavers because I filed a request for records through MFIPPA.
- The city released the invoice from the trapper and I circulated it.

- I asked for the records because when I tried to get updated by making an enquiry to the storm management dept. I was ignored.
- I also learned from the release of eternal records that the former manager of storm sewer operations made several attempts to avoid killing the beavers.

- Two years ago, a family of beavers were removed from the Stanton Drain. The manager of storm sewers along with staff from Aecom, searched to find an alternative site for the beavers within one kilometer of their original pond.
- They found none because there was no other woodland large enough to act as a food supply for the beavers. It wasn't until members of the public became involved that they were able to arrange the removal of the beavers to a sanctuary.

- The same protocol was used at Stoney Creek to remove the beavers.
- There was an attempt to find a suitable alternative. None was found.
- They did not appear to have permission to move the beavers out of the area.
- The same people who moved the Stanton Drain beavers to a sanctuary were contacted. They came to London and concluded that the beavers were not responsible for any flooding and refused to move the beavers.
- They also informed the city at that time that moving beavers is not a rule but an exception. The city cannot rely on moving beavers out of an area to resolve conflicts.

- In the end the City had the beavers killed.
- I am pointing this out to the committee because city staff have already utilized all options available to them to avoid killing beavers.
- But these options eventually run out if it is decided that beavers need to be removed.

- Therefore a good policy acknowledges a need to prevent conflicts as a first priority.
- This policy only addresses how to resolve conflict once it arises, only with beavers and applies only to city owned property which in most cases does involve residents.

- How can a human / wildlife conflict policy ignore its residents or the 'human' part .
- This policy does not address conflicts with White-tailed Deer.
- White-tailed Deer cannot be moved and they are not trapped. They are killed either by guns or bows.
- This is also true for coyotes. Coyotes cannot be moved and aggressive coyotes are generally baited and shot, not trapped.

- There are mitigating strategies for avoid conflict with urban animals but they are limited if the city continually evicts them from open spaces.
- Some of these mitigating strategies can be very cruel especially as it relates to beavers as one option to lethal control is to starve beavers by eliminating their food source i.e. wrapping trees.
- This policy is reactive to a incident where the city lethally controlled beavers.
- Good policies are proactive and not a knee-jerk reaction to a negative incident. A proactive approach would recognize wildlife as part of our communities, that increase recreational and intrinsic value of city living.
- A good policy would make room for wildlife by giving them space to roam without interfering with residential areas.