

Attachment 2: Additional Research

Per direction from Council ([2025.EC18.8](#)), staff reviewed best practices for coyote management across comparable jurisdictions and tools and technologies for diversion. The jurisdictions reviewed for this analysis include British Columbia, Burlington, Calgary, Collingwood, Markham, Mississauga, Niagara, Oakville, Ottawa and Vaughan in Canada and Chicago, Los Angeles, Phoenix, Portland, San Francisco, Seattle, Town of Superior (Colorado), and Tucson in the US. These cities all follow a common approach of first utilizing public education, habitat modification, and aversion conditioning for coyotes, with situation-specific investigation to determine additional responses.

Aversion conditioning is a set of behavioural techniques used to reinforce the low tolerance of wildlife for humans. It involves using noise, physical gestures, and handheld objects to deter animals. The term aversion conditioning is used interchangeably with humane hazing in the industry. Aversion conditioning has been proven to work on bears, tigers, wolves, and coyotes when deployed appropriately and with an understanding of what triggers wildlife. Examples of tools across category types are listed in Table 1 below.

When the frequency of aversion conditioning is increased and applied consistently by experienced staff or an external team, it can be classified as high-intensity hazing. High-intensity hazing efforts will complement the aversion conditioning applied by the general public when they encounter a coyote. When used exclusively by staff, this approach is resource intensive as it requires staff to be active in all areas where coyotes are reported. When staff coverage is concentrated to high activity areas, coyotes have been known to temporarily avoid those locations.

Community members and private property owners play a critical role in prevention and low-intensity hazing efforts. Public participation ensures that coyotes consistently encounter deterrents when approaching urban areas for food or shelter.

Table 1: Summary of Deterrents Used for Coyote Management by Other Jurisdictions

Type of Deterrent	Description	Examples
Preventative Measures	Proactive strategies to prevent human-coyote interactions by discouraging presence.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Public education• Physical barriers (i.e. fencing, fladry, rocks)• Motion-activated equipment (i.e. lights, alarms, propane canons, sprinklers)• Odor-based deterrents (i.e. ammonia-soaked rags, cayenne pepper)• Auditory deterrents (i.e. radio, human voices)• Visual deterrents (i.e. scarecrows)• Drones

Attachment 2: Additional Research

Type of Deterrent	Description	Examples
Low/Moderate Intensity	Non-aggressive deterrents aimed at discouraging coyote presence.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Face the coyote and maintain eye contact (do not turn your back)• Stand tall, make yourself appear larger by waving your arms and make loud noises (clap, stomp, yell)• Wave or snap a large colored plastic bag• Wave objects (i.e. hockey stick, broom, jacket)• Use a noisemaker (i.e. air horn, whistle, pots/pans, keys)• Wear a high-visibility vest• Pop open an umbrella• Throw a projectile in the direction of the coyotes (i.e. sticks, dirt, rocks, tennis balls). Do not throw it at them as this may make them feel the need to stand their ground as opposed to fleeing• Spray coyotes with liquid in warm months (i.e. garden hose, water gun or spray bottle with vinegar, water balloons)• Shine a flashlight• Consistent vehicle presence