

Consolidated Summary Report: Expert Panel on Coyotes in Fort York/Liberty Village

*Prepared by LURA Consulting for Toronto Animal
Services (Municipal Licensing and Standards Division,
City of Toronto)*

March 2025

Table of Contents

Background	1
Purpose and Objective.....	1
Consultation Activities.....	1
Key Stakeholders’ Perspectives and Accounts.....	2
Toronto Animal Services (Part of MLS)	2
Bylaw Enforcement (Part of MLS)	4
Deputy Mayor Malik’s Office	5
Coyote Safety Coalition.....	6
Individual Residents.....	7
Resident #1	7
Resident #2.....	8
Panel’s Assessment and Conclusions	8
Findings	9
Human Feeding and Other Food Sources	9
Refugia	9
Physical Geography and Disturbances in Urban Environment.....	9
Seasonal Factors.....	10
Perceptions of Residents and Decision-Makers	10
Genetics/Epigenetics of Eastern Coyotes.....	10
Analysis of City Response To-Date	11
Recommendations	11
Proposed Response Options.....	11
Enforcement and Reporting.....	12
Escalation Causes.....	12
Greenspace and Derelict Sites	12
Public Education and Engagement	13
Empathy and Empowerment	13
Collaboration and Evaluation	14

Management Strategies from Other North American Cities 14

- Chicago 14
- San Francisco 14
- Los Angeles..... 15
- Phoenix and Tucson..... 15
- Portland and Seattle 15

Background

Since Fall 2024, there has been an increase in reported incidents and interactions between coyotes and domestic dogs in the dense, urban Fort York/Liberty Village neighbourhood west of Downtown Toronto, both anecdotally and as reported to City of Toronto Animal Services (TAS) via the City's 311 contact centre. The increased frequency, nature or drivers of these incidents have attracted substantial media coverage and galvanized many residents and Ward 10 Spadina-Fort York Councillor Ausma Malik to organize and to request that TAS investigate and take action to reduce the unusually high prevalence of occurrences featuring bolder or more aggressive behaviour from coyotes.

Purpose and Objective

To lend an independent, expert perspective on the recent circumstances and provide recommendations for the City and area residents, in March 2025 TAS retained a seven-person panel of professionals with academic, field-based and Indigenous expertise in biology, ecology, animal behaviour, and wildlife management, particularly with coyotes and other wild canids (hereafter referred to as “the Panel”).

The Panel reviewed notes from residents and Deputy Mayor Ausma Malik's office, in addition to materials provided by TAS (such as incident reports, maps, field notes and photos, and educational signage and pamphlets) and other sources found independently. Additionally, TAS requested that the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources review these materials and provide their assessment from the provincial standpoint.

The City of Toronto's Municipal Licensing and Standards Division (MLS) also hired LURA Consulting, an independent community engagement and public consultation firm, to coordinate, facilitate, and report on consultative meetings between the Panel and key stakeholders.

Consultation Activities

Between March 6 and March 10, 2025, LURA organized and facilitated five meetings held virtually via Microsoft Teams between panelists and various key stakeholders, and two meetings for panelists to discuss their analyses and findings amongst themselves.

LURA and TAS also co-hosted a site walk the morning of Monday, March 10 for involved residents (including Coyote Safety Coalition members) to introduce panelists to key hotspots and share their personal observations, and for the panelists to familiarize

themselves first-hand with the neighbourhood and its physical features that compose the local coyote habitat and that may be contributing to the recent uptick in incidents.

The consultation activities are summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Consultation Activities

Date (2025)	Stakeholder	Attendance
Thursday, March 6 10:00am – 11:00am	Toronto Animal Services staff	2 City staff 5 Panelists
Thursday, March 6 Noon – 1:00pm	Resident #1	1 Resident 4 Panelists
Thursday, March 6 Noon – 1:00pm	Deputy Mayor Ausma Malik's Office	5 Panelists Deputy Mayor Assistant Deputy Mayor
Friday, March 7 3:00pm – 4:00pm	Coyote Safety Coalition (a resident coalition)	4 Coyote Safety Coalition members 5 Panelists
Sunday, March 9 11:00am – Noon	N/A (internal panelist discussion)	7 Panelists
Monday, March 10 10:30am – 12:30pm	Site walk	3 City staff 3 Coyote Safety Coalition members 2 Panelists
Monday, March 10 12:30pm – 1:30pm	City of Toronto Bylaw Enforcement staff	2 Bylaw Enforcement Officers 2 Panelists
Monday, March 10 3:00pm – 4:00pm	N/A (internal panelist discussion)	4 Panelists
Tuesday, March 11 11:30am – 12:30pm	Resident #2	1 Resident 3 Panelists

Key Stakeholders' Perspectives and Accounts

Toronto Animal Services (Part of MLS)

TAS staff at this meeting included both a manager and an animal control officer who is familiar with the area from field visits. They acknowledged that the Fort York/Liberty Village area exhibits a human density that continues to rise with new residential construction, and the lack of per-capita greenspace compared to other Toronto neighbourhoods. Like many other neighbourhoods in and around downtown Toronto, staff confirmed the presence of

encampments in the Fort York and Garrison Common area and added that many encampment residents have dogs of their own.

Staff emphasized that coyotes have been present in the area for many decades and by the nearby Lake Ontario shoreline, but that encounters with local residents and their dogs had generally not been as numerous or problematic until the fall of 2024. They noted that coyotes use the area's few greenspaces and the railroad tracks as corridors, and that they feel the demolition of Ontario Place adjacent to Coronation Park at the lakefront, combined with regular activity at residential and Exhibition GO construction sites, sparse foliage, and high winter snowfall volumes may have led to recent displacement of area coyotes from more obscured sites and movement corridors. As a result, residents may have noticed greater visibility of coyotes and experienced more frequent encounters with them. With the exception of an attack on a human at Trillium Park near Ontario Place but outside the boundaries of Liberty Village or Fort York, all local coyote attacks formally reported through City channels only involved attacks on domestic dogs, not humans, staff confirmed. They added that most incidents took place along bushy perimeters of parks and that lighting is very poor at night.

Staff believe that food attractants do pose a contributing factor to the recent coyote encounters, but that it is less likely due to overflowing garbage bins at residential properties in Fort York/Liberty Village and more likely because of food or waste availability (and potential intentional feeding) at and around nearby encampments and construction sites, leading to food conditioning and willingness on the part of the coyotes to explore the adjacent parks frequented by residents and their dogs.

Beginning in November 2024, TAS staff increased their patrols in the area to observe conditions and educate residents about preventing and mitigating coyote encounters through aversion techniques (even when not with one's dog), attractant elimination, and other best practices. TAS has also employed social media channels to educate Torontonians about co-existing with coyotes and dispel common myths, but staff commented that voluntary compliance with leashing rules and earning the community's trust and attention through their educational efforts remains a challenge.

There are three designated off-leash dog parks within a one kilometre radius of Garrison Common/Ordnance Triangle, but staff remarked that observations of dogs being off-leash in non-designated zones continue to be frequent and that there has been friction with City Council about attempts to conduct enforcement through fines/ticketing after their educational initiatives and leniency for voluntary compliance did not yield substantial results. Moreover, aesthetic considerations by City of Toronto Parks, Forestry & Recreation

(PF&R) precluded the installation of larger or more visually prominent signs with coyote warnings and aversion instructions, they said.

TAS staff expressed empathy for the heightened concern of many Fort York/Liberty Village residents, and for the trauma some dog owners have from coyote encounters, a small proportion of which resulted in the death of their dog. Lastly, the staff implored the community to commit to active, good-faith partnership with the City; not flood the 311 reporting system or escalate anecdotes without factual evidence; and not expect an immediate or short-term solution to this complex issue, nor a change of the status quo without a whole-community effort.

Bylaw Enforcement (Part of MLS)

Two bylaw enforcement officers attended this meeting and provided the Panel with their first-hand accounts and observations. They explained that their primary role in the Fort York/Liberty Village area is to patrol the parks and educate residents about the importance of keeping dogs on-leash in areas not explicitly designated as off-leash and of not feeding wildlife, enforcing violations of the respective bylaws if warranted.

The officers confirmed the presence of coyotes in the area based on their observations from patrols, with regular sightings at local encampments, Coronation Park on the lakefront, at Garrison Common and Ordnance Triangle, and along the rail corridor between the greenspaces, particularly around dawn and dusk. Like in the TAS meeting, the bylaw enforcement officers highlighted the high density of residents and dogs in the neighbourhood and suspect that the Ontario Place demolition and condominium construction is displacing local coyote populations from their usual feeding and denning grounds and is contributing (among other factors) to more frequent sightings by residents.

The officers have increased their patrols and augmented their enforcement efforts specifically towards off-leash violations since the uptick in coyote sightings. They remarked that although dog owners must register their dogs with the City and place a collar tag on them, some owners refuse to identify themselves and their dog when being issued violations, making enforcement more difficult. Nonetheless, they feel that the more frequent presence and education efforts of bylaw enforcement officers in the area (sometimes in collaboration with the Toronto Police Service) has yielded an overall increase in compliance regarding leashing requirements.

When spotting coyotes and approaching them with a flashlight, the officers have observed the coyotes making escapes that they believe would be possible only through holes in fencing, adding that the coyotes observed have a “healthy” flight response to humans.

Observed occurrences of intentional feeding of non-coyote wildlife in the area (such as squirrels) is nevertheless attracting coyotes, the officers noted. Indirect feeding through improper food storage at encampments and illegal dumping of household waste on sidewalks and in parks is also taking place in the neighbourhood. However, they note that enforcement of these kinds of bylaw violations falls to other MLS units or Transportation Services, depending on the dumping site.

Deputy Mayor Malik's Office

Deputy Mayor and Ward 10 Spadina-Fort York Councillor Ausma Malik participated in this meeting with the Panel and her Constituency and Planning Advisor, Vienna O'Shea.

Cllr. Malik remarked on the high density of her ward, with around 30,000 people and the most front doors (units) of any electoral district in Canada. She added that the density of dogs in the neighbourhood sometimes feels as high as humans, and that there is extremely limited greenspace compared to other areas of Toronto, meaning that coyotes and residents must share the little parkland that exists.

She stressed the importance of the panelists visiting the neighbourhood and reported sites of coyote incidents in-person with City staff and local residents in order to better understand the unique urban geography of Fort York/Liberty Village and how it might influence area coyotes' behaviour. This walk by panelists was a commitment she made to her constituents, she explained. Vienna also has also been conducting weekly check-in meetings with involved residents to identify hotspots of coyote activity in the neighbourhood.

The higher frequency of reported coyote-related incidents started in November 2024 and steadily escalated since then, according to Cllr. Malik, with the rate of related complaints to her office now up to eight daily and residents also filing reports via 311. She indicated that coyotes have been observed venturing northward to Stanley Park (including the off-leash area), Liberty Village Park, Lisgar Park, and Trinity-Bellwoods Park. Doorbell camera footage and other reports submitted to her office by residents suggest that the coyotes have become bolder, approaching residents with dogs outside of greenspaces, such as at the front steps of houses.

Cllr. Malik noted that TAS staff have recently educated residents on aversion techniques but feels that despite many residents taking them to heart and most following leashing rules, they have not been effective in reducing the frequency or severity of coyote encounters. She explained that while pets are like family members to residents and they want to follow best practices if it means it will protect their dogs, it is not realistic to expect the high level of community compliance that would render education, enforcement, and

aversion efforts truly effective. From a resourcing perspective, it is also not realistic to have constant involvement from TAS staff for residents to feel that they can move about the neighbourhood with their dogs safely, she added.

While Cllr. Malik acknowledged that some residents may be exaggerating circumstances, people in her ward have a high tolerance for inconvenience and disruption in daily life in this dense part of the city, so the unusually high volume of complaints and discourse about the recent coyote encounters lends credibility to the seriousness of the issue. She expressed that the community feels defensive because they believe they are being unfairly blamed by TAS, especially because most reported incidents involved dogs that were leashed.

Regarding coyote attractants, Cllr. Malik did not believe encampments are a contributing factor, remarking that while tents do appear and disappear around the perimeter of Fort York, they are not as entrenched or as numerous as in other parts of Toronto. However, she did comment that food waste outside area restaurants before being picked up may be a factor.

Coyote Safety Coalition

The Panel met with the Coyote Safety Coalition (CSC), an organized group of concerned residents in the Liberty Village/Fork York area that has active Facebook and WhatsApp groups. The CSC provided the panel with a comprehensive overview of members' recent observations and encounters with coyotes in the neighbourhood and described their impacts on daily life and mental health. CSC members also joined panelists on the March 10 site walk.

The CSC noted that they have documented over 70 incidents involving coyotes since the increase in visibility and encounters that they and other stakeholder parties reported beginning in November 2024. They described a range of bolder or more aggressive coyote behaviours generally not seen before (or to this extent) in the neighbourhood, such as habituation around humans, larger dogs being attacked, circling of dogs and their owners, and stalking/ambushing of leashed dogs, including at residential building entrances. Attacks have been happening during daylight hours and not only at dawn and dusk when coyotes are traditionally active, the CSC added, however they have noticed a cyclical nature or seasonality to the frequency of incidents whereby there are periods of dormancy followed by an uptick in encounters.

CSC members shared that multiple dogs have been killed by coyotes and believe that they are being actively hunted despite following best practices from TAS's educational efforts, including keeping dogs leashed, not feeding wildlife, and making loud noises to deter/avert

coyotes. In addition, they have reported instances of coyotes following and/or attacking humans when no domestic dogs are present. Like other stakeholders interviewed, they agree that the demolition of Ontario Place is probably displacing the coyote population that previously lived there northward toward the more residential part of Fort York/Liberty Village. They have also observed encampments in the area, but like Cllr. Malik noted their transience, especially during the summer concert season.

The relationship between CSC and TAS/311 has soured, according to CSC members. The CSC feels that reports to 311 go unanswered or receive rude or unhelpful responses, and that calls for action have generally fallen on deaf ears. They insist that they have been educated to a fault by TAS and bylaw enforcement officers and have striven to follow their guidelines diligently and encourage their neighbours to do the same, but to no avail: They are ineffective and have not produced tangible results that restore a sense of safety. Additionally, the CSC has observed bylaw enforcement and/or TAS animal control officers remaining in their vehicles on patrols through the neighbourhood, suggesting that they are not proactively monitoring for and averting coyotes. CSC members commented that when speaking with officers about this, they respond that they should not be responsible for coyote deterrence and are not equipped to do so.

The CSC emphasized to the Panel the mental and emotional toll the recent coyote-related events have taken on them and other residents. They have instilled fear, disrupted daily routines, and have left trauma, especially for those who have lost their pets or witnessed attacks first-hand. They feel unjustifiably shamed by the City and urged TAS to demonstrate greater empathy, take their concerns seriously, and commit to immediate action.

Individual Residents

Resident #1

The Panel met with a female resident of the neighbourhood who is an owner of a small 10-pound dog. She told of a sudden encounter between her dog and a coyote when in a well-lit area of a local park with her dog leashed, emphasizing what she perceived to be stalking behaviour and unsuccessful attempts to scare the coyote. This event has led the resident to carry her dog until they are inside the designated, fenced-in off-leash dog park, though she noted that there is a range of concern among local dog owners, with owners of smaller dogs generally being more worried about coyotes. Since then, however, she has not seen any coyotes.

The resident remarked upon the dense development and construction activity in the area, as well as an increase of encampments near local parks, and feels that these could be

contributing factors to more frequent coyote sightings due to displacement and greater food availability. She also said she frequently observes unleashed dogs in Stanley Park outside of the designated, fenced-off off-leash area, and that this frustrates her, knowing that coyotes can stealthily approach those dogs at any time.

Education from TAS and 311 have been helpful, the resident commented, especially during the coyote encounter with her own dog, because she knew what to do to attempt to avert the coyote. She believes that education will continue to play an important role in the coyote response and expressed gratitude to the Panel for lending its expertise.

Resident #2

A male resident who lives adjacent to Stanley Park also met with the Panel to share their experiences with local coyotes and perspective on the situation. He remarked that Stanley Park is an important greenspace for dog owners in the Liberty Village and King West neighbourhoods and remains fairly busy but owners of smaller dogs are more reticent to walk their pets there than owners of larger ones.

The resident owns a medium-sized dog and encountered a coyote stalking from behind and attempting to bite the leashed dog while walking them in the open greenspace of Stanley Park. The resident commented that he was distracted and did not notice the coyote's initial approach but successfully managed to scare off the coyote by making a loud noise. He reported the occurrence to 311 and found the tips he received in response from the City helpful, in addition to the educational signage posted at the park.

Nevertheless, he expressed frustration that residents with dogs (including himself) now need to be hypervigilant about where and when they take their dogs to neighbourhood greenspaces and wished for a solution to be found.

Like others interviewed, the resident only recently noticed more direct contact between coyotes and area residents and their dogs, starting in November 2024 and accelerating in January and February 2025. He too has witnessed both individuals and groups of coyotes at all times of day, not just at dawn and dusk. He added that they ranged in size, but all had a slender build and he did not observe them attempting to attack humans, only dogs. The resident also suspects the recent demolition of Ontario Place could be leading to displacement of local coyotes and affecting their typical habitat.

Panel's Assessment and Conclusions

The Panel presented its findings, analysis, and recommendations to TAS and other Municipal Licensing & Standards staff as well as the Deputy City Manager at a Microsoft

Teams meeting from 3:00pm to 4:00pm on Wednesday, March 12. This section summarizes the Panel's collective, unified insights.

Findings

The Panel compared a baseline of known precursors to conflict with urban coyotes in North America against the reports from key stakeholders (as summarized above), in-person observations, photos from the site walk, and materials provided by the City, including incident reports. They also consulted mass media reports, social media posts, mapping applications, and scientific literature. Lastly, they drew from their own professional, academic, field-based, and Indigenous knowledge and experience in biology, ecology, animal behaviour, and wildlife management. The following findings serve as the foundation upon which the Panel conducted its analysis and formulated their recommendations.

Human Feeding and Other Food Sources

Coyotes in Fort York/Liberty are exhibiting food-conditioned behaviour likely resulting from reported direct/intentional and indirect/opportunistic feeding sources in the area, including improperly disposed household waste, human food provided to wildlife, litter, and potentially available food at encampments, along the rail corridors, and/or at construction sites. Human food sources are implicated in all similar events of human-coyote conflict in Canada, so the presence of feeding in this site is a critical driver of coyotes staying in-situ and potentially a driver of changes in coyote behaviour.

Refugia

Coyotes are taking advantage of available spaces in the dense neighbourhood for feeding and shelter, including the rail corridors and vacant lots, both of which are near or abut local parks. In other sites of North America, vacant/derelict sites are known to be selected by urban coyotes for denning.

Physical Geography and Disturbances in Urban Environment

The intensive pace of construction (of condominiums) and destruction (e.g., Ontario Place) disrupts the coyotes' habitat and results in displacement within the neighbourhood, and they perceive the high density of dogs in the sites they are moving to as a threat or disturbance in their territory. However, the coyotes are still surviving despite the stressors because of the sufficient natural and human food sources. As well, the ravines, railway tracks, other movement corridors, and refugia that weave through and dot Fort York/Liberty Village provide coyotes access to and through the neighbourhood, leading to direct

interactions with people and pets. The geography of the site is not unique compared to other sites in North America where similar conflict has emerged.

Seasonal Factors

The timing of incidents indicated by resident, TAS, and bylaw officer observations represent a pattern that is consistent with the natural seasonality of the coyotes' reproductive biology and protective behaviour. November is a peak time for coyote movement and dispersal, and January/February is their breeding season, meaning that defensive and territorial behaviour exhibited by coyotes towards other canids that get too close is typically higher during this time of year.

Perceptions of Residents and Decision-Makers

The Panel reconciled discourse from the key stakeholder interviews and both mass and social media with scientifically established precursors and factors contributing to coyote behaviour. While doing so, Panel members found evidence of social amplification of risk within the community and local decision-makers that requires awareness and countering. In other words, while the fear of coyotes and trauma from attacks is real and significant for some residents of Fort York/Liberty Village, the frequency of sightings and behaviours coyotes exhibited during recently reported incidents are consistent with other cases of habituated coyote conflict in North America. The community and City can address the same root causes behind the behaviour of the coyotes through concerted and collective effort and time, so sensationalizing reported incidents as wholly unprecedented and unexpected in the local context can inadvertently make the community feel that a solution is out of reach, needs to be highly sophisticated, or that they cannot take part in it.

Genetics/Epigenetics of Eastern Coyotes

The Panel flagged that the genetics and epigenetics (environmentally influenced activation/deactivation of genes – for example, through exposure to constant stress and trauma) have played a role in changes in behaviour of coyotes in other parts of North America. The implications of this cannot be concluded on for this area; more studies would be needed to determine the degree of causality of these factors specifically. Importantly, the behaviours observed in the Liberty Village coyotes remains within the range of known biology and ecology of eastern coyotes, and within the known responses of coyotes to human encroachment, habituation and food conditioning across North America.

Analysis of City Response To-Date

The Panel analyzed the City of Toronto's response and actions to-date considering the above circumstantial findings, and determined that, from a best practices standpoint, the City's current approach aligns with best practices and research from other North American cities regarding education, aversion, and mitigation.

However, limitations to the efficacy of some measures persist; suggested ameliorative steps are outlined in the "Enforcement and Reporting" sub-section under "Recommendations" below.

Recommendations

The Panel presented the following set of recommendations for moving forward in addressing the coyote activity in Fort York/Liberty Village.

Proposed Response Options

The priority should be to continue adaptive aversion condition (AC) of local coyotes and of educating the community, in tandem with identification and removal of food attractants.

Implementation of these measures should begin immediately in order to avoid further reinforcement of the problem animals' maladaptive behaviour. Where the City does not have in-house expertise or capacity, the City should complete an expedited procurement process for a company specializing in coyote aversion.

Should AC fail, and coyotes require removal only after careful assessment, the most human practice is for trained specialists to selectively and discreetly kill by a firearm specific, positively identified problem coyote individuals. If used, humane outcomes must be ensured and traumatizing exposure of the dispatch by the community should be avoided to the extent possible.

Live capture and off-site euthanization of problematic coyote individuals is not recommended due to practical and logistical considerations, as well as the risks involved in implementation. Dogs can easily be maimed, de-limbed or killed by traps set for coyotes, no matter how careful the placement.

Finally, culling of the coyote population is not supported by evidence and is unlikely to produce desired results (there are always more coyotes who can repopulate the area quickly), and cannot be ethically justified. Culling coyote populations indiscriminately has led to counterproductive results elsewhere in North America, including increased conflict with humans or predation of livestock; these effects are the basis for coexistence-driven solutions.

Enforcement and Reporting

The Panel notes that limited staffing and enforcement capacity, and insufficient detail in incident reporting data are limiting the effectiveness of the actions the City is currently taking; greater resourcing levels are recommended.

Positive outcomes could also be more effectively achieved with stronger interdepartmental communication and collaboration, improved enforcement of relevant bylaws and regulations (including involving the Toronto Police Service as required and increasing penalties), additional staff training in aversive conditioning and scat identification, and enhancing TAS/MLS staff presence in the neighbourhood during periods of heightened coyote activity.

Finally, the City could improve tracking of pets with a history of owner non-compliance and communicating to the public the importance of reporting instances of wildlife feeding. New 311 call centre representatives should continue to undergo sensitivity training to handle reports of attack incidents with empathy and care, with periodic re-training as needed for existing staff.

Escalation Causes

The City should augment efforts to identify, manage, and eliminate (where possible) both the direct and indirect feeding of all wildlife in the neighbourhood. Coyote health and behavioural patterns should be monitored, including how they may be affected by nearby construction and encampments, and by human behaviour and movement patterns.

Outcomes of aversion conditioning should be closely tracked and the approach/strategy iteratively modified if the desired results are not being achieved.

Identifying the driving components of social amplification of risk in the local context would also be helpful in building/restoring community trust and collaboration.

Partnerships could be forged with academia and the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources for these research efforts.

Greenspace and Derelict Sites

The Panel emphasizes that the City and community must understand that greenspaces inherently facilitate coyote-human interactions, and that they and vacant/derelict sites are *both* essential to conflict prevention because they provide more space for wildlife movement and refuge: Coyotes are always present and normally navigate urban landscapes by avoiding people. The presence of these sites allows them to avoid direct encounters, mitigating chances of conflict.

Environmental steps that the City can take to address this factor include improving lighting and sightlines, reinforcing fencing, and carefully modifying habitat to minimize coyote contact. The City can also reduce (and potentially remove) attractants by identifying movement and litter hotspots with GIS and/or trail cameras, and securing waste receptacles.

Public Education and Engagement

The Panel stresses that education must remain a continuous and central strategy to reach as many residents as possible in this populous neighbourhood. It should not be discontinued, even when targeted aversion or removal programs are underway and after their completion. Messaging should be consistent across relevant City departments, who can all amplify key educational points through their respective public outreach channels.

Educational initiatives should aim for wide reach yet individual engagement activities should be targeted and adapted to key groups in priority neighbourhoods, such as construction workers, K-12 students, dog owners, and other residents. A multiformat approach is recommended, with clear and easy-to-understand signs, workshops, and videos.

The public should know how to actively participate in mitigating food attractants in parks with known high coyote activity, and how to report incidents thoroughly and properly to 311 and/or GIS applications.

Finally, the community should be made aware of how social amplification of risk works and how it influences collective and individual responses to coyote activity in Fort York/Liberty Village. The City should devise a strategy and craft messaging to counter social amplification of risk and sensationalization in situations where they are not justified.

Empathy and Empowerment

The Panel highlights the importance of acknowledging and empathizing with the concerns and trauma of some members of the community have from interactions with coyotes. By the same token, the City must request that the community cease harassment of City staff and other residents, and to communicate respectfully and in good faith.

The community should be encouraged to capture and empowered to easily submit videos and other documentary evidence to the City when filing incident reports; this will support more evidence-based decision-making and lessen the weight given to anecdotal accounts.

Collaboration and Evaluation

The Panel encourages the City to continue work with biologists, conservationists, and other professional practitioners in the field, and to coordinate actions and strategies with other orders of government.

The City should regularly review the effectiveness of its coyote strategies and encourage and incorporate community feedback to that end as a supplement to professional input.

Management Strategies from Other North American Cities

Urban coyotes pose challenges in other cities across North America, such as Chicago, San Francisco, Los Angeles Phoenix, Portland, Seattle, and Tucson due to their adaptability and proximity to human and domestic animal populations. To mitigate conflicts in these cities, engagement strategies have been implemented, including public education, aversive conditioning, and habitat modification.

Notably, these strategies are tailored to the specific needs and challenges of each city, with the goal of fostering harmony between urban coyotes and human populations, thereby reducing potential conflicts. In summary, these efforts have demonstrated partial success in mitigating conflicts, although problems persist due to the dynamic nature of urban environments and variations in public compliance. Continuous adaptation and public engagement are essential for long-term success in managing urban coyote populations.

Chicago

The city has implemented extensive educational programs to inform citizens on how to coexist with coyotes, emphasizing the importance of refraining from feeding them and keeping pets on leashes. The use of aversive conditioning, such as making loud noises or employing non-lethal projectiles, discourages coyotes from approaching populated areas.

San Francisco

In San Francisco, efforts have focused on modifying habitats to make them less attractive to coyotes, such as securing garbage and removing food sources. The City also collaborates with wildlife organizations to monitor coyote populations and educate the public.

Los Angeles

In response to coyote sightings and conflicts, Los Angeles has established a “Hazardous Wildlife Task Force” that provides resources and guidelines for residents on how to handle encounters. Public awareness campaigns emphasize coexistence and responsible behaviour, such as pet supervision and yard management.

Phoenix and Tucson

To address conflicts between coyotes and humans, these cities have implemented various management strategies:

- **Public Education:** Both cities focus heavily on educating residents about how to coexist with coyotes. This includes securing trash, not feeding wildlife, and understanding coyote behavior. Arizona Game and Fish Department (AZGFD) provides resources and guidelines to help residents reduce attractants.
- **Hazing Practices:** Authorities encourage hazing, which involves using deterrents to scare coyotes and discourage them from coming too close to urban areas. This includes making loud noises or using motion-sensitive lights.
- **Capture and Relocation:** In cases where coyotes pose an imminent threat, they may be trapped and relocated by wildlife officials. However, this is usually a last resort due to the adaptability and territoriality of coyotes.
- **Research and Monitoring:** Ongoing research and monitoring help wildlife officials understand coyote behavior and adapt management practices as needed.

The effectiveness of these strategies is mixed. Education and hazing have been somewhat successful in reducing conflicts, according to reports from the Arizona Game and Fish Department, which notes a decrease in aggressive coyote incidents when these measures are followed. Nevertheless, complete elimination of conflicts is challenging due to coyote adaptability and the varied levels of public compliance.

Portland and Seattle

Coyotes have been part of Portland’s urban landscape for years. According to the City of Portland’s Bureau of Environmental Services, coyotes are well-established in the metropolitan area. Their presence is documented through numerous sightings and reports. Similarly, in Seattle, coyotes are a familiar sight. The Seattle Urban Carnivore Project has collected data and sightings, indicating a stable population of coyotes within Seattle and its suburbs.

Management Strategies

Public Education

Portland: The City focuses on educating residents about coexisting with coyotes. Initiatives include providing information on securing garbage, not feeding wildlife, and supervising pets, particularly at night.

Seattle: Seattle's approach also emphasizes education through the Seattle Urban Carnivore Project, which encourages reporting sightings and offers educational materials on coyote behaviour and conflict prevention.

Community Engagement

Both cities encourage residents to report coyote sightings and incidents. These data helps in tracking coyote movements and assessing risk levels.

Habitat Modification

Urban planners in both cities work towards modifying environments to make them less attractive to coyotes. This includes managing open spaces and reducing food availability.

Regulated Control Measures

In extreme cases, regulated trapping and removal are considered, although these measures are a last resort due to their known limited long-term effectiveness.

Success of Management Efforts

The success of these management strategies varies:

- Portland: Efforts in Portland have led to a relatively stable coexistence between humans and coyotes. While conflicts do occur, they are typically resolved through community cooperation and education.
- Seattle: In Seattle, the use of citizen science projects like the Seattle Urban Carnivore Project has been successful in reducing fear and misinformation about coyotes, leading to fewer conflicts.