



# Concepts for Regulations to Support the *Animal Health Act*

## **Discussion Document**

Reportable Hazards, Compensation and Appeals

Prepared March 2015

Animal Health Unit  
Government of Yukon

[animalhealth@gov.yk.ca](mailto:animalhealth@gov.yk.ca)

Phone: 867-667-5600

Or 1-800-661-0408 X5600

**Deadline for comments: July 7, 2015**

## Introduction

The *Animal Health Act* (2014) is important legislation that protects the health of Yukon's animals. It also protects public health by limiting the spread of animal hazards that can affect people. The Act gives the Yukon government the ability to offer compensation and provides for an appeal process.

While the Act confers these powers, regulations are needed to clarify details in three areas:

- which hazards should be reportable (see p. 2)
- what is eligible for compensation (see p. 10) and
- how appeals for compensation are handled (see p. 14).

The Agriculture Branch (Energy, Mines and Resources) and the Animal Health Unit (Environment) recognize that people who work with, and depend on, animals want a role in developing *Animal Health Act* regulations that are fair, transparent and consistent. Ideally, by encouraging early reporting of potential hazards, these regulations will reduce potential threats to Yukon's animals and people.

In this discussion document, the complex topics are structured to present two options along with the potential advantages and disadvantages of each. Other topics have specific questions that will help shape the regulations.

This document is intended to support discussion by a focus group with representatives from:

- Growers of Organic Food Yukon,
- Yukon veterinarians,
- Yukon Agriculture Association,
- Yukon Conservation Society,
- Yukon Fish and Game Association,
- Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board,
- Yukon Game Growers Association,
- Yukon Horse and Rider Association,
- Yukon Outfitters Association, and
- Yukon Trappers Association.

Individuals are encouraged to provide feedback through their organization's representative on the focus group who will share the substance of discussions with the group they represent. In the alternative, they can provide a written submission directly to the government using the contact information on the web page.

The opinions shared in the focus group will be made available in a 'What We Heard' document. The key findings will be taken into consideration by the Yukon government when the regulations are drafted.

# Reportable Hazards Regulation

## Discussion item 1: Which hazards should be reportable in Yukon?

The *Animal Health Act* requires that a person who knows, or reasonably ought to know, that a **reportable** hazard is present in an animal, animal product, conveyance or area must immediately report it to the chief veterinary officer (CVO). A **hazard** is a disease or biological, chemical or physical agent that is likely to adversely affect the health of an animal or human, or anything prescribed in regulation. A regulation is needed to specify which hazards will be reportable in Yukon because of the threat they pose to Yukon wild and domestic animals and, in some cases, to people.

The Government of Canada lists 51 reportable diseases in the federal *Reportable Diseases Regulations* that must be reported to the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) by anyone who suspects they may be present. Some provinces use that federal list through a direct reference to it in their legislation; some cite specific diseases in addition to making reference to the federal list, while others use a fully customized list.

Once a hazard is reportable in Yukon, it will be subject to measures of control. Reportable status also means that other governments are obligated to share information with the Yukon CVO if they have detected any of Yukon's reportable hazards. This can include information that would normally be protected by privacy legislation. It is therefore important that the list of reportable hazards in Yukon, even if it does not include the full federal list, should include any that are of concern here so that the federal authorities can share complete information with the Yukon CVO if they suspect one of these is present in Yukon.

***The full list of federally reportable diseases is available on request.***

Two options are proposed:

- 1 Create a regulation listing Yukon-specific reportable hazards, or
- 2 Adopt the complete federal list through a reference to the *Reportable Diseases Regulations* and add hazards specific to Yukon

### **Option 1: Create a regulation listing Yukon-specific reportable hazards**

Pros:

- The list will be short, precise and reflect only those hazards (diseases and biological/ chemical/ physical agents) relevant to Yukon, including those that may be a threat to public health.
- The list will only include federally reportable diseases that are likely to occur in Yukon or would be of great significance if they did occur here.
- Yukon's list will not be directly linked, through reference, to a list of diseases that only the federal government controls.

Cons:

- New or emerging diseases added to the federal list would not automatically become reportable in Yukon. An amendment to the Yukon regulation would be needed to include new diseases if they were of concern to Yukon animals and/or public health.

- The CFIA would only be required to notify and share information with the Yukon CVO about the federally reportable diseases that are also on Yukon’s list of reportable hazards. There would be 35 diseases that would not be reportable to the Yukon CVO if the CFIA found them in Yukon.

### Suggested Yukon-specific list of reportable hazards

- **Anthrax \***
- **Avian chlamydiosis**
- **Bovine spongiform encephalopathy \***
- **Bovine tuberculosis (*M. bovis*) \***
- **Brucella species**
- Ceratomyxosis (*Ceratomyxa shasta*) \*
- Chronic wasting disease of cervids \*
- **Cysticercosis \***
- Enzootic abortion of ewes
- Equine infectious anemia \*
- **Exposure of food-producing animals to a toxic substance that is a threat to human health (e.g., lead)**
- Foot and mouth disease (FMD) \*
- **Hantavirus**
- Infectious haematopoietic necrosis \*
- Infectious pancreatic necrosis \*
- Infectious salmon anaemia \*
- **Influenza in domestic birds and swine**
- **Listeria monocytogenes**
- Maedi-Visna virus
- **Newcastle disease \***
- **Q fever**
- **Rabies \***
- Respiratory disease in sheep, goats and camelids
- **Salmonella species**
- Scrapie \*
- Spring viraemia of carp \*
- **Trichinella species**
- **Tularemia**
- Varroa mite
- Viral hemorrhagic septicaemia \*

\* Also listed in the federal *Reportable Diseases Regulations*

**Bolded Italics** indicate hazards that can also affect humans

See Appendix II for a complete description of each suggested hazard.

**Option 2: Adopt the complete federal list through a direct reference to the *Reportable Diseases Regulations* and add hazards specific to Yukon**

Pros:

- This will ensure that the CFIA would have to immediately advise the Yukon CVO when *any* federally reportable disease is present in Yukon.
- The list of diseases would update automatically when the CFIA adds new diseases of concern or removes diseases that are no longer of concern.
- Easier reporting for veterinarians when both lists are aligned makes it more likely that both CFIA and Yukon CVO will be informed.

Cons:

- Yukon legislation would include reference to approximately 35 diseases on the federal list that are of little to no concern to Yukon.
- Would require a regulatory amendment if the CFIA removed a disease from the federal list that Yukon wanted to maintain as reportable.

## **Discussion item 2: What action(s) should be required before an order is issued by an inspector?**

The *Animal Health Act* requires that persons who have reported a suspected hazard “...in the case of an animal, animal product or conveyance under that person’s custody or control, take such measures as may be prescribed” (Section 8(b)). Prescribed measures are those that are specified in a regulation and therefore mandatory.

The measures prescribed in regulations would be based on accepted “best practices” that will help prevent the spread of a hazard until an investigation by an inspector can verify if the suspected hazard is present. These best practices include:

- Do not move animals, animal products or conveyances,
- Do not bury or otherwise dispose of the bodies of dead animals,
- Do not sell or otherwise transfer ownership of animals, animal products or conveyances, and
- Do not destroy and/or dispose of animal products

If these measures are prescribed in regulations, they must be followed until the time an inspector issues an order or determines that a hazard does not exist. The Act does not provide compensation for actions taken or losses incurred unless they relate to the order or direction of an inspector. If measures to prevent spread of a hazard are prescribed, any costs or losses that result from implementing these would not be eligible for compensation. But having these measures prescribed does provide direct guidance to individuals faced with a potential hazard that would offset the personal liability they might face if they inadvertently spread a hazard.

Two options are proposed:

- 1 Prescribe measures that must be taken when a hazard is suspected, or
- 2 Do not prescribe measures at this time, and instead rely on recommended best practices

### **Option 1: Prescribe measures that must be taken when a hazard is suspected**

Pros:

- Provides specific and effective ways to limit the spread of the hazard prior to an order being issued by an inspector.
- Clarifies what must or must not be done prior to receiving direction from an inspector.
- Helps ensure the inspection and investigation of a suspected hazard can take place before things are altered.
- Provides some protection against personal liability for the individual responsible if they can state that they complied with prescribed measures.
- Allows inspectors time to complete an investigation and confirm a hazard before they issue directions or orders, so the orders will be specific to the hazard and as precise as possible.

Cons:

- A person who suspects the presence of a reportable hazard may suffer losses by taking the prescribed measures that are not eligible for compensation (e.g. products that go bad because they can't be sold during their shelf life).
- A person who suspects the presence of a reportable hazard may suffer financial losses (e.g. due to restrictions on animal or product movement, loss of reputation) even if the hazard is not confirmed.
- It will be challenging to implement when the individual who reports a hazard is not the person responsible for (i.e. the owner of) the animal, animal products or conveyance and so may not be able to ensure the prescribed measures are implemented.

**Option 2: Do not prescribe measures at this time, and instead rely on recommended best practices**

Pros:

- Individuals are not required to perform actions that may be costly and for which they would not be eligible for compensation.
- Best practices can be updated without requiring a change to regulations as science advances.

Cons:

- Actions would be voluntary and there would be no penalty (other than personal liability) for individuals who knowingly altered the area where a hazard was suspected or took actions that spread the hazard before orders were issued.
- The person responsible for the potential hazard might do something that results in spreading of the hazard and may make it worse, e.g., selling a seemingly healthy animal that later turns out to be infected.
- The circumstances around a suspected hazard might be substantially altered before an inspector can investigate, which could interfere with verifying the presence of a hazard.
- This would require that inspectors would issue directions or orders as soon as a hazard was reported and before they had investigated it or confirmed it, to support eligibility for compensation.



## Compensation and Appeals Regulation

Under the *Animal Health Act*, losses incurred by an animal owner as a result of government-ordered actions to prevent the spread of animal health hazards may be compensated. It also provides for a compensation appeal process. The Act empowers the Minister to determine the amount of compensation in accordance with criteria that are specified in regulation. Until these criteria are established, all decisions will reside with the Minister. The Act outlines the basics of appeal board membership and the conduct of appeal hearings, but a regulation will provide additional clarity and guidance.

The Government of Yukon could adopt a standard for compensation that defines a set value for animal categories. This is the approach of the federal government and Appendix II lists federal maximum values for selected animals. Alternatively, some provinces specify that a fair market value be determined for animals, based on the opinion of an expert. In most instances other costs are compensated based on receipts.

There are Yukon examples of legislation respecting compensation and appeals. Through this targeted engagement process, we are seeking stakeholder input into the appeal and compensation processes. The Government of Yukon will consider that input when developing the regulations, but the government will also be guided by current Yukon administrative practices.

### Discussion item 3: How to establish compensation for animals, animal products and things?

The *Animal Health Act* allows for a regulation that sets out the amount of compensation that may be paid. This regulation will provide essential guidance to the Minister about how to determine the value of animals, animal products and things eligible for compensation.

Two options are proposed:

- 1 Adopt a set, fixed value for each animal category based on the maximum value listed in the federal *Compensation for Destroyed Animals Regulations*, and negotiate fair market value for animal products and things on a case by case basis, or
- 2 Rely on a neutral third party expert to determine fair market value of compensation due for animals, animal products and things, on a case-by-case basis.

#### **Option 1: Adopt a set, fixed value for each animal category based on the maximum value listed in the federal *Compensation for Destroyed Animals Regulations*, and negotiate fair market value for animal products and things on a case by case basis,**

Pros:

- If the compensation amounts for animals are established in advance, the destruction of animals could happen more quickly and help prevent spread of a hazard.
- While the federal maximum value for animals may exceed the actual value of individual animals in Yukon, this method could be less costly, complex and contentious than gaining agreement on selecting and hiring an independent expert to establish fair market value.
- There may be less delay in paying compensation.
- When federal compensation maximums are updated to reflect fair market value, Yukon amounts will automatically update.

Cons:

- If federal maximum values are significantly lower than Yukon fair market value this could require a Yukon “market modifier” be established which may complicate the system.
- The federal maximum does not differentiate between “high grade” and “low grade” animals which could result in over- or under-payment compared to fair market value.
- If a fixed maximum value is established for animals, this may limit the extent of appeals on the amount of compensation for the value of animals.

Other? – please specify

---

---

---

---

**Option 2: Rely on a neutral third party expert to determine fair market value of compensation due for animals, animal products and things, on a case-by-case basis**

Pros:

- Using fair market value for all animals, animal products and things eligible for compensation will result in the most accurate payment.
- Compensation amounts are not tied to federal regulations which might change in ways that adversely affect Yukon interests.
- Animal owners may appreciate that there is no maximum limit for compensation for animal value.

Cons:

- Will require a transparent, efficient process to agree on a neutral, third party expert at a time when compensation must be established rapidly to ensure control of the hazard.
- Quarantine or other orders may last longer if the government must establish the fair market value of all of the animals, animal products and things to support compensation decisions.
- Hiring an expert to set values for animals, not just animal products and things, adds an extra step in the compensation determination process, potentially delaying compensation.
- There is no maximum limit for compensation for animals which makes the costs less predictable.
- There will be cost to select and contract the expert(s) (e.g., contract fee, travel, food, incidentals).

Other? – please specify

---

---

---

---

## Discussion item 4: Reasonable Costs Eligible for Compensation

The *Animal Health Act* allows for compensation of “any reasonable costs incurred by the applicant in the course of complying with an order or direction under this Act” (Section 45(1)(c)). While the amount of compensation is ultimately determined by the Minister, “reasonable costs” could be defined in a regulation to guide decisions.

Defining “reasonable costs” entails deciding what is eligible, what is excluded and any limitations that might be applied. It is important that stakeholders have input into this process to ensure that decisions are fair, transparent, and consistent, especially when several applicants may be involved and compensation awards should not be subjective. It may not be feasible to define all possibilities in advance however.

The following actions could be ordered or directed by an inspector under the Act and those that result in a loss or cost to the person ordered could be eligible for compensation if they are considered “reasonable”.

Indicate below which of these actions you consider a “reasonable cost” and eligible for compensation and which should be excluded. For those eligible for compensation, what proof (e.g., receipt, affidavit) should be required to support the claim for compensation?

Cost or Loss	Eligible/ Excluded	Proof Required
<b>Labour Costs for/to:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• movement or transport of animals, animal products or other things into, from or within the area or conveyance</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• handling of animals, animal products or other things within the area or conveyance</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• affixing of an identification mark or device to an animal, animal product or other thing in order to identify that it is subject to the quarantine order</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• installation of signage or barriers at, on or within the area or conveyance</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• relocation or movement of the conveyance</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• segregation of animals within the area or conveyance</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• cleaning and disinfection of the area or conveyance</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• maintaining information, including required records, during the term of the quarantine order</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• produce relevant records in the person’s possession or control</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• make an animal accessible for the purposes of conducting an examination</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• exhume the carcass of an animal in order to</li> </ul>		

Cost or Loss	Eligible/ Excluded	Proof Required
examine or take samples from it		
• transport the remains of an animal to another location in order to examine or take samples from it		
• disposing of an animal that was destroyed, or died due to its injury, in the course of complying with an order or direction		
• disposing of an animal product or other thing that was destroyed under order by an inspector		
<b>Non-labour costs:</b>		
• veterinary treatment for an animal, including vaccination, within the area or conveyance		
• cleaners and disinfectants		
• materials to support record keeping ordered by an inspector		
• fencing or other containment materials		
• signs or barriers		
• materials used to identify animals, animal products or things		
• animal handling equipment (e.g., halters, ropes, chutes)		
• non-labour costs incurred while disposing of an animal, animal product or thing		
• animal product or thing that must be repaired or replaced as a result of the order (e.g., damaged during inspection)		
• administrative costs (e.g., postage, fees)		
• costs related to signed contracts that could not be completed as a direct result of the order (e.g., sale or purchase of animals)		
• mileage and/or transportation (including fuel)		

1. Should a maximum eligible amount for each reasonable cost be established?

- Yes  No

2. Should the cost of labor performed by the person subject to the order, or one or more of their family members, be considered acceptable?

- Yes  No

## Discussion Item 5: Deductions from compensation

According to the *Animal Health Act*, the Minister must “determine whether a deduction will be made from that payment based upon a prescribed reason” (Section 47(1)(c)). While the deductions from compensation are ultimately determined by the Minister, specific deductions could be defined in a regulation to guide the Minister’s decisions. However, it may not be feasible to define all these possibilities in advance.

As with compensation allocated for “reasonable costs,” it is essential that decisions about deductions are fair, transparent, and consistent, especially when several applicants may be involved and compensation awards must not be subjective.

1. Should the following be deducted from the compensation to be awarded by the Government of Yukon:

a. Compensation awarded by the federal government for the same loss or cost?

Yes

No

b. Amount received from the sale of the carcasses or parts (hide, antlers) of animals eligible for compensation?

Yes

No

c. Amount received from the sale of animal products that are eligible for compensation?

Yes

No

d. Other? – please specify

---

---

---

---

## Discussion item 6: Circumstances for refusing to consider an application for compensation

The *Animal Health Act* specifies that the Minister must refuse to consider an application for compensation “if, in relation to the subject matter of the application, the applicant has been charged with an offence under this Act or any law of Canada or a province relating to animal health, food safety or a hazard, or for any prescribed reason” (sections 48(a) and 48(b)).

Animal welfare is separate from animal health. In Yukon, the *Animal Protection Act* deals with animal welfare. As the *Animal Health Act* now stands, people charged with an offence under the Yukon *Animal Protection Act* or any law of Canada or a province relating to animal welfare would be eligible to apply for compensation if they suffered losses under the *Animal Health Act*.

1. Should the Minister refuse to consider an application submitted if, in relation to the subject matter of the application, the applicant has been charged with an offence relating to animal welfare?

Yes

No

2. Are there any additional reasons for refusing to consider an application for compensation that should be prescribed in regulation? If yes, please specify.

Yes

No

---

---

---

---

## Discussion item 7: Appeal board membership

The *Animal Health Act* requires that the Minister appoint an appeal board immediately when a notice of appeal is received. The board must consist of three people, one of whom must be designated as chair.

While it is up to the Minister to determine who should be on the board, a framework in regulation would provide guidance. Without a regulation, the Minister would be guided by existing policy. Other Yukon acts (*Wilderness Tourism Licensing Act* and *Gas Burning Devices Act*) define the membership of their appeal boards.

1. Should we specify the criteria for appeal board member appointment in regulation?

Yes

No

2. Are there organisations, associations, groups or departments that should be represented on an *Animal Health Act* appeal board? If yes, please specify.

Yes

No

---

---

---

---



## Discussion item 8: How to conduct an appeal hearing

The *Animal Health Act* specifies that an appeal hearing must allow for the Minister and applicant to be heard and to be represented by counsel and that the hearing be closed to the public. The Government of Yukon has regulations to describe the conduct of hearings held by similarly appointed appeal boards, such as the *Wilderness Tourism Licensing Appeal Board Regulation* under the *Wilderness Tourism Licensing Act*.

Should any of the following be defined in regulation?

1. The deadline for the Minister to advise the applicant that the appeal board has been appointed (i.e. The Minister must notify the appeal applicant of the appointment of the appeal board within XX days following that appointment).

Yes

No

2. The deadline for holding the initial hearing once the appeal board has been appointed.

Yes

No

3. The timeframe for the appeal board to reach a decision and communicate it to the Minister.

Yes

No

4. Any further considerations?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Appendix I:

### Description of suggested reportable hazards for Yukon

Hazards in *italics* affect humans

Hazard name	Present in Canada	Present in Yukon	Species of concern	Why it's important to Yukon
<i>Anthrax</i>	Yes	Not reported	Cattle, sheep, goats, bison, horses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contaminated environment infective for years</li> <li>Kills animals quickly</li> <li>Can be fatal in humans</li> </ul>
<i>Avian chlamydiosis</i>	Yes	Not reported	Wild and domestic birds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infected birds can pass disease to humans in close contact with them</li> </ul>
<i>Bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE, mad cow disease)</i>	Last confirmed case in 2015.	No	Cattle, bison	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trade implications for Canada</li> <li>Disease can be transmitted to humans via contaminated meat</li> </ul>
<i>Bovine tuberculosis (M. bovis)</i>	Yes – rare in wildlife	Unknown	All mammals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Present in pockets of wildlife in Canada</li> <li>Long treatment period in humans. Can be difficult to treat.</li> </ul>
<i>Brucella species</i>	Yes - wildlife	Yes – caribou and reindeer	Cattle, bison elk, swine, goats, sheep, reindeer, caribou	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two positive areas in Canada – Wood Buffalo National Park (bison) and Arctic and sub-arctic range (caribou and reindeer)</li> </ul>
Ceratomyxosis (Ceratomyxa shasta)	Yes – British Columbia	No	Salmon, trout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Salmon health of great concern to Yukon</li> <li>Potential for Yukon salmon to become infected in the ocean off BC</li> </ul>
Chronic wasting disease of cervids (CWD)	Yes	No	Elk, caribou, deer, moose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trade implications for Yukon</li> <li>Risk to wild elk, deer, moose and caribou</li> <li>Contaminated environment infective for years</li> </ul>
<i>Cysticercosis</i>	Sporadically	Not reported	Cattle, humans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Human tapeworm infects cattle muscle but does not cause disease in cattle</li> <li>Humans get tapeworm by eating infected beef</li> </ul>
Enzootic abortion of ewes	Yes	Not reported	Sheep, goats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High abortion risk for pregnant women</li> <li>Could be transmitted to wild sheep in close proximity to infected sheep farm</li> </ul>

Hazard name	Present in Canada	Present in Yukon	Species of concern	Why it's important to Yukon
Equine infectious anemia	Yes	Yes	Horses, donkeys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Animals are infected for life</li> <li>Infected animals can appear healthy for many years before showing signs of disease</li> </ul>
<i>Exposure of food-producing animals to a toxic substance that is a threat to human health (e.g., lead)</i>	Yes	Yes	Any animal slaughtered or harvested for human consumption	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could be an important human health risk depending on source, type and level of toxin.</li> </ul>
Foot and mouth disease (FMD)	No	No	Cattle, pigs, sheep, goats, bison, elk, deer, moose, caribou	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Severe economic and trade implications for Canada</li> <li>Disease of great global importance</li> </ul>
<i>Hantavirus</i>	Yes	Yes	Rodents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Present in rodent droppings</li> <li>Can cause fatal disease in humans</li> <li>Animals do not show signs of disease</li> </ul>
Infectious haematopoietic necrosis	Yes – British Columbia	No	Salmon, trout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Salmon health of great concern to Yukon</li> <li>Potential for Yukon salmon to become infected in the ocean off BC</li> </ul>
Infectious pancreatic necrosis	Yes – Atlantic provinces and Quebec	No	Salmon, trout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Salmon health of great importance to Yukon</li> <li>Severe implications for west coast salmon fisheries if spreads from east coast</li> </ul>
Infectious salmon anaemia	Yes – Atlantic provinces	No	Atlantic salmon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Salmon health of great importance to Yukon</li> <li>Severe implications for west coast salmon fisheries if spreads from east coast</li> </ul>
<i>Influenza in domestic birds and swine</i>	Yes	Unknown	Pigs, ducks, geese, chickens, turkeys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some strains cause severe disease in humans</li> <li>Potential for spread from wild waterfowl to domestic birds</li> </ul>
<i>Listeria monocytogenes</i>	Yes	Presumed yes	Cattle and soil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can be fatal in humans</li> <li>Transmitted through food (high risk: deli meats, raw milk, cheese made from raw milk, sprouts, smoked seafood)</li> </ul>

Hazard name	Present in Canada	Present in Yukon	Species of concern	Why it's important to Yukon
Maedi-Visna virus	Yes	No	Sheep, goats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Animals infected for life</li> <li>• Clinical disease is fatal</li> <li>• Requires close contact for spread</li> </ul>
<i>Newcastle disease</i>	Yes – wild birds	Not reported	Wild birds, poultry, ducks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Causes fatal disease in poultry</li> <li>• Causes mild eye disease in humans</li> </ul>
<i>Q fever</i>	Yes	Not reported	Sheep, goats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Causes disease in humans</li> <li>• Potential for spread to wild sheep</li> </ul>
<i>Rabies</i>	Yes	Last case diagnosed in 1970s	Mammals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fatal once infected</li> <li>• Disease of greatest public health importance in the world</li> <li>• Positive cases identified annually in Alaska, NWT, BC and Alberta</li> </ul>
Respiratory disease in sheep, goats and camelids	Yes	Yes	Sheep, goats, llamas, alpacas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disease transmitted from domestic animals to wild sheep and goats</li> <li>• Disease very severe in wild sheep</li> </ul>
<i>Salmonella species</i>	Yes	Yes	Poultry, cattle, pets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some strains can cause severe disease in humans</li> <li>• Transmitted in contaminated food and by direct contact</li> </ul>
Scrapie	Yes	No	Sheep, goats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Federal government involvement and movement restrictions for farms with confirmed cases</li> </ul>
Spring viraemia of carp	No	No	Carp	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can affect wild fish</li> <li>• Sporadic outbreaks in US</li> <li>• Clinical signs are more common in colder water (&lt; 17°C)</li> </ul>
<i>Trichinella species</i>	Yes	Yes	Pigs, bears, rodents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can cause severe disease in humans</li> <li>• Greatest risk is from eating undercooked or raw meat from bears</li> </ul>
<i>Tularemia</i>	Yes	Not reported	Rabbits, sheep, pigs, horses, muskrats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infective in soil for weeks to months</li> <li>• Can cause severe pneumonia in humans</li> <li>• Risk to trappers who skin animals</li> </ul>

<b>Hazard name</b>	<b>Present in Canada</b>	<b>Present in Yukon</b>	<b>Species of concern</b>	<b>Why it's important to Yukon</b>
Varroa mite	Yes	Not reported	Bees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very common in rest of Canada</li> <li>• Severe economic implications for infected hives</li> <li>• Spreads easily between hives</li> </ul>
Viral hemorrhagic septicaemia	Yes – Pacific and Atlantic oceans	No	Salmon, trout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Salmon health is very important to Yukon</li> <li>• Economic impact for Yukon</li> </ul>

## Appendix II:

### **Compensation for Destroyed Animals Regulations** (Federal regulation)

This list is shortened to show animals relevant to Yukon

Animal	Max. Amount (\$)
Dog ( <i>Canis familiaris</i> ) Registered	2,500
Dog ( <i>Canis familiaris</i> ) Nonregistered	1,500
Cat ( <i>Felix silvestrus</i> ) Registered	500
Cat ( <i>Felix silvestrus</i> ) Nonregistered	200
Cattle ( <i>Bos taurus</i> and <i>Bos indicus</i> ) Registered	8,000
Cattle ( <i>Bos taurus</i> and <i>Bos indicus</i> ) Non-registered	2,500
Bison ( <i>Bison bison</i> ) Bull, 1 year and older	4,000
Bison ( <i>Bison bison</i> ) All bison other than those referred to above	2,500
Sheep ( <i>Ovis aires</i> ) Registered	1,200
Sheep ( <i>Ovis aires</i> ) Non-registered	825
Goat ( <i>Capra hircus</i> ) Registered	1,000
Goat ( <i>Capra hircus</i> ) Non-registered	600
Swine ( <i>Sus Scrofa</i> ) Registered	5,000
Swine ( <i>Sus Scrofa</i> ) Non-registered	2,000
Horse ( <i>Equus equus</i> ) Ordered destroyed due to Equine Infectious Anemia	2,000
Horse ( <i>Equus equus</i> ) All horses other than those referred to above	8,000
Chicken ( <i>Gallus gallus</i> ) — For egg production	30
Turkey ( <i>Meleagris gallopavo</i> ) For meat production	70
Duck ( <i>Cairina moschata</i> ) For meat production	28
Duck ( <i>Cairina moschata</i> ) For egg production	60
Honey Bee ( <i>Apis mellifera</i> )	250/Colony
Elk ( <i>Cervus elaphus</i> ) Bull, 1 year and older	8,000