

The Mayor's agenda item re: encampments has no revision, nor is there any separate item, that includes the draft by-law the mayor posted on X(Twitter) just over one day before delegation deadline. Respectfully, why was this not included, when it has a major impact on the encampment issue, directly affects nearby residents, and has cost implications (funding allocation and taxpayers) esp. at budget time?

Regarding the agenda item of a daytime 'drop-in' site, which is directly related to encampments, and the mayor's by-law:

There is **nothing** in the attached staff report that references what this really is, and its primary purpose per the Collective Results Reports that was previously accepted & adopted by Council.

The language around a related agenda item of "Daytime Drop In Services" is **not** a fair and accurate representation of what this actually is. According to a Collective Results report [p. 81], it is:

1. Accessible, low-barrier daytime space **with safe consumption options**: There is a **lack of daytime low-barrier locations for people with substance issues to go to** for social support, recreational opportunities, **safe consumption** and support services [emphasis mine]

This is a totally different and specific use case that IMHO should be explicitly stated in this agenda. Also, the recommendation to put this outside the core is telling, in relation to the Mayor's new Downtown Public Safety by-law—which had zero community consultation outside of specific, vested interests, yet we are going to have it forced on our community outside the Core. All of the issues caused by low barrier services under harm reduction drug strategy (itself w/o public mandate) are now the subject of by-law to remove this from the Core, but it's OK to force it on an adjacent neighbourhood? One with schools, daycares, senior facilities, etc? All without **any** public a/o stakeholder consultation, including affected human rights status groups like the disabled and elderly. As a consumption site this should go through the Province, as it's considered part of health care, and they have specific guidelines around these sites.

It's worth noting that new applications are now on pause due to the public safety concerns (including a murder) around these sites. [A quick google search provides ample, credible sourced evidence of repeated public health and safety issues around the country.]

The staff reports here and generally have also not considered negative community impacts experienced in the Core and other areas with low barrier drug use facilities, let alone allowed people negatively affected to voice their concerns in a safe, inclusive, environment/process. The above report this is based on is qualitative (based on people's subjective experience w/no verification) and doesn't include the public or anyone else affected outside the narrow harm reduction services whose workers have a conflict of interest, even including other street-involved a/o drug users, especially outside the Core.

Given the ridiculously short window for people to delegate and comment on this, please consider an open, inclusive, **city-wide** Town Hall on harm reduction drug strategy generally, but

also the proposed by-law in relation to public safety concerns in all of Guelph re: encampments, effects on working class and marginalized residents (esp. disabled, low income, ODSP/ people in social housing, etc.).

Moving this out of the core because of gentrification and specific businesses being upset does not address the issues and will only exacerbate them, because it creates a corridor affecting residents without respectfully but honestly stating and dealing with known issues. And this is now well beyond the Core—there are problems throughout the city.

And again, I'd like to stress that this is **not** about all street-involved, homeless a/o drug using people, in or out of the Core. It is a large minority of street-involved drug users who often victimize those vulnerable people.

jj salmon

Ward 2