

I am writing re: the encampment item, and City staff report recommendations.

Previously delegated problems around wider harm reduction policy this falls under are still in effect for encampments: undemocratic, exclusionary secret committees (Mayor's homelessness and community safety Emergency Task Force; Toward Common Ground), private symposia setting policy & making funding requests (Housing & health care), exclusion of affected human rights status-holders, esp. disabled, and ongoing ghosting of the public around their negative lived experiences (vandalism, violence, harassment, public safety, etc.)

However, there are specific issues around the city's report and response presented to the Committee of Whole, and for Council's consideration at the 28 May meeting.

Why was there no Have Your Say page on this issue, a city website template already used by the city for engagement? It already has a template, and has been used in the past. That should significantly reduce time constraints re: other survey methods. It is also more inclusive, since **all** citizens can participate, and the homeless/street-involved have access to computers, & wi-fi hotspots at the downtown library (and staff to help navigate the process).

City staff cite time constraints as the reason for their engagement approach. The period between Committee of the Whole (15 May) and City Council (28 May) meetings is 13 days, why didn't they not have wider public engagement, and include it in Council meeting submissions?

No specifics or rationale, including explanation of time constraints, for only consulting Stepping Stone residents. Is the community outreach staff theirs?

Stepping Stone and other advocate/activist groups owe their existence to gov't support and funding, They are also given stakeholder status. Therefore, there's an appearance of gross conflict of interest going through them and asking their clients re: encampment services, especially to the exclusion of everyone else, including other precariously housed/homeless people. Many of those can't use their services because of their policies, like zero barrier drug use. Those policies are specifically cited in city documents as used at any encampment.

The potential for accurate, quality info is not there when this conflict exists. Also, city staff should consider that people who use their services might be afraid to say anything against their positions for fear of retaliation.

Why are affected residents again excluded from location siting for low/zero barrier housing? According to the report, using downtown parks was chosen and specific sites evaluated by the city. There is no information on criteria, etc. Residents living around parks are stakeholders and

should be consulted before sites are chosen. Parks are used differently, and have different demographics, e.g. the Beaumont Cres. project forced on a community with a higher number of neurodivergent children who used the public space where the city proposed container housing units.

Additionally, this is a major new land usage proposed for **public** parks, and should have through, inclusive public policy development-including zoning process, specific to Guelph. Using other communities' experiences is going to produce the same incomplete results, particularly if the city used the Region of Waterloo (There are no specifics of jurisdictions, criteria, or other information reports cited).

Also, the city's statement of competing usage is not in keeping with recent court rulings. It's a competing rights issue, and the rights of the public (Charter Rights/Freedoms [esp.section 7]), and other marginalized groups (Ontario Human Rights Code) were never included in court filing by municipalities, especially in Waterloo. The council vote on allowing the encampment in downtown Kitchener was deliberately left off the public agenda. No one was able to formally delegate for the record on any negative experiences with encampments. The region's court filing didn't contain the full picture of real impacts.

The city's preferred location in the middle of residential & business district near downtown is a recipe for disaster. This is exactly what happened in Kitchener, and despite police, by-law, community workers, advocate groups, it was unsafe, dangerous and had organized crime & human trafficking allegations. The new location, although it has the same problems, is not as bad for the public, and is on the edge of town for a reason.

Permanent supportive housing is not a panacea, and has no objective, third party evidence of being a solution to the housing crisis or the drug epidemic. (The majority of those in encampments are there due to problem drug use preventing them from keeping housing.) All evidence and "lived experience" testimony comes from a narrow band of extreme left social justice advocates and religious groups who have conflicts of interest, as their funding, identity and existence are predicated on forcing harm reduction on the public. It is also predicated on the intent of the users, who do not have to use any of the services, or commit to being on the housing ladder-per the county. The Delhi project is at \$10 million and counting, and even their costs aren't fully known.

Finally, there is no detail around the costs. They are not based on the reality of any encampment, and the city hasn't shown its work on how they arrived at these figures.

jj salmon
ward 2