

## Attached report

This report is written by a University group that is part of the Toward Common Ground social justice collective that does not represent a neutral, human rights based position.

They looked at washrooms throughout the city, but only interviewed 15 people? This is not statistically significant.

They claimed interviewees were from “varied lived experiences” but provided no methodology, including how they selected interviewees, and whether they actively sought out those with diverse views outside the homeless/social justice bubble. Locations also weren’t provided.

The citations consist of clear social justice and harm reduction activist bias, with all or a major part of the works being qualitative from an exclusionary position, both in subject interviews and Charter/human rights biases against those outside the harm reduction circle-particularly who have conflicting rights issues, especially the disabled.

Once again, legitimate security issues and concerns are blithely ignored and omitted. Having unmonitored, private space means it’s vulnerable to illegal activity (drug dealing, prostitution), and will attract drug use if it’s used as a de facto consumption site, which is something researchers regard as normal. Any well documented public safety issues have been pointed ignored. They should look at any places with problems, as well those they claim are a success.

The Winnipeg example has no third party evaluation of the project, only qualitative data from those with a direct, vested conflict of interest.

The issues around ‘informal’ consumption sites, including at public library branch washrooms, have been ignored by harm reduction advocates, city councils and staff-including Guelph.

The main branch library washrooms have been used as a "community toilet scheme" & SCS for years now, and the public is kept in the dark about the results and the costs.

The vandalism and ODs have removed accessible washrooms from public use, with no acknowledgement from staff. The public is directed to use the children's washrooms, which are not accessible, something they didn't even publicly mention until recently, and even then it's not consistent.

There is absolutely no honest discussion of known security issues both locally and in media (which is usually biased left, pro harm reduction) that occur with public washrooms. That includes crime, anti-social behaviour, harassment, etc. including at homeless-targeted low/zero

barrier shelters and drop-in centres that prevent people not only from using bathrooms, but also shelter rooms themselves.

Yet, the report recommends no security? Where are the local comparables with the Central Station/train station spaces, and their known security problems?

Community police can easily walk a beat without violating privacy and monitor public places generally, including areas around washrooms, and the washrooms themselves between uses if they suspect illegal activities. [No one is monitored for drug use per se, and stand alone drug possession is not enforced in Guelph per Chief Cobey.]

Why are homelessness initiatives funding by a tax levy, instead of using previous or future allocations from other levels of government? And why is there no attempt at costing for any of this?

Citizens are being asked to support a plan based on an undemocratic, unmandated philosophy (harm reduction) have no say in plan development, no consideration as "community partners" yet they're expected to foot the bill?

This needs deferment until these issues are addressed.

jj salmon ward 2