

The origin of this report & reorganization is the mayor bullying Advisory Council members, especially at Heritage Guelph, when he didn't get his way. This is the end result of the "performance reviews" the Mayor threatened. There is nothing I can find in city files or council agendas/reports that shows any persistent issue with the advice/information provided or the structure of the committees themselves.

The community engagement part of the development consisted of current ACOC members, city staff and a "a dinner with 32 residents from equity-deserving groups who participated in a discussion about how to make ACOC membership more inclusive". How were they chosen? In other words, the general public was excluded.

The restructuring consists of lumping large, complicated subjects into one group that will make it impossible to provide the information needed to accurately advise council, and create public engagement. The whole point was to provide local knowledge/expertise to the problems facing the city, or how wider issues will affect specific council motions. Without these committees, that knowledge will be lost from the public, and will cost the city.

How will this knowledge be replaced? "Consultants" and "advisors" the mayor, council and county choose behind the scenes, in another undemocratic star chamber? Oh, and we'll have the luxury of paying for those consultants, directly or indirectly, through taxes.

There is no justification or reasoning for a turn to "policy" focus over local expertise; how "policy" is defined and what that actually means is not explained in this report.

The current Homelessness committee—also includes "community safety" and the downtown working group. This is a closed, undemocratic group that excludes those who don't believe in harm reduction policy. It should not even exist in its current form. It should have been an advisory group in

the first place. And it is completely untrue that it would not “have a real impact”—it’s impact would be opening it up to the general public, which provides diverse viewpoints. That itself is major.

The County as social housing/services ***manager*** is completely irrelevant to the issue of having a public advisory committee for council, especially if there is an emphasis on policy.

That’s like saying there shouldn’t be an environmental advisory committee because the city manages local green spaces (urban tree canopy, parks, etc.)

This is a Trump move. I urge council: Don’t endorse that here. Vote against this restructuring & dissolution of democracy.

jj salmon
Ward 2