

All of the report groups consulted are from the Mayor's ETF, and/or were formed from the housing symposiums which excluded the public and any group who disagreed with the harm reduction agenda. They do not represent all the positions and solutions on this issue, and are NOT human rights informed because they exclude any rights groups outside this agenda, and don't consider the issue of competing rights which are non-hierarchical, i.e. the rights of those in the groups aren't ranked above anyone else.

The Provision of Basic Needs for Persons Experiencing Homelessness is a sub-working group of the Wellington-Guelph Health and Housing Community Planning Table that was initiated by the Health and Housing Symposiums.

Any report recommendation should not be based on exclusionary groups a formed out of secret, closed entities

This report also ignores the serious conflicts of interest of having council motions, policy, programs, proposals and procedures recommended by groups within the ETF and its subgroups who could be receiving the related funds from either the city/county or higher government funding allocations to run all or part of these facilities and related services.

It should also be noted that the Mayor's ETF and all related sub/working groups represent a harm reduction agenda with a particular religious (Christian) & socio-political bias. It does not even represent all marginalized people who currently or potentially would use these services, let alone the general public who are frequently seriously negatively affected-including other CCRF/OHRC status rights groups like the LGBT+ & disabled communities.

This report is a gross misrepresentation of what previous reports have included as part of a daytime shelter. As it has moved through Council, the county and the ETF, including the closed housing symposium, it has NOT been considered just a resting place for the street involved/homeless/drug users. Both previous recommendations to the city/county from the housing symposium and Collective Results report included as a core proposed element of a daytime shelter space a zero barrier site for drug use. This is a specific recommendation quoted on page 79 of the Collective Results report City Staff omit mentioning:

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** [all emphasis mine]

Why the omission? This is a major issue, including public safety, site location and potential retrofitting. The symposium request specifically included methamphetamines, and didn't acknowledge that many users inhale not inject now anyway, including opiates. Any drug inhalation facility requires expensive ventilation and exhaust systems, potentially adding 6 if not 7 figures to any budget estimate, depending on retrofitting an existing building, redesigning standard building plans to accommodate it in a new build, location, etc.

Why have staff excluded the following related programs, outcomes and issues from their report analysis:

Why is the city recommending a RFP with no budget estimates and details, including expected costs to the city, and % of funding from other governments, no location/siting process, especially involved the public?

There is also no reason why the city needs an RFP process to assess costs. In fact, the city should have an information and cost assessment done before any RFPs, in order to have the knowledge to assess the viability of proposals, whether or not the amounts are reasonable, and whether or not providers can deliver what they've claimed, including basic feasibility of services. Hamilton has recently run into serious issues with a related project, and cost the city a lot of money by not doing due diligence before the RFP/procurement process.

<https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/hamilton/tiny-homes-microshelters-1.7433258>

Why is there no mention or link to a report on the services provided by the Mission, including impacts on businesses and the general community? They provided these daytime shelter services, so why is there no discussion of detailed services, outcomes/concerns for shelter service users, impact on nearby businesses and the wider downtown Core (especially including extra City cost incurred for cleaning and waste receptacle provision, including needle bins)?

The rest of these services seem to overlap with a HART hub, which the city/Community Health Centre—again excluding the general public and behind the scenes—has applied for and been approved. Why then is this being considered now?

This is not an emergency situation, and wasn't described as such in any previous

reports. The service gap is narrower than cited as it also didn't consider the Main Branch library, which is open from 9am all day, Mon-Sat, has public washrooms and has been used as a de facto drop-in centre [and consumption site for that matter] for the homeless for the last several years. This has been explicitly allowed—mentioned by the CEO and Board on numerous occasions. Both the CEO and Board Chair have publicly commented on that continuing at the new library <https://www.guelphtoday.com/local-news/new-library-new-programs-new-space-same-people-9534354>

The only difference between what is being proposed now and a HART hub is drug consumption-supervised or not. As is, this just seems like another end run around involving the public and being accountable, like the initial self-declaration of an emergency the CHC used to open the original consumption site with no government approval process or public input. (in that case through the province as an OPS or overdose prevention site).

This is hypocritical of Council and the mayor especially to use strong mayor powers, without public consultation, on a public space by-law to address issues downtown related to some homeless/drug addicts who were causing problems, then turn around and propose this facility. [In the original reports, the location was supposed to be downtown, then changed to just outside it.]

This is another harm reduction related project that should be deferred until it has more detail, includes the public and has objective, honest comparables to other Homeless hubs, including the ones cited, because they also had the same related disorder, violence and public safety problems the mayor claimed he wanted to solve with the public-use bylaw.

jj salmon
Ward 2