



City of Hamilton

CITY COUNCIL ADDENDUM

20-020

Wednesday, September 16, 2020, 9:30 A.M.

Due to the COVID-19 and the Closure of City Hall

All electronic meetings can be viewed at:

City's Website: <https://www.hamilton.ca/council-committee/council-committee-meetings/meetings-and-agendas>

City's YouTube Channel: <https://www.youtube.com/user/InsideCityofHamilton> or Cable 14

4. COMMUNICATIONS

4.10 Correspondence respecting the reduction of Aberdeen Avenue from 4 lanes to 2 lanes:

*4.10.bf Dr. Haider Saeed

*4.10.bg Christine McLeod

*4.10.bh Christi Hodgson

*4.10.bi Lynda Narducci

*4.10.bj Samantha Fuller

*4.10.bk Susie Folco

*4.10.bl Brenda Berketo

- *4.10.bm Roy Leggat
- *4.10.bn Cathy Swenson
- *4.10.bo Alex Beer
- *4.10.bp Chris Ritsma
- *4.10.bq Erik Dickenson
- *4.10.br Durand Neighbourhood Association
- *4.10.bs Steven McKay
- *4.10.bt Peter Quaglia

Recommendation: Be received and referred to the General Manager of Public Works for appropriate action.

*4.17 Correspondence respecting Temporary Emergency Shelter:

- *4.17.a Carmen Orlandis
- *4.17.b Michelle Cho
- *4.17.c Dr. Jeffrey Weatherby
- *4.17.d Pam Summers
- *4.17.e Damon Joo
- *4.17.f Stephen Butson & Kazue Suzuki

Recommendation: Be received.

*4.18 Correspondence from the Honourable Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing respecting the federal-provincial Safe Restart Agreement.

Recommendation: Be received.

*4.19 Correspondence from Bridget Marsdin respecting Encampments in Hamilton.

Recommendation: Be received.

7. NOTICES OF MOTIONS

- *7.1 Demolition Permit for 832 Barton Street, Stoney Creek - WITHDRAWN

- *7.2 Federation of Canadian Municipalities – Election to the Board of Directors
- *7.3 Proactive Community Information and Solutions Regarding Metrolinx Demolitions on King St East, Ward 3

10. BY-LAWS AND CONFIRMING BY-LAW

- *10.10 197

Being a By-law to Permanently Close a Portion of a Unassumed Alley Abutting 11 Avalon Place, Hamilton, established by Registered Plan 165, in the City of Hamilton, designated as Part 2 on Reference Plan 62R-21364, being Part of PIN 17201-0157 (LT), City of Hamilton

- *10.11 198

Being a By-law to Permanently Close a Portion of a Unassumed Alley Abutting 13 Avalon Place, Hamilton, established by Registered Plan 165, in the City of Hamilton, designated as Part 1 on Reference Plan 62R-21364, being Part of PIN 17201-0157 (LT), City of Hamilton

- *10.12 199

Being a By-law to Permanently Close a Portion of Road Allowance Abutting 600 5th Concession Road West, Flamborough, established by Part of the Road Allowance between Lots 12 and 13, Concession 4, in the Geographic Township of West Flamborough, in the City of Hamilton, designated as Part 2 on Reference Plan 62R-21259, being Part of PIN 17545-0099 (LT), City of Hamilton

Pilon, Janet

Subject: I support the traffic calming changes to Aberdeen

From: Haider Saeed <saeed@mcmaster.ca>

Sent: Sunday, September 13, 2020 10:34 AM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca

Subject: I support the traffic calming changes to Aberdeen

Haider Saeed, MD, MSc, CCFP, FCFP

Pilon, Janet

Subject: Aberdeen road diet

From: christine mcleod <brontebeat@yahoo.ca>

Sent: September 13, 2020 2:03 PM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca

Subject: Aberdeen road diet

Dear Mr. Mayor and Members of Council,

I am writing with urgency to express my strong support for the Aberdeen road diet initiatives to calm and reduce traffic on Aberdeen. As a pedestrian, I cannot say how many times I have avoided walking along Aberdeen for fear of speeding cars and very little to no protection in the form of buffer zones along sidewalks. As a resident of Kirkendall who lives near Queen st I can report very clearly how dangerous speed is to this city, and how costly.

Please add my voice to the many who are in support of Councillor Wilson (ward 1) and her incredible work on behalf of Ward 1 residents for a safer city to live in.

Sincerely,

Christine McLeod

Pilon, Janet

Subject: #leanaberdeen delegates used a democratic process in 2015 to ask for a pedestrian-friendly Aberdeen Avenue

Attachments: Lean%20Aberdeen%20Earl%20Kitchener%20School%20Council.docx

From: The Hodgson Family

Sent: September 13, 2020 5:40 PM

To: Eisenberger, Fred <Fred.Eisenberger@hamilton.ca>; Office of the Mayor <mayor@hamilton.ca>; Wilson, Maureen <Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca>; Farr, Jason <Jason.Farr@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Merulla, Sam <Sam.Merulla@hamilton.ca>; Collins, Chad <Chad.Collins@hamilton.ca>; Jackson, Tom <Tom.Jackson@hamilton.ca>; Pauls, Esther <Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca>; Danko, John-Paul <John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca>; Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Pearson, Maria <Maria.Pearson@hamilton.ca>; Johnson, Brenda <Brenda.Johnson@hamilton.ca>; Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>; VanderBeek, Arlene <Arlene.VanderBeek@hamilton.ca>; Whitehead, Terry <Terry.Whitehead@hamilton.ca>; clerk@hamilton.ca

Subject: #leanaberdeen delegates used a democratic process in 2015 to ask for a pedestrian-friendly Aberdeen Avenue

Dear Members of Council and Mayor Eisenberger,

I am very concerned about a vote that will happen this week at the traffic meeting concerning a petition from people asking to stop the Aberdeen traffic calming plans.

Please do not vote to overturn the decision to calm traffic on Aberdeen Ave.

I share #visionzero and I'm raising kids in this city who deserve the freedom to walk and ride their bikes without fear.

I presented the attached speech on behalf of parents and students from Earl Kitchener and St Joe's elementary schools plus Ryerson Middle School in 2015 because our municipal government has a process and I wanted to participate in that to affect change. The issue has not changed, Aberdeen is a dangerous street, but the City was making progress with the plan for Aberdeen's road diet.

On Friday evening I heard the terrible news that part of council is challenging the plan that was set in place to protect children in my neighborhood. Now I feel like the council for the City of Hamilton doesn't respect effort (large group of concerned citizens who participated in the #leanaberdeen campaign) and time we take to participate in our community. Here is a link to the Spec article that covered the delegates back in 2015.

<https://www.thespec.com//news/hamilton-region/2015/12/02/hamilton-to-study-pedestrian-friendly-aberdeen-avenue.html>

Please do not vote against traffic calming in my neighbourhood. Please consider the sentiments from 2015 in the attached speech.

Sincerely,
Christi Hodgson

My name is Christi Hodgson and I am the vice-chair of the Earl Kitchener School Council. In line with The City of Hamilton's Mission, and as the mother of three elementary-aged children, I agree that Hamilton is the best place to raise a child.

Earl Kitchener school council is in the process of re-engaging the School Travel Plan project - a project designed to encourage students and staff to use active transportation travelling to and from school. We felt the need to re-engage the STP project as traffic in the immediate area around the school has become increasingly dangerous. The traffic rushing down Dundurn and Aberdeen, ignoring crossing guards, or racing to catch lights to access or exit the highway has become a danger to students travelling to school. We believe many more students and families in the area would walk or cycle to their destinations if the roads were slower and safer. Aberdeen bears the burden of both incoming and outgoing traffic from Highway 403, and although it is a residential neighbourhood, there are no barriers to enforce the reduction of speed.

I discourage my children from using Aberdeen as a safe route because of this traffic, and I know that many other parents avoid this route as well.

The school travel plan encourages active transportation in accordance with Smart Commute Hamilton, an initiative that takes action on climate change and health in the GTHA through transportation efficiency, policy development and infrastructure renewal.

Part of Smart Commute Hamilton is Active & Sustainable School Transportation (ASST) - this emphasizes the importance of walking, cycling, and public transit. More students using ASST means less cars on the road, less pollution, improved safety, and increased physical activity.

On October 7th, 2015, a formal signing of the Active & Sustainable School Transportation Charter took place in front of City Hall by:

HWDSB

HWCDSD

and the City of Hamilton.

The Ontario Ministry of Education's Foundation for a Healthy School, Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board, and the City of Hamilton's Strategic Plan is reflected in this charter. To quote from the charter "I/We will work together to encourage safe, healthy, and sustainable routes to school through our commitment to the following principles:" The first principle of

which is: “Street design for comfort, convenience, and safety for all users” (Note – ALL users, not just vehicles)

And under this principle, one of the actions is to “reduce speed limits and install traffic calming devices along school commuting routes.” For Earl Kitchener, there are presently 477 primary school students who live in walking distance of the school.

We understand that Aberdeen and Dundurn are two main access roads in our neighbourhood, and are to be shared by residents, students, and businesses, and that vehicular traffic is a part of all of our lives - we are asking that traffic calming devices be considered for our main roads to ensure safe commutes and travel for all. It is a heavily travelled, but residential neighbourhood, and Aberdeen is a school commute route.

Our school community is divided by Aberdeen Avenue, where children who spend the day in class together often don't play together outside of school hours because of the divide. Parents who would otherwise feel comfortable sending their children to the library or parks on their own, do not allow this independence solely because of the issues of safety along Aberdeen.

We want our children to have the ability to safely walk and cycle to school and around our neighbourhood for their physical health, social well being, interaction with their community and the health of our environment.

It is important to recognize that my children will be the first generation of commuters to have access to the newly built LRT system in Hamilton. Cars will no longer be a rite of passage for these kids, who are far more excited by a bicycle and a cell phone as markers of their independence. THIS is my future Hamilton.

On behalf of Earl Kitchener, I ask that you consider a complete street makeover for Aberdeen Avenue to ensure the continued safety of all students and residents alike, and to give them the freedom to choose safe, active transportation.

Pilon, Janet

Subject: Aberdeen

From: Lynda Narducci

Sent: September 13, 2020 8:15 PM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca

Cc: Eisenberger, Fred <Fred.Eisenberger@hamilton.ca>; Office of the Mayor <mayor@hamilton.ca>; Pearson, Maria <Maria.Pearson@hamilton.ca>; Johnson, Brenda <Brenda.Johnson@hamilton.ca>; Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Pauls, Esther <Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca>; Jackson, Tom <Tom.Jackson@hamilton.ca>; VanderBeek, Arlene <Arlene.VanderBeek@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Danko, John-Paul <John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca>; Wilson, Maureen <Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Aberdeen

I live in Ward One and I 100% support traffic calming on Aberdeen!

Lynda Narducci

Pilon, Janet

Subject: Aberdeen Street Safety

From: Samantha Fuller

Sent: September 13, 2020 8:41 PM

To: Eisenberger, Fred <Fred.Eisenberger@hamilton.ca>; Office of the Mayor <mayor@hamilton.ca>; Pearson, Maria <Maria.Pearson@hamilton.ca>; Johnson, Brenda <Brenda.Johnson@hamilton.ca>; Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Pauls, Esther <Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca>; Jackson, Tom <Tom.Jackson@hamilton.ca>; VanderBeek, Arlene <Arlene.VanderBeek@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Danko, John-Paul <John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca>; Wilson, Maureen <Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca>; clerk@hamilton.ca
Subject: Aberdeen Street Safety

Good evening!

My name is Samantha Fuller and I support the Aberdeen traffic calming pilot. As someone that was born and raised in Kirkendall this is yet another necessity the city needs to fix in order for current and future generations to safely navigate our community.

Thank you.

Samatha Fuller

Pilon, Janet

Subject: Ward 2

From: susie folco

Sent: Saturday, September 12, 2020 9:11 AM

To: Eisenberger, Fred; Office of the Mayor; Pearson, Maria; Johnson, Brenda; Clark, Brad; Pauls, Esther; Jackson, Tom; VanderBeek, Arlene; Nann, Nrinder; Danko, John-Paul; Wilson, Maureen; clerk@hamilton.ca

Subject: Ward 2

Hey

I live in ward 2 and I support traffic calming on Aberdeen !

Pilon, Janet

Subject: FW:

From: Brenda Berketo

Sent: September 14, 2020 10:33 AM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca

Subject:

I live in Ward 2 and I support traffic calming on Aberdeen.

Pilon, Janet

Subject: Aberdeen

From: Roy Leggat

Sent: September 14, 2020 10:53 AM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca

Subject: Aberdeen

We are all so totally against the lane closures on Aberdeen.

During the Queen Street closure, my wife and I decided to go for a walk various evenings down Kent Street. Kent Street had signs for 'local traffic only'. Well guess how well that went over. We couldn't believe the number of cars speeding up Kent in spite of the 'local traffic' signs. No one apparently wanted to take the slow route over to Locke.

So given that fact which I can attest to over the course of various evenings--how many more people are going to be racing around all the side streets leading to Aberdeen if you go ahead with the closures.

Instead of worrying only about the people who live on Aberdeen, how about all the people, many times more than live on Aberdeen who now have increased traffic on their streets. You don't think it will happen???? Look at all the traffic on the side streets during the Queen Street closure!!!! Or did anyone bother to go down and have a look at the traffic during that period of time?????????

Let me guess!!!!

NO!!

Pilon, Janet

Subject: I support traffic calming on Aberdeen

From: Cathy Swenson

Sent: September 14, 2020 9:36 AM

To: Eisenberger, Fred <Fred.Eisenberger@hamilton.ca>; Office of the Mayor <mayor@hamilton.ca>; Wilson, Maureen <Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca>; Farr, Jason <Jason.Farr@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Merulla, Sam <Sam.Merulla@hamilton.ca>; Collins, Chad <Chad.Collins@hamilton.ca>; Jackson, Tom <Tom.Jackson@hamilton.ca>; Pauls, Esther <Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca>; Danko, John-Paul <John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca>; Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Pearson, Maria <Maria.Pearson@hamilton.ca>; Johnson, Brenda <Brenda.Johnson@hamilton.ca>; Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>; VanderBeek, Arlene <Arlene.VanderBeek@hamilton.ca>; Whitehead, Terry <Terry.Whitehead@hamilton.ca>; Partridge, Judi <Judi.Partridge@hamilton.ca>; clerk@hamilton.ca

Subject: I support traffic calming on Aberdeen

Lives are at risk.

Thank you,

Cathy Swenson
Ward3

4.10 (bo)

Pilon, Janet

Subject: Regarding Aberdeen Ave. lane reduction

From: Alex Beer

Sent: September 15, 2020 8:43 AM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca

Cc: Office of the Mayor <mayor@hamilton.ca>; Wilson, Maureen <Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca>; Farr, Jason <Jason.Farr@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Merulla, Sam <Sam.Merulla@hamilton.ca>; Collins, Chad <Chad.Collins@hamilton.ca>; Jackson, Tom <Tom.Jackson@hamilton.ca>; Pauls, Esther <Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca>; Ward 8 Office <ward8@hamilton.ca>; Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Pearson, Maria <Maria.Pearson@hamilton.ca>; Johnson, Brenda <Brenda.Johnson@hamilton.ca>; Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>; VanderBeek, Arlene <Arlene.VanderBeek@hamilton.ca>; Whitehead, Terry <Terry.Whitehead@hamilton.ca>; Partridge, Judi <Judi.Partridge@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Regarding Aberdeen Ave. lane reduction

September 15, 2020

Dear Mayor and Members of City Council:

I am writing to reiterate the main concerns of our “Keep Aberdeen Moving” group, which I presented at the Public Works Committee meeting on September 11, 2020, and also to respond to the arguments made by the delegations and council members in support of the Aberdeen lane reduction.

We appreciate that, for several years, concerns have been raised about speeding traffic along Aberdeen - and we shared these concerns. In recent years, a number of measures have already been taken to address this problem, including adding two pedestrian traffic lights so there are now five traffic lights in a 10-block stretch to allow pedestrians to safely cross this road. Just this past year, other measures have included designating the Dundurn to Queen street section of road as a 40-km school safety zone.

While Councillors Wilson and Nann argue that the lane reduction will make Aberdeen safer for children walking along this roadway, council should note that most of the 710 residents of the affected wards who signed our petition are also parents and grandparents concerned with the safety of children.

We are worried that the added congestion caused by the lane reduction will add more traffic speeding through the neighbourhoods on both sides of Aberdeen. These are streets where people walk dogs and ride bikes. These are streets where children live and play.

We note that no proper traffic study has been done to justify the lane reduction. By this we mean a Transportation Impact Study which reports on the current traffic flow throughout the neighbourhood – not just along Aberdeen - and what is anticipated after the lanes have been reduced. At the very least, a baseline study should have been conducted in advance of the change, along with a follow-up study after the pilot period to provide the council with an accurate assessment of the impacts.

We also note that while there have been concerns raised about traffic safety along Aberdeen over several years - along with some community meetings where this and other issues have been discussed - there’s been no community consultation specifically on this blunt instrument of a lane reduction - neither by the Ward 1 councillor nor by the Kirkendall Neighbourhood Association. In responding to a question posed by Councillor Danko at a Public Works Committee meeting in June of 2019, Transportation director Edward Soldo admitted that the lane reduction was not part of the scope of work that was originally contemplated for Aberdeen.

According to the city's Transportation Department, at the current morning peak period, the back-up heading west along Aberdeen at a red light stop at Dundurn is now 26 metres. The department predicts this will increase to 291 metres after the lane reduction. At Locke Street the line-up will grow from 5 metres to an incredible 279 metres.

Not only does this represent considerable congestion, but the idling of these lined-up cars will add to greenhouse gas emissions in the area. It will also restrict side street residents from turning to and from Aberdeen.

While officials in the city's Transportation Department estimate the lane reduction will only add one minute of travel time along Aberdeen, we find this hard to believe, given the estimated backup at red lights once the change has been made. Also, there has been no accounting for human behaviour. We suspect that rather than track the time it takes to drive along Aberdeen before and after the lane reduction, motorists will simply cut through neighbouring side streets to avoid the congestion. We've all experienced getting stuck in a traffic jam on the highway, and noticed people changing lanes in an effort to keep moving forward - only to find the other lanes are very soon backed up as well. Rather than wait for traffic to begin moving again, they try to find a faster way, even if staying in their original lane would have gotten them to their destination sooner.

Aberdeen is designated as an arterial road and the city describes the purpose of such roads as being "to move traffic efficiently to reduce the amount of traffic and speeds on lower classification roads."

We are opposed to using congestion as a means of reducing speeding on Aberdeen.

Last year, council approved four separate roadway safety measures for Aberdeen. Our group is objecting to only one of these. The others have already been implemented and we are fine with them.

We are asking that council overturn the decision on the lane reduction.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

Alex Beer

[REDACTED]
Hamilton, ON [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Pilon, Janet

Subject: In support Aberdeen Traffic Calming - Sep 16, 2020 Council Meeting

From: Chris Ritsma

Sent: September 15, 2020 12:05 AM

To: Office of the Mayor <mayor@hamilton.ca>; Farr, Jason <Jason.Farr@hamilton.ca>; clerk@hamilton.ca

Subject: In support Aberdeen Traffic Calming - Sep 16, 2020 Council Meeting

Hello,

My name is Chris Ritsma and I am a resident of Ward 2. I am send a concise email to voice my support for calming of Aberdeen.

While I do not live on or beside Aberdeen, I have walked, driven and cycled along Aberdeen multiple times. I support traffic calming measures because I support a balanced mode split for transportation in the city. People living in many parts of the city feel uncomfortable and unsafe walking and cycling while drivers are given all the space we have. The sidewalks in the city are hilariously thin beside what sometimes amounts to a urban highway. Aberdeen may not be seen my some to be a neighbourhood street, but I think that is a false way to think of areas in the lower city (neighbourhood street, arterial, et cetera). The lower city was designed well before cars, and as a result fitting cars into it and many other century old cities has been like trying to fit a round peg into a square hole.

This means that to have a successful city there must be discomfort with driving. This is a reality that many are afraid to spell out. In every single city designed for people, it is sometimes difficult to drive. People do not flock to New York, Chicago, Toronto, Vancouver, Montreal, Amsterdam, downtown Burlington and Oakville, Tokyo, Brussels, all for their great highways and lack of congestion. They do so because it is enjoyable to walk, and to get around and because they are lively and culture-filled. If Hamilton wants to be seen as a successful city, it needs to stop trying to be the highway capital of Canada.

One may think Aberdeen is not a street of culture, it is one with concrete and pavement, but when we think this way, rather than holistically about the entire city as one community and as a place to live, not speed, we fail ourselves.

When I cycle to a friends, or to work, or to get groceries, I don't always get to choose the most scenic routes. Sometimes going around a dangerous street means a 20 minute detour on a 25 minute ride. So I choose the dangerous path because I've got limited time in a day. If there are long stretches filling our city where people do not feel safe, and are not safe, people will choose to not cycle, walk, or take transit, and our roads will become more filled with cars, and people will avoid creating culture, livelihoods and families in these areas. Many do not have a choice in how they get around, such as seniors, children, people with disabilities and those who cannot afford the burden of a automobile. Cities are not about driving, they are about living. I didn't move to Hamilton to drive, I moved here to live, and no matter where you live, you should be and feel safe, no matter how you get around our city.

Regards,

Chris Ritsma.

4.10 (bq)

Pilon, Janet

Subject: FW: Keep Aberdeen Moving - Opposition to Proposal Lane Reductions on Aberdeen

From: Erik Dickenson

Sent: September 15, 2020 12:09 PM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca

Cc: Wilson, Maureen <Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca>; Farr, Jason <Jason.Farr@hamilton.ca>; Merulla, Sam <Sam.Merulla@hamilton.ca>; Whitehead, Terry <Terry.Whitehead@hamilton.ca>; Danko, John-Paul <John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Keep Aberdeen Moving - Opposition to Proposal Lane Reductions on Aberdeen

Good Morning City of Hamilton Council Members,

I hope you have all been keeping healthy and safe. My name is Erik Dickenson and I am emailing you to express my key concerns with proposed lane reductions on Aberdeen Avenue. I am including all Council members that were included on Information Update #TOM1904, but please feel free to forward to your colleagues. I have been resident of Ward 1 for over 29 years, living on both Aberdeen and Mount Royal Avenue. I am an avid cyclist, runner, commuter, and advocate for a safe and healthy lifestyle in our community. As an Engineer, I base my beliefs on facts and science, not anecdotal evidence. I have summarized my concerns below, kindly review and comment at your earliest convenience.

- Per the City of Hamilton's report #PW17021a, the overall collision rate for the Aberdeen Avenue corridor between Queen Street and Longwood Road is 4.70 collisions per million vehicle-kilometers. The City has implemented multiple safety measures over the past few years including a Flashing 40km/hr Zone, Pedestrian Signal Crossing at Cottage Avenue, Signaling and Right Turn Modifications at Dundurn to name a few. What is the revised collision rate after these new safety measurements have been implemented? The City's report #TOM1904 also highlights some interesting facts. The City collected data on vehicle speeds over a 3-day period at (3) locations along Aberdeen. What date(s) was this speed data collected on? Was the speed data collected before or after ALL recent traffic calming measures were implemented? Should the City collect updated traffic speed and collision data PRIOR to the lane reduction Pilot to see if our current safety measures have already satisfied our safety goals and Vision Zero mandates? Let me also emphasise that the answer is not to "do nothing" either. We have already done so much. We have implemented a multitude of safety-improvement measures on Aberdeen to-date, and we must first evaluate the success or failures of these measures.
- Per the comments from Edward Soldo during the Council Meeting on September 11th, traffic volumes are ~30% lower due to Covid-19. If the lane reductions on Aberdeen are a Pilot Project, why is it being implemented now with dramatically reduced traffic volumes? I see from the City's reports that all traffic studies on Aberdeen to-date were conducted using pre-Covid-19 traffic counts. With "Rat Running" through neighboring Kirkendall Streets being a primary concern, what meaningful data will be collected on side street traffic volumes from our Pilot Project if our models are based upon a

statistical sample size that is now 30% smaller than real world conditions? We can all agree the traffic patterns during Covid-19 are fundamentally different. Would it not be prudent to implement a Pilot when our City's traffic patterns reflect that of real-world conditions?

- There have been 466 collisions on Aberdeen between Queen Street and Longwood Road from 2008 – 2019 according to the City's report #PW17021a. Where have these traffic collisions occurred along Aberdeen; at intersections or along the main thoroughfare? My concern is that the overall design of the intersections along Aberdeen will not be changing with the proposed parking changes. In fact, having no parking within a certain distance of each intersection would promote speeding and dangerous passing to bypass slower drivers and those turning onto side streets.
- To combat "Rat Running" I understand the City will "monitor the effects of this change and respond as needed". The monitoring will include recording license plate information and tracking drivers through Kirkendall side streets. Have the existing traffic conditions been monitored and recorded (*pre-Covid for real-world conditions*) in neighbouring Kirkendall side streets and not just Aberdeen? It is imperative that we have a valid baseline of data for Kirkendall side streets upon which traffic speed and volume changes can be benchmarked. If we don't have a baseline of data from these side streets already (pre-Covid-19), what could we possibly compare the "Pilot Period" data to? This "Pilot Period" data will be our justification for either extending or abolishing the Pilot Project. In addition, what evidence supports the notion that drivers will not be persuaded to cut through side streets? At peak AM hours there will be a queue of 291 vehicles stopped at Dundurn headed westbound (APPENDIX "B", Report #TOM1904). Traffic psychology indicates that drivers would be persuaded to cut through side streets (regardless of speed humps and stop signs) to avoid these long queues, it's natural human behavior to find a faster route.
- There have been many discussions comparing Aberdeen Avenue to Rousseaux St/Mohawk Road in Ancaster since it is a Major Arterial Road with a higher volume of ~24,000 vehicles per day. Rousseaux Street also connects to Highway 403/Linc and appears to handle the volume well. Rousseaux Street/Mohawk Road is approximately 1.6km long has 3 intersections/stoplights (Filman Road, Lime Kiln Road, Wilson St.). Aberdeen is 1.7km long and has 8 intersections/stoplights. How can we compare traffic congestion on Rousseaux Street to Aberdeen when the fundamental designs are completely different? If Aberdeen did not have over 2.6 times the number of intersections and stoplights as Rousseaux Street/Mohawk Road we could more accurately predict that traffic congestion would NOT be an issue.

In its current form, the lane reduction proposal appears ill-conceived. Given the recent public outcry in opposition to these changes, I urge Council to reconsider the proposed lane reduction Pilot on Aberdeen. I look forward to your feedback.

Best Regards and Stay Healthy,



September 2020

To Whom It May Concern,

Since its founding in 1972, the Durand Neighbourhood Association's mission has been to be an active, resident-based voice engaging community members and advocating for neighbourhood priorities and improvements. One of the key priorities of the DNA in recent years has been safe streets. In particular, the DNA is committed to advocating on behalf of projects that make streets safer for all users, including pedestrians, cyclists, and automobiles.

In the past, the DNA has been involved in a number of traffic calming projects culminating in the Durand Traffic Study in 2002. From principles of this study a number of projects have emerged in the neighbourhood which the DNA has advocated on behalf of. Some of these include, traffic calming on Aberdeen Avenue west of Queen, two way conversions of Bold and Duke, the creation of the Herkimer and Charkton bike lanes, a leaner Bay Street South with two way bike lanes, and most recently the Queen Street two-way conversion. These projects have been successful in calming traffic, making streets safer, and helping make the neighbourhood more livable. We believe that the traffic calming pilot project planned for Aberdeen Avenue is a measure that has the potential to bring about similar positive benefits to both the Kirkendall neighbourhood and the Durand neighbourhood. Data available from the City of Hamilton clearly indicates that the measures being proposed are justified and needed to ensure safety of all road users.

Moreover, the traffic calming measures being proposed are only part of a pilot project. This means that temporary changes can be made, data can be collected, and the traffic calming measures can be amended if any major negative impacts arise from the changes. We believe that now is not the time for city council to waver in their support of vision zero, and the pursuit of their stated goal of making Hamilton the best place to 'raise a child and age successfully'. For these reasons, the board of directors of the DNA has chosen to wholeheartedly support Councillor Wilson and residents of Kirkendall in their desire to bring about changes through the Aberdeen traffic calming pilot project.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Chris Redmond', written in a cursive style.

Christopher Redmond
President, Durand Neighbourhood Association

On behalf of the board of directors, DNA

CC: Jason Farr, City Councillor, Ward 2

Pilon, Janet

Subject: Traffic calming on Aberdeen

From: Steven McKay

Sent: September 15, 2020 11:46 AM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca

Subject: Traffic calming on Aberdeen

Hello

My name is Steve McKay and I am a resident of Ward 1. I am writing to inform the clerk of session that I support the traffic calming on Aberdeen.

Best regards,
Steve

Pilon, Janet

Subject: Mayor and Members of Council

From: Peter Quaglia

Sent: September 15, 2020 11:45 AM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca; Office of the Mayor <mayor@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Merulla, Sam <Sam.Merulla@hamilton.ca>; Collins, Chad <Chad.Collins@hamilton.ca>; Jackson, Tom <Tom.Jackson@hamilton.ca>; Pauls, Esther <Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca>; Ward 8 Office <ward8@hamilton.ca>; Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Pearson, Maria <Maria.Pearson@hamilton.ca>; Johnson, Brenda <Brenda.Johnson@hamilton.ca>; Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>; VanderBeek, Arlene <Arlene.VanderBeek@hamilton.ca>; Whitehead, Terry <Terry.Whitehead@hamilton.ca>; Partridge, Judi <Judi.Partridge@hamilton.ca>; Wilson, Maureen <Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Mayor and Members of Council

Mr. Mayor and Members of Council

I, the undersigned manage and operate a business in Ward 3 that has served the Hamilton Community for over **153** years. (Established in 1867) During a pandemic a population is as vulnerable as its most vulnerable members. The present situation in our community was created by decades of neglect of the duty to house with dignity vulnerable fellow Canadians. I have been informed that the City "owns" many empty apartment buildings. To open the "temporary" emergency shelter as planned by City Hall at Main and Emerald St at the heart of our neighborhood, Stinson Community/Ward 3, creates the conditions for a serious outbreak of Covid-19: Pandemic+Stinson's high concentration of Community Living Facilities+New Good Shepherd Ministries emergency shelter= Outbreak. Pandemic+Stinson's high concentration of Community Living Facilities+"Motel Cathedral"+ Tenting Encampments= Explosive Outbreak.

It is a logical prognostication that there will be interactions between our local vulnerable resident population, the vulnerable transient clients of the Good Shepherd Ministries and the vulnerable population of the encampments that need to access the services of "Motel Cathedral" as they have named the emergency shelter.

If after ignoring our warning, the new emergency shelter opens as it was announced, at the site of the Old Cathedral Boys School in September, The City of Hamilton, the Good Shepherd Ministries and all other parties involved directly and indirectly at the Provincial and Federal level, shall take action NOW to prevent the crises that it will manifest in situ and they shall urgently implement the following safety and security measures that Toronto was forced to take after the crises developed in their midst, as it was reported by CBC:

"City says steps being taken to increase safety. The city said local residents have shared their concerns with the city and it has taken steps to address community concerns. These steps include the following measures:

- Installation of 33 security cameras.
- Enhanced 24/7 mobile patrols.
- Four security guards at the Roehampton site around the clock.
- A community safety team of seven people between the Roehampton and Broadway Avenue sites who are picking up hazards, such as needles and monitoring and addressing inappropriate activity.
- Work with Inner City Health Associates to provide clinical health supports, including registered nurses and a physician, a virtual addictions physician clinic and day-time on call support, plus psychiatric clinical support.
- Meetings held regularly with the clients, which include reviewing the Good Neighbours Policy and their responsibilities as residents of the shelter.
- Educational signs posted in the building regarding conduct in the neighbourhood.
- Regular visits from Toronto police's community response unit." (Source CBC)"

The City of Hamilton, the Good Shepherd Ministries and other parties directly and indirectly involved at the Provincial and Federal level, shall take immediate action to implement preventive Covid19 safety and security measures to protect the Stinson Community and avoid the birth of the First Canadian COVID-19 Ghetto.

Preventing the community transmission of COVID-19 is a priority for all of us. We reviewed the following documents:

1. Ministry of Health. May 28, 2020. Memorandum to: Mental Health and Addictions Service Providers. RE: COVID-19 Guidance: Congregate Living for Vulnerable Populations.
2. Public Health Ontario, 05/23/2020. COVID-19 Preparedness and Prevention in Congregate Living Settings.
3. Ministry of Health. May 24, 2020. MEMORANDUM TO: Health System Organizations and Providers. SUBJECT: Additional Direction on Testing Strategy.
4. COVID-19 Proactive Surveillance Testing Update to York Region Long-Term Care/Retirement Homes and Community Living Facilities as of April 23, 2020
5. Public Health Ontario, 05/23/2020. Managing COVID-19 Outbreaks in Congregate Living Settings.
6. Tenants Re-Engaging in Community Life. Homes for Special Care and Community Homes for Opportunity. July 17, 2020.

In the case that our warnings are ignored, as to this moment, then the protocols described in these 6 documents shall be followed to the letter at the Good Shepherd emergency shelter and in all the assisting living facilities in the Stinson Community area.

Furthermore, we have identified in those 6 documents many blind spots, weak areas and weak protocols that shall be corrected to prevent an outbreak. Immediate action shall be taken by Hamilton City Hall and all other agencies and entities involved:

1. The "flood" of Tenting Encampments that intends to set up in the vicinity of the new emergency shelter to access the services provide by the Good Shepherd Ministries should be stopped immediately. Members of the encampment "scouted" already the green space/parkettes including Bishop Park, Carter Park, Wellington Park, parkette off of West Ave S, business property at Main and Emerald, they have stated their intentions to set up camp in those locations a couple days before the Good Shepherd temporary emergency shelter (aka Motel Cathedral) opens for business someday this month of September 2020. We immediately fulfilled our pandemic civic duty to inform, by reporting to our new Councillor Nann, City Hall and other authorities.

We received this worrisome information: " I found out last night that the company the city was using to rent the porta potties that were outside First Ontario, have cancelled the contract due to extreme damage, that is why there are no porta potties on Ferguson, because besides the company they were using, that city cannot find another company that will put them in that area."

We also take in consideration these paragraphs from the article CBC News Sept 1, 2020:

"The city says a waste collection worker received minor injuries on Ferguson Avenue North around 8 a.m. on Tuesday, Aug. 25. More than 35 tents there house people who are sleeping rough."

"The city says its crews regularly collect waste from encampment areas around the First Ontario Centre and Ferguson Avenue North. Now, "the city is looking at the frequency of waste collection schedules in those areas," the city said, "and will be updating the advice it gives outreach workers to provide services to those areas."

"The encampments have been a divisive issue in Hamilton since they appeared with greater visibility during the COVID-19 pandemic. There are more than 50 tents downtown, mostly outside the temporary shelter on York Boulevard and the Wesley Day Centre on Ferguson Avenue North."

"It's not new for people to be sleeping in tents around Hamilton, says Dr. Jill Wiwcharuk of the Hamilton Social Medicine Response Team (Hamsmart). People have convened around FirstOntario Centre and the Wesley Day Centre because there are resources like food and restrooms there."

"Temporary shelter moving from FirstOntario Centre to former boys school next month"

Notice that the article does not mention the problem presented by human feces and urine, both bio-hazard materials that may carry the virus and contaminate shoes. City Hall shall provide more cleaning crews instead of less and the cleaning crews shall work under the protection of trained security teams.

2. A team of Covid-19 prevention experts shall be created to monitor the compliance to the pandemic protocols in all the Congregate Living Settings located in Stinson Community/Ward 3. The monitoring of these facilities shall be done often, at least once a week, and their inspection of the facilities to survey the implementation of Covid-19 protocols shall be unannounced to the managers of those facilities. We fulfilled our civic duty by reporting to our Ward 3, new Councillor Nann, City Hall and other authorities multiple times in the past weeks that the Covid-19 protocols are not being enforced by the care-givers.

Updates and new information on this subject shall be periodically shared with the community.

3. The Good Shepherd emergency shelter shall follow ALL the protocols outline in the 6 documents mentioned above. In addition, the City of Hamilton, the Good Shepherd Ministries and other parties involved directly and indirectly at the Provincial and Federal level, shall take immediate action to implement the following safety and security measures to protect the clients of the Good Shepherd Ministries and our neighborhood, the Stinson Community/Ward 3, from a Corona outbreak:

3.1. Good Shepherd shall provide 24/7 washrooms attendants: As the emergency shelter will shelter, by definition, a constant transient population of 45 plus men overnight + the numerous people who access the facilities during the day without spending the night in the shelter, there shall be 24/7 employees, in full Covid-19 protection gear, sanitizing the toilets and the showers after each use. The toilets need to be equipped with toilet LIDS to stop the Covid19 to be airborne after each flush and infect the surrounding area.

3.2. Cleaning crews to remove bio-hazard materials from the neighborhood, not only needles and condoms but human feces. Human feces and urine had manifested as a grave problem around the "tent encampment sites" in downtown Hamilton and in Toronto. The human feces collected could be tested for Covid19 and thus create a databank. Updates shall be made public.

3.3. To the basic screening & daily temperature check of all those who access the shelter shall be added obligatory Covid-19 testing to identify asymptomatic individuals. City Hall and the Good Shepherd Ministries shall provide the One Hour Covid-19 test already in use in other countries. This information should be entered in a databank. The data (not the names of the infected) shall be made public.

3.4. Daily sanitation of our sidewalks and public and private parking spaces with Eco-friendly products. Those neighbors that object to their portion of the sidewalk being sprayed may opt out.

3.5. Modification of the Pre-Covid-19 curfews currently used by Good Shepherd Ministries in their shelters to: The men that had secured a bed for the night, shall be permitted to come in during the night at any time but they shall not leave the premises until 9am.

3.6. Washrooms at the emergency shelter should remain open 24/7 for those who have not secure an overnight bed thus minimize the use of public and private spaces as latrines, especially vital during the Second Wave. There shall be facilities attendants 24/7 to sanitize the facilities after each use.

4. We do not support a "police state" but we support all temporary pandemic emergency measures that can assist us the Stinson Community, to survive this crisis. Police presence shall greatly increase, cars, bicycles and drones, during the pandemic.

September 1, 2020, a black drone was spotted flying over Victoria Ave South between Main and East Ave. at 3am; as we are aware that it is unlawful to fly a private drone over Victoria Ave South, the neighbors assumed it was a Police drone.

5. Emergency financial assistance for the neighbors of the Stinson Community:

5.1. Compensation for the cost of upgrading and protecting our homes and business with surveillance cameras and flood lights.

5.2. Tax forgiveness from the day the emergency shelter opens until the day it closes, to compensate the neighbors from the hardships, the added burdens and the extraordinary Covid-19 risks imposed upon us.

5.3. A fund shall be created to compensate for damage to property.

6. In the case that a Covid-19 outbreak occurs in our Stinson Community/Ward 3 following the opening of the emergency shelter:

6.1. A fund shall be created by City Hall and by The Hospitaller Order of St. John of God (The Good Shepherd Ministries) to compensate families for the death of a family member arising from any circumstances related to a resident of temporary emergency shelter or tent encampment.

6.2. A fund shall be created to support Stinson surviving residents that become "Covid-19 long haulers".

6.3. A fund shall be created by City Hall and The Hospitaller Order of St. John of God (The Good Shepherd Ministries) to compensate for any loss of income due to an outbreak of Covid-19 in our Stinson Community-Ward 3.

7. Other questions presented by the Stinson Community neighbours(the proper prevention Covid-19 answer to all questions is YES):

- will the men be wearing masks outside the shelter?
- will there be supervised sanitation stations tables at all exits/entrances 24 hrs per day, as the men are presently allowed to leave at anytime of the day or night when they so please.
- will the men be made to stay 6ft apart outside, and will there be 24hr outside staff to reinforce this.
- will the Good Shepherd be giving out free masks, and hand sanitizer to those coming in and out from the encampments to take back to the tents.
- how often will Covid-19 screening be done of the staff, residents and all those accessing the emergency shelter services.
- have they hired specific cleaning staff, trained in covid cleaning, 24hrs a day at the high touch points.
- will the bikes that will be kept inside of the building be sanitized before entry by a specific cleaning staff.
- will grocery carts full of unsanitized stuff be allowed inside the building, if so, will there be a specific trained staff designated to this if grocery carts full of stuff are NOT allowed in the building where the secure, locked place be that they will be kept.
- will the residents be obliged to sanitize their hands before and after smoking.
- will contact tracing be done for not only the sleep over men but daytime men as well?
- will temperature checks be taken from anyone going inside during the open door daytime policy?
- will the neighbours be informed of a covid outbreak before it hits the media?
- where will a person be isolated once a confirmed covid test comes back?
- is there a 24hr phone number for residents to call directly into the shelter if so, how will this number be made known to the community?
- What are the daytime contact numbers for management from the Good Shepherd?
- What is the emergency contact for Brother Reginald Howson, Provincial Superior of the Order of Hospitaller Brothers of St. John of God that runs the Good Shepherd Ministries.
- Will a constant and visible police patrol of the neighborhood, in bicycles and cars, be deployed.
- Will the military, with so much experience assisting other countries in crisis, be called to assess the risks of the present situation and to assist with proper protocols or better still, be called to assist identifying alternative safer locations for the emergency shelter and for a safe tent encampment.
- If Stinson is hit hard by an outbreak, will the military be deployed as they were when the seniors long-term care homes suffered the outbreak due to negligence and poor preparedness.
- It was stated that this will be a "temporary emergency shelter" and that it will be "probably closed by June 30, 2021". Will the City of Hamilton and Good Shepherd Ministries provide daily briefings regarding the selection of the new location and daily briefings regarding the advance of the work-renovations done to prepare it.

It is your duty to keep us safe. Act now!

Peter Quaglia

Pilon, Janet

Subject: Mayor and Members of Council

From: Edawin

Sent: Monday, September 14, 2020 9:24 PM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca; Bates, Tamara <Tamara.Bates@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Mayor and Members of Council

Mayor and Members of Council

September 14, 2020

I, the undersigned, have resided in Hamilton/Ward 3 for 23 years.

I write at the best of my abilities, under the pressure to submit in time and with the very limited amount of information that I have been able to gather from the officials, the newspapers and the community.

This is an addendum to the two emails I have already submitted along with some neighbours, to the Clerk for the Council meeting of September 10, 2020, regarding the Old Cathedral Boys School emergency shelter. I attach 5 documents and the FAQ.

This letter has also being composed to the best of my ability also considering that numerous neighbours, me included, who have been asking questions to Councillor Nann since mid August and received to this date no answers or only answers deflecting our inquiries.

I will leave aside now the stressors that the opening of the emergency shelter will add onto our historically vulnerable Stinson community and how this increases the risks for an outbreak of Corona in our neighborhood because we have addressed these issues already in those two emails.

Councillor Nann wrote to me: "this decision was made under emergency orders which cannot be revoked"

I bring to your attention that those words misled many neighbours into believing that it was pointless to make the effort to exercise their duty and right to express their opposition to the opening of the temporary emergency shelter in the location of the Old Cathedral Boys High School. Most of my neighbours added sadly: "Besides, there is no point to fight City Hall."

But we discussed it further and then I passed on in an email our thinking to Councillor Nann: "Your affirmation does not stand legally, as any emergency order SHALL BE REVOKED immediately when it is shows indications to be unwise, ill-conceived, dangerous to the local population, taken in the interest of third parties, promoting self-interest or corrupt."

It appears that the actions of those involved may also fit the parameters for what is called Conspiracy Against Rights in the USA code (Conspiracy against rights is a criminal offense involving acts to prevent others from exercising their constitutional rights). The same universal legal principles and arguments could be presented to the Canadian Courts in this case. The seriousness may be compounded by the use/or abuse of the sacrosanct and extraordinary powers of an "emergency order" because it may create a dangerous legal precedent to the well-being not just of the Stinson community but to all Canadians in the future.

All aspects of how this emergency order was passed shall be made public, including the names of all those who participated in the different stages of conception and what role those people played and the interests they represented

and the dates when each one of those conversations took place. It appears, but we are not sure, that the emergency order conception began after the order to shelter in place was already lifted. In Ontario, Phase 1 started May 19, 2020; Phase 2 started June 12, 2020 and Phase 3 started July 17, 2020. It appears that the Emergency Committee gave their approval for funding the emergency shelter at the Old Cathedral Boys School at the July 17, 2020 meeting, the exact day Phase 3 began in Ontario. The timing should be investigated; it appears that the Good Shepherd Hamilton already owned or had possession of the building in 2018. All of this is public record.

I will focus now on the document published in August by Nringer Nann, City Councillor/ Ward 3. entitled "Community Information Session on Temporary Shelter Services." , I attached the document to this email under that title.

The document opens: "This document contains a summary to the questions my office has received in relation to the September opening of a temporary shelter at 378 Main St. E."

Please note that instead of "a summary of questions", it should read: "a selection of questions"; it has being reported by neighbors that they were blocked in the "social media" for asking "inconvenient questions" that perhaps did not suit Nann's narrative.

The document concludes with the contact information of two of the protagonists of the Zoom info-meeting:

Rob Mastroianni Manager of Emergency Shelter Services & RCF Subsidies at Rob.Mastroianni@Hamilton.ca

Katherine Kalinowski, Chief Operating Officer, Good Shepherd Housing Services kkalinowski@gsch.ca (905)528-5877 Ext. 3323

It appears that the document and the the Zoom info meeting hosted by Councillor Nann in August, are in sync. The linguistic styles of both formats are identical. The type of language used to communicate the "news" to the community after the decision was already passed under "an emergency order", may indicate a willfully and orchestrated strategic intention to distract, to purposely occult the facts and to mislead the public. The type of language may indicate that the authors had awareness that they were manipulating and taking advantage of and abusing the emergency order process letter and/or spirit for their own personal ideology, interests or gains. This type of intention constitutes cause for the revocation of the emergency order. As it stands at this moment it may set a dangerous legal precedent for all Canadians.

It is possible that Councillor Nann, a holistic nutritionist from New York and only a recent resident of Hamilton/Ward 3, Gage Park, was not "familiar" with the history of our City, including the sinister scams of the famously nefarious family Martino that seemly became rich by sucking the life blood from the vulnerable and marginalized population placed under their care by the City and the Province, and the unsolved murder of Joe Melo, seemly implicated in assisting living schemes and a mega "pharmacy legal scheme" as reported in the Spec, until we informed her about it. It appears that the Martino family still runs the same kind of business they used to under other names and numbered companies as reported in the Spec article "House of Horrors", Jun 11, 2020 and other recent articles. Note the dates:

1. House of Horrors was published June 11, 2020.
2. At the beginning of July 2020, some yet unnamed party approached Councillor Nann with the plan to locate the emergency shelter at the corner of Main and Emerald St. under an emergency order.

House of Horrors should have raised a red flag for the location.

Another red flag emerges from the on-line City of Hamilton Covid -19 map. Since the beginning of the pandemic the composite area of of Stinson-Landsdale has being colored "Dark Gray" indicating the high number of infections compared to the rest of Hamilton.

It seems that Councillor Nann was also not aware of the dynamics of the Stinson community, not just regarding the high

concentration of badly run assisting living operations, but the high concentration of other social ills buildings, crystal meth dens and rooming houses, "trouble buildings" that even the police are afraid to enter. This problem is presently compounded by the "red fentani" and the Covid-19.

A study for the Ontario Marginalization Index (ON-MARG) should be done on the composite area of Stinson-Landsdale.

On the other hand, Mastroianni and Kalinowski should have being fully aware of the situation of Stinson-Landsdale, given their seniority in Hamilton, their jobs and their titles.

Another red flag was raised by the independent journalist Joey Coleman's Tweet:"City Manager's office just deleted video of last week's meeting of the Housing and Homelessness Advisory Committee from YouTube." He has now requested this video under the "Freedom of Information Act". We ask you to look into the matter and to use your Councillor position to release this video to the public immediately, so that given the urgency of the matter we do not have to wait for many months before it is released. You shall also require the name/s of the persons who requested for this video to be deleted and the reasons they alleged for this action. The public has a right to know who and why.

This could constitute cause for the revocation of the emergency order, as it may indicate rush and/or wrong-doing and/or self-interest and/or conspiracy against rights and thus abuse of the emergency order legal process letter and/or spirit.

Furthermore, their actions de facto disregard the well-being of the population that resides already in situ during the pandemic and are not financially able to move elsewhere at this moment. If an Covid-19 outbreak manifests at the heart of Stinson, then there will be grounds to claim the action-planners and other interested parties are open to liability because we warn them.

I noticed that today, September 14, the cases of Covid-19 are increasing as it was prognosticated.

I noticed that in Hamilton, the Stinson neighbourhood was down from the recent "Dark Grey" to "Medium Grey" but that Landsdale is in "Dark Grey", meaning there is a higher numbers of new infections in that community. Notice that both neighborhoods are geographically touching. The boundary is Main St. exactly were Motel Cathedral will open soon. So it is a fact that the emergency shelter is opening at the geographical heart of the largest numbers of Covid-19 reported cases in Hamilton.

I take now the task to point out to the Mayor and Council some of the other red flags where it seems that misleading language was used regarding the "temporary status of the emergency shelter". This may legally constitute deception and conspiracy and a will to mislead the community and to corrupt letter and/or the spirit of the order.

1. "What makes you think that Cathedral will be any more successful than the First Ontario?"

The shelter at First Ontario has offered a safe, hospitable environment for single men experiencing homelessness. Good Shepherd has no authority over the space outside of the FOC that is currently an encampment site. Staff do monitor that area and actively offer shelter services but we do not direct any activity outside of the FOC. At the Cathedral site, Good Shepherd will be responsible for activity both inside and outside of the building. We will not accommodate campers on this site. We will, however, work with individuals who are not registered in shelter but who approach us seeking other kinds of housing help or support services."

Perhaps Councillor Nann has not enough experience to know that, naturally and logically, the encampment site will move from First Ontario to the Stinson green spaces/ parkettes, because the tenters need to be close to the services of "Motel Cathedral", as they call it. The tenters have already scouted our neighbourhood and stated their intentions to move onto the various green spaces, as we have reported to the authorities and thus fulfilled our civic duties (during a pandemic to report infractions or weakness of the safety protocols is a ethical and a legal duty not only a civic right.)

It is reasonable to think that Mastroniani and the Good Shepherd Hamilton, more experienced than Nann, may had

already prognosticated this encampment possibility and not only chose to remain silent but they may have tried to hide it from the community by stating that: "We will not accommodate campers on this site. We will, however, work with individuals who are not registered in shelter but who approach us seeking other kinds of housing help or support services."

If they contemplated the possibility of the tenting camp moving closer to Motel Cathedral attracted to the services the tenters will receive there, they spoke knowingly with the "intention to deceive the public" and their use of the "emergency order" is null. If they did not contemplate the likelihood of a "flood of tents", it may indicate that these individuals are not equipped to hold on their present jobs or to invoke a pandemic "emergency order". Council shall interrogate the individuals separately, ask them for all their documentations and notes to determine which one of these two scenarios took place.

"We will, however, work with individuals who are not registered in shelter but who approach us seeking other kinds of housing help or support services.

The opening of the doors of the new emergency shelter was orchestrated behind close doors. The plan endangers the community with the approaching Second Wave, thus a new Covid-19 emergency order shall be invoked if the Motel Cathedral opens in disregard of sound scientific pandemic strategies and protocols:

For the time that this particular shelter remains open, the services that historically the Good Shepherd Ministries has offered to "the individuals who are not registered in shelter but who approach us seeking other kinds of housing help or support services." shall be suspended.

The support services the homeless desperately need are food, toilets and showers. As a Covid-19 precautionary measure, the doors of Motel Cathedral shall be closed to all-non residents. These Good Shepherd Ministries services to individuals who are not registered in the shelter shall be suspended in this precise location due to Covid-19 "community distancing protocols" and these vital services shall be offered at a different location. If the tenting folk needs are served outside of Stinson, this will stop the tenting camp from setting in Stinson and it will reduce the compounded risk of a Covid-19 outbreak that our community is facing at the moment.

2. "Site & Location

How was the Former Cathedral Boys' School site chosen for this facility?

The property is privately owned by the Catholic Diocese who offered the site for this purpose to the Good Shepherd in response to the population needs. Upon review, the site was in appropriate state of use and contained the amenities most appropriate for shelter use including: showers, gym, overnight accommodation and day programming use."

The Ownership of the building is not clear, therefore the interests of third parties is obscured:

Taken from the Good Shepherd Blog: "On January 19, 2015, the Little Brothers of the Good Shepherd fused with the Hospitaller Brothers of St. John of God. This 'fusion' of the two religious orders saw the end of the Little Brothers of the Good Shepherd as a formal entity. The Little Brothers of the Good Shepherd have now become Hospitaller Brothers of St. John of God.

The Little Brothers of the Good Shepherd are known locally for the work that is done through Good Shepherd Ministries in Toronto."

This means that The Good Shepherd Hamilton is indeed a Catholic entity located within the Hamilton Diocese, but it is legally a "formal entity" [An association, corporation, partnership, proprietorship, trust, or individual that has legal standing in the eyes of law. A legal entity has legal capacity to enter into agreements or contracts, assume obligations, incur and pay debts, sue and be sued in its own right, and to be held responsible for its actions] and as such it is legally different from the Dioceses even if they are geographically within the Diocese and thus "belong" to the Diocese but it is not privately own by the Diocese. Thus the statement that "The property is privately owned by the Catholic Diocese who offered the site for this purpose to the Good Shepherd in response to the population needs" may appear to be

purposefully "misleading".

I selected 2 lines from the Cultural Heritage Assessment Report on the Former Cathedral Boys' High School.

<https://pub-hamilton.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=151834>

1.0 Introduction, 3rd paragraph: " On November 9, 2016, Alan Whittle of Good Shepherd Hamilton greeted Peter Stewart, Francine Antoniou and Paul Dilse for photographic recording of the school."

This indicates that Alan Whittle/Good Shepherd Hamilton had already "some level of interest" in the building in 2016.

The next document is dated 2018, 2 years before the pandemic began:

<https://pub-hamilton.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=152578>

Note the last line:

"HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The subject property, municipally known as 378 Main Street East, Hamilton (see Appendix "A" to Report PED17168) is known locally as the Cathedral Boys' High School.

The School was built in 1928 and funded by the Hamilton Catholic population. This school was the first purpose built Catholic High School in Hamilton. Designed by Hutton and Souter, the Former Cathedral Boys' High School was designed in the architectural style known as Modern Gothic, Collegiate Gothic or Neo-Gothic. Hutton and Souter were prominent architects responsible for a number of other significant buildings in Hamilton such as the Delta Collegiate High School, the Royal Connaught Hotel, and the John Sopinka Courthouse.

In 1951, a wing was built to memorialize students that fought and lost their lives in the First and Second World Wars. Constructed in a vernacular style, the architect is unknown. In September 1992, the Cathedral Boys' High School and Cathedral Girls' High School (on Main Street East, two blocks east of Cathedral Boys' High School) were integrated.

In September 1995, the publicly funded Cathedral High School opened at King Street East and Wentworth Street North, replacing Cathedral Boys' High School and Cathedral Girls' High School.

The property is currently owned by Good Shepherd Hamilton."

According to the Cultural Heritage folk, the Good Shepherd Hamilton already owned the property in 2018.

Furthermore, in a recent Spec. article we read: "Good Shepherd is working out an arrangement with the Roman Catholic diocese to rent out a part of the former Cathedral school, said agency spokesperson Alan Whittle."

<https://www.thespec.com/news/council/2020/07/10/millions-more-on-table-to-help-hamiltons-homeless-amid-pandemic.html>

How can this be if the Cultural Heritage report lists the Good Shepherd Hamilton as the "owner" of the building?

If Bishop Crosby and the Hospitaller Brothers of St. John of God and the Good Shepherd Hamilton and Alan Whittle had no intention to mislead the Stinson community regarding the "temporary location of the emergency shelter" instead of: "The property is privately owned by the Catholic Diocese who offered the site for this purpose to the Good Shepherd in response to the population needs.", they should have said (my words): "The property is currently owned by Good Shepherd Hamilton", even if the property was acquired or perhaps leased for only \$1 since at least 2018 .

We question the parties name above regarding the lease and we were ignored.

And how could Bishop Crosby, head of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Hamilton "offered the site for this purpose" two years before Covid-19?

3. "Who approached the Diocese? Will they be compensated/reimbursed for use of the space? Good Shepherd approached the Diocese and they have a lease in place."

After reading this, many neighbors believed it and repeatedly requested information regarding the terms and length of this "lease", myself included. There was absolute silence from Nann, Mastroianni and the Good Shepherd Hamilton and the Hospitaller Brothers of St. John of God and Bishop Crosby on the subject. The optics are not good with respect to these actors' bona fides during the process of invoking an emergency order and the ownership or lease of the building.

It is not a stretch to say that The Old Cathedral Boys' High School is what is known in real estate terms as a "white elephant": a burdensome possession whose cost of upkeep is not in line with its usefulness or value. It was calculated, after the inspection of the building that the cost to remedy the asbestos, the plumbing and the electrical would be at least 15 million dollars. If we add to this astronomical cost the "heritage designation", "the white elephant" real estate definition is met.

This real estate deal is not clear and it may cross the boundaries of ethical behavior and transparency and it shall be looked into and investigated in depth by the Hamilton City Council. Perhaps there are some other benefits to Good Shepherd Hamilton by opening the pandemic temporary emergency shelter at the "white elephant" property and later on obtain favors or special considerations regarding the property? This shall be disclosed.

This could constitute cause for the revocation of the emergency order, as it may indicate deception, wrong-doing, interest of third parties, tit for tot and abuse of the emergency order process with a possible ulterior motive to by-pass a lawful "Cultural Heritage designation". It should be looked into it by City Hall and the Ethics Committee.

3. "What is the hard end date for this use? Is there one?"

June 2021 is the approved end date for this temporary use. However, it is also dependent on what unfolds with the pandemic and potential second wave. Extending beyond this date would require Council approval and additional funding."

It appears that this ambiguous and open-ended answer is designed to reassure the overwhelmed community and perhaps even to bypass the "heritage designation" under the pandemic emergency orders.

Once "in situ" with the shelter running, pandemic or not by June 2021, there will be little incentive for City Hall NOT to renew the contract, mostly if it supported by Rob Mastroianni and Ward 3 Councillor Nann.

If indeed June 2021 is the approved final date line for this temporary use, and in case that the opening of this so called "emergency shelter" takes place against our dutifully reported concerns and warnings, then Rob Mastroianni and City Hall shall actively and immediately engage in the selection and the preparedness of a more suitable site for another Good Shepherd Hamilton emergency shelter so that it is ready for June 30 2021. This should be done under a new "emergency order". This immediate and active engagement to find another location is urgent because there is no guarantee that the pandemic will be resolved by June 2021, and the community may be forced to live under these extreme conditions for 9 long months + the delays. This time, the process shall be public to avoid wasting precious resources again, aka taxpayers money.

4. "Why are these facilities so concentrated in Landsdale and Stinson?"

How was this factored into the decision? There are a number of social service type agencies in the central lower city, such as shelters, Residential Care Facilities, and others. Many of these programs have long standing histories in the neighbourhood that date back 30+ years.

Due to proximity to other services which residents would access, the downtown core is often seen as an ideal location to ensure ease of access to those services."

I follow this statement with the words of Councillor Nann in the email she sent me, dated 05/09/2020:

"I truly do appreciate your concern of the over concentration in the Stinson neighbourhood, as with several other neighborhoods in Ward 3 of poorly run RCFs. It is something I will continue to tirelessly flag and demand action on. Historical decisions led to this over-concentration and it must be rectified!"

Councillor Nann contradicts herself by:

a. Actively supporting to open the emergency shelter by invoking an extreme "emergency order" and thus purposely bypassing her constituents concerns regarding the over-concentration of the area.

b. While affirming that "Historical decisions led to this over-concentration and it must be rectified!"

This contradiction of thought disqualify her from invoking "emergency orders" because her support for the plan just increased the historical over-concentration she states needs to be rectified.

Perhaps there was "no time to consult the community" but there was plenty time to consult the experts, like ON-MARG and any urban epidemiologist from McMaster.

I firmly believe that the Ontario Human Rights Code is intended to protect us all, and in particular to protect the human rights of the vulnerable and marginalized and that the legislation is not to be used to create an urban ghetto, which constitutes a violation of Section 7 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. 7. Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice. Myself included.

"Due to proximity to other services which residents would access, the downtown core is often seen as an ideal location to ensure ease of access to those services." This is a deceptive excuse that has already been used in the past in Hamilton and in other cities with disastrous results. This is precisely how urban ghettos were and are created. Services shall be provide in situ at the emergency shelter, wherever it is located, this is the year 2020 and it can be done.

Furthermore, under the heading "Operations" the document reads: "Primary healthcare will be provided by a nurse practitioner employed by Good Shepherd and doctors from the Shelter Health Network. Harm reduction support will be provided. Shelter staff offer case management services including referrals, advocacy and supportive counseling. Housing and support services will be offered to every resident."

If this is true, then there is no need to locate the emergency shelter in Stinson, as the services will be provided already "in house" somewhere else.

It feels like the most marginalized and at risk populations are herded into one single area. The intentional creation of a ghetto indicates wrong-doing and abuse of the emergency order process. The unintentional creation of a ghetto indicates ignorance and negligence. Both instances constitute cause for the revocation of the emergency order. To live in a ghetto endangers me, my security and my well-being as well as the security and the well-being of my family and my community, especially during Covid-19.

5."It is obvious to many residents that this was a hasty decision to expedite the approval of a capital project at First Ontario Centre. Why didn't the shelter there continue to operate? Are there other shelters opening in other wards? As the City of Hamilton moves into Phase 3 of it's re-opening plan, many businesses are returning to regular operations. This includes First Ontario Centre.

Many service providers feel that Sir John A. Macdonald was a better choice. Why wasn't this site chosen instead?

Factors such as size of building, degree of renovations required, and facilities on site such as showers, etc are factors in making the decision of location. Sir John A MacDonald was a less feasible choice."

Here my question echos the voices of Stinson residents: Is Sir John A. Macdonald part of the the downtown mega development plan and was this the real reason or one of the reasons it was not chosen?

After receiving the news of the opening of the emergency shelter, some neighbours have put their house for sale or are intending to do it. The buzz word in Stinson is that the City is concentrating the most vulnerable population in our neighbourhood with the nefarious intention to control the pandemic by creating a Covid-19 Ghetto and thus maintain the rest of Hamilton open for business. I also have come to believe this.

Most people believe that the "emergency order decision" is directly related to a the mega real estate development plans for downtown. This could constitute cause for the revocation of the emergency order, as it may indicate wrong-doing, third parties interests and abuse of the emergency order process.

The optics are bad and a public inquiry of how "this led to that" going back at least to 2015 shall be opened and the matter shall be investigated by City Council without delay.

6."Who is advocating for residents of existing RCF's and shelters in the neighbourhood? There is a program review of Subsidized RCFs currently underway, lead by Housing Services Division of the City of Hamilton. As part of this review, increased collaboration with other support sectors such as Health Care are being explored in order to provide an increased level of mental health and related supports."

"How many residential group homes, shelters other assisted/supportive living homes are already in operation in this neighbourhood/ward?

There are 14 RCFs and 1 Shelter located within Ward 3."

These 2 points support our arguments that Stinson needs immediate assistance and NOT ADDED STRESSORS, especially during the pandemic and that the decision to open the emergency shelter at Main and Emerald, was flawed and dangerous and the historical facts were probably known to most of the actors that invoked the "emergency order".

6. "What are the long-term plans for Cathedral Boys' School? Longer term, Good Shepherd would like to develop a Senior's 'hub' that would combine affordable housing with support services that would be more broadly available to the community. An important part of this development would be incorporating the historic original school into the project."

I found some consolation in this last answer until a senior neighbor raised another red flag: "Any person above 50 qualifies as a senior and some are "trouble" and not just impoverished elders."

I had envisioned a kind of affordable housing for law abiding seniors that would contribute with their presence to bring stability to our area.

I copy paste the latest email I received:

"A few people have asked

Do we know what premise the city is directing taxpayers money to good shepherd?

Should we be emailing the police chief, or anyone else on the force?

Do we keep resenting the same emails every few days given we feel we are being ignored with the lack of response from anyone?"

What do I tell them?

It is the Mayor and City Council's duty to keep us safe, especially during Covid-19.

September 11 2020

Dear Mayor Eisenberger and Councillor Nann:

I am a resident of Ward 3/ Stinson.

A few weeks ago Stinson community members had interactions with the scouts from the "tenting camps" exploring Stinson green spaces in advance of the opening of Motel Cathedral with the intention of being close to their services. They said that they will be back. This is a photo of a tent that in the alleyway behind Cathedral was taken today. The neighbors informed that the tenter is aggressive and consuming drugs.

I watched yesterday the meeting of the Emergency & Community Services Committee. I had submitted 2 documents and none of my concerns were addressed.

There was no one word regarding extra security measures or measures to prevent a outbreak of Covid-19 in Stinson:

1. Not one word about the extraordinary Covid-19 safety protocols that need to be implemented when the "temporary" emergency shelter opens at Old Cathedral Boys School.
2. Not one word about cleaning crews to remove bio-hazard materials from the neighborhood, not only needles and condoms but human feces. Human feces and urine had manifested as a grave problem around the "tent encampment sites" in downtown Hamilton and in Toronto and BC. Human feces and urine are both bio-hazard materials that may carry the virus and contaminate shoes. City Hall shall provide more cleaning crews instead of less and the cleaning crews shall work under the protection of trained security teams.
3. Not one word about daily sanitation of Stinson sidewalks and public and private parking spaces with Eco-friendly products to prevent the community spread of the virus in Stinson.
4. No one word regarding enhanced pandemic sanitation measures at Motel Cathedral, for instance: Good Shepherd shall provide 24/7 washrooms attendants because as the emergency shelter will shelter, by definition, a constant transient population of 45 plus men overnight + the numerous people who access the facilities during the day without spending the night in the shelter, there shall be 24/7 employees, in full Covid-19 protection gear, sanitizing the toilets and the showers after each use. The toilets need to be equipped with toilet LIDS to stop the Covid19 to be airborne after each flush and infect the surrounding area.
5. No one word regarding how to prevent the flood of tents into the 3 green spaces/ parkettes situated in Hunter, for instance:

For the time that this particular shelter (Motel Cathedral) remains open, the services that historically the Good Shepherd Ministries has offered to "the individuals who are not registered in shelter but who approach us seeking other kinds of housing help or support services." shall be suspended.

The support services the homeless desperately need are food, toilets and showers. As a Covid-19 extraordinary precautionary measure, the doors of Motel Cathedral shall be closed to all-non residents. These Good Shepherd Ministries services to individuals who are not registered in the shelter shall be suspended in this location due to Covid-19 Community distancing protocols and these vital services shall be offered at a different location. If the tenting folk needs are served outside of Stinson, this will stop the tenting camp from setting in Stinson and it will reduce the compounded risk of a Covid-19 outbreak that my community is facing at the moment.

6. Not one single answer to ANY of the questions I collected from the neighbors.

7. Read in Global News: <https://apple.news/AB4QusTeMRjOvx34mFBbj3A>

Please, advice us asap on how to proceed. Pleas asing an independent advocate for Stinson because we are simple folk and we do not know the rules of how City Hall funtions. Ward 3 Councillor Nann went on vacation after she invoked the "emergency order"; an emergency order is invoked in extremely rare occasions, war and pandemics. It would have been reasanoble that a polititian after invoking an emergency order remain working to assist his/her constituents during the emergency.

Carmen Orlandis.

September 14 2020

Coun. Nann: The article "Residents push back on Old Cathedral boy's plan", by Teviah Moro, reads in part :

Coun. Ninder Nann rejects claims from some Ward 3 residents that city officials "deliberately and maliciously" withheld a plan to turn a former school into a temporary shelter.

"I want to acknowledge that these kinds of decisions in an emergency setting have a very rapid nature."

"Nann noted that she learned of the plan for Old Cathedral in early July and by the end of that month started promoting an Aug. 11 online feedback session." An online session attended by 32 people (followers) from a population of 41,000+ is NOT public consultation. No wonder that the "feedback" was mostly positive. No one knew about it! We do not accept in any way that this was a public consultation and we maintain that the entire process was neither open nor transparent and indeed, deliberate. The most recent entry in the news section of your website is July 5, 2019. And the most recent entry in your "Information Update" is dated November 27, 2019. Where exactly did you promote this so-called feedback session? Where was the robust communication system that you promised leading up to your being elected in Ward 3? Also, leading up to the election, you said that you would "establish a monthly email and web newsletter to keep residents up to date, and price out the cost of doing periodic printed and post delivered updates, because not everyone is on social media."

By any measure, you cannot keep making the perfidious claim that you "promoted" anything.

"John said the city looked at other locations for the temporary shelter but landed on Old Cathedral as the best option.

He acknowledged some residents' concerns about a high concentration of lodging homes in the neighborhood." Teviah Moro, The Spectator.

Indeed we claim that the "plan" was deliberately withheld, according to your own words in your Zoom infomercial, but unfortunately, we have come to sincerely believe that the plan of opening the emergency shelter in Stinson during Covid-19 is a neglectful urban strategy or it is a malicious strategy aimed to contain a Covid-19 outbreak in one section of the Hamilton, in our neighbourhood. We have come to this sincere belief with a heavy heart. Our feelings on the subject were generated by the total lack of transparency of the process. We are common folk already exhausted by 6 months of pandemic and we have limited access to information.

It is possible that somebody else misled you in this affair. If so, we expect that you rise now to the occasion and make immediately public the information you have. To begin with, we need to know:

1. Who really owns the building? The Cultural Heritage Report, 2018, names as the owner, Good Shepherd Hamilton. You will find this information in City Hall Property Register. In your selective FAQ you state that "Good Shepherd approached the Diocese and they have a lease in place." If there is a "lease" as you claim, who are the named parties on the lease? What are the terms? Will you make this

document public? Also, in your FAQ, you failed to answer the additional questions: Will they be compensated/reimbursed for use of the space? Will they?

2. "Nann noted she learned of the plan for Old Cathedral in early July". The date is important...what day? We deduced that "you learned of the plan" means that "somebody else" hatched it. Who approached you with the plan? Do you have contemporaneous notes?

3. What is the name of the person/s who "counseled" you to keep the plan secret?

4. Independent journalist Joey Coleman's Tweet:"City Manager's office just deleted video of last week's meeting of the Housing and Homelessness Advisory Committee from YouTube." He has now requested this video under the "Freedom of Information Act". We ask you to look into the matter and to use your Councillor position to release this video to the public immediately, so that given the urgency of the matter we do not have to wait for many months before it is released. You shall also require the name/s of the persons who requested for this video to be deleted and the reasons they alleged for this action. The public has a right to know who and why.

We are normal folk and our ability to bring to the light occult facts is limited. Transparency is now the only way that you can prove to your constituents that you were misled by others. Your silence so far has been a strong contributor to the community buzz that the plan to use an "emergency order" to create a Covid-19 ghetto in Stinson is unfolding.

Carmen Orlandis



COMMUNITY INFORMATION SESSION ON TEMPORARY SHELTER SERVICES

This document contains a summary to the questions my office has received in relation to the September opening of a temporary shelter at 378 Main St. E.

Community Relationships & Communication

What agencies were consulted in the creation of this shelter and how was that consultation completed?

During this pandemic, the City of Hamilton struck a coordinating table with local agencies serving people experiencing homelessness to align responses, resources and to collaborate on addressing the complex health and housing needs. Consequently, the need to expand the capacity within the shelter system and options for achieving it continues to be discussed with sector partners.

Many residents have indicated interest in volunteering, who can they contact?

Good Shepherd welcomes those interested in becoming volunteers to apply here:

<https://www.goodshepherdcentres.ca/volunteer/>

Why was there no consultation with adjacent neighbours?

Due to the Global Pandemic, the Emergency Operations Centre at the City of Hamilton has made a number of difficult decisions in a very short time frame, consultation was not possible. Under normal circumstances, the City of Hamilton consults as regular practice, which normally takes 12-18 months. Consultation of this type was not possible in light of COVID-19.

Has there been any consultation with local businesses?

Unfortunately not. The same situation as described above relates in terms of consultation with local business.

When neighbourhood/community association meetings resume, will a representative from Good Shepherd attend?

Yes, Good Shepherd would be pleased to attend both GALA and Stinson Community meetings.

Operations

What amenities will be available to residents staying at the shelter?

Shelter residents will be accommodated in shared bedroom (4 – 5 per room) that will provide barriers/screens to offer some privacy and infection prevention. The shelter will offer residents 3 meals/day, bagged lunches for those who need to be away from the shelter during a mealtime and snacks. Primary healthcare will be provided by a nurse practitioner employed by Good Shepherd and doctors from the Shelter Health Network. Harm reduction support will be provided. Shelter staff offer case management services including referrals, advocacy and supportive counselling. Housing support services will be offered to every resident.

Will there be 24/7 security and cameras?

The Cathedral site is equipped with security cameras. The shelter will be staffed 24/7. Formal safety and security policies will be in place.

The neighbourhood has a high parking load already. Is there designated parking for staff?

Yes. Good Shepherd Staff will utilize the back parking lot.

Will residents of the shelter have outdoor space?

Yes, Good Shepherd will create a designated outdoor space at the back of the building, with measures taken to protect the privacy of both shelter residents and adjacent neighbours.

Will there be a curfew in place?

Shelter occupancy is confirmed each night at 10 pm. Residents may arrive back to shelter later than 10 pm (e.g. working a late shift) if pre-arranged with staff. Residents are encouraged to remain on shelter property after this time however, there are no curfew policies in place.

How will non residents be discouraged from congregating outside the building?

Staff monitor activity on and adjacent to shelter sites. Residents may not entertain guests on site. Non-residents will be asked to leave the property and actively discouraged from congregating on adjacent sidewalks etc.

What makes you think that Cathedral will be any more successful than the First Ontario?

The shelter at First Ontario has offered a safe, hospitable environment for single men experiencing homelessness. Good Shepherd has no authority over the space outside of the FOC that is currently an encampment site. Staff do monitor that area and actively offer shelter services but we do not direct any activity outside of the FOC. At the Cathedral site, Good Shepherd will be responsible for activity both inside and outside of the building. We will not accommodate campers on this site. We will, however, work with individuals who are not registered in shelter but who approach us seeking other kinds of housing help or support services.

How does Good Shepherd's approach to substance use differ from that of police? Good Shepherd strives to work within a harm reduction framework. We provide sharps containers and harm reduction kits at our sites. We host harm reduction and addiction services in our programs. We have no desire to further stigmatize or criminalize people due to their substance use. We do, however, advise shelter residents that drug use in shelter is not permitted. We will discharge an individual from the shelter if there is persistent evidence of onsite drug use (unsafe disposal of needles, impairment that puts individual, other clients and/or staff at risk). We are also vigilant in discouraging drug trade on or near our sites.

Will Good Shepherd be working with the Social Navigator, Hamilton Paramedics and Keeping six?

Good Shepherd already works with the Social Navigator, Keeping Six, Paramedics and many

other stakeholders engaged in supporting people who are precariously housed or experiencing homelessness. These relationships will remain important to our work at the Cathedral site.

Site & Location

How was the Former Cathedral Boys' School site chosen for this facility?

The property is privately owned by the Catholic Diocese who offered the site for this purpose to the Good Shepherd in response to the population needs. Upon review, the site was in appropriate state of use and contained the amenities most appropriate for shelter use including: showers, gym, overnight accommodation and day programming use.

In addition to an expansion at the Salvation Army, the Cathedral Boy's site was the only facility available, which could be easily transformed into a shelter in a reasonable time and for a reasonable cost.

Who approached the Diocese? Will they be compensated/reimbursed for use of the space?

Good Shepherd approached the Diocese and they have a lease in place.

What is the hard end date for this use? Is there one?

June 2021 is the approved end date for this temporary use. However, it is also dependent on what unfolds with the pandemic and potential second wave. Extending beyond this date would require Council approval and additional funding.

Why are these facilities so concentrated in Landsdale and Stinson? How was this factored into the decision?

There are a number of social service type agencies in the central lower city, such as shelters, Residential Care Facilities, and others. Many of these programs have long standing histories in the neighbourhood that date back 30+ years.

Due to proximity to other services which residents would access, the downtown core is often seen as an ideal location to ensure ease of access to those services.

Who is advocating for residents of existing RCF's and shelters in the neighbourhood?

There is a program review of Subsidized RCFs currently underway, lead by Housing Services Division of the City of Hamilton. As part of this review, increased collaboration with other support sectors such as Health Care are being explored in order to provide an increased level of mental health and related supports.

How many residential group homes, shelters other assisted/supportive living homes are already in operation in this neighbourhood/ward?

There are 14 RCFs and 1 Shelter located within Ward 3.

It is obvious to many residents that this was a hasty decision to expedite the approval of a capital project at First Ontario Centre. Why didn't the shelter there continue to operate? Are there other shelters opening in other wards?

As the City of Hamilton moves into Phase 3 of its re-opening plan, many businesses are returning to regular operations. This includes First Ontario Centre.

Many service providers feel that Sir John A. Macdonald was a better choice. Why wasn't this site chosen instead?

Factors such as size of building, degree of renovations required, and facilities on site such as showers, etc are factors in making the decision of location. Sir John A MacDonald was a less feasible choice.

Feedback & Future Action

Will Digital Canaries Studio return to CBS or will other TV/Movie shooting return to the building?

Digital Canaries Studio have secured another location with the Diocese in the City. Whether filming occur in the building in the future is up to the property owner. However the future use goal is to transform the site into affordable and mixed-income senior housing.

What are the long term plans for Cathedral Boys' School?

Longer term, Good Shepherd would like to develop a Senior's 'hub' that would combine affordable housing with support services that would be more broadly available to the community. An important part of this development would be incorporating the historic original school into the project.

Contact Information

Rob Mastroianni Manager of Emergency Shelter Services & RCF Subsidies at
Rob.Mastroianni@Hamilton.ca

Katherine Kalinowski, Chief Operating Officer, Good Shepherd Housing Services
kkalinowski@gsch.ca
(905)528-5877 Ext. 3323

Pilon, Janet

Subject: Relocation of Men's homeless shelter

From: Michelle Cho

Sent: September 15, 2020 10:38 AM

To: Bates, Tamara <Tamara.Bates@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Relocation of Men's homeless shelter

Mayor and Members of Council

September 14, 2020

I, the undersigned, have resided in Hamilton/Ward 3 for 13 years.

I write at the best of my abilities, under the pressure to submit in time and with the very limited amount of information that I have been able to gather from the officials, the newspapers and the community.

This is an addendum to the two emails I have already submitted along with some neighbours, to the Clerk for the Council meeting of September 10, 2020, regarding the Old Cathedral Boys School emergency shelter. I attach 5 documents and the FAQ.

This letter has also been composed to the best of my ability also considering that numerous neighbours, me included, who have been asking questions to Councillor Nann since mid-August and received to this date no answers or only answers deflecting our inquiries.

I will leave aside now the stressors that the opening of the emergency shelter will add onto our historically vulnerable Stinson community and how this increases the risks for an outbreak of Corona in our neighborhood because we have addressed these issues already in those two emails.

Councillor Nann wrote to me: "this decision was made under emergency orders which cannot be revoked"

I bring to your attention that those words misled many neighbours into believing that it was pointless to make the effort to exercise their duty and right to express their opposition to the opening of the temporary emergency shelter in the location of the Old Cathedral Boys High School. Most of my neighbours added sadly: "Besides, there is no point to fight City Hall."

But we discussed it further and then I passed on in an email our thinking to Councillor Nann: "Your affirmation does not stand legally, as any emergency order SHALL BE REVOKED immediately when it is shown indications to be unwise, ill-conceived, dangerous to the local population, taken in the interest of third parties, promoting self-interest or corrupt."

It appears that the actions of those involved may also fit the

parameters for what is called Conspiracy Against Rights in the USA code (Conspiracy against rights is a criminal offense involving acts to prevent others from exercising their constitutional rights). The same universal legal principles and arguments could be presented to the Canadian Courts in this case. The seriousness may be compounded by the use/or abuse of the sacrosanct and extraordinary powers of an "emergency order" because it may create a dangerous legal precedent to the well-being not just of the Stinson community but to all Canadians in the future.

All aspects of how this emergency order was passed shall be made public, including the names of all those who participated in the different stages of conception and what role those people played and the interests they represented and the dates when each one of those conversations took place. It appears, but we are not sure, that the emergency order conception began after the order to shelter in place was already lifted. In Ontario, Phase 1 started May 19, 2020; Phase 2 started June 12, 2020 and Phase 3 started July 17, 2020. It appears that the Emergency Committee gave their approval for funding the emergency shelter at the Old Cathedral Boys School at the July 17, 2020 meeting, the exact day Phase 3 began in Ontario. The timing should be investigated; it appears that the Good Shepherd Hamilton already owned or had possession of the building in 2018. All of this is public record.

I will focus now on the document published in August by Nrinder Nann, City Councillor/ Ward 3. entitled "Community Information Session on Temporary Shelter Services." , I attached the document to this email under that title.

The document opens: "This document contains a summary to the questions my office has received in relation to the September opening of a temporary shelter at 378 Main St. E."

Please note that instead of "a summary of questions", it should read: "a selection of questions"; it has been reported by neighbors that they were blocked in the "social media" for asking "inconvenient questions" that perhaps did not suit Nann's narrative.

The document concludes with the contact information of two of the protagonists of the Zoom info-meeting:

Rob Mastroianni Manager of Emergency Shelter Services & RCF Subsidies at Rob.Mastroianni@Hamilton.ca

Katherine Kalinowski, Chief Operating Officer, Good Shepherd Housing Services kkalinowski@gsch.ca (905)528-5877 Ext. 3323

It appears that the document and the the Zoom info meeting hosted by Councillor Nann in August, are in sync. The linguistic styles of both formats are identical. The type of language used to communicate the "news" to the community after the decision was already passed under "an emergency order", may indicate a willfully and orchestrated strategic intention to distract, to purposely occult the facts and to mislead the public. The type of language may indicate that the authors had awareness that they were manipulating and taking advantage of and abusing the emergency order process letter and/or spirit for their own personal

ideology, interests or gains. This type of intention constitutes cause for the revocation of the emergency order. As it stands at this moment it may set a dangerous legal precedent for all Canadians.

It is possible that Councillor Nann, a holistic nutritionist from New York and only a recent resident of Hamilton/Ward 3, Gage Park, was not "familiar" with the history of our City, including the sinister scams of the famously nefarious family Martino that seemingly became rich by sucking the life blood from the vulnerable and marginalized population placed under their care by the City and the Province, and the unsolved murder of Joe Melo, seemingly implicated in assisting living schemes and a mega "pharmacy legal scheme" as reported in the Spec, until we informed her about it. It appears that the Martino family still runs the same kind of business they used to under other names and numbered companies as reported in the Spec article "House of Horrors", Jun 11, 2020 and other recent articles. Note the dates:

1. House of Horrors was published June 11, 2020.
2. At the beginning of July 2020, some yet unnamed party approached Councillor Nann with the plan to locate the emergency shelter at the corner of Main and Emerald St. under an emergency order.

House of Horrors should have raised a red flag for the location.

Another red flag emerges from the on-line City of Hamilton Covid -19 map. Since the beginning of the pandemic the composite area of Stinson-Landsdale has been colored "Dark Gray" indicating the high number of infections compared to the rest of Hamilton.

It seems that Councillor Nann was also not aware of the dynamics of the Stinson community, not just regarding the high concentration of badly run assisting living operations, but the high concentration of other social ills buildings, crystal meth dens and rooming houses, "trouble buildings" that even the police are afraid to enter. This problem is presently compounded by the "red fentanyl" and the Covid-19.

A study for the Ontario Marginalization Index (ON-MARG) should be done on the composite area of Stinson-Landsdale.

On the other hand, Mastroianni and Kalinowski should have being fully aware of the situation of Stinson-Landsdale, given their seniority in Hamilton, their jobs and their titles.

Another red flag was raised by the independent journalist Joey Coleman's Tweet: "City Manager's office just deleted video of last week's meeting of the Housing and Homelessness Advisory Committee from YouTube." He has now requested this video under the "Freedom of Information Act". We ask you to look into the matter and to use your Councillor position to release this video to the public immediately, so that given the urgency of the matter we do not have to wait for many months before it is released. You shall also require the name/s of the persons who requested for this video to be deleted and the reasons they alleged for this action. The public has a right to know who and why.

This could constitute cause for the revocation of the emergency order,

as it may indicate rush and/or wrong-doing and/or self-interest and/or conspiracy against rights and thus abuse of the emergency order legal process letter and/or spirit.

Furthermore, their actions de facto disregard the well-being of the population that resides already in situ during the pandemic and are not financially able to move elsewhere at this moment. If an Covid-19 outbreak manifests at the heart of Stinson, then there will be grounds to claim the action-planners and other interested parties are open to liability because we warn them.

I noticed that today, September 14, the cases of Covid-19 are increasing as it was prognosticated.

I noticed that in Hamilton, the Stinson neighbourhood was down from the recent "Dark Grey" to "Medium Grey" but that Landsdale is in "Dark Grey", meaning there is a higher number of new infections in that community. Notice that both neighborhoods are geographically touching. The boundary is Main St. exactly where Motel Cathedral will open soon. So it is a fact that the emergency shelter is opening at the geographical heart of the largest numbers of Covid-19 reported cases in Hamilton.

I take now the task to point out to the Mayor and Council some of the other red flags where it seems that misleading language was used regarding the "temporary status of the emergency shelter". This may legally constitute deception and conspiracy and a will to mislead the community and to corrupt letter and/or the spirit of the order.

1. "What makes you think that Cathedral will be any more successful than the First Ontario?"

The shelter at First Ontario has offered a safe, hospitable environment for single men experiencing homelessness. Good Shepherd has no authority over the space outside of the FOC that is currently an encampment site. Staff do monitor that area and actively offer shelter services but we do not direct any activity outside of the FOC. At the Cathedral site, Good Shepherd will be responsible for activity both inside and outside of the building. We will not accommodate campers on this site. We will, however, work with individuals who are not registered in shelter but who approach us seeking other kinds of housing help or support services."

Perhaps Councillor Nann has not enough experience to know that, naturally and logically, the encampment site will move from First Ontario to the Stinson green spaces/ parkettes, because the tenters need to be close to the services of "Motel Cathedral", as they call it. The tenters have already scouted our neighbourhood and stated their intentions to move onto the various green spaces, as we have reported to the authorities and thus fulfilled our civic duties (during a pandemic to report infractions or weakness of the safety protocols is an ethical and a legal duty not only a civic right.)

It is reasonable to think that Mastroniani and the Good Shepherd Hamilton, more experienced than Nann, may have already prognosticated this encampment possibility and not only chose to remain silent but they may have tried to hide it from the community by stating that: "We will not accommodate campers on this site. We will, however, work with individuals who are not registered in shelter but who approach us

seeking other kinds of housing help or support services."

If they contemplated the possibility of the tenting camp moving closer to Motel Cathedral attracted to the services the tenters will receive there, they spoke knowingly with the "intention to deceive the public" and their use of the "emergency order" is null. If they did not contemplate the likelihood of a "flood of tents", it may indicate that these individuals are not equipped to hold on their present jobs or to invoke a pandemic "emergency order". Council shall interrogate the individuals separately, ask them for all their documentations and notes to determine which one of these two scenarios took place.

"We will, however, work with individuals who are not registered in shelter but who approach us seeking other kinds of housing help or support services.

The opening of the doors of the new emergency shelter was orchestrated behind closed doors. The plan endangers the community with the approaching Second Wave, thus a new Covid-19 emergency order shall be invoked if the Motel Cathedral opens in disregard of sound scientific pandemic strategies and protocols:

For the time that this particular shelter remains open, the services that historically the Good Shepherd Ministries has offered to "the individuals who are not registered in shelter but who approach us seeking other kinds of housing help or support services." shall be suspended.

The support services the homeless desperately need are food, toilets and showers. As a Covid-19 precautionary measure, the doors of Motel Cathedral shall be closed to all-non-residents. These Good Shepherd Ministries services to individuals who are not registered in the shelter shall be suspended in this precise location due to Covid-19 "community distancing protocols" and these vital services shall be offered at a different location. If the tenting folk needs are served outside of Stinson, this will stop the tenting camp from setting in Stinson and it will reduce the compounded risk of a Covid-19 outbreak that our community is facing at the moment.

2. "Site & Location

How was the Former Cathedral Boys' School site chosen for this facility? The property is privately owned by the Catholic Diocese who offered the site for this purpose to the Good Shepherd in response to the population needs. Upon review, the site was in appropriate state of use and contained the amenities most appropriate for shelter use including: showers, gym, overnight accommodation and day programming use."

The Ownership of the building is not clear, therefore the interests of third parties are obscured:

Taken from the Good Shepherd Blog: "On January 19, 2015, the Little Brothers of the Good Shepherd fused with the Hospitaller Brothers of St. John of God. This 'fusion' of the two religious orders saw the end of the Little Brothers of the Good Shepherd as a formal entity. The Little Brothers of the Good Shepherd have now become Hospitaller Brothers of St. John of God.

The Little Brothers of the Good Shepherd are known locally for the work that is done through Good Shepherd Ministries in Toronto."

This means that The Good Shepherd Hamilton is indeed a Catholic entity located within the Hamilton Diocese, but it is legally a "formal entity" [An association, corporation, partnership, proprietorship, trust, or individual that has legal standing in the eyes of law. A legal entity has legal capacity to enter into agreements or contracts, assume obligations, incur and pay debts, sue and be sued in its own right, and to be held responsible for its actions] and as such it is legally different from the Dioceses even if they are geographically within the Diocese and thus "belong" to the Diocese but it is not privately own by the Diocese. Thus the statement that "The property is privately owned by the Catholic Diocese who offered the site for this purpose to the Good Shepherd in response to the population needs" may appear to be purposefully "misleading".

I selected 2 lines from the Cultural Heritage Assessment Report on the Former Cathedral Boys' High School.

<https://pub-hamilton.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=151834>

1.0 Introduction, 3rd paragraph: " On November 9, 2016, Alan Whittle of Good Shepherd Hamilton greeted Peter Stewart, Francine Antoniou and Paul Dilse for photographic recording of the school."

This indicates that Alan Whittle/Good Shepherd Hamilton had already "some level of interest" in the building in 2016.

The next document is dated 2018, 2 years before the pandemic began:
<https://pub-hamilton.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=152578>

Note the last line:

"HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The subject property, municipally known as 378 Main Street East, Hamilton (see Appendix "A" to Report PED17168) is known locally as the Cathedral Boys' High School.

The School was built in 1928 and funded by the Hamilton Catholic population. This school was the first purpose built Catholic High School in Hamilton. Designed by Hutton and Souter, the Former Cathedral Boys' High School was designed in the architectural style known as Modern Gothic, Collegiate Gothic or Neo-Gothic. Hutton and Souter were prominent architects responsible for a number of other significant buildings in Hamilton such as the Delta Collegiate High School, the Royal Connaught Hotel, and the John Sopinka Courthouse.

In 1951, a wing was built to memorialize students that fought and lost their lives in the First and Second World Wars. Constructed in a vernacular style, the architect is unknown. In September 1992, the Cathedral Boys' High School and Cathedral Girls' High School (on Main Street East, two blocks east of Cathedral Boys' High School) were integrated.

In September 1995, the publicly funded Cathedral High School opened at

King Street East and Wentworth Street North, replacing Cathedral Boys' High School and Cathedral Girls' High School.

The property is currently owned by Good Shepherd Hamilton."

According to the Cultural Heritage folk, the Good Shepherd Hamilton already owned the property in 2018.

Furthermore, in a recent Spec. article we read: "Good Shepherd is working out an arrangement with the Roman Catholic diocese to rent out a part of the former Cathedral school, said agency spokesperson Alan Whittle."

<https://www.thespec.com/news/council/2020/07/10/millions-more-on-table-to-help-hamiltons-homeless-amid-pandemic.html>

How can this be if the Cultural Heritage report lists the Good Shepherd Hamilton as the "owner" of the building?

If Bishop Crosby and the Hospitaller Brothers of St. John of God and the Good Shepherd Hamilton and Alan Whittle had no intention to mislead the Stinson community regarding the "temporary location of the emergency shelter" instead of : "The property is privately owned by the Catholic Diocese who offered the site for this purpose to the Good Shepherd in response to the population needs.", they should have said (my words): "The property is currently owned by Good Shepherd Hamilton", even if the property was acquired or perhaps leased for only \$1 since at least 2018 .

We question the parties name above regarding the lease and we were ignored.

And how could Bishop Crosby, head of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Hamilton "offered the site for this purpose" two years before Covid-19?

3. "Who approached the Diocese? Will they be compensated/reimbursed for use of the space? Good Shepherd approached the Diocese and they have a lease in place."

After reading this, many neighbors believed it and repeatedly requested information regarding the terms and length of this "lease", myself included. There was absolute silence from Nann, Mastroianni and the Good Shepherd Hamilton and the Hospitaller Brothers of St. John of God and Bishop Crosby on the subject. The optics are not good with respect to these actors' bona fides during the process of invoking an emergency order and the ownership or lease of the building.

It is not a stretch to say that The Old Cathedral Boys' High School is what is known in real estate terms as a "white elephant": a burdensome possession whose cost of upkeep is not in line with its usefulness or value. It was calculated, after the inspection of the building that the cost to remedy the asbestos, the plumbing and the electrical would be at least 15 million dollars. If we add to this astronomical cost the "heritage designation", "the white elephant" real estate definition is met.

This real estate deal is not clear and it may cross the boundaries of ethical behavior and transparency and it shall be looked into and investigated in depth by the Hamilton City Council. Perhaps there are some other benefits to Good Shepherd Hamilton by opening the pandemic

temporary emergency shelter at the "with the elephant" property and later on obtain favors or special considerations regarding the property? This shall be disclosed.

This could constitute cause for the revocation of the emergency order, as it may indicate deception, wrong-doing, interest of third parties, tit for tat and abuse of the emergency order process with a possible ulterior motive to by-pass a lawful "Cultural Heritage designation". It should be looked into it by City Hall and the Ethics Committee.

3. "What is the hard end date for this use? Is there one?"

June 2021 is the approved end date for this temporary use. However, it is also dependent on what unfolds with the pandemic and potential second wave. Extending beyond this date would require Council approval and additional funding."

It appears that this ambiguous and open-ended answer is designed to reassure the overwhelmed community and perhaps even to bypass the "heritage designation" under the pandemic emergency orders.

Once "in situ" with the shelter running, pandemic or not by June 2021, there will be little incentive for City Hall NOT to renew the contract, mostly if it supported by Rob Mastroianni and Ward 3 Councillor Nann.

If indeed June 2021 is the approved final date line for this temporary use, and in case that the opening of this so called "emergency shelter" takes place against our dutifully reported concerns and warnings, then Rob Mastroianni and City Hall shall actively and immediately engage in the selection and the preparedness of a more suitable site for another Good Shepherd Hamilton emergency shelter so that it is ready for June 30 2021. This should be done under a new "emergency order". This immediate and active engagement to find another location is urgent because there is no guarantee that the pandemic will be resolved by June 2021, and the community may be forced to live under these extreme conditions for 9 long months + the delays. This time, the process shall be public to avoid wasting precious resources again, aka taxpayer's money.

4. "Why are these facilities so concentrated in Landsdale and Stinson? How was this factored into the decision? There are a number of social service type agencies in the central lower city, such as shelters, Residential Care Facilities, and others. Many of these programs have long standing histories in the neighbourhood that date back 30+ years. Due to proximity to other services which residents would access, the downtown core is often seen as an ideal location to ensure ease of access to those services."

I follow this statement with the words of Councillor Nann in the email she sent me, dated 05/09/2020:

"I truly do appreciate your concern of the over concentration in the Stinson neighbourhood, as with several other neighborhoods in Ward 3 of poorly run RCFs. It is something I will continue to tirelessly flag and demand action on. Historical decisions led to this over-concentration and it must be rectified!"

Councillor Nann contradicts herself by:

a. Actively supporting to open the emergency shelter by invoking an extreme "emergency order" and thus purposely bypassing her constituents concerns regarding the over-concentration of the area.

b. While affirming that "Historical decisions led to this over-concentration and it must be rectified!".

This contradiction of thought disqualifies her from invoking "emergency orders" because her support for the plan just increased the historical over-concentration she states needs to be rectified.

Perhaps there was "no time to consult the community" but there was plenty time to consult the experts, like ON-MARG and any urban epidemiologist from McMaster.

I firmly believe that the Ontario Human Rights Code is intended to protect us all, and in particular to protect the human rights of the vulnerable and marginalized and that the legislation is not to be used to create an urban ghetto, which constitutes a violation of Section 7 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. 7. Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice. Myself included.

"Due to proximity to other services which residents would access, the downtown core is often seen as an ideal location to ensure ease of access to those services." This is a deceptive excuse that has already been used in the past in Hamilton and in other cities with disastrous results. This is precisely how urban ghettos were and are created. Services shall be provided in situ at the emergency shelter, wherever it is located, this is the year 2020 and it can be done.

Furthermore, under the heading "Operations" the document reads: "Primary healthcare will be provided by a nurse practitioner employed by Good Shepherd and doctors from the Shelter Health Network. Harm reduction support will be provided. Shelter staff offer case management services including referrals, advocacy and supportive counseling. Housing and support services will be offered to every resident."

If this is true, then there is no need to locate the emergency shelter in Stinson, as the services will be provided already "in house" somewhere else.

It feels like the most marginalized and at-risk populations are herded into one single area. The intentional creation of a ghetto indicates wrong-doing and abuse of the emergency order process. The unintentional creation of a ghetto indicates ignorance and negligence. Both instances constitute cause for the revocation of the emergency order. To live in a ghetto endangers me, my security and my well-being as well as the security and the well-being of my family and my community, especially during Covid-19.

5."It is obvious to many residents that this was a hasty decision to expedite the approval of a capital project at First Ontario Centre. Why didn't the shelter there continue to operate? Are there other shelters

opening in other wards?

As the City of Hamilton moves into Phase 3 of its re-opening plan, many businesses are returning to regular operations. This includes First Ontario Centre.

Many service providers feel that Sir John A. Macdonald was a better choice. Why wasn't this site chosen instead? Factors such as size of building, degree of renovations required, and facilities on site such as showers, etc are factors in making the decision of location. Sir John A MacDonald was a less feasible choice."

Here my question echo's the voices of Stinson residents: Is Sir John A. Macdonald part of the downtown mega development plan and was this the real reason or one of the reasons it was not chosen?

After receiving the news of the opening of the emergency shelter, some neighbours have put their house for sale or are intending to do it. The buzz word in Stinson is that the City is concentrating the most vulnerable population in our neighbourhood with the nefarious intention to control the pandemic by creating a Covid-19 Ghetto and thus maintain the rest of Hamilton open for business. I also have come to believe this.

Most people believe that the "emergency order decision" is directly related to the mega real estate development plans for downtown. This could constitute cause for the revocation of the emergency order, as it may indicate wrong-doing, third parties' interests and abuse of the emergency order process.

The optics are bad and a public inquiry of how "this led to that" going back at least to 2015 shall be opened and the matter shall be investigated by City Council without delay.

6. "Who is advocating for residents of existing RCF's and shelters in the neighbourhood? There is a program review of Subsidized RCFs currently underway, led by Housing Services Division of the City of Hamilton. As part of this review, increased collaboration with other support sectors such as Health Care are being explored in order to provide an increased level of mental health and related supports."

"How many residential group homes, shelters other assisted/supportive living homes are already in operation in this neighbourhood/ward? There are 14 RCFs and 1 Shelter located within Ward 3."

These 2 points support our arguments that Stinson needs immediate assistance and NOT ADDED STRESSORS, especially during the pandemic and that the decision to open the emergency shelter at Main and Emerald, was flawed and dangerous and the historical facts were probably known to most of the actors that invoked the "emergency order".

6. "What are the long-term plans for Cathedral Boys' School? Longer term, Good Shepherd would like to develop a Senior's 'hub' that would combine affordable housing with support services that would be more broadly available to the community. An important part of this development would be incorporating the historic original school into the project."

I found some consolation in this last answer until a senior neighbor raised another red flag: "Any person above 50 qualifies as a senior and

some are "trouble" and not just impoverished elders."

I had envisioned a kind of affordable housing for law abiding seniors that would contribute with their presence to bring stability to our area.

I copy paste the latest email I received:

"A few people have asked

Do we know what premise the city is directing taxpayer's money to good shepherd?

Should we be emailing the police chief, or anyone else on the force?

Do we keep resenting the same emails every few days given we feel we are being ignored with the lack of response from anyone?"

What do I tell them?

It is the Mayor and City Council's duty to keep us safe, especially during Covid19

September 14 2020

Coun. Nann: The article "Residents push back on Old Cathedral boy's plan", by Teviah Moro, reads in part :

Coun. Ninder Nann rejects claims from some Ward 3 residents that city officials "deliberately and maliciously" withheld a plan to turn a former school into a temporary shelter.

"I want to acknowledge that these kinds of decisions in an emergency setting have a very rapid nature."

"Nann noted that she learned of the plan for Old Cathedral in early July and by the end of that month started promoting an Aug. 11 online feedback session." An online session attended by 32 people (followers) from a population of 41,000+ is NOT public consultation. No wonder that the "feedback" was mostly positive. No one knew about it! We do not accept in any way that this was a public consultation and we maintain that the entire process was neither open nor transparent and indeed, deliberate. The most recent entry in the news section of your website is July 5, 2019. And the most recent entry in your "Information Update" is dated November 27, 2019. Where exactly did you promote this so-called feedback session? Where was the robust communication system that you promised leading up to your being elected in Ward 3? Also, leading up to the election, you said that you would "establish a monthly email and web newsletter to keep residents up to date, and price out the cost of doing periodic printed and post delivered updates, because not everyone is on social media."

By any measure, you cannot keep making the perfidious claim that you "promoted" anything.

"John said the city looked at other locations for the temporary shelter but landed on Old Cathedral as the best option.

He acknowledged some residents' concerns about a high concentration of lodging homes in the neighborhood." Teviah Moro, The Spectator.

Indeed we claim that the "plan" was deliberately withheld, according to your own words in your Zoom infomercial, but unfortunately, we have come to sincerely believe that the plan of opening the emergency shelter in Stinson during Covid-19 is a neglectful urban strategy or it is a malicious strategy aimed to contain a Covid-19 outbreak in one section of the Hamilton, in our neighbourhood. We have come to this sincere belief with a heavy heart. Our feelings on the subject were generated by the total lack of transparency of the process. We are common folk already exhausted by 6 months of pandemic and we have limited access to information.

It is possible that somebody else misled you in this affair. If so, we expect that you rise now to the occasion and make immediately public the information you have. To begin with, we need to know:

1. Who really owns the building? The Cultural Heritage Report, 2018, names as the owner, Good Shepherd Hamilton. You will find this information in City Hall Property Register. In your selective FAQ you state that "Good Shepherd approached the Diocese and they have a lease in place." If there is a "lease" as you claim, who are the named parties on the lease? What are the terms? Will you make this

document public? Also, in your FAQ, you failed to answer the additional questions: Will they be compensated/reimbursed for use of the space? Will they?

2. "Nann noted she learned of the plan for Old Cathedral in early July". The date is important...what day? We deduced that "you learned of the plan" means that "somebody else" hatched it. Who approached you with the plan? Do you have contemporaneous notes?

3. What is the name of the person/s who "counseled" you to keep the plan secret?

4. Independent journalist Joey Coleman's Tweet:"City Manager's office just deleted video of last week's meeting of the Housing and Homelessness Advisory Committee from YouTube." He has now requested this video under the "Freedom of Information Act". We ask you to look into the matter and to use your Councillor position to release this video to the public immediately, so that given the urgency of the matter we do not have to wait for many months before it is released. You shall also require the name/s of the persons who requested for this video to be deleted and the reasons they alleged for this action. The public has a right to know who and why.

We are normal folk and our ability to bring to the light occult facts is limited. Transparency is now the only way that you can prove to your constituents that you were misled by others. Your silence so far has been a strong contributor to the community buzz that the plan to use an "emergency order" to create a Covid-19 ghetto in Stinson is unfolding.

Carmen Orlandis



COMMUNITY INFORMATION SESSION ON TEMPORARY SHELTER SERVICES

This document contains a summary to the questions my office has received in relation to the September opening of a temporary shelter at 378 Main St. E.

Community Relationships & Communication

What agencies were consulted in the creation of this shelter and how was that consultation completed?

During this pandemic, the City of Hamilton struck a coordinating table with local agencies serving people experiencing homelessness to align responses, resources and to collaborate on addressing the complex health and housing needs. Consequently, the need to expand the capacity within the shelter system and options for achieving it continues to be discussed with sector partners.

Many residents have indicated interest in volunteering, who can they contact?

Good Shepherd welcomes those interested in becoming volunteers to apply here:

<https://www.goodshepherdcentres.ca/volunteer/>

Why was there no consultation with adjacent neighbours?

Due to the Global Pandemic, the Emergency Operations Centre at the City of Hamilton has made a number of difficult decisions in a very short time frame, consultation was not possible. Under normal circumstances, the City of Hamilton consults as regular practice, which normally takes 12-18 months. Consultation of this type was not possible in light of COVID-19.

Has there been any consultation with local businesses?

Unfortunately not. The same situation as described above relates in terms of consultation with local business.

When neighbourhood/community association meetings resume, will a representative from Good Shepherd attend?

Yes, Good Shepherd would be pleased to attend both GALA and Stinson Community meetings.

Operations

What amenities will be available to residents staying at the shelter?

Shelter residents will be accommodated in shared bedroom (4 – 5 per room) that will provide barriers/screens to offer some privacy and infection prevention. The shelter will offer residents 3 meals/day, bagged lunches for those who need to be away from the shelter during a mealtime and snacks. Primary healthcare will be provided by a nurse practitioner employed by Good Shepherd and doctors from the Shelter Health Network. Harm reduction support will be provided. Shelter staff offer case management services including referrals, advocacy and supportive counselling. Housing support services will be offered to every resident.

Will there be 24/7 security and cameras?

The Cathedral site is equipped with security cameras. The shelter will be staffed 24/7. Formal safety and security policies will be in place.

The neighbourhood has a high parking load already. Is there designated parking for staff?

Yes. Good Shepherd Staff will utilize the back parking lot.

Will residents of the shelter have outdoor space?

Yes, Good Shepherd will create a designated outdoor space at the back of the building, with measures taken to protect the privacy of both shelter residents and adjacent neighbours.

Will there be a curfew in place?

Shelter occupancy is confirmed each night at 10 pm. Residents may arrive back to shelter later than 10 pm (e.g. working a late shift) if pre-arranged with staff. Residents are encouraged to remain on shelter property after this time however, there are no curfew policies in place.

How will non residents be discouraged from congregating outside the building?

Staff monitor activity on and adjacent to shelter sites. Residents may not entertain guests on site. Non-residents will be asked to leave the property and actively discouraged from congregating on adjacent sidewalks etc.

What makes you think that Cathedral will be any more successful than the First Ontario?

The shelter at First Ontario has offered a safe, hospitable environment for single men experiencing homelessness. Good Shepherd has no authority over the space outside of the FOC that is currently an encampment site. Staff do monitor that area and actively offer shelter services but we do not direct any activity outside of the FOC. At the Cathedral site, Good Shepherd will be responsible for activity both inside and outside of the building. We will not accommodate campers on this site. We will, however, work with individuals who are not registered in shelter but who approach us seeking other kinds of housing help or support services.

How does Good Shepherd's approach to substance use differ from that of police? Good Shepherd strives to work within a harm reduction framework. We provide sharps containers and harm reduction kits at our sites. We host harm reduction and addiction services in our programs. We have no desire to further stigmatize or criminalize people due to their substance use. We do, however, advise shelter residents that drug use in shelter is not permitted. We will discharge an individual from the shelter if there is persistent evidence of onsite drug use (unsafe disposal of needles, impairment that puts individual, other clients and/or staff at risk). We are also vigilant in discouraging drug trade on or near our sites.

Will Good Shepherd be working with the Social Navigator, Hamilton Paramedics and Keeping six?

Good Shepherd already works with the Social Navigator, Keeping Six, Paramedics and many

other stakeholders engaged in supporting people who are precariously housed or experiencing homelessness. These relationships will remain important to our work at the Cathedral site.

Site & Location

How was the Former Cathedral Boys' School site chosen for this facility?

The property is privately owned by the Catholic Diocese who offered the site for this purpose to the Good Shepherd in response to the population needs. Upon review, the site was in appropriate state of use and contained the amenities most appropriate for shelter use including: showers, gym, overnight accommodation and day programming use.

In addition to an expansion at the Salvation Army, the Cathedral Boy's site was the only facility available, which could be easily transformed into a shelter in a reasonable time and for a reasonable cost.

Who approached the Diocese? Will they be compensated/reimbursed for use of the space?

Good Shepherd approached the Diocese and they have a lease in place.

What is the hard end date for this use? Is there one?

June 2021 is the approved end date for this temporary use. However, it is also dependent on what unfolds with the pandemic and potential second wave. Extending beyond this date would require Council approval and additional funding.

Why are these facilities so concentrated in Landsdale and Stinson? How was this factored into the decision?

There are a number of social service type agencies in the central lower city, such as shelters, Residential Care Facilities, and others. Many of these programs have long standing histories in the neighbourhood that date back 30+ years.

Due to proximity to other services which residents would access, the downtown core is often seen as an ideal location to ensure ease of access to those services.

Who is advocating for residents of existing RCF's and shelters in the neighbourhood?

There is a program review of Subsidized RCFs currently underway, lead by Housing Services Division of the City of Hamilton. As part of this review, increased collaboration with other support sectors such as Health Care are being explored in order to provide an increased level of mental health and related supports.

How many residential group homes, shelters other assisted/supportive living homes are already in operation in this neighbourhood/ward?

There are 14 RCFs and 1 Shelter located within Ward 3.

It is obvious to many residents that this was a hasty decision to expedite the approval of a capital project at First Ontario Centre. Why didn't the shelter there continue to operate? Are there other shelters opening in other wards?

As the City of Hamilton moves into Phase 3 of its re-opening plan, many businesses are returning to regular operations. This includes First Ontario Centre.

Many service providers feel that Sir John A. Macdonald was a better choice. Why wasn't this site chosen instead?

Factors such as size of building, degree of renovations required, and facilities on site such as showers, etc are factors in making the decision of location. Sir John A MacDonald was a less feasible choice.

Feedback & Future Action

Will Digital Canaries Studio return to CBS or will other TV/Movie shooting return to the building?

Digital Canaries Studio have secured another location with the Diocese in the City. Whether filming occur in the building in the future is up to the property owner. However the future use goal is to transform the site into affordable and mixed-income senior housing.

What are the long term plans for Cathedral Boys' School?

Longer term, Good Shepherd would like to develop a Senior's 'hub' that would combine affordable housing with support services that would be more broadly available to the community. An important part of this development would be incorporating the historic original school into the project.

Contact Information

Rob Mastroianni Manager of Emergency Shelter Services & RCF Subsidies at
Rob.Mastroianni@Hamilton.ca

Katherine Kalinowski, Chief Operating Officer, Good Shepherd Housing Services
kkalinowski@gsch.ca
(905)528-5877 Ext. 3323

Pilon, Janet

Subject: Regarding Stinson Neighborhood

From: Jeff W

Sent: September 15, 2020 11:04 AM

To: Office of the Mayor <mayor@hamilton.ca>; Wilson, Maureen <Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca>; Farr, Jason <Jason.Farr@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Merulla, Sam <Sam.Merulla@hamilton.ca>; Collins, Chad <Chad.Collins@hamilton.ca>; Jackson, Tom <Tom.Jackson@hamilton.ca>; Pauls, Esther <Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca>; Ward 8 Office <ward8@hamilton.ca>; Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Pearson, Maria <Maria.Pearson@hamilton.ca>; Johnson, Brenda <Brenda.Johnson@hamilton.ca>; Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>; VanderBeek, Arlene <Arlene.VanderBeek@hamilton.ca>; Whitehead, Terry <Terry.Whitehead@hamilton.ca>; Partridge, Judi <Judi.Partridge@hamilton.ca>; Bates, Tamara <Tamara.Bates@hamilton.ca>;

Subject: Regarding Stinson Neighborhood

Dear Council Members,

My neighbour informed me that residents of this community are to compose concerns by noon today. I again was not told of this until 10 am Tuesday the 15 September, and therefore am writing a quick draft.

In the way of background, I am a clinical psychologist, and I am working in the community. I moved to Hamilton to start a new life in a smaller city than Toronto (I am born and raised in western Canada). I bought a Victorian house in Stinson with the hopes of restoring its history and heritage. I feel Hamilton is one of the few standing heritage communities in Canada, and I have a passion for it; I have hopes for this community. However, I think that it is being mismanaged and run by several people with a narrow viewpoint and a quest to make their ideals a community identity. Unfortunately, it is not consistent with all the homeowners, and I feel it also has an irresponsible element to it because compassion before functionality and logic can be problematic. I have found that during my stay here since December 2019, after purchasing the house, the violence has increased. I have so far witnessed severe fighting, yelling and threatening behaviour, not to mention endless petty crimes. My walks on the street have seen unsavoury behaviour that has left me feeling threatened, and to the point, I can not walk the streets comfortably in Stinson.

Furthermore, when I addressed the issue to the Facebook Stinson community, I was ridiculed and attacked personally. This attack was most disturbing, and I choose to leave the group. My concern is the sheer amount of care homes that the Hamilton council approves in the community. I understand the need, and with COVID, it makes it difficult, but we can not concentrate poverty in one area alone for the simple reason that it will create further social problems for all involved. All communities should share the burden, not just the wards that may welcome the ideas. Those that push back must also share responsibilities for social issues, regardless of their socioeconomic positions. Please consider that in the future as we need balance.

Obviously, we need more primary prevention, but balance with tertiary prevention is imperative.

Sincerely,

Dr. Jeffrey Weatherby

Pilon, Janet

Subject: Mayor and Members of Council

From: Pam Summers

Sent: September 15, 2020 11:40 AM

To: Office of the Mayor <mayor@hamilton.ca>; Wilson, Maureen <Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca>; Farr, Jason <Jason.Farr@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Merulla, Sam <Sam.Merulla@hamilton.ca>; Collins, Chad <Chad.Collins@hamilton.ca>; Jackson, Tom <Tom.Jackson@hamilton.ca>; Pauls, Esther <Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca>; Ward 8 Office <ward8@hamilton.ca>; Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Pearson, Maria <Maria.Pearson@hamilton.ca>; Johnson, Brenda <Brenda.Johnson@hamilton.ca>; Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>; VanderBeek, Arlene <Arlene.VanderBeek@hamilton.ca>; Whitehead, Terry <Terry.Whitehead@hamilton.ca>; Partridge, Judi <Judi.Partridge@hamilton.ca>; Bates, Tamara <Tamara.Bates@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Fw: Mayor and Members of Council

I support the letter sent to Council by our community members, and would like to add (information/questions) to reflect my own experiences and thoughts.

Nrinder Nann publically announced that there are 15 RCF'S in Ward 3 and continued by stating:

"I understand Rob Mastroianni has replied with the specifics. **You will notice that though we have a high number in Ward 3, we do not have the highest, and certainly the RCFs are highly concentrated in the lower city and closer to the Downtown core**"

Although, in office for 2yrs as an advocate and supporter of vulnerable and marginalized residents in her ward, she had NO clue that the number of 15 was completely incorrect. The list was not up to date, and was still reflecting the old ward boundaries. Even if the list was not correct it is her duty as an elected council to be current with her information especially when it comes to over saturation issues.

It has been almost 3 weeks since I emailed her to have her correct the numbers using some kind of public platform, my emails have gone completely unanswered to this date.

As a tax paying citizen this is completely unprofessional, legally I am entitled to have my emails answered. If I was to just "ignore" emails from my "boss" for 3 weeks, with repeated reminders, I would not have a job.

Mayor and Members of Council

September 14, 2020

I, the undersigned, have resided in Hamilton/Ward 3 for 23 years.

I write at the best of my abilities, under the pressure to submit in time and with the very limited amount of information that I have been able to gather from the officials, the newspapers and the community.

This is an addendum to the two emails I have already submitted along

with some neighbours, to the Clerk for the Council meeting of September 10, 2020, regarding the Old Cathedral Boys School emergency shelter. I attach 5 documents and the FAQ.

This letter has also been composed to the best of my ability also considering that numerous neighbours, me included, who have been asking questions to Councillor Nann since mid-August and received to this date no answers or only answers deflecting our inquiries.

I will leave aside now the stressors that the opening of the emergency shelter will add onto our historically vulnerable Stinson community and how this increases the risks for an outbreak of Corona in our neighborhood because we have addressed these issues already in those two emails.

Councillor Nann wrote to me: "this decision was made under emergency orders which cannot be revoked"

I bring to your attention that those words misled many neighbours into believing that it was pointless to make the effort to exercise their duty and right to express their opposition to the opening of the temporary emergency shelter in the location of the Old Cathedral Boys High School. Most of my neighbours added sadly: "Besides, there is no point to fight City Hall."

But we discussed it further and then I passed on in an email our thinking to Councillor Nann: "Your affirmation does not stand legally, as any emergency order SHALL BE REVOKED immediately when it is shows indications to be unwise, ill-conceived, dangerous to the local population, taken in the interest of third parties, promoting self-interest or corrupt."

It appears that the actions of those involved may also fit the parameters for what is called Conspiracy Against Rights in the USA code (Conspiracy against rights is a criminal offense involving acts to prevent others from exercising their constitutional rights). The same universal legal principles and arguments could be presented to the Canadian Courts in this case. The seriousness may be compounded by the use/or abuse of the sacrosanct and extraordinary powers of an "emergency order" because it may create a dangerous legal precedent to the well-being not just of the Stinson community but to all Canadians in the future.

All aspects of how this emergency order was passed shall be made public, including the names of all those who participated in the different stages of conception and what role those people played and the interests they represented and the dates when each one of those conversations took place. It appears, but we are not sure, that the emergency order conception began after the order to shelter in place was already lifted. In Ontario, Phase 1 started May 19, 2020; Phase 2 started June 12, 2020 and Phase 3 started July 17, 2020. It appears that the Emergency Committee gave their approval for funding the emergency shelter at the

Old Cathedral Boys School at the July 17, 2020 meeting, the exact day Phase 3 began in Ontario. The timing should be investigated; it appears that the Good Shepherd Hamilton already owned or had possession of the building in 2018. All of this is public record.

I will focus now on the document published in August by Nrinder Nann, City Councillor/ Ward 3. entitled "Community Information Session on Temporary Shelter Services." , I attached the document to this email under that title.

The document opens: "This document contains a summary to the questions my office has received in relation to the September opening of a temporary shelter at 378 Main St. E."

Please note that instead of "a summary of questions", it should read: "'a selection of questions"; it has been reported by neighbors that they were blocked in the "social media" for asking "inconvenient questions" that perhaps did not suit Nann's narrative.

The document concludes with the contact information of two of the protagonists of the Zoom info-meeting:

Rob Mastroianni Manager of Emergency Shelter Services & RCF Subsidies at Rob.Mastroianni@Hamilton.ca

Katherine Kalinowski, Chief Operating Officer, Good Shepherd Housing Services kkalinowski@gsch.ca (905)528-5877 Ext. 3323

It appears that the document and the the Zoom info meeting hosted by Councillor Nann in August, are in sync. The linguistic styles of both formats are identical. The type of language used to communicate the "news" to the community after the decision was already passed under "an emergency order", may indicate a willfully and orchestrated strategic intention to distract, to purposely occult the facts and to mislead the public. The type of language may indicate that the authors had awareness that they were manipulating and taking advantage of and abusing the emergency order process letter and/or spirit for their own personal ideology, interests or gains. This type of intention constitutes cause for the revocation of the emergency order. As it stands at this moment it may set a dangerous legal precedent for all Canadians.

It is possible that Councillor Nann, a holistic nutritionist from New York and only a recent resident of Hamilton/Ward 3, Gage Park, was not "familiar" with the history of our City, including the sinister scams of the famously nefarious family Martino that seemly became rich by sucking the life blood from the vulnerable and marginalized population placed under their care by the City and the Province, and the unsolved murder of Joe Melo, seemly implicated in assisting living schemes and a mega "pharmacy legal scheme" as reported in the Spec, until we informed her about it. It appears that the Martino family still runs the same kind of business they used to under other names and numbered companies as reported in the Spec article "House of Horrors", Jun 11, 2020 and other

recent articles. Note the dates:

1. House of Horrors was published June 11, 2020.
2. At the beginning of July 2020, some yet unnamed party approached Councillor Nann with the plan to locate the emergency shelter at the corner of Main and Emerald St. under an emergency order.

House of Horrors should have raised a red flag for the location.

Another red flag emerges from the on-line City of Hamilton Covid -19 map. Since the beginning of the pandemic the composite area of of Stinson-Landsdale has been colored "Dark Gray" indicating the high number of infections compared to the rest of Hamilton.

It seems that Councillor Nann was also not aware of the dynamics of the Stinson community, not just regarding the high concentration of badly run assisting living operations, but the high concentration of other social ills buildings, crystal meth dens and rooming houses, "trouble buildings" that even the police are afraid to enter. This problem is presently compounded by the "red fentanyl" and the Covid-19.

A study for the Ontario Marginalization Index (ON-MARG) should be done on the composite area of Stinson-Landsdale.

On the other hand, Mastroianni and Kalinowski should have being fully aware of the situation of Stinson-Landsdale, given their seniority in Hamilton, their jobs and their titles.

Another red flag was raised by the independent journalist Joey Coleman's Tweet: "City Manager's office just deleted video of last week's meeting of the Housing and Homelessness Advisory Committee from YouTube." He has now requested this video under the "Freedom of Information Act". We ask you to look into the matter and to use your Councillor position to release this video to the public immediately, so that given the urgency of the matter we do not have to wait for many months before it is released. You shall also require the name/s of the persons who requested for this video to be deleted and the reasons they alleged for this action. The public has a right to know who and why.

This could constitute cause for the revocation of the emergency order, as it may indicate rush and/or wrong-doing and/or self-interest and/or conspiracy against rights and thus abuse of the emergency order legal process letter and/or spirit.

Furthermore, their actions de facto disregard the well-being of the population that resides already in situ during the pandemic and are not financially able to move elsewhere at this moment. If an Covid-19 outbreak manifests at the heart of Stinson, then there will be grounds to claim the action-planners and other interested parties are open to liability because we warn them.

I noticed that today, September 14, the cases of Covid-19 are increasing as it was prognosticated.

I noticed that in Hamilton, the Stinson neighbourhood was down from the recent "Dark Grey" to "Medium Grey" but that Landsdale is in "Dark Grey", meaning there is a higher number of new infections in that community. Notice that both neighborhoods are geographically touching. The boundary is Main St. exactly where Motel Cathedral will open soon. So it is a fact that the emergency shelter is opening at the geographical heart of the largest numbers of Covid-19 reported cases in Hamilton.

I take now the task to point out to the Mayor and Council some of the other red flags where it seems that misleading language was used regarding the "temporary status of the emergency shelter". This may legally constitute deception and conspiracy and a will to mislead the community and to corrupt letter and/or the spirit of the order.

1. "What makes you think that Cathedral will be any more successful than the First Ontario?"

The shelter at First Ontario has offered a safe, hospitable environment for single men experiencing homelessness. Good Shepherd has no authority over the space outside of the FOC that is currently an encampment site. Staff do monitor that area and actively offer shelter services but we do not direct any activity outside of the FOC. At the Cathedral site, Good Shepherd will be responsible for activity both inside and outside of the building. We will not accommodate campers on this site. We will, however, work with individuals who are not registered in shelter but who approach us seeking other kinds of housing help or support services."

Perhaps Councillor Nann has not enough experience to know that, naturally and logically, the encampment site will move from First Ontario to the Stinson green spaces/ parkettes, because the tenters need to be close to the services of "Motel Cathedral", as they call it. The tenters have already scouted our neighbourhood and stated their intentions to move onto the various green spaces, as we have reported to the authorities and thus fulfilled our civic duties (during a pandemic to report infractions or weakness of the safety protocols is an ethical and a legal duty not only a civic right.)

It is reasonable to think that Mastroniani and the Good Shepherd Hamilton, more experienced than Nann, may have already prognosticated this encampment possibility and not only chose to remain silent but they may have tried to hide it from the community by stating that: "We will not accommodate campers on this site. We will, however, work with individuals who are not registered in shelter but who approach us seeking other kinds of housing help or support services."

If they contemplated the possibility of the tenting camp moving closer to Motel Cathedral attracted to the services the tenters will receive there, they spoke knowingly with the "intention to deceive the public" and their use of the "emergency order" is null. If they did not contemplate the likelihood of a "flood of tents", it may indicate that

these individuals are not equipped to hold on their present jobs or to invoke a pandemic "emergency order". Council shall interrogate the individuals separately, ask them for all their documentations and notes to determine which one of these two scenarios took place.

"We will, however, work with individuals who are not registered in shelter but who approach us seeking other kinds of housing help or support services.

The opening of the doors of the new emergency shelter was orchestrated behind closed doors. The plan endangers the community with the approaching Second Wave, thus a new Covid-19 emergency order shall be invoked if the Motel Cathedral opens in disregard of sound scientific pandemic strategies and protocols:

For the time that this particular shelter remains open, the services that historically the Good Shepherd Ministries has offered to "the individuals who are not registered in shelter but who approach us seeking other kinds of housing help or support services." shall be suspended.

The support services the homeless desperately need are food, toilets and showers. As a Covid-19 precautionary measure, the doors of Motel Cathedral shall be closed to all-non-residents. These Good Shepherd Ministries services to individuals who are not registered in the shelter shall be suspended in this precise location due to Covid-19 "community distancing protocols" and these vital services shall be offered at a different location. If the tenting folk needs are served outside of Stinson, this will stop the tenting camp from setting in Stinson and it will reduce the compounded risk of a Covid-19 outbreak that our community is facing at the moment.

2. "Site & Location

How was the Former Cathedral Boys' School site chosen for this facility? The property is privately owned by the Catholic Diocese who offered the site for this purpose to the Good Shepherd in response to the population needs. Upon review, the site was in appropriate state of use and contained the amenities most appropriate for shelter use including: showers, gym, overnight accommodation and day programming use."

The Ownership of the building is not clear, therefore the interests of third parties are obscured:

Taken from the Good Shepherd Blog: "On January 19, 2015, the Little Brothers of the Good Shepherd fused with the Hospitaller Brothers of St. John of God. This 'fusion' of the two religious orders saw the end of the Little Brothers of the Good Shepherd as a formal entity. The Little Brothers of the Good Shepherd have now become Hospitaller Brothers of St. John of God.

The Little Brothers of the Good Shepherd are known locally for the work that is done through Good Shepherd Ministries in Toronto."

This means that The Good Shepherd Hamilton is indeed a Catholic entity located within the Hamilton Diocese, but it is legally a "formal entity" [An association, corporation, partnership, proprietorship, trust, or individual that has legal standing in the eyes of law. A legal entity has legal capacity to enter into agreements or contracts, assume obligations, incur and pay debts, sue and be sued in its own right, and to be held responsible for its actions] and as such it is legally different from the Dioceses even if they are geographically within the Diocese and thus "belong" to the Diocese but it is not privately own by the Diocese. Thus the statement that "The property is privately owned by the Catholic Diocese who offered the site for this purpose to the Good Shepherd in response to the population needs" may appear to be purposefully "misleading".

I selected 2 lines from the Cultural Heritage Assessment Report on the Former Cathedral Boys' High School.

<https://pub-hamilton.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=151834>

1.0 Introduction, 3rd paragraph: " On November 9, 2016, Alan Whittle of Good Shepherd Hamilton greeted Peter Stewart, Francine Antoniou and Paul Dilse for photographic recording of the school."

This indicates that Alan Whittle/Good Shepherd Hamilton had already "some level of interest" in the building in 2016.

The next document is dated 2018, 2 years before the pandemic began:

<https://pub-hamilton.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=152578>

Note the last line:

"HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The subject property, municipally known as 378 Main Street East, Hamilton (see Appendix "A" to Report PED17168) is known locally as the Cathedral Boys' High School.

The School was built in 1928 and funded by the Hamilton Catholic population. This school was the first purpose built Catholic High School in Hamilton. Designed by Hutton and Souter, the Former Cathedral Boys' High School was designed in the architectural style known as Modern Gothic, Collegiate Gothic or Neo-Gothic. Hutton and Souter were prominent architects responsible for a number of other significant buildings in Hamilton such as the Delta Collegiate High School, the Royal Connaught Hotel, and the John Sopinka Courthouse.

In 1951, a wing was built to memorialize students that fought and lost their lives in the First and Second World Wars. Constructed in a vernacular style, the architect is unknown. In September 1992, the Cathedral Boys' High School and Cathedral Girls' High School (on Main Street East, two blocks east of Cathedral Boys' High School) were integrated.

In September 1995, the publicly funded Cathedral High School opened at King Street East and Wentworth Street North, replacing Cathedral Boys' High School and Cathedral Girls' High School.

The property is currently owned by Good Shepherd Hamilton."

According to the Cultural Heritage folk, the Good Shepherd Hamilton already owned the property in 2018.

Furthermore, in a recent Spec. article we read: "Good Shepherd is working out an arrangement with the Roman Catholic diocese to rent out a part of the former Cathedral school, said agency spokesperson Alan Whittle."

<https://www.thespec.com/news/council/2020/07/10/millions-more-on-table-to-help-hamiltons-homeless-amid-pandemic.html>

How can this be if the Cultural Heritage report lists the Good Shepherd Hamilton as the "owner" of the building?

If Bishop Crosby and the Hospitaller Brothers of St. John of God and the Good Shepherd Hamilton and Alan Whittle had no intention to mislead the Stinson community regarding the "temporary location of the emergency shelter" instead of : "The property is privately owned by the Catholic Diocese who offered the site for this purpose to the Good Shepherd in response to the population needs.", they should have said (my words): "The property is currently owned by Good Shepherd Hamilton", even if the property was acquired or perhaps leased for only \$1 since at least 2018 .

We question the parties name above regarding the lease and we were ignored.

And how could Bishop Crosby, head of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Hamilton "offered the site for this purpose" two years before Covid-19?

3. "Who approached the Diocese? Will they be compensated/reimbursed for use of the space? Good Shepherd approached the Diocese and they have a lease in place."

After reading this, many neighbors believed it and repeatedly requested information regarding the terms and length of this "lease", myself included. There was absolute silence from Nann, Mastroianni and the Good Shepherd Hamilton and the Hospitaller Brothers of St. John of God and Bishop Crosby on the subject. The optics are not good with respect to these actors' bona fides during the process of invoking an emergency order and the ownership or lease of the building.

It is not a stretch to say that The Old Cathedral Boys' High School is what is known in real estate terms as a "white elephant": a burdensome possession whose cost of upkeep is not in line with its usefulness or value. It was calculated, after the inspection of the building that the cost to remedy the asbestos, the plumbing and the electrical would be at least 15 million dollars. If we add to this astronomical cost the "heritage designation", "the white elephant" real estate definition is met.

This real estate deal is not clear and it may cross the boundaries of ethical behavior and transparency and it shall be looked into and investigated in depth by the Hamilton City Council. Perhaps there are some other benefits to Good Shepherd Hamilton by opening the pandemic temporary emergency shelter at the "with the elephant" property and later on obtain favors or special considerations regarding the property? This shall be disclosed.

This could constitute cause for the revocation of the emergency order, as it may indicate deception, wrong-doing, interest of third parties, tit for tat and abuse of the emergency order process with a possible ulterior motive to by-pass a lawful "Cultural Heritage designation". It should be looked into it by City Hall and the Ethics Committee.

3. "What is the hard end date for this use? Is there one?"

June 2021 is the approved end date for this temporary use. However, it is also dependent on what unfolds with the pandemic and potential second wave. Extending beyond this date would require Council approval and additional funding."

It appears that this ambiguous and open-ended answer is designed to reassure the overwhelmed community and perhaps even to bypass the "heritage designation" under the pandemic emergency orders.

Once "in situ" with the shelter running, pandemic or not by June 2021, there will be little incentive for City Hall NOT to renew the contract, mostly if it supported by Rob Mastroianni and Ward 3 Councillor Nann.

If indeed June 2021 is the approved final date line for this temporary use, and in case that the opening of this so called "emergency shelter" takes place against our dutifully reported concerns and warnings, then Rob Mastroianni and City Hall shall actively and immediately engage in the selection and the preparedness of a more suitable site for another Good Shepherd Hamilton emergency shelter so that it is ready for June 30 2021. This should be done under a new "emergency order". This immediate and active engagement to find another location is urgent because there is no guarantee that the pandemic will be resolved by June 2021, and the community may be forced to live under these extreme conditions for 9 long months + the delays. This time, the process shall be public to avoid wasting precious resources again, aka taxpayer's money.

4. "Why are these facilities so concentrated in Landsdale and Stinson? How was this factored into the decision? There are a number of social service type agencies in the central lower city, such as shelters, Residential Care Facilities, and others. Many of these programs have long standing histories in the neighbourhood that date back 30+ years. Due to proximity to other services which residents would access, the downtown core is often seen as an ideal location to ensure ease of access to those services."

I follow this statement with the words of Councillor Nann in the email

she sent me, dated 05/09/2020:

"I truly do appreciate your concern of the over concentration in the Stinson neighbourhood, as with several other neighborhoods in Ward 3 of poorly run RCFs. It is something I will continue to tirelessly flag and demand action on. Historical decisions led to this over-concentration and it must be rectified!"

Councillor Nann contradicts herself by:

a. Actively supporting to open the emergency shelter by invoking an extreme "emergency order" and thus purposely bypassing her constituents concerns regarding the over-concentration of the area.

b. While affirming that "Historical decisions led to this over-concentration and it must be rectified!".

This contradiction of thought disqualifies her from invoking "emergency orders" because her support for the plan just increased the historical over-concentration she states needs to be rectified.

Perhaps there was "no time to consult the community" but there was plenty time to consult the experts, like ON-MARG and any urban epidemiologist from McMaster.

I firmly believe that the Ontario Human Rights Code is intended to protect us all, and in particular to protect the human rights of the vulnerable and marginalized and that the legislation is not to be used to create an urban ghetto, which constitutes a violation of Section 7 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. 7. Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice. Myself included.

"Due to proximity to other services which residents would access, the downtown core is often seen as an ideal location to ensure ease of access to those services." This is a deceptive excuse that has already been used in the past in Hamilton and in other cities with disastrous results. This is precisely how urban ghettos were and are created. Services shall be provided in situ at the emergency shelter, wherever it is located, this is the year 2020 and it can be done.

Furthermore, under the heading "Operations" the document reads: "Primary healthcare will be provided by a nurse practitioner employed by Good Shepherd and doctors from the Shelter Health Network. Harm reduction support will be provided. Shelter staff offer case management services including referrals, advocacy and supportive counseling. Housing and support services will be offered to every resident."

If this is true, then there is no need to locate the emergency shelter in Stinson, as the services will be provided already "in house" somewhere else.

It feels like the most marginalized and at-risk populations are herded into one single area. The intentional creation of a ghetto indicates wrong-doing and abuse of the emergency order process. The unintentional creation of a ghetto indicates ignorance and negligence. Both instances constitute cause for the revocation of the emergency order. To live in a ghetto endangers me, my security and my well-being as well as the security and the well-being of my family and my community, especially during Covid-19.

5. "It is obvious to many residents that this was a hasty decision to expedite the approval of a capital project at First Ontario Centre. Why didn't the shelter there continue to operate? Are there other shelters opening in other wards?

As the City of Hamilton moves into Phase 3 of its re-opening plan, many businesses are returning to regular operations. This includes First Ontario Centre.

Many service providers feel that Sir John A. Macdonald was a better choice. Why wasn't this site chosen instead? Factors such as size of building, degree of renovations required, and facilities on site such as showers, etc are factors in making the decision of location. Sir John A MacDonald was a less feasible choice."

Here my question echo's the voices of Stinson residents: Is Sir John A. Macdonald part of the downtown mega development plan and was this the real reason or one of the reasons it was not chosen?

After receiving the news of the opening of the emergency shelter, some neighbours have put their house for sale or are intending to do it. The buzz word in Stinson is that the City is concentrating the most vulnerable population in our neighbourhood with the nefarious intention to control the pandemic by creating a Covid-19 Ghetto and thus maintain the rest of Hamilton open for business. I also have come to believe this.

Most people believe that the "emergency order decision" is directly related to the mega real estate development plans for downtown. This could constitute cause for the revocation of the emergency order, as it may indicate wrong-doing, third parties' interests and abuse of the emergency order process.

The optics are bad and a public inquiry of how "this led to that" going back at least to 2015 shall be opened and the matter shall be investigated by City Council without delay.

6. "Who is advocating for residents of existing RCF's and shelters in the neighbourhood? There is a program review of Subsidized RCFs currently underway, led by Housing Services Division of the City of Hamilton. As part of this review, increased collaboration with other support sectors such as Health Care are being explored in order to provide an increased level of mental health and related supports."

"How many residential group homes, shelters other assisted/supportive living homes are already in operation in this neighbourhood/ward?

There are 14 RCFs and 1 Shelter located within Ward 3."

These 2 points support our arguments that Stinson needs immediate assistance and NOT ADDED STRESSORS, especially during the pandemic and that the decision to open the emergency shelter at Main and Emerald, was flawed and dangerous and the historical facts were probably known to most of the actors that invoked the "emergency order".

6. "What are the long-term plans for Cathedral Boys' School? Longer term, Good Shepherd would like to develop a Senior's 'hub' that would combine affordable housing with support services that would be more broadly available to the community. An important part of this development would be incorporating the historic original school into the project."

I found some consolation in this last answer until a senior neighbor raised another red flag: "Any person above 50 qualifies as a senior and some are "trouble" and not just impoverished elders."

I had envisioned a kind of affordable housing for law abiding seniors that would contribute with their presence to bring stability to our area.

I copy paste the latest email I received:

"A few people have asked
Do we know what premise the city is directing taxpayer's money to good shepherd?
Should we be emailing the police chief, or anyone else on the force?
Do we keep resenting the same emails every few days given we feel we are being ignored with the lack of response from anyone?"

What do I tell them?

It is the Mayor and City Council's duty to keep us safe, especially during Covid-19.



COMMUNITY INFORMATION SESSION ON TEMPORARY SHELTER SERVICES

This document contains a summary to the questions my office has received in relation to the September opening of a temporary shelter at 378 Main St. E.

Community Relationships & Communication

What agencies were consulted in the creation of this shelter and how was that consultation completed?

During this pandemic, the City of Hamilton struck a coordinating table with local agencies serving people experiencing homelessness to align responses, resources and to collaborate on addressing the complex health and housing needs. Consequently, the need to expand the capacity within the shelter system and options for achieving it continues to be discussed with sector partners.

Many residents have indicated interest in volunteering, who can they contact?

Good Shepherd welcomes those interested in becoming volunteers to apply here:

<https://www.goodshepherdcentres.ca/volunteer/>

Why was there no consultation with adjacent neighbours?

Due to the Global Pandemic, the Emergency Operations Centre at the City of Hamilton has made a number of difficult decisions in a very short time frame, consultation was not possible. Under normal circumstances, the City of Hamilton consults as regular practice, which normally takes 12-18 months. Consultation of this type was not possible in light of COVID-19.

Has there been any consultation with local businesses?

Unfortunately not. The same situation as described above relates in terms of consultation with local business.

When neighbourhood/community association meetings resume, will a representative from Good Shepherd attend?

Yes, Good Shepherd would be pleased to attend both GALA and Stinson Community meetings.

Operations

What amenities will be available to residents staying at the shelter?

Shelter residents will be accommodated in shared bedroom (4 – 5 per room) that will provide barriers/screens to offer some privacy and infection prevention. The shelter will offer residents 3 meals/day, bagged lunches for those who need to be away from the shelter during a mealtime and snacks. Primary healthcare will be provided by a nurse practitioner employed by Good Shepherd and doctors from the Shelter Health Network. Harm reduction support will be provided. Shelter staff offer case management services including referrals, advocacy and supportive counselling. Housing support services will be offered to every resident.

Will there be 24/7 security and cameras?

The Cathedral site is equipped with security cameras. The shelter will be staffed 24/7. Formal safety and security policies will be in place.

The neighbourhood has a high parking load already. Is there designated parking for staff?

Yes. Good Shepherd Staff will utilize the back parking lot.

Will residents of the shelter have outdoor space?

Yes, Good Shepherd will create a designated outdoor space at the back of the building, with measures taken to protect the privacy of both shelter residents and adjacent neighbours.

Will there be a curfew in place?

Shelter occupancy is confirmed each night at 10 pm. Residents may arrive back to shelter later than 10 pm (e.g. working a late shift) if pre-arranged with staff. Residents are encouraged to remain on shelter property after this time however, there are no curfew policies in place.

How will non residents be discouraged from congregating outside the building?

Staff monitor activity on and adjacent to shelter sites. Residents may not entertain guests on site. Non-residents will be asked to leave the property and actively discouraged from congregating on adjacent sidewalks etc.

What makes you think that Cathedral will be any more successful than the First Ontario?

The shelter at First Ontario has offered a safe, hospitable environment for single men experiencing homelessness. Good Shepherd has no authority over the space outside of the FOC that is currently an encampment site. Staff do monitor that area and actively offer shelter services but we do not direct any activity outside of the FOC. At the Cathedral site, Good Shepherd will be responsible for activity both inside and outside of the building. We will not accommodate campers on this site. We will, however, work with individuals who are not registered in shelter but who approach us seeking other kinds of housing help or support services.

How does Good Shepherd's approach to substance use differ from that of police? Good Shepherd strives to work within a harm reduction framework. We provide sharps containers and harm reduction kits at our sites. We host harm reduction and addiction services in our programs. We have no desire to further stigmatize or criminalize people due to their substance use. We do, however, advise shelter residents that drug use in shelter is not permitted. We will discharge an individual from the shelter if there is persistent evidence of onsite drug use (unsafe disposal of needles, impairment that puts individual, other clients and/or staff at risk). We are also vigilant in discouraging drug trade on or near our sites.

Will Good Shepherd be working with the Social Navigator, Hamilton Paramedics and Keeping six?

Good Shepherd already works with the Social Navigator, Keeping Six, Paramedics and many

other stakeholders engaged in supporting people who are precariously housed or experiencing homelessness. These relationships will remain important to our work at the Cathedral site.

Site & Location

How was the Former Cathedral Boys' School site chosen for this facility?

The property is privately owned by the Catholic Diocese who offered the site for this purpose to the Good Shepherd in response to the population needs. Upon review, the site was in appropriate state of use and contained the amenities most appropriate for shelter use including: showers, gym, overnight accommodation and day programming use.

In addition to an expansion at the Salvation Army, the Cathedral Boy's site was the only facility available, which could be easily transformed into a shelter in a reasonable time and for a reasonable cost.

Who approached the Diocese? Will they be compensated/reimbursed for use of the space?

Good Shepherd approached the Diocese and they have a lease in place.

What is the hard end date for this use? Is there one?

June 2021 is the approved end date for this temporary use. However, it is also dependent on what unfolds with the pandemic and potential second wave. Extending beyond this date would require Council approval and additional funding.

Why are these facilities so concentrated in Landsdale and Stinson? How was this factored into the decision?

There are a number of social service type agencies in the central lower city, such as shelters, Residential Care Facilities, and others. Many of these programs have long standing histories in the neighbourhood that date back 30+ years.

Due to proximity to other services which residents would access, the downtown core is often seen as an ideal location to ensure ease of access to those services.

Who is advocating for residents of existing RCF's and shelters in the neighbourhood?

There is a program review of Subsidized RCFs currently underway, lead by Housing Services Division of the City of Hamilton. As part of this review, increased collaboration with other support sectors such as Health Care are being explored in order to provide an increased level of mental health and related supports.

How many residential group homes, shelters other assisted/supportive living homes are already in operation in this neighbourhood/ward?

There are 14 RCFs and 1 Shelter located within Ward 3.

It is obvious to many residents that this was a hasty decision to expedite the approval of a capital project at First Ontario Centre. Why didn't the shelter there continue to operate? Are there other shelters opening in other wards?

As the City of Hamilton moves into Phase 3 of its re-opening plan, many businesses are returning to regular operations. This includes First Ontario Centre.

Many service providers feel that Sir John A. Macdonald was a better choice. Why wasn't this site chosen instead?

Factors such as size of building, degree of renovations required, and facilities on site such as showers, etc are factors in making the decision of location. Sir John A MacDonald was a less feasible choice.

Feedback & Future Action

Will Digital Canaries Studio return to CBS or will other TV/Movie shooting return to the building?

Digital Canaries Studio have secured another location with the Diocese in the City. Whether filming occur in the building in the future is up to the property owner. However the future use goal is to transform the site into affordable and mixed-income senior housing.

What are the long term plans for Cathedral Boys' School?

Longer term, Good Shepherd would like to develop a Senior's 'hub' that would combine affordable housing with support services that would be more broadly available to the community. An important part of this development would be incorporating the historic original school into the project.

Contact Information

Rob Mastroianni Manager of Emergency Shelter Services & RCF Subsidies at
Rob.Mastroianni@Hamilton.ca

Katherine Kalinowski, Chief Operating Officer, Good Shepherd Housing Services
kkalinowski@gsch.ca
(905)528-5877 Ext. 3323

September 11 2020

Dear Mayor Eisenberger and Councillor Nann:

I am a resident of Ward 3/ Stinson.

A few weeks ago Stinson community members had interactions with the scouts from the "tenting camps" exploring Stinson green spaces in advance of the opening of Motel Cathedral with the intention of being close to their services. They said that they will be back. This is a photo of a tent that in the alleyway behind Cathedral was taken today. The neighbors informed that the tenter is aggressive and consuming drugs.

I watched yesterday the meeting of the Emergency & Community Services Committee. I had submitted 2 documents and none of my concerns were addressed.

There was no one word regarding extra security measures or measures to prevent a outbreak of Covid-19 in Stinson:

1. Not one word about the extraordinary Covid-19 safety protocols that need to be implemented when the "temporary" emergency shelter opens at Old Cathedral Boys School.

2. Not one word about cleaning crews to remove bio-hazard materials from the neighborhood, not only needles and condoms but human feces. Human feces and urine had manifested as a grave problem around the "tent encampment sites" in downtown Hamilton and in Toronto and BC. Human feces and urine are both bio-hazard materials that may carry the virus and contaminate shoes. City Hall shall provide more cleaning crews instead of less and the cleaning crews shall work under the protection of trained security teams.

3. Not one word about daily sanitation of Stinson sidewalks and public and private parking spaces with Eco-friendly products to prevent the community spread of the virus in Stinson.

4. No one word regarding enhanced pandemic sanitation measures at Motel Cathedral, for instance: Good Shepherd shall provide 24/7 washrooms attendants because as the emergency shelter will shelter, by definition, a constant transient population of 45 plus men overnight + the numerous people who access the facilities during the day without spending the night in the shelter, there shall be 24/7 employees, in full Covid-19 protection gear, sanitizing the toilets and the showers after each use. The toilets need to be equipped with toilet LIDS to stop the Covid19 to be airborne after each flush and infect the surrounding area.

5. No one word regarding how to prevent the flood of tents into the 3 green spaces/ parkettes situated in Hunter, for instance:

For the time that this particular shelter (Motel Cathedral) remains open, the services that historically the Good Shepherd Ministries has offered to "the individuals who are not registered in shelter but who approach us seeking other kinds of housing help or support services." shall be suspended.

The support services the homeless desperately need are food, toilets and showers. As a Covid-19 extraordinary precautionary measure, the doors of Motel Cathedral shall be closed to all-non residents. These Good Shepherd Ministries services to individuals who are not registered in the shelter shall be suspended in this location due to Covid-19 Community distancing protocols and these vital services shall be offered at a different location. If the tenting folk needs are served outside of Stinson, this will stop the tenting camp from setting in Stinson and it will reduce the compounded risk of a Covid-19 outbreak that my community is facing at the moment.

6. Not one single answer to ANY of the questions I collected from the neighbors.

7. Read in Global News: <https://apple.news/AB4QusTeMRjOvx34mFBbj3A>

Please, advice us asap on how to proceed. Pleas asing an independent advocate for Stinson because we are simple folk and we do not know the rules of how City Hall funtions. Ward 3 Councillor Nann went on vacation after she invoked the "emergency order"; an emergency order is invoked in extremely rare occasions, war and pandemics. It would have been reasanoble that a polititian after invoking an emergency order remain working to assist his/her constituents during the emergency.

Carmen Orlandis.

September 14 2020

Coun. Nann: The article "Residents push back on Old Cathedral boy's plan", by Teviah Moro, reads in part :

Coun. Ninder Nann rejects claims from some Ward 3 residents that city officials "deliberately and maliciously" withheld a plan to turn a former school into a temporary shelter.

"I want to acknowledge that these kinds of decisions in an emergency setting have a very rapid nature."

"Nann noted that she learned of the plan for Old Cathedral in early July and by the end of that month started promoting an Aug. 11 online feedback session." An online session attended by 32 people (followers) from a population of 41,000+ is NOT public consultation. No wonder that the "feedback" was mostly positive. No one knew about it! We do not accept in any way that this was a public consultation and we maintain that the entire process was neither open nor transparent and indeed, deliberate. The most recent entry in the news section of your website is July 5, 2019. And the most recent entry in your "Information Update" is dated November 27, 2019. Where exactly did you promote this so-called feedback session? Where was the robust communication system that you promised leading up to your being elected in Ward 3? Also, leading up to the election, you said that you would "establish a monthly email and web newsletter to keep residents up to date, and price out the cost of doing periodic printed and post delivered updates, because not everyone is on social media."

By any measure, you cannot keep making the perfidious claim that you "promoted" anything.

"John said the city looked at other locations for the temporary shelter but landed on Old Cathedral as the best option.

He acknowledged some residents' concerns about a high concentration of lodging homes in the neighborhood." Teviah Moro, The Spectator.

Indeed we claim that the "plan" was deliberately withheld, according to your own words in your Zoom infomercial, but unfortunately, we have come to sincerely believe that the plan of opening the emergency shelter in Stinson during Covid-19 is a neglectful urban strategy or it is a malicious strategy aimed to contain a Covid-19 outbreak in one section of the Hamilton, in our neighbourhood. We have come to this sincere belief with a heavy heart. Our feelings on the subject were generated by the total lack of transparency of the process. We are common folk already exhausted by 6 months of pandemic and we have limited access to information.

It is possible that somebody else misled you in this affair. If so, we expect that you rise now to the occasion and make immediately public the information you have. To begin with, we need to know:

1. Who really owns the building? The Cultural Heritage Report, 2018, names as the owner, Good Shepherd Hamilton. You will find this information in City Hall Property Register. In your selective FAQ you state that "Good Shepherd approached the Diocese and they have a lease in place." If there is a "lease" as you claim, who are the named parties on the lease? What are the terms? Will you make this

document public? Also, in your FAQ, you failed to answer the additional questions: Will they be compensated/reimbursed for use of the space? Will they?

2. "Nann noted she learned of the plan for Old Cathedral in early July". The date is important...what day? We deduced that "you learned of the plan" means that "somebody else" hatched it. Who approached you with the plan? Do you have contemporaneous notes?

3. What is the name of the person/s who "counseled" you to keep the plan secret?

4. Independent journalist Joey Coleman's Tweet:"City Manager's office just deleted video of last week's meeting of the Housing and Homelessness Advisory Committee from YouTube." He has now requested this video under the "Freedom of Information Act". We ask you to look into the matter and to use your Councillor position to release this video to the public immediately, so that given the urgency of the matter we do not have to wait for many months before it is released. You shall also require the name/s of the persons who requested for this video to be deleted and the reasons they alleged for this action. The public has a right to know who and why.

We are normal folk and our ability to bring to the light occult facts is limited. Transparency is now the only way that you can prove to your constituents that you were misled by others. Your silence so far has been a strong contributor to the community buzz that the plan to use an "emergency order" to create a Covid-19 ghetto in Stinson is unfolding.

Carmen Orlandis

Pilon, Janet

Subject: FW:

From: Damon Joo

Sent: September 15, 2020 11:36 AM

To: Bates, Tamara <Tamara.Bates@hamilton.ca>; Wilson, Maureen <Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca>; Jackson, Tom <Tom.Jackson@hamilton.ca>; Ward 8 Office <ward8@hamilton.ca>; Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Pearson, Maria <Maria.Pearson@hamilton.ca>; Johnson, Brenda <Brenda.Johnson@hamilton.ca>; Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>; VanderBeek, Arlene <Arlene.VanderBeek@hamilton.ca>; Whitehead, Terry <Terry.Whitehead@hamilton.ca>; Partridge, Judi <Judi.Partridge@hamilton.ca>; Office of the Mayor <mayor@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Pauls, Esther <Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca>

Subject:

Mayor and Members of Council

September 14, 2020

I, the undersigned, have resided in Hamilton/Ward 3 for 13 years.

I write at the best of my abilities, under the pressure to submit in time and with the very limited amount of information that I have been able to gather from the officials, the newspapers and the community.

This is an addendum to the two emails I have already submitted along with some neighbours, to the Clerk for the Council meeting of September 10, 2020, regarding the Old Cathedral Boys School emergency shelter. I attach 5 documents and the FAQ.

This letter has also been composed to the best of my ability also considering that numerous neighbours, me included, who have been asking questions to Councillor Nann since mid-August and received to this date no answers or only answers deflecting our inquiries.

I will leave aside now the stressors that the opening of the emergency shelter will add onto our historically vulnerable Stinson community and how this increases the risks for an outbreak of Corona in our neighborhood because we have addressed these issues already in those two emails.

Councillor Nann wrote to me: "this decision was made under emergency orders which cannot be revoked"

I bring to your attention that those words misled many neighbours into believing that it was pointless to make the effort to exercise their duty and right to express their opposition to the opening of the temporary emergency shelter in the location of the Old Cathedral Boys High School. Most of my neighbours added sadly: "Besides, there is no point to fight City Hall."

But we discussed it further and then I passed on in an email our thinking to Councillor Nann: "Your affirmation does not stand legally,

as any emergency order SHALL BE REVOKED immediately when it is shows indications to be unwise, ill-conceived, dangerous to the local population, taken in the interest of third parties, promoting self-interest or corrupt."

It appears that the actions of those involved may also fit the parameters for what is called Conspiracy Against Rights in the USA code (Conspiracy against rights is a criminal offense involving acts to prevent others from exercising their constitutional rights). The same universal legal principles and arguments could be presented to the Canadian Courts in this case. The seriousness may be compounded by the use/or abuse of the sacrosanct and extraordinary powers of an "emergency order" because it may create a dangerous legal precedent to the well-being not just of the Stinson community but to all Canadians in the future.

All aspects of how this emergency order was passed shall be made public, including the names of all those who participated in the different stages of conception and what role those people played and the interests they represented and the dates when each one of those conversations took place. It appears, but we are not sure, that the emergency order conception began after the order to shelter in place was already lifted. In Ontario, Phase 1 started May 19, 2020; Phase 2 started June 12, 2020 and Phase 3 started July 17, 2020. It appears that the Emergency Committee gave their approval for funding the emergency shelter at the Old Cathedral Boys School at the July 17, 2020 meeting, the exact day Phase 3 began in Ontario. The timing should be investigated; it appears that the Good Shepherd Hamilton already owned or had possession of the building in 2018. All of this is public record.

I will focus now on the document published in August by Nrinder Nann, City Councillor/ Ward 3. entitled "Community Information Session on Temporary Shelter Services." , I attached the document to this email under that title.

The document opens: "This document contains a summary to the questions my office has received in relation to the September opening of a temporary shelter at 378 Main St. E."

Please note that instead of "a summary of questions", it should read: "a selection of questions"; it has been reported by neighbors that they were blocked in the "social media" for asking "inconvenient questions" that perhaps did not suit Nann's narrative.

The document concludes with the contact information of two of the protagonists of the Zoom info-meeting:

Rob Mastroianni Manager of Emergency Shelter Services & RCF Subsidies at Rob.Mastroianni@Hamilton.ca

Katherine Kalinowski, Chief Operating Officer, Good Shepherd Housing Services kkalinowski@gsch.ca (905)528-5877 Ext. 3323

It appears that the document and the the Zoom info meeting hosted by Councillor Nann in August, are in sync. The linguistic styles of both formats are identical. The type of language used to communicate the

"news" to the community after the decision was already passed under "an emergency order", may indicate a willfully and orchestrated strategic intention to distract, to purposely occult the facts and to mislead the public. The type of language may indicate that the authors had awareness that they were manipulating and taking advantage of and abusing the emergency order process letter and/or spirit for their own personal ideology, interests or gains. This type of intention constitutes cause for the revocation of the emergency order. As it stands at this moment it may set a dangerous legal precedent for all Canadians.

It is possible that Councillor Nann, a holistic nutritionist from New York and only a recent resident of Hamilton/Ward 3, Gage Park, was not "familiar" with the history of our City, including the sinister scams of the famously nefarious family Martino that seemly became rich by sucking the life blood from the vulnerable and marginalized population placed under their care by the City and the Province, and the unsolved murder of Joe Melo, seemly implicated in assisting living schemes and a mega "pharmacy legal scheme" as reported in the Spec, until we informed her about it. It appears that the Martino family still runs the same kind of business they used to under other names and numbered companies as reported in the Spec article "House of Horrors", Jun 11, 2020 and other recent articles. Note the dates:

1. House of Horrors was published June 11, 2020.
2. At the beginning of July 2020, some yet unnamed party approached Councillor Nann with the plan to locate the emergency shelter at the corner of Main and Emerald St. under an emergency order.

House of Horrors should have raised a red flag for the location.

Another red flag emerges from the on-line City of Hamilton Covid -19 map. Since the beginning of the pandemic the composite area of of Stinson-Landsdale has been colored "Dark Gray" indicating the high number of infections compared to the rest of Hamilton.

It seems that Councillor Nann was also not aware of the dynamics of the Stinson community, not just regarding the high concentration of badly run assisting living operations, but the high concentration of other social ills buildings, crystal meth dens and rooming houses, "trouble buildings" that even the police are afraid to enter. This problem is presently compounded by the "red fentanyl" and the Covid-19.

A study for the Ontario Marginalization Index (ON-MARG) should be done on the composite area of Stinson-Landsdale.

On the other hand, Mastroianni and Kalinowski should have being fully aware of the situation of Stinson-Landsdale, given their seniority in Hamilton, their jobs and their titles.

Another red flag was raised by the independent journalist Joey Coleman's Tweet: "City Manager's office just deleted video of last week's meeting of the Housing and Homelessness Advisory Committee from YouTube." He has now requested this video under the "Freedom of Information Act". We ask you to look into the matter and to use your Councillor position to release this video to the public immediately, so that given the urgency

of the matter we do not have to wait for many months before it is released. You shall also require the name/s of the persons who requested for this video to be deleted and the reasons they alleged for this action. The public has a right to know who and why.

This could constitute cause for the revocation of the emergency order, as it may indicate rush and/or wrong-doing and/or self-interest and/or conspiracy against rights and thus abuse of the emergency order legal process letter and/or spirit.

Furthermore, their actions de facto disregard the well-being of the population that resides already in situ during the pandemic and are not financially able to move elsewhere at this moment. If an Covid-19 outbreak manifests at the heart of Stinson, then there will be grounds to claim the action-planners and other interested parties are open to liability because we warn them.

I noticed that today, September 14, the cases of Covid-19 are increasing as it was prognosticated.

I noticed that in Hamilton, the Stinson neighbourhood was down from the recent "Dark Grey" to "Medium Grey" but that Landsdale is in "Dark Grey", meaning there is a higher number of new infections in that community. Notice that both neighborhoods are geographically touching. The boundary is Main St. exactly where Motel Cathedral will open soon. So it is a fact that the emergency shelter is opening at the geographical heart of the largest numbers of Covid-19 reported cases in Hamilton.

I take now the task to point out to the Mayor and Council some of the other red flags where it seems that misleading language was used regarding the "temporary status of the emergency shelter". This may legally constitute deception and conspiracy and a will to mislead the community and to corrupt letter and/or the spirit of the order.

1. "What makes you think that Cathedral will be any more successful than the First Ontario?"

The shelter at First Ontario has offered a safe, hospitable environment for single men experiencing homelessness. Good Shepherd has no authority over the space outside of the FOC that is currently an encampment site. Staff do monitor that area and actively offer shelter services but we do not direct any activity outside of the FOC. At the Cathedral site, Good Shepherd will be responsible for activity both inside and outside of the building. We will not accommodate campers on this site. We will, however, work with individuals who are not registered in shelter but who approach us seeking other kinds of housing help or support services."

Perhaps Councillor Nann has not enough experience to know that, naturally and logically, the encampment site will move from First Ontario to the Stinson green spaces/ parkettes, because the tents need to be close to the services of "Motel Cathedral", as they call it. The tents have already scouted our neighbourhood and stated their intentions to move onto the various green spaces, as we have reported to the authorities and thus fulfilled our civic duties (during a pandemic to report infractions or weakness of the safety protocols is an ethical and a legal duty not only a civic right.)

It is reasonable to think that Mastroniani and the Good Shepherd Hamilton, more experienced than Nann, may have already prognosticated this encampment possibility and not only chose to remain silent but they may have tried to hide it from the community by stating that: "We will not accommodate campers on this site. We will, however, work with individuals who are not registered in shelter but who approach us seeking other kinds of housing help or support services."

If they contemplated the possibility of the tenting camp moving closer to Motel Cathedral attracted to the services the tenters will receive there, they spoke knowingly with the "intention to deceive the public" and their use of the "emergency order" is null. If they did not contemplate the likelihood of a "flood of tents", it may indicate that these individuals are not equipped to hold on their present jobs or to invoke a pandemic "emergency order". Council shall interrogate the individuals separately, ask them for all their documentations and notes to determine which one of these two scenarios took place.

"We will, however, work with individuals who are not registered in shelter but who approach us seeking other kinds of housing help or support services.

The opening of the doors of the new emergency shelter was orchestrated behind closed doors. The plan endangers the community with the approaching Second Wave, thus a new Covid-19 emergency order shall be invoked if the Motel Cathedral opens in disregard of sound scientific pandemic strategies and protocols:

For the time that this particular shelter remains open, the services that historically the Good Shepherd Ministries has offered to "the individuals who are not registered in shelter but who approach us seeking other kinds of housing help or support services." shall be suspended.

The support services the homeless desperately need are food, toilets and showers. As a Covid-19 precautionary measure, the doors of Motel Cathedral shall be closed to all-non-residents. These Good Shepherd Ministries services to individuals who are not registered in the shelter shall be suspended in this precise location due to Covid-19 "community distancing protocols" and these vital services shall be offered at a different location. If the tenting folk needs are served outside of Stinson, this will stop the tenting camp from setting in Stinson and it will reduce the compounded risk of a Covid-19 outbreak that our community is facing at the moment.

2. "Site & Location

How was the Former Cathedral Boys' School site chosen for this facility? The property is privately owned by the Catholic Diocese who offered the site for this purpose to the Good Shepherd in response to the population needs. Upon review, the site was in appropriate state of use and contained the amenities most appropriate for shelter use including: showers, gym, overnight accommodation and day programming use."

The Ownership of the building is not clear, therefore the interests of third parties are obscured:

Taken from the Good Shepherd Blog: "On January 19, 2015, the Little Brothers of the Good Shepherd fused with the Hospitaller Brothers of St. John of God. This 'fusion' of the two religious orders saw the end of the Little Brothers of the Good Shepherd as a formal entity. The Little Brothers of the Good Shepherd have now become Hospitaller Brothers of St. John of God.

The Little Brothers of the Good Shepherd are known locally for the work that is done through Good Shepherd Ministries in Toronto."

This means that The Good Shepherd Hamilton is indeed a Catholic entity located within the Hamilton Diocese, but it is legally a "formal entity" [An association, corporation, partnership, proprietorship, trust, or individual that has legal standing in the eyes of law. A legal entity has legal capacity to enter into agreements or contracts, assume obligations, incur and pay debts, sue and be sued in its own right, and to be held responsible for its actions] and as such it is legally different from the Dioceses even if they are geographically within the Diocese and thus "belong" to the Diocese but it is not privately owned by the Diocese. Thus the statement that "The property is privately owned by the Catholic Diocese who offered the site for this purpose to the Good Shepherd in response to the population needs" may appear to be purposefully "misleading".

I selected 2 lines from the Cultural Heritage Assessment Report on the Former Cathedral Boys' High School.

<https://pub-hamilton.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=151834>

1.0 Introduction, 3rd paragraph: " On November 9, 2016, Alan Whittle of Good Shepherd Hamilton greeted Peter Stewart, Francine Antoniou and Paul Dilse for photographic recording of the school."

This indicates that Alan Whittle/Good Shepherd Hamilton had already "some level of interest" in the building in 2016.

The next document is dated 2018, 2 years before the pandemic began:
<https://pub-hamilton.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=152578>

Note the last line:

"HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The subject property, municipally known as 378 Main Street East, Hamilton (see Appendix "A" to Report PED17168) is known locally as the Cathedral Boys' High School.

The School was built in 1928 and funded by the Hamilton Catholic population. This school was the first purpose built Catholic High School in Hamilton. Designed by Hutton and Souter, the Former Cathedral Boys' High School was designed in the architectural style known as Modern Gothic, Collegiate Gothic or Neo-Gothic. Hutton and Souter were prominent architects responsible for a number of other significant buildings in Hamilton such as the Delta Collegiate High School, the Royal Connaught Hotel, and the John Sopinka Courthouse.

In 1951, a wing was built to memorialize students that fought and lost

their lives in the First and Second World Wars. Constructed in a vernacular style, the architect is unknown. In September 1992, the Cathedral Boys' High School and Cathedral Girls' High School (on Main Street East, two blocks east of Cathedral Boys' High School) were integrated.

In September 1995, the publicly funded Cathedral High School opened at King Street East and Wentworth Street North, replacing Cathedral Boys' High School and Cathedral Girls' High School.

The property is currently owned by Good Shepherd Hamilton."

According to the Cultural Heritage folk, the Good Shepherd Hamilton already owned the property in 2018.

Furthermore, in a recent Spec. article we read: "Good Shepherd is working out an arrangement with the Roman Catholic diocese to rent out a part of the former Cathedral school, said agency spokesperson Alan Whittle."

<https://www.thespec.com/news/council/2020/07/10/millions-more-on-table-to-help-hamiltons-homeless-amid-pandemic.html>

How can this be if the Cultural Heritage report lists the Good Shepherd Hamilton as the "owner" of the building?

If Bishop Crosby and the Hospitaller Brothers of St. John of God and the Good Shepherd Hamilton and Alan Whittle had no intention to mislead the Stinson community regarding the "temporary location of the emergency shelter" instead of : "The property is privately owned by the Catholic Diocese who offered the site for this purpose to the Good Shepherd in response to the population needs.", they should have said (my words): "The property is currently owned by Good Shepherd Hamilton", even if the property was acquired or perhaps leased for only \$1 since at least 2018 .

We question the parties name above regarding the lease and we were ignored.

And how could Bishop Crosby, head of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Hamilton "offered the site for this purpose" two years before Covid-19?

3. "Who approached the Diocese? Will they be compensated/reimbursed for use of the space? Good Shepherd approached the Diocese and they have a lease in place."

After reading this, many neighbors believed it and repeatedly requested information regarding the terms and length of this "lease", myself included. There was absolute silence from Nann, Mastroianni and the Good Shepherd Hamilton and the Hospitaller Brothers of St. John of God and Bishop Crosby on the subject. The optics are not good with respect to these actors' bona fides during the process of invoking an emergency order and the ownership or lease of the building.

It is not a stretch to say that The Old Cathedral Boys' High School is what is known in real estate terms as a "white elephant": a burdensome possession whose cost of upkeep is not in line with its usefulness or value. It was calculated, after the inspection of the building that the cost to remedy the asbestos, the plumbing and the electrical would be at least 15 million dollars. If we add to this astronomical cost the

"heritage designation", "the white elephant" real estate definition is met.

This real estate deal is not clear and it may cross the boundaries of ethical behavior and transparency and it shall be looked into and investigated in depth by the Hamilton City Council. Perhaps there are some other benefits to Good Shepherd Hamilton by opening the pandemic temporary emergency shelter at the "white elephant" property and later on obtain favors or special considerations regarding the property? This shall be disclosed.

This could constitute cause for the revocation of the emergency order, as it may indicate deception, wrong-doing, interest of third parties, tit for tat and abuse of the emergency order process with a possible ulterior motive to by-pass a lawful "Cultural Heritage designation". It should be looked into it by City Hall and the Ethics Committee.

3. "What is the hard end date for this use? Is there one?"

June 2021 is the approved end date for this temporary use. However, it is also dependent on what unfolds with the pandemic and potential second wave. Extending beyond this date would require Council approval and additional funding."

It appears that this ambiguous and open-ended answer is designed to reassure the overwhelmed community and perhaps even to bypass the "heritage designation" under the pandemic emergency orders.

Once "in situ" with the shelter running, pandemic or not by June 2021, there will be little incentive for City Hall NOT to renew the contract, mostly if it supported by Rob Mastroianni and Ward 3 Councillor Nann.

If indeed June 2021 is the approved final date line for this temporary use, and in case that the opening of this so called "emergency shelter" takes place against our dutifully reported concerns and warnings, then Rob Mastroianni and City Hall shall actively and immediately engage in the selection and the preparedness of a more suitable site for another Good Shepherd Hamilton emergency shelter so that it is ready for June 30 2021. This should be done under a new "emergency order". This immediate and active engagement to find another location is urgent because there is no guarantee that the pandemic will be resolved by June 2021, and the community may be forced to live under these extreme conditions for 9 long months + the delays. This time, the process shall be public to avoid wasting precious resources again, aka taxpayer's money.

4. "Why are these facilities so concentrated in Landsdale and Stinson? How was this factored into the decision? There are a number of social service type agencies in the central lower city, such as shelters, Residential Care Facilities, and others. Many of these programs have long standing histories in the neighbourhood that date back 30+ years. Due to proximity to other services which residents would access, the downtown core is often seen as an ideal location to ensure ease of access to those services."

I follow this statement with the words of Councillor Nann in the email she sent me, dated 05/09/2020:

"I truly do appreciate your concern of the over concentration in the

Stinson neighbourhood, as with several other neighborhoods in Ward 3 of poorly run RCFs. It is something I will continue to tirelessly flag and demand action on. Historical decisions led to this over-concentration and it must be rectified!"

Councillor Nann contradicts herself by:

a. Actively supporting to open the emergency shelter by invoking an extreme "emergency order" and thus purposely bypassing her constituents concerns regarding the over-concentration of the area.

b. While affirming that "Historical decisions led to this over-concentration and it must be rectified!".

This contradiction of thought disqualifies her from invoking "emergency orders" because her support for the plan just increased the historical over-concentration she states needs to be rectified.

Perhaps there was "no time to consult the community" but there was plenty time to consult the experts, like ON-MARG and any urban epidemiologist from McMaster.

I firmly believe that the Ontario Human Rights Code is intended to protect us all, and in particular to protect the human rights of the vulnerable and marginalized and that the legislation is not to be used to create an urban ghetto, which constitutes a violation of Section 7 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. 7. Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice. Myself included.

"Due to proximity to other services which residents would access, the downtown core is often seen as an ideal location to ensure ease of access to those services." This is a deceptive excuse that has already been used in the past in Hamilton and in other cities with disastrous results. This is precisely how urban ghettos were and are created. Services shall be provided in situ at the emergency shelter, wherever it is located, this is the year 2020 and it can be done.

Furthermore, under the heading "Operations" the document reads: "Primary healthcare will be provided by a nurse practitioner employed by Good Shepherd and doctors from the Shelter Health Network. Harm reduction support will be provided. Shelter staff offer case management services including referrals, advocacy and supportive counseling. Housing and support services will be offered to every resident."

If this is true, then there is no need to locate the emergency shelter in Stinson, as the services will be provided already "in house" somewhere else.

It feels like the most marginalized and at-risk populations are herded into one single area. The intentional creation of a ghetto indicates wrong-doing and abuse of the emergency order process. The unintentional creation of a ghetto indicates ignorance and negligence. Both instances constitute cause for the revocation of the emergency order. To live in a ghetto endangers me, my security and my well-being as well as the

security and the well-being of my family and my community, especially during Covid-19.

5. "It is obvious to many residents that this was a hasty decision to expedite the approval of a capital project at First Ontario Centre. Why didn't the shelter there continue to operate? Are there other shelters opening in other wards?"

As the City of Hamilton moves into Phase 3 of its re-opening plan, many businesses are returning to regular operations. This includes First Ontario Centre.

Many service providers feel that Sir John A. Macdonald was a better choice. Why wasn't this site chosen instead? Factors such as size of building, degree of renovations required, and facilities on site such as showers, etc are factors in making the decision of location. Sir John A MacDonald was a less feasible choice."

Here my question echo's the voices of Stinson residents: Is Sir John A. Macdonald part of the downtown mega development plan and was this the real reason or one of the reasons it was not chosen?

After receiving the news of the opening of the emergency shelter, some neighbours have put their house for sale or are intending to do it. The buzz word in Stinson is that the City is concentrating the most vulnerable population in our neighbourhood with the nefarious intention to control the pandemic by creating a Covid-19 Ghetto and thus maintain the rest of Hamilton open for business. I also have come to believe this.

Most people believe that the "emergency order decision" is directly related to the mega real estate development plans for downtown. This could constitute cause for the revocation of the emergency order, as it may indicate wrong-doing, third parties' interests and abuse of the emergency order process.

The optics are bad and a public inquiry of how "this led to that" going back at least to 2015 shall be opened and the matter shall be investigated by City Council without delay.

6. "Who is advocating for residents of existing RCF's and shelters in the neighbourhood? There is a program review of Subsidized RCFs currently underway, led by Housing Services Division of the City of Hamilton. As part of this review, increased collaboration with other support sectors such as Health Care are being explored in order to provide an increased level of mental health and related supports."

"How many residential group homes, shelters other assisted/supportive living homes are already in operation in this neighbourhood/ward?
There are 14 RCFs and 1 Shelter located within Ward 3."

These 2 points support our arguments that Stinson needs immediate assistance and NOT ADDED STRESSORS, especially during the pandemic and that the decision to open the emergency shelter at Main and Emerald, was flawed and dangerous and the historical facts were probably known to most of the actors that invoked the "emergency order".

6. "What are the long-term plans for Cathedral Boys' School? Longer term, Good Shepherd would like to develop a Senior's 'hub' that would combine affordable housing with support services that would be more

broadly available to the community. An important part of this development would be incorporating the historic original school into the project."

I found some consolation in this last answer until a senior neighbor raised another red flag: "Any person above 50 qualifies as a senior and some are "trouble" and not just impoverished elders."

I had envisioned a kind of affordable housing for law abiding seniors that would contribute with their presence to bring stability to our area.

I copy paste the latest email I received:

"A few people have asked
Do we know what premise the city is directing taxpayer's money to good shepherd?
Should we be emailing the police chief, or anyone else on the force?
Do we keep resenting the same emails every few days given we feel we are being ignored with the lack of response from anyone?"

What do I tell them?

It is the Mayor and City Council's duty to keep us safe, especially during Covid19

Cheers,
Damon

Mayor and Members of Council

August 27, 2020

I, the undersigned, have resided in Ward 3 for 23 years and I request emergency action.

I request that this letter/email is entered into and be included on the Agenda of City Council Meeting of September 16, 2020 at 9:30am.

Five residents of Ward 3, only 5, were able to submit their personal letters in time for the Emergency and Community Services Committee of August 17, 2020. Their knowledge of our neighborhood and their sound objections stand on the record. Let the record reflect that those 5 voices do not stand alone. I commend "the Awesome 5" for their presentation of the dynamics of our neighborhood. Their writings reflect my personal experience. The subject that is missing in their letters is the pandemic Covid 19.

The Elders who died unnecessarily in senior homes during the First Wave of Covid 19 are fresh in our collective memory. Their death was directly connected to unsound and negligent pandemic protocols, poor preparedness and slow reaction to the emergency. The suffering that we all experienced during the live-saving lock-down of Canada is also vivid. We want to avoid another lock-down in our neighborhood during the Second Wave.

I believe that during a pandemic a society is as safe as its most vulnerable members. The dignified and safe housing of the vulnerable and marginalized has not been addressed appropriately in the past and it has been neglected for decades by City Hall. This has created the crisis that we, the residents of Stinson neighborhood, are now facing and it is of our leaders' making.

I have been informed, after the fact, of the September opening of a new "temporary emergency shelter" to be managed by the Good Shepherd Ministries at the location of the Old Cathedral Boys' High School at 378 Main St. East.

To open an emergency shelter is an urgent necessity and an ethical and moral duty, but to open it in this precise location reflects negligent planning and a total disregard of the realities of our neighborhood. The community invites all the parties involved in the "decision making" to urgently "walk" the grounds with the guide of a few neighbors and a member of the police department (the area is "well known to the police") to open their eyes to the conditions and the risks in place.

I firmly believe that the Ontario Human Rights Code is intended to protect us all, and in particular to protect the human rights of the vulnerable and marginalized and that the legislation is not to be used to create an urban ghetto, which constitutes a violation of Section 7 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. 7. Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice.

In a Pre-Covid 19 time, it would NOT have been a sound and sustainable urban planning strategy to shelter more vulnerable and marginalized people in an already over saturated and vulnerable area like Stinson, because de facto this would create a ghetto.

But during the pandemic, the opening of the emergency shelter in an over saturated neighborhood, it is a scientific non-sense that sets the conditions for an outbreak during the Second Wave. De facto it sets the conditions for the Stinson neighborhood to become the first Canadian Covid 19 Ghetto.

WE LOVE STINSON! We choose to live here. Within Ward 3 we are a neighborhood of no frills low middle class, retired elders, small business, hard working poor and seniors homes, all solid people, good and compassionate people living in the midst of an unbelievable concentration of badly run, legal for-profit assisted living lodges, rooming houses, halfway houses, hostels and hard-drugs dealing dens. At the moment, Stinson is already a "special needs" neighborhood that asks for remedies instead of added stressors. Our vulnerability to Covid19 is being overlooked.

It seems that the opening of the emergency shelter is a fait accompli, something that has been decided before those affected hear about it, leaving them with no option but to accept it.

It seems that the lack of transparency was intentional and it was facilitated by Councillor Nann, whose fiduciary duty resides with the well-being of her constituents. The Catholic Bishop Douglas Crosby and Brother Reginal Howson, Provincial Superior of the Hospitallers Order of St. John of God (Good Shepherd Ministries) are the Hamilton's heads of 2 of the interested parties. The secrecy of the process was unethical and immoral, especially during a pandemic.

As I understand it, the process began months ago, therefore there was ample opportunity for Councillor Nann to "robustly communicate" (as she stated in her own words) and contact ALL the residents of Ward 3 and, in particular, the residents of the Stinson neighborhood, especially during the lock-down, by mail and delivering a flyer to our homes. "Because not everyone is on social media."

Thus, we were denied our legal right to present our experienced and informed opinions and concerns to City Hall Council and the Emergency Committee. I view this as a grave neglect of fiduciary obligation. Councillor Nann's argument for the opening of the emergency shelter without consulting the community was that it was made possible by the State of Emergency but her argument is only valid in appearance but not de facto.

Since the news leaked to the community, many people have tried to exercise their civil duty to inform and their right to participate and ask questions. Our duties and rights were denied when twitter accounts were maliciously blocked and the multiple lengthy letters and emails continue to go unanswered in the past weeks.

It is a sound scientific prognostication that the opening of the shelter in the designated location will facilitate the transmission of the virus between the mobile 45 men (or more) that it will shelter and our dense local vulnerable population. Furthermore, because some of the local for-profit Lodges are run poorly and don't enforce the Covid 19 protocols, as the neighbors witness on a daily bases and it has been denounced, the transmission of Coronavirus between the mobile males and the local vulnerable people; the mentally ill, the addicts and other at-risk residents will accelerate. Add to this, the countless people frequenting the numerous drug dealing outlets well known to the police. This is unavoidable.

Additionally, "the tenting population" has already scouted the 3 green spaces/parkettes situated on Hunter St. between Wellington and East Ave. This fact is terrifying the neighbors. I told a young woman who just moved to the neighbourhood in January almost fainted and I had to hold her up.

The first scouters with tents appeared after the announcement of the opening of the Good Shepherd shelter was made public. They left after 3 days when a neighbor informed them that the date in September had not been announced yet. The tenters themselves declared to this neighbor that we should expect a flood of tents coming 2 days before the opening of the new emergency shelter, which they call "Motel Cathedral". In their own words: "not even the cops can move us, you guys know that right"; when our neighbour tried to explain that the shelter will have some rules their response was: "been there done that, the Good Shepherd is a fuckin joke". Since the announcement, we have observed daily an unusual number of "unfamiliar faces" in our 3 green spaces/parkettes. They come in groups of 2-5 people, on foot or bicycles without tents. They stay for a couple hours and leave. This is an indicator.

I believe that this solid information regarding the upcoming "tent encampment" in our 3 small green spaces reveals the ignorance or the malicious deception of the words that the Good Shepherd's executives uttered in the slick Zoom meeting facilitated by Councilor Nann. This infomercial was orchestrated AFTER the decision of opening of the "Motel Cathedral" was already made. Good Shepherd stated that "no tents will be allowed on the grounds of the emergency shelter" thus, either the "professionals" of the Good Shepherd Ministries were ignorant that the "tent encampment" would naturally settle in the proximity of the emergency shelter to access the services they offer, or they did neglect to consider the possibility, or they were cognizant and choose to be silent.

Ward 3 residents have contacted many City Hall departments pleading to temporarily close access to the 3 parkettes to avoid the tenting encampment to settle in and their response was: the only thing we can do is to monitor and wait for the injunction in the Courts scheduled for September. September? Act now before the encampment sets in or we will have to live under these Covid 19 stressors at least until June 2021 when, perhaps but "not surely", the Good Shepherd Ministries said that it may close, "depending of the circumstances", they avoided to give a direct answer when the question was raised.

In my opinion, the formula of an over-saturated vulnerable neighborhood+ Motel Cathedral+Tent Encampment= Covid19 Disaster.

I am aware of the grave problem present in Toronto and at Hamilton's First Ontario Place, and on Ferguson regarding human feces and urine. In my community we have lived with feces and urine and needles and condoms on our properties and back alleys; with the presence of the emergency shelter+the tent encampment, the amount of bio-hazard material will exponentially increase and so will be the risk of "community transmission" of Covid 19.

Furthermore, I have being informed that there was another location that was considered for the emergency shelter and was rejected. One of the reasons from Nann's FAQ flyer was "facilities on site such as showers, etc." Are you trying to tell me that there are no showers at the school?

We heard that the site of Sir John A. Macdonald School offers safer conditions to control and limit a Covid 19 outbreak, and thus AVOID A SECOND LOCK-DOWN of Hamilton, or Ward 3 or, to protect the city at large, the lock-down ONLY of our Stinson neighborhood. City Hall is gambling with our lives.

We have been informed that this other location is not only safer to open a Good Shepherd emergency shelter during Covid 19 but that it could be ALSO the key to remedy the present crisis of the "tent encampments". This population is cognizant of Covid 19, they are afraid to take refuge in shelters, lodges, hostels and rooming houses, but they access the services provided by the Good Shepherd.

Nothing is impossible if there is a will and a crisis. Because City Hall has not been able to remedy the present emergency in 5 months, then, the Canadian Military Engineers and Habitat for Humanity should be called to take immediate action. Our military excels in giving assistance to the population of other countries during and after a disaster, and they have the capacity to prepare John A. Macdonald School at great speed to house the Good Shepherd emergency shelter+ Safe encampment grounds with access to separate and dedicated facilities, showers, toilets, a clinic with nurses and doctors and other social services that they are entitled to for being Canadians and human beings. This would be a sustainable strategy at this moment. We can also use the counsel of the heroic troops that took control of the virus on the senior's residences.

What is the duration of the lease that the Good Shepherd has for the Catholic Boys' High School? Does it stretch beyond June 31, 2021?

What are the plans of Good Shepherd to find the next shelter once the Temporary Emergency Shelter at the Catholic Boys' High School has ended?

If our warning is not heard and the opening of the emergency shelter goes ahead in September 2020 as planned, the community will present a long list of necessary protective and sanitation measures to be implemented in our neighborhood immediately. The cost of the sound scientific protocols to prevent an outbreak in our dense neighborhood could be astronomical but we are morally entitled.

Guidelines from the Ministry of Health would be good place to start.

COVID-19 Proactive Surveillance Testing April 23, 2020

COVID-19 Preparedness and Prevention in Congregate Living Settings May 23, 2020

Managing COVID-19 Outbreaks in Congregate Living Settings May 23, 2020

Additional Direction on Testing Strategy May 24, 2020

COVID-19 Guidance: Congregate Living for Vulnerable Populations May 28, 2020

Tenants Re-Engaging in Community Life Homes for Special Care and Community Homes for Opportunity July 17, 2020

If our warning is not heard and an outbreak occurs and contact tracing shows that it started at the emergency shelter or in the population they serve or from the tenting population that the Good Shepherd attracts, we will proceed legally, perhaps collectively.

Keep us safe!

Carmen Orlandis

September 11 2020

Dear Mayor Eisenberger and Councillor Nann:

I am a resident of Ward 3/ Stinson.

A few weeks ago Stinson community members had interactions with the scouts from the "tenting camps" exploring Stinson green spaces in advance of the opening of Motel Cathedral with the intention of being close to their services. They said that they will be back. This is a photo of a tent that in the alleyway behind Cathedral was taken today. The neighbors informed that the tenter is aggressive and consuming drugs.

I watched yesterday the meeting of the Emergency & Community Services Committee. I had submitted 2 documents and none of my concerns were addressed.

There was no one word regarding extra security measures or measures to prevent a outbreak of Covid-19 in Stinson:

1. Not one word about the extraordinary Covid-19 safety protocols that need to be implemented when the "temporary" emergency shelter opens at Old Cathedral Boys School.

2. Not one word about cleaning crews to remove bio-hazard materials from the neighborhood, not only needles and condoms but human feces. Human feces and urine had manifested as a grave problem around the "tent encampment sites" in downtown Hamilton and in Toronto and BC. Human feces and urine are both bio-hazard materials that may carry the virus and contaminate shoes. City Hall shall provide more cleaning crews instead of less and the cleaning crews shall work under the protection of trained security teams.

3. Not one word about daily sanitation of Stinson sidewalks and public and private parking spaces with Eco-friendly products to prevent the community spread of the virus in Stinson.

4. No one word regarding enhanced pandemic sanitation measures at Motel Cathedral, for instance: Good Shepherd shall provide 24/7 washrooms attendants because as the emergency shelter will shelter, by definition, a constant transient population of 45 plus men overnight + the numerous people who access the facilities during the day without spending the night in the shelter, there shall be 24/7 employees, in full Covid-19 protection gear, sanitizing the toilets and the showers after each use. The toilets need to be equipped with toilet LIDS to stop the Covid19 to be airborne after each flush and infect the surrounding area.

5. No one word regarding how to prevent the flood of tents into the 3 green spaces/ parkettes situated in Hunter, for instance:

For the time that this particular shelter (Motel Cathedral) remains open, the services that historically the Good Shepherd Ministries has offered to "the individuals who are not registered in shelter but who approach us seeking other kinds of housing help or support services." shall be suspended.

The support services the homeless desperately need are food, toilets and showers. As a Covid-19 extraordinary precautionary measure, the doors of Motel Cathedral shall be closed to all-non residents. These Good Shepherd Ministries services to individuals who are not registered in the shelter shall be suspended in this location due to Covid-19 Community distancing protocols and these vital services shall be offered at a different location. If the tenting folk needs are served outside of Stinson, this will stop the tenting camp from setting in Stinson and it will reduce the compounded risk of a Covid-19 outbreak that my community is facing at the moment.

6. Not one single answer to ANY of the questions I collected from the neighbors.

7. Read in Global News: <https://apple.news/AB4QusTeMRjOvx34mFBbj3A>

Please, advice us asap on how to proceed. Pleas asing an independent advocate for Stinson because we are simple folk and we do not know the rules of how City Hall funtions. Ward 3 Councillor Nann went on vacation after she invoked the "emergency order"; an emergency order is invoked in extremely rare occasions, war and pandemics. It would have been reasanoble that a polititian after invoking an emergency order remain working to assist his/her constituents during the emergency.

Carmen Orlandis.

Pilon, Janet

Subject: Stinson Mens Shelter

From:

Sent: September 15, 2020 11:52 AM

To: Bates, Tamara <Tamara.Bates@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Stinson Mens Shelter

- Dear Mayor and Members of Council,

I support the letter below, sent to Council by our Stinson community members, because at the best of my

knowledge and without any added information, it reflects my own experience and thoughts.

I support the letter sent to Council by our community members, and would like to add (information/questions) to reflect my own experiences and thoughts:

The ramifications of having of a mens shelter in our residential neighbourhood are a real concern for us. The Stinson neighbourhood is already overwhelmed with long term care facilities and shelters; crime and violence and drug use are problems that go along with these facilities and we don't want more of it, not to mention potential Covid outbreak possibilities. This is clearly not the right place for this facility and it was clearly rushed thru approval without consulting the residents of Stinson. As well, we are VERY CONCERNED about potential encampments in Stinson parks and green spaces; apparently they have been scouted already by York St encampment residents. Please do not allow this to happen and help these people find a more appropriate place to camp out; there are many possibilities that are not in a residential area.

Mayor and Members of Council

September 14, 2020

I, the undersigned, have resided in Hamilton/Ward 3 for 23 years.

I write at the best of my abilities, under the pressure to submit in time and with the very limited amount of information that I have been able to gather from the officials, the newspapers and the community.

This is an addendum to the two emails I have already submitted along with some neighbours, to the Clerk for the Council meeting of September 10, 2020, regarding the Old Cathedral Boys School emergency shelter. I attach 5 documents and the FAQ.

This letter has also been composed to the best of my ability also considering that numerous neighbours, me included, who have been asking questions to Councillor Nann since mid-August and received to this date no answers or only answers deflecting our inquiries.

I will leave aside now the stressors that the opening of the emergency shelter will add onto our historically vulnerable Stinson community and how this increases the risks for an outbreak of Corona in our neighborhood because we have addressed these issues already in those two emails.

Councillor Nann wrote to me: "this decision was made under emergency orders which cannot be revoked"

I bring to your attention that those words misled many neighbours into believing that it was pointless to make the effort to exercise their duty and right to express their opposition to the opening of the temporary emergency shelter in the location of the Old Cathedral Boys High School. Most of my neighbours added sadly: "Besides, there is no point to fight City Hall."

But we discussed it further and then I passed on in an email our thinking to Councillor Nann: "Your affirmation does not stand legally, as any emergency order SHALL BE REVOKED immediately when it is shown indications to be unwise, ill-conceived, dangerous to the local population, taken in the interest of third parties, promoting self-interest or corrupt."

It appears that the actions of those involved may also fit the parameters for what is called Conspiracy Against Rights in the USA code (Conspiracy against rights is a criminal offense involving acts to prevent others from exercising their constitutional rights). The same universal legal principles and arguments could be presented to the Canadian Courts in this case. The seriousness may be compounded by the use/or abuse of the sacrosanct and extraordinary powers of an "emergency order" because it may create a dangerous legal precedent to the well-being not just of the Stinson community but to all Canadians in the future.

All aspects of how this emergency order was passed shall be made public, including the names of all those who participated in the different stages of conception and what role those people played and the interests they represented and the dates when each one of those conversations took place. It appears, but we are not sure, that the emergency order conception began after the order to shelter in place was already lifted. In Ontario, Phase 1 started May 19, 2020; Phase 2 started June 12, 2020 and Phase 3 started July 17, 2020. It appears that the Emergency Committee gave their approval for funding the emergency shelter at the Old Cathedral Boys School at the July 17, 2020 meeting, the exact day Phase 3 began in Ontario. The timing should be investigated; it appears that the Good Shepherd Hamilton already owned or had possession of the

building in 2018. All of this is public record.

I will focus now on the document published in August by Ninder Nann, City Councillor/ Ward 3. entitled "Community Information Session on Temporary Shelter Services." , I attached the document to this email under that title.

The document opens: "This document contains a summary to the questions my office has received in relation to the September opening of a temporary shelter at 378 Main St. E."

Please note that instead of "a summary of questions", it should read: "a selection of questions"; it has been reported by neighbors that they were blocked in the "social media" for asking "inconvenient questions" that perhaps did not suit Nann's narrative.

The document concludes with the contact information of two of the protagonists of the Zoom info-meeting:

Rob Mastroianni Manager of Emergency Shelter Services & RCF Subsidies at Rob.Mastroianni@Hamilton.ca

Katherine Kalinowski, Chief Operating Officer, Good Shepherd Housing Services kkalinowski@gsch.ca (905)528-5877 Ext. 3323

It appears that the document and the the Zoom info meeting hosted by Councillor Nann in August, are in sync. The linguistic styles of both formats are identical. The type of language used to communicate the "news" to the community after the decision was already passed under "an emergency order", may indicate a willfully and orchestrated strategic intention to distract, to purposely occult the facts and to mislead the public. The type of language may indicate that the authors had awareness that they were manipulating and taking advantage of and abusing the emergency order process letter and/or spirit for their own personal ideology, interests or gains. This type of intention constitutes cause for the revocation of the emergency order. As it stands at this moment it may set a dangerous legal precedent for all Canadians.

It is possible that Councillor Nann, a holistic nutritionist from New York and only a recent resident of Hamilton/Ward 3, Gage Park, was not "familiar" with the history of our City, including the sinister scams of the famously nefarious family Martino that seemly became rich by sucking the life blood from the vulnerable and marginalized population placed under their care by the City and the Province, and the unsolved murder of Joe Melo, seemly implicated in assisting living schemes and a mega "pharmacy legal scheme" as reported in the Spec, until we informed her about it. It appears that the Martino family still runs the same kind of business they used to under other names and numbered companies as reported in the Spec article "House of Horrors", Jun 11, 2020 and other recent articles. Note the dates:

1. House of Horrors was published June 11, 2020.
2. At the beginning of July 2020, some yet unnamed party approached Councillor Nann with the plan to locate the emergency shelter at the corner of Main and Emerald St. under an emergency order.

House of Horrors should have raised a red flag for the location.

Another red flag emerges from the on-line City of Hamilton Covid -19 map. Since the beginning of the pandemic the composite area of of Stinson-Landsdale has been colored "Dark Gray" indicating the high number of infections compared to the rest of Hamilton.

It seems that Councillor Nann was also not aware of the dynamics of the Stinson community, not just regarding the high concentration of badly run assisting living operations, but the high concentration of other social ills buildings, crystal meth dens and rooming houses, "trouble buildings" that even the police are afraid to enter. This problem is presently compounded by the "red fentanyl" and the Covid-19.

A study for the Ontario Marginalization Index (ON-MARG) should be done on the composite area of Stinson-Landsdale.

On the other hand, Mastroianni and Kalinowski should have being fully aware of the situation of Stinson-Landsdale, given their seniority in Hamilton, their jobs and their titles.

Another red flag was raised by the independent journalist Joey Coleman's Tweet: "City Manager's office just deleted video of last week's meeting of the Housing and Homelessness Advisory Committee from YouTube." He has now requested this video under the "Freedom of Information Act". We ask you to look into the matter and to use your Councillor position to release this video to the public immediately, so that given the urgency of the matter we do not have to wait for many months before it is released. You shall also require the name/s of the persons who requested for this video to be deleted and the reasons they alleged for this action. The public has a right to know who and why.

This could constitute cause for the revocation of the emergency order, as it may indicate rush and/or wrong-doing and/or self-interest and/or conspiracy against rights and thus abuse of the emergency order legal process letter and/or spirit.

Furthermore, their actions de facto disregard the well-being of the population that resides already in situ during the pandemic and are not financially able to move elsewhere at this moment. If an Covid-19 outbreak manifests at the heart of Stinson, then there will be grounds to claim the action-planners and other interested parties are open to liability because we warn them.

I noticed that today, September 14, the cases of Covid-19 are increasing as it was prognosticated.

I noticed that in Hamilton, the Stinson neighbourhood was down from the recent "Dark Grey" to "Medium Grey" but that Landsdale is in "Dark Grey", meaning there is a higher number of new infections in that community. Notice that both neighborhoods are geographically touching. The boundary is Main St. exactly were Motel Cathedral will open soon. So it is a fact that the emergency shelter is opening at the geographical heart of the largest numbers of Covid-19 reported cases in Hamilton.

I take now the task to point out to the Mayor and Council some of the other red flags where it seems that misleading language was used regarding the "temporary status of the emergency shelter". This may legally constitute deception and conspiracy and a will to mislead the community and to corrupt letter and/or the spirit of the order.

1. "What makes you think that Cathedral will be any more successful than the First Ontario?"

The shelter at First Ontario has offered a safe, hospitable environment for single men experiencing homelessness. Good Shepherd has no authority over the space outside of the FOC that is currently an encampment site. Staff do monitor that area and actively offer shelter services but we do not direct any activity outside of the FOC. At the Cathedral site, Good Shepherd will be responsible for activity both inside and outside of the building. We will not accommodate campers on this site. We will, however, work with individuals who are not registered in shelter but who approach us seeking other kinds of housing help or support services."

Perhaps Councillor Nann has not enough experience to know that, naturally and logically, the encampment site will move from First Ontario to the Stinson green spaces/ parkettes, because the tenters need to be close to the services of "Motel Cathedral", as they call it. The tenters have already scouted our neighbourhood and stated their intentions to move onto the various green spaces, as we have reported to the authorities and thus fulfilled our civic duties (during a pandemic to report infractions or weakness of the safety protocols is an ethical and a legal duty not only a civic right.)

It is reasonable to think that Mastroniani and the Good Shepherd Hamilton, more experienced than Nann, may have already prognosticated this encampment possibility and not only chose to remain silent but they may have tried to hide it from the community by stating that: "We will not accommodate campers on this site. We will, however, work with individuals who are not registered in shelter but who approach us seeking other kinds of housing help or support services."

If they contemplated the possibility of the tenting camp moving closer to Motel Cathedral attracted to the services the tenters will receive there, they spoke knowingly with the "intention to deceive the public" and their use of the "emergency order" is null. If they did not contemplate the likelihood of a "flood of tents", it may indicate that these individuals are not equipped to hold on their present jobs or to invoke a pandemic "emergency order". Council shall interrogate the individuals separately, ask them for all their documentations and notes to determine which one of these two scenarios took place.

"We will, however, work with individuals who are not registered in shelter but who approach us seeking other kinds of housing help or support services.

The opening of the doors of the new emergency shelter was orchestrated behind closed doors. The plan endangers the community with the approaching Second Wave, thus a new Covid-19 emergency order shall be invoked if the Motel Cathedral opens in disregard of sound scientific pandemic strategies and protocols:

For the time that this particular shelter remains open, the services that historically the Good Shepherd Ministries has offered to "the individuals who are not registered in shelter but who approach us seeking other kinds of housing help or support services." shall be suspended.

The support services the homeless desperately need are food, toilets and showers. As a Covid-19 precautionary measure, the doors of Motel Cathedral shall be closed to all-non-residents. These Good Shepherd Ministries services to individuals who are not registered in the shelter shall be suspended in this precise location due to Covid-19 "community distancing protocols" and these vital services shall be offered at a different location. If the tenting folk needs are served outside of Stinson, this will stop the tenting camp from setting in Stinson and it will reduce the compounded risk of a Covid-19 outbreak that our community is facing at the moment.

2. "Site & Location

How was the Former Cathedral Boys' School site chosen for this facility? The property is privately owned by the Catholic Diocese who offered the site for this purpose to the Good Shepherd in response to the population needs. Upon review, the site was in appropriate state of use and contained the amenities most appropriate for shelter use including: showers, gym, overnight accommodation and day programming use."

The Ownership of the building is not clear, therefore the interests of third parties are obscured:

Taken from the Good Shepherd Blog: "On January 19, 2015, the Little Brothers of the Good Shepherd fused with the Hospitaller Brothers of St. John of God. This 'fusion' of the two religious orders saw the end of the Little Brothers of the Good Shepherd as a formal entity. The Little Brothers of the Good Shepherd have now become Hospitaller Brothers of St. John of God.

The Little Brothers of the Good Shepherd are known locally for the work that is done through Good Shepherd Ministries in Toronto."

This means that The Good Shepherd Hamilton is indeed a Catholic entity located within the Hamilton Diocese, but it is legally a "formal entity" [An association, corporation, partnership, proprietorship, trust, or individual that has legal standing in the eyes of law. A legal entity has legal capacity to enter into agreements or contracts, assume obligations, incur and pay debts, sue and be sued in its own right, and to be held responsible for its actions] and as such it is legally different from the Dioceses even if they are geographically within the Diocese and thus "belong" to the Diocese but it is not privately own by the Diocese. Thus the statement that "The property is privately owned by the Catholic Diocese who offered the site for this purpose to the Good Shepherd in response to the population needs" may appear to be purposefully "misleading".

I selected 2 lines from the Cultural Heritage Assessment Report on the Former Cathedral Boys' High School.

<https://pub-hamilton.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=151834>

1.0 Introduction, 3rd paragraph: " On November 9, 2016, Alan Whittle of Good Shepherd Hamilton greeted Peter Stewart, Francine Antoniou and Paul Dilse for photographic recording of the school."

This indicates that Alan Whittle/Good Shepherd Hamilton had already "some level of interest" in the building in 2016.

The next document is dated 2018, 2 years before the pandemic began:
<https://pub-hamilton.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=152578>

Note the last line:

"HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The subject property, municipally known as 378 Main Street East, Hamilton (see Appendix "A" to Report PED17168) is known locally as the Cathedral Boys' High School.

The School was built in 1928 and funded by the Hamilton Catholic population. This school was the first purpose built Catholic High School in Hamilton. Designed by Hutton and Souter, the Former Cathedral Boys' High School was designed in the architectural style known as Modern Gothic, Collegiate Gothic or Neo-Gothic. Hutton and Souter were prominent architects responsible for a number of other significant buildings in Hamilton such as the Delta Collegiate High School, the Royal Connaught Hotel, and the John Sopinka Courthouse.

In 1951, a wing was built to memorialize students that fought and lost their lives in the First and Second World Wars. Constructed in a vernacular style, the architect is unknown. In September 1992, the Cathedral Boys' High School and Cathedral Girls' High School (on Main Street East, two blocks east of Cathedral Boys' High School) were integrated.

In September 1995, the publicly funded Cathedral High School opened at King Street East and Wentworth Street North, replacing Cathedral Boys' High School and Cathedral Girls' High School.

The property is currently owned by Good Shepherd Hamilton."

According to the Cultural Heritage folk, the Good Shepherd Hamilton already owned the property in 2018.

Furthermore, in a recent Spec. article we read: "Good Shepherd is working out an arrangement with the Roman Catholic diocese to rent out a part of the former Cathedral school, said agency spokesperson Alan Whittle."

[Old Cathedral boys' school to become temporary homeless shelter as desperation builds for city bailout](#)

How can this be if the Cultural Heritage report lists the Good Shepherd Hamilton as the "owner" of the building?

If Bishop Crosby and the Hospitaller Brothers of St. John of God and the Good Shepherd Hamilton and Alan Whittle had no intention to mislead the Stinson community regarding the "temporary location of the emergency shelter" instead of : "The property is privately owned by the Catholic Diocese who offered the site for this purpose to the Good Shepherd in

response to the population needs.", they should have said (my words): "The property is currently owned by Good Shepherd Hamilton", even if the property was acquired or perhaps leased for only \$1 since at least 2018 .

We question the parties name above regarding the lease and we were ignored.

And how could Bishop Crosby, head of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Hamilton "offered the site for this purpose" two years before Covid-19?

3. "Who approached the Diocese? Will they be compensated/reimbursed for use of the space? Good Shepherd approached the Diocese and they have a lease in place."

After reading this, many neighbors believed it and repeatedly requested information regarding the terms and length of this "lease", myself included. There was absolute silence from Nann, Mastroianni and the Good Shepherd Hamilton and the Hospitaller Brothers of St. John of God and Bishop Crosby on the subject. The optics are not good with respect to these actors' bona fides during the process of invoking an emergency order and the ownership or lease of the building.

It is not a stretch to say that The Old Cathedral Boys' High School is what is known in real estate terms as a "white elephant": a burdensome possession whose cost of upkeep is not in line with its usefulness or value. It was calculated, after the inspection of the building that the cost to remedy the asbestos, the plumbing and the electrical would be at least 15 million dollars. If we add to this astronomical cost the "heritage designation", "the white elephant" real estate definition is met.

This real estate deal is not clear and it may cross the boundaries of ethical behavior and transparency and it shall be looked into and investigated in depth by the Hamilton City Council. Perhaps there are some other benefits to Good Shepherd Hamilton by opening the pandemic temporary emergency shelter at the "white elephant" property and later on obtain favors or special considerations regarding the property? This shall be disclosed.

This could constitute cause for the revocation of the emergency order, as it may indicate deception, wrong-doing, interest of third parties, tit for tot and abuse of the emergency order process with a possible ulterior motive to by-pass a lawful "Cultural Heritage designation". It should be looked into it by City Hall and the Ethics Committee.

3. "What is the hard end date for this use? Is there one? June 2021 is the approved end date for this temporary use. However, it is also dependent on what unfolds with the pandemic and potential second wave. Extending beyond this date would require Council approval and additional funding."

It appears that this ambiguous and open-ended answer is designed to reassure the overwhelmed community and perhaps even to bypass the "heritage designation" under the pandemic emergency orders.

Once "in situ" with the shelter running, pandemic or not by June 2021, there will be little incentive for City Hall NOT to renew the contract, mostly if it supported by Rob Mastroianni and Ward 3 Councillor Nann.

If indeed June 2021 is the approved final date line for this temporary use, and in case that the opening of this so called "emergency shelter" takes place against our dutifully reported concerns and warnings, then Rob Mastroianni and City Hall shall actively and immediately engage in the selection and the preparedness of a more suitable site for another Good Shepherd Hamilton emergency shelter so that it is ready for June 30 2021. This should be done under a new "emergency order". This immediate and active engagement to find another location is urgent because there is no guarantee that the pandemic will be resolved by June 2021, and the community may be forced to live under these extreme conditions for 9 long months + the delays. This time, the process shall be public to avoid wasting precious resources again, aka taxpayer's money.

4. "Why are these facilities so concentrated in Landsdale and Stinson? How was this factored into the decision? There are a number of social service type agencies in the central lower city, such as shelters, Residential Care Facilities, and others. Many of these programs have long standing histories in the neighbourhood that date back 30+ years. Due to proximity to other services which residents would access, the downtown core is often seen as an ideal location to ensure ease of access to those services."

I follow this statement with the words of Councillor Nann in the email she sent me, dated 05/09/2020:

"I truly do appreciate your concern of the over concentration in the Stinson neighbourhood, as with several other neighborhoods in Ward 3 of poorly run RCFs. It is something I will continue to tirelessly flag and demand action on. Historical decisions led to this over-concentration and it must be rectified!"

Councillor Nann contradicts herself by:

- a. Actively supporting to open the emergency shelter by invoking an extreme "emergency order" and thus purposely bypassing her constituents concerns regarding the over-concentration of the area.
- b. While affirming that "Historical decisions led to this over-concentration and it must be rectified!".

This contradiction of thought disqualifies her from invoking "emergency orders" because her support for the plan just increased the historical over-concentration she states needs to be rectified.

Perhaps there was "no time to consult the community" but there was plenty time to consult the experts, like ON-MARG and any urban epidemiologist from McMaster.

I firmly believe that the Ontario Human Rights Code is intended to protect us all, and in particular to protect the human rights of the vulnerable and marginalized and that the legislation is not to be used to create an urban ghetto, which constitutes a violation of Section 7 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. 7. Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental

justice. Myself included.

"Due to proximity to other services which residents would access, the downtown core is often seen as an ideal location to ensure ease of access to those services." This is a deceptive excuse that has already been used in the past in Hamilton and in other cities with disastrous results. This is precisely how urban ghettos were and are created. Services shall be provided in situ at the emergency shelter, wherever it is located, this is the year 2020 and it can be done.

Furthermore, under the heading "Operations" the document reads: "Primary healthcare will be provided by a nurse practitioner employed by Good Shepherd and doctors from the Shelter Health Network. Harm reduction support will be provided. Shelter staff offer case management services including referrals, advocacy and supportive counseling. Housing and support services will be offered to every resident."

If this is true, then there is no need to locate the emergency shelter in Stinson, as the services will be provided already "in house" somewhere else.

It feels like the most marginalized and at-risk populations are herded into one single area. The intentional creation of a ghetto indicates wrong-doing and abuse of the emergency order process. The unintentional creation of a ghetto indicates ignorance and negligence. Both instances constitute cause for the revocation of the emergency order. To live in a ghetto endangers me, my security and my well-being as well as the security and the well-being of my family and my community, especially during Covid-19.

5."It is obvious to many residents that this was a hasty decision to expedite the approval of a capital project at First Ontario Centre. Why didn't the shelter there continue to operate? Are there other shelters opening in other wards?
As the City of Hamilton moves into Phase 3 of its re-opening plan, many businesses are returning to regular operations. This includes First Ontario Centre.
Many service providers feel that Sir John A. Macdonald was a better choice. Why wasn't this site chosen instead? Factors such as size of building, degree of renovations required, and facilities on site such as showers, etc are factors in making the decision of location. Sir John A MacDonald was a less feasible choice."

Here my question echo's the voices of Stinson residents: Is Sir John A. Macdonald part of the downtown mega development plan and was this the real reason or one of the reasons it was not chosen?

After receiving the news of the opening of the emergency shelter, some neighbours have put their house for sale or are intending to do it. The buzz word in Stinson is that the City is concentrating the most vulnerable population in our neighbourhood with the nefarious intention to control the pandemic by creating a Covid-19 Ghetto and thus maintain the rest of Hamilton open for business. I also have come to believe this.

Most people believe that the "emergency order decision" is directly related to the mega real estate development plans for downtown. This

could constitute cause for the revocation of the emergency order, as it may indicate wrong-doing, third parties' interests and abuse of the emergency order process.

The optics are bad and a public inquiry of how "this led to that" going back at least to 2015 shall be opened and the matter shall be investigated by City Council without delay.

6. "Who is advocating for residents of existing RCF's and shelters in the neighbourhood? There is a program review of Subsidized RCFs currently underway, led by Housing Services Division of the City of Hamilton. As part of this review, increased collaboration with other support sectors such as Health Care are being explored in order to provide an increased level of mental health and related supports."

"How many residential group homes, shelters other assisted/supportive living homes are already in operation in this neighbourhood/ward?
There are 14 RCFs and 1 Shelter located within Ward 3."

These 2 points support our arguments that Stinson needs immediate assistance and NOT ADDED STRESSORS, especially during the pandemic and that the decision to open the emergency shelter at Main and Emerald, was flawed and dangerous and the historical facts were probably known to most of the actors that invoked the "emergency order".

6. "What are the long-term plans for Cathedral Boys' School? Longer term, Good Shepherd would like to develop a Senior's 'hub' that would combine affordable housing with support services that would be more broadly available to the community. An important part of this development would be incorporating the historic original school into the project."

I found some consolation in this last answer until a senior neighbor raised another red flag: "Any person above 50 qualifies as a senior and some are "trouble" and not just impoverished elders."


I had envisioned a kind of affordable housing for law abiding seniors that would contribute with their presence to bring stability to our area.

I copy paste the latest email I received:

"A few people have asked
Do we know what premise the city is directing taxpayer's money to good shepherd?
Should we be emailing the police chief, or anyone else on the force?
Do we keep resenting the same emails every few days given we feel we are being ignored with the lack of response from anyone?"

What do I tell them?

It is the Mayor and City Council's duty to keep us safe, especially during Covid-19.



**Old Cathedral boys' school to become temporary
homeless shelter as despe...**

City urges federal and provincial governments to come through
with funding as budget hole grows

Please take this seriously.

Sincerely,

Stephen Butson & Kazue Suzuki

**Ministry of
Municipal Affairs
and Housing**

Office of the Minister
777 Bay Street, 17th Floor
Toronto ON M7A 2J3
Tel.: 416 585-7000

**Ministère des
Affaires municipales
et du Logement**

Bureau du ministre
777, rue Bay, 17^e étage
Toronto ON M7A 2J3
Tél. : 416 585-7000



234-2020-3359

August 12, 2020

Mayor Fred Eisenberger
City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West, City Hall
Hamilton ON L8P 4Y5

Dear Mayor Eisenberger:

On July 27, 2020, as part of the federal-provincial Safe Restart Agreement, the Ontario government announced that it had secured up to \$4 billion in emergency assistance to provide Ontario's 444 municipalities with the support they need to respond to COVID-19. I am writing to you today to provide further details on this funding investment.

Municipalities play a key role in delivering critical services that Ontarians rely on and are at the frontlines of a safe reopening of the economy. This investment will provide support to municipalities and public transit operators to help them address financial pressures related to COVID-19, maintain critical services and protect vulnerable people as the province safely and gradually opens. It includes:

- Up to \$2 billion to support municipal operating pressures, and
- Up to \$2 billion to support municipal transit systems.

The Honourable Caroline Mulroney, Minister of Transportation, will provide more information on the transit stream of this funding.

I would also like to acknowledge the Federal government in their role in this historic agreement. As Premier Ford has indicated, "by working together, we have united the country in the face of the immense challenges brought on by COVID-19 and secured a historic deal with the federal government to ensure a strong recovery for Ontario and for Canada".

Under the municipal operating stream, \$1.39 billion will be available to Ontario's municipalities to address operating pressures and local needs. This funding will be allocated in two phases: 50% allocated in Phase 1 for all municipalities, and 50% allocated in Phase 2 for municipalities that require additional funding.

The Safe Restart Agreement also includes a second phase of Social Services Relief Funding (SSRF) totalling \$362 million. This is in addition to significant investments made earlier to the SSRF and in support of public health. Details will be outlined in a letter to Service Managers in the coming days.

Municipal Operating Funding Phase 1: Immediate Funding for Municipal Pressures

Phase 1 of this funding will be allocated on a per household basis and I am pleased to share that the **City of Hamilton will receive a payment of \$27,614,200** to support your COVID-19 operating costs and pressures.

Please note that your municipality is accountable for using this funding for the purpose of addressing your priority COVID-19 operating costs and pressures. If the amount of the funding exceeds your municipality's 2020 COVID-19 operating costs and pressures, the province's expectation is that your municipality will place the excess funding into reserves to be accessed to support COVID-19 operating costs and pressures that you may continue to incur in 2021. Your municipality will be expected to report back to the province in March 2021 with details on your 2020 COVID-19 operating costs and pressures, your overall 2020 financial position, and the use of the provincial funds in a template to be provided by the ministry. More details on this reporting will be shared in the coming weeks.

In the meantime, I am requesting that your municipal treasurer sign the acknowledgement below and return the signed copy to the ministry by email by September 11, 2020 to Municipal.Programs@ontario.ca. Please note that we must receive this acknowledgement before making a payment to your municipality. We intend to make payments to municipalities in September, subject to finalizing details.

Phase 2: Funding for Additional Municipal Pressures

I anticipate that the funding our government is providing through Phase 1 of the municipal operating stream will be sufficient to address COVID-19 costs and pressures for most municipalities. However, we recognize that some municipalities have experienced greater financial impacts arising from COVID-19 than others. As a result,

we are offering a second phase of funding to those municipalities that can demonstrate that 2020 COVID-19 operating costs and pressures exceed their Phase 1 per household allocation.

To be considered for this Phase 2 funding, municipalities will be required to submit reports outlining their COVID-19 operating costs and pressures in a template to be provided by the ministry. **These reports will be due by October 30, 2020.**

Municipalities that require additional time to submit their report are asked to reach out to their Municipal Services Office contact by October 30, 2020 to request an extension to November 6, 2020. **Please note that the ministry is unable to consider municipal requests for Phase 2 funding if the municipality has not submitted its report by November 6, 2020.**

A template for this municipal report and request for consideration for Phase 2 funding will be provided shortly and will require:

1. Information about measures the municipality has undertaken to reduce financial pressures (e.g. use of reserves, cost saving measures);
2. Explanation of how the municipality applied or plans to spend Phase 1 funding towards COVID-19 operating costs and pressures;
3. A year-end forecast of COVID-19 operating costs and pressures;
4. Actual COVID-related impacts as of the end of Q3 of the municipal fiscal year (September 30, 2020);
5. Treasurer's statement as to accuracy of reporting;
6. Resolution of Council seeking additional funding.

Municipalities who are eligible and approved to receive funding under Phase 2 will be informed before the end of the calendar year and can expect to receive a payment in early 2021.

Our government will continue to be a champion for communities as we chart a path to a strong economic recovery. As part of the larger mandate to modernize Long Term Care facilities to address issues of quality and sustainability, we are pursuing a multi-faceted strategy, including leveraging surplus Government properties with potential to be repurposed for the Province's Long Term Care objectives.

This includes the former Hamilton Psychiatric Hospital in the City of Hamilton where the primary objective of Government is to achieve added Long Term Care capacity on the site. We have also considered opportunities to enable housing on the site. We look forward to working with the municipality to achieve this shared goal.

We thank all 444 Ontario municipal heads of council for their support through our negotiations with the federal government. Working together, we will ensure Ontario gets back on track.

Sincerely,



Steve Clark
Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

c. Municipal Treasurer and Municipal CAO

By signing below, I acknowledge that the per household allocation of \$27,614,200 is provided to the City of Hamilton for the purpose of assisting with COVID-19 costs and pressures and that the province expects any funds not required for this purpose in 2020 will be put into reserves to support potential COVID-19 costs and pressures in 2021. I further acknowledge that the City of Hamilton is expected to report back to the province on 2020 COVID-19 costs and pressures and the use of this funding.

Name:

Title:

Signature:

Date:

Pilon, Janet

Subject: Encampments in Hamilton

From: Bridget Marsdin

Sent: September 14, 2020 4:38 PM

To: Farr, Jason <Jason.Farr@hamilton.ca>; clerk@hamilton.ca

Cc: Vaccaro, Mary-Elizabeth <vaccarm@mcmaster.ca>; Vengris, Jennie <vengris@mcmaster.ca>

Subject: Encampments in Hamilton

Dear Councillor Jason Farr and Ms. Andrea Holland (City Clerk),

I am writing to you in hopes that you will listen to deep concerns that are echoing throughout Ward 2. I have been a constituent of Ward 2 for over a decade. My first home was located in Corktown, and now I am a proud owner of a small property on Simcoe St East, in the Beasley neighbourhood. I care deeply about my community and do my best to contribute to the well-being of my neighbours. I also have a strong background working in social services serving some of the most marginalized folks in our city. As you are aware, several of my fellow neighbours and Ward 2 constituents have been forced to live in encampments located near First Ontario Centre and on Ferguson St. These encampments are a testament to the critical gaps in supportive housing and care for homeless folks. As we are in the midst of the COVID 19 pandemic, a housing crisis and an opiate epidemic, should we not be addressing the genuine needs of our fellow citizens and not trying to sweep them away by destroying people's safety, community and dignity by forcibly dismantling their shelter?

I am a mature, fourth-year Social Work student at McMaster University and I am doing my student placement with the Community University Policy Alliance through the School of Social Work at McMaster. This work focuses on developing policy approaches to bring about the kinds of housing and support that is desperately needed by women, and gender diverse people who experience complex homelessness in Hamilton. Encampments in our community further highlight the urgent need for supportive, communal and low-barrier housing with supports.

On April 30 2020, Dr. Kaitlin Schwan, and Leilani Farha (UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Adequate Housing) released [the National Protocol for Homelessness Encampments in Canada](#). Why is Hamilton not following this human-rights based protocol?

Hamilton has been described as one of the most generous cities in Canada and these encampments allow us the opportunity to demonstrate that generosity. It has been deeply disheartening to read about the opinions voiced by several city councillors requesting that these encampments be dismantled and destroyed. This knee-jerk reaction is both shortsighted and elitist. The Mayor and City Council are public servants; elected

to serve all constituents of Hamilton, and this includes folks living in encampments. Class and financial status can be fluid and fragile and all of us must realize how fleeting our acquired status can be. What tragedy would have to strike your life to throw you from your home and comfortable lifestyle? Would you want us to be there to offer you support? Do you believe that there is anything accidental about these encampments or do they shine a glaring light on how we are failing these folks? These encampments signal a time for true change, rather than sparking vitriol and condemnation for our neighbours. The nation is watching us- what do we want them to see? I am a lifelong Hamiltonian and I have always defended this city, but I am profoundly shocked and ashamed at how City Council has chosen to react to my neighbours living in encampments and I support the recommendations put forth by local organizations (including Keeping Six, HAMSMaRT, and the Hamilton Community Legal Clinic) that call for the City to not dismantle encampments, until there are low-barrier, temporary and permanent housing options made available by the City for the residents of these encampments.

I look forward to your reply and the opportunity to discuss this with you further.

Respectfully,
Bridget Marsdin

I acknowledge that I live and work on the unceded territories of the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation and Haudenosaunee First Nations, within the lands protected by the "Dish With One Spoon" Wampum, an agreement amongst all allied Nations to peaceably share and care for the resources around the Great Lakes.

CITY OF HAMILTON

NOTICE OF MOTION

Council: September 16, 2020

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR M. PEARSON.....

Demolition Permit for 832 Barton Street, Stoney Creek

WHEREAS the owner of 832 Barton Street, Stoney continues to deal with untoward activity at this vacant property that is uninhabitable.

WHEREAS this property is in the Fruitland/Winona Secondary Plan and intended to be part of the major development moving forward in this area.

WHEREAS it is not appropriate to pursue repair or restoration of this uninhabitable building to the standards prescribed by the Property Standards By-the or maintain this property on the Vacant Building Registry and demolition is appropriate; and,

WHEREAS, the owner is part of a consortium of developers who will be pursuing building intensification on these lands and surrounding lands that he owns.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

That the Chief Building Official be authorized to issue a demolition permit for 832 Barton Street, Stoney Creek, in accordance with By-law 09-208, as amended by By-law 13-185, pursuant to Section 33 of the *Planning Act* as amended, without having to comply with conditions 6(a), (b), and (c) of the Demolition Control By-law 09-208.

CITY OF HAMILTON

NOTICE OF MOTION

Council: September 16, 2020

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR T. JACKSON.....

Federation of Canadian Municipalities – Election to the Board of Directors

WHEREAS the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) represents the interests of municipalities on policy and program matters that fall within federal jurisdiction; and

WHEREAS FCM’s Board of Directors is comprised of elected municipal officials from all regions and sizes of communities to form a broad base of support and provide FCM with the prestige required to carry the municipal message to the federal government;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

- (a) That Council of the City of Hamilton endorse Councillor Judi Partridge to stand for election on FCM’s Board of Directors for the remainder of the 2018 – 2022 Term of Council; and
- (b) That Council assumes all costs associated with Councillor Judi Partridge attending FCM’s Conferences and Board of Directors meetings be charged to the General Legislative 300100 account.

CITY OF HAMILTON

NOTICE OF MOTION

Council: September 16, 2020

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR N. NANN.....

Proactive Community Information and Solutions Regarding Metrolinx Demolitions on King St East, Ward 3

WHEREAS Metrolinx has announced their intention to demolish 21 vacant properties in Ward 3 for expressed safety concerns.

WHEREAS the duration of boarded up and vacant buildings have had a negative impact on the sense of community safety, pride and belonging.

WHEREAS residents have indicated they would prefer to see the vacant properties considered for proactive community enhancing solutions such as placemaking and art.

WHEREAS the COVID-19 pandemic has made more urgent and pressing the housing crisis Hamilton faces increasing the need for safe and deeply affordable housing.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

- (a) That the City Manager and Chief Building Official request of Metrolinx to prepare a community information plan that includes proactive communication from Metrolinx with adjacent neighbours to mitigate concerns of but not limited to noise, dust, structural impacts, pest management and to explore interim placemaking solutions for any properties slated for demolition.
- (b) That the City Manager and Chief Building Official request Metrolinx to provide a dedicated contact, including phone and email, for residents to connect with directly in regards to demolition related and safety concerns on the Metrolinx properties; and
- (c) That the City Manager and Director of Housing be directed to connect with Metrolinx to discuss the potential of using the Metrolinx owned properties for affordable housing.

Authority: Item 6, Public Works
Committee Report 19-009
(PW19049)
CM: June 26, 2019
Ward(s): 3

Bill No.197

CITY OF HAMILTON

BY-LAW NO. 20-

Being a By-law to Permanently Close a Portion of a Unassumed Alley Abutting 11 Avalon Place, Hamilton, established by Registered Plan 165, in the City of Hamilton, designated as Part 2 on Reference Plan 62R-21364, being Part of PIN 17201-0157 (LT), City of Hamilton

WHEREAS Sections 8, 9 and 10 of the *Municipal Act, 2001* authorize the City of Hamilton to pass by-laws necessary or desirable for municipal purposes, and in particular by-laws with respect to highways; and

WHEREAS Section 34(1) of the *Municipal Act, 2001* provides that a by-law permanently closing a highway does not take effect until a certified copy of the by-law is registered in the proper land registry office; and

WHEREAS highways to be closed by by-law are declared to be surplus to the needs of the City of Hamilton under the Sale of Land Policy By-law;

AND WHEREAS at its meeting of June 26, 2019, the Council approved Item 6 of Public Works Committee Report 19-009, and authorized the City to permanently close and sell a portion of a unassumed alley abutting 11 Avalon Place, Hamilton, Ontario, established by Registered Plan 165, in the City of Hamilton, designated as Part 2 on Reference Plan 62R-21364, being Part of PIN 17201-0157 (LT), City of Hamilton;

AND WHEREAS notice of the City's intention to pass this By-law has been published pursuant to the *Municipal Act, 2001*, S.O. 2001, c.25 as amended.

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the City of Hamilton enacts as follows:

1. That the portion of the unassumed alley, set out as:

Part of the Alleyway on Registered Plan 165, in the City of Hamilton, designated as Part 2, Plan 62R-21364, being Part of PIN 17201-0157 (LT)

is hereby permanently closed.

2. That the soil and freehold of Part 2 on Reference Plan 62R-21364, hereby permanently closed, be sold to Daniela Houlihan and Michael Houlihan for the sum of One Thousand, Three Hundred and Fifty Dollars (\$1,350.00).
3. That this by-law shall come into force and effect on the date of its registration in the Land Registry Office for the Land Titles Division of Wentworth (No. 62).

PASSED AND ENACTED on this 16th day of September, 2020.

F. Eisenberger
Mayor

A. Holland
City Clerk

Authority: Item 6, Public Works
Committee Report 19-009
(PW19049)
CM: June 26, 2019
Ward(s): 3

Bill No.198

CITY OF HAMILTON

BY-LAW NO. 20-

Being a By-law to Permanently Close a Portion of a Unassumed Alley Abutting 13 Avalon Place, Hamilton, established by Registered Plan 165, in the City of Hamilton, designated as Part 1 on Reference Plan 62R-21364, being Part of PIN 17201-0157 (LT), City of Hamilton

WHEREAS Sections 8, 9 and 10 of the *Municipal Act, 2001* authorize the City of Hamilton to pass by-laws necessary or desirable for municipal purposes, and in particular by-laws with respect to highways; and

WHEREAS Section 34(1) of the *Municipal Act, 2001* provides that a by-law permanently closing a highway does not take effect until a certified copy of the by-law is registered in the proper land registry office; and

WHEREAS highways to be closed by by-law are declared to be surplus to the needs of the City of Hamilton under the Sale of Land Policy By-law;

AND WHEREAS at its meeting of June 26, 2019, the Council approved Item 6 of Public Works Committee Report 19-009, and authorized the City to permanently close and sell a portion of a unassumed alley abutting 13 Avalon Place, Hamilton, Ontario, established by Registered Plan 165, in the City of Hamilton, designated as Part 1 on Reference Plan 62R-21364, being Part of PIN 17201-0157 (LT), City of Hamilton;

AND WHEREAS notice of the City's intention to pass this By-law has been published pursuant to the *Municipal Act, 2001*, S.O. 2001, c.25 as amended.

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the City of Hamilton enacts as follows:

1. That the portion of the unassumed alley, set out as:

Part of the Alleyway on Registered Plan 165, in the City of Hamilton, designated as Part 1, Plan 62R-21364, being Part of PIN 17201-0157 (LT)

is hereby permanently closed.

2. That the soil and freehold of Part 1 on Reference Plan 62R-21364, hereby permanently closed, be sold to Elizabeth Wood for the sum of Seven Thousand Dollars (\$7,000.00).
3. That this by-law shall come into force and effect on the date of its registration in the Land Registry Office for the Land Titles Division of Wentworth (No. 62).

PASSED AND ENACTED on this 16th day of September, 2020.

F. Eisenberger
Mayor

A. Holland
City Clerk

Authority: Item 2, Public Works
Committee Report 19-004
(PW19049)
CM: March 27, 2019
Ward(s): 15

Bill No.199

CITY OF HAMILTON

BY-LAW NO. 20-

Being a By-law to Permanently Close a Portion of Road Allowance Abutting 600 5th Concession Road West, Flamborough, established by Part of the Road Allowance between Lots 12 and 13, Concession 4, in the Geographic Township of West Flamborough, in the City of Hamilton, designated as Part 2 on Reference Plan 62R-21259, being Part of PIN 17545-0099 (LT), City of Hamilton

WHEREAS Sections 8, 9 and 10 of the *Municipal Act, 2001* authorize the City of Hamilton to pass by-laws necessary or desirable for municipal purposes, and in particular by-laws with respect to highways; and

WHEREAS Section 34(1) of the *Municipal Act, 2001* provides that a by-law permanently closing a highway does not take effect until a certified copy of the by-law is registered in the proper land registry office; and

WHEREAS highways to be closed by by-law are declared to be surplus to the needs of the City of Hamilton under the Sale of Land Policy By-law;

AND WHEREAS at its meeting of March 27, 2019, the Council approved Item 2 of Public Works Committee Report 19-004, and authorized the City to permanently close and sell a portion of road allowance abutting 600 5th Concession Road West, Flamborough, established by Part of the Road Allowance between Lots 12 and 13, Concession 4, in the Geographic Township of West Flamborough, in the City of Hamilton, designated as Part 2 on Reference Plan 62R-21259, being Part of PIN 17545-0099 (LT), City of Hamilton;

AND WHEREAS notice of the City's intention to pass this By-law has been published pursuant to the *Municipal Act, 2001*, S.O. 2001, c.25 as amended.

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the City of Hamilton enacts as follows:

1. That the portion of the unassumed alley, set out as:

Part of the Road Allowance between Lots 12 and 13, Concession 4, in the Geographic Townshio of West Flamborough, in the City of Hamilton, designated as Part 2 on Reference Plan 62R-21259, being Part of PIN 17545-0099 (LT), City of Hamilton

is hereby permanently closed.

2. That the soil and freehold of Part 2 on Reference Plan 62R-21259, hereby permanently closed, be sold to Countrywind Farm Inc. for the sum of Forty Thousand Dollars (\$40,000.00).
3. That this by-law shall come into force and effect on the date of its registration in the Land Registry Office for the Land Titles Division of Wentworth (No. 62).

PASSED AND ENACTED on this 16th day of September, 2020.

F. Eisenberger
Mayor

A. Holland
City Clerk