

CARMEN Orlandis, Elder, Ward 3 Stinson.

Subject: Old Cathedral Boys School, 24 Dec 2021 Housing Services Division Q&A pdf.

January 9, 2022

To all to whom this is addressed:

I rightfully & respectfully request from all to whom this is addressed to answer the questions I pose today. Your response will **be proof** that you actually open this document; the extend of your response will be proof that you read it; the quality of your response will be proof that you understand the facts I present and the remedy you may offer will be proof that you are performing your job conscientiously, ethically and with fairness.

Carmen (C) Fairness, Accountability, Transparency (FAT) Question 1: Is it true that the Old Cathedral Boys School 100 beds temporary shelter is “less costly” than other options and this offers the City an opportunity to save cash? Did the City consider cutting costs more important that the well-being & safety of the homeless women and the well-being & safety of the Stinson neighborhood?

(C) FAT Q. 2: What is the recourse & due process to halt or curtail the new Old Cathedral Boys School (OC) 100 bed Low Barrier Mega Shelter in my neighborhood?

REALITY CHECK: The due process of the emergency recommendation & approval seems oddly fast-tracked. If the City had been on the edge of financial collapse, this would have explained the urgent need to fast-track the recommendation & approval of a cost shaving temporary emergency mega shelter that impacts so many people. But this is not the case. This is the fast track -time line of the due process as it took place:

Nov 29, 2021: HSD sent the first email announcing a meeting about the future of OC without further explanation

Dec 2, 2021: After we “robustly” requested information about the meeting, so that the community may prepare questions, HSD sent an overall plan of their recommendation to open at OC a 100 bed temporary emergency shelter. We were shocked.

Dec 6 2021: HSD held a poorly announced community webex meeting.

Dec 09, 2021: HSD presented their recommendation to ECS, and it was approved.

Dec 15, 2021: The recommendation was presented to Council and I was told that it was approved.

Dec 24, 2021: HSD finally emailed some neighbors their Q&A pdf. to the questions we posed Dec 06 2021.

Dec 30 2021: Good Shepherd Cathedral shelter Covid 19 outbreak.

January 9 2022: Hamilton active cases: 7.577. New cases- 7 day Avg: 634. Percent positivity: 31.2%.

My document illustrates how Stinson was once more made “powerless” and poses the questions:

(C) FAT Q. 3: Was the process fair?

(C) FAT Q. 4: Was the process transparent?

(C) FAT Q.5: Who is accountable?

(C) FAT Q.6: What is the remedy?

(C) FAT Q.7: Is it legitimate and fair for the City to invoke in this particular case the powers of an emergency order?

(C) FAT Q.8: If not, what is the remedy?

For further clarification, please contact me! Thank you. Carmen

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Fairness-Accountability- Transparency. Introduction and questions.

2. Old Cathedral Boys’ School. Long-pending questions (LPQ).

3. Housing Services Division Q&A final pdf Dec 24 2021. Questions that HSD did not adequately answer and/or avoided in their Q&A pdf; plus other Q's that arose upon reading the HSD Q&A pdf. Reality checks and notes to guide the reader through the confusing background facts and the complex situation.

4. Addendum I: The Nov 28 2021 Ontario emergency orders and the questions I pose. As it is difficult for an average elder to comprehend all the ramifications of this legislature, I request that City Hall staff explains how it applies to the present case.

5. Addendum II: The November 23 2021 CTV News explains simply to the average citizen, the implications of the extended government powers in a manner that we can understand and the questions I pose.

1. FAIRNESS - ACCOUNTABILITY - TRANSPARENCY

INTRODUCTION

The recent quiet & peace that we experienced in our area for the last 4 weeks is threatened again by the new Low Barrier Mega Shelter plan for Old Cathedral as fast tracked by City Hall.

A shelter for homeless women is a difficult & delicate subject to argue against. I feel compassion for any person who due to misfortunes &/or mental illnesses &/or addictions, need to be housed temporarily in a low barrier shelter, which is better & safer for them than the infra-humane conditions of the encampments I have witnessed in Stinson, especially during a pandemic. But a Low Barrier Mega Shelter is not a good plan for the persons it shelters or for the neighborhoods where it is located. It is another lose-lose situation. And I feel compelled to stand up for my neighborhood when City Hall Power House unburdens & neglects its social duties by increasing the burdens of a neighborhood that has been already historically burdened.

From August 2020 to Dec 7 2021, Ward 3, Stinson experienced a new and **unprecedented number of high acuity persons** flocking into the neighborhood and taking residence in Old Cathedral temporary shelter for men and in the encampments. **High acuity persons have high acuity needs and present high acuity behaviors.** Sadly, the presence of these large & new population manifested in a state of social disorder and strife, in vandalism, crime, psychotic episodes, violence, knives, open drug use and other antisocial behaviors as it has been already reported. I feel admiration & gratitude for the front-line workers who staff the shelters and go to work even after being punched in the face by a high acuity client.

During this period, our safety was compromised and we lived in fear even within our homes. The police records reflect this crisis but these records are not complete as many neighbors refused to report those cases that may "identify" them as the plaintiff **for fear of later retaliation**, e.g., broken windows & costly damage to their property; I myself have officially reported to the police only a small number of incidents, like 3 attempts of break and enter, because like my neighbors, I am afraid of being identified. This is the reality Stinson has lived under for more than one year with the aggravating factor of the pandemic.

Given **the increase of the number of meals** served locally at St Patrick during this period, **we extrapolated that the increased number of high acuity persons in Stinson may have been at least 100-120 persons, possibly more.**

The words of my response to the Housing Services Division Q&A pdf may seem harsh to the reader, but I tried to present our reality as fairly and truthfully as I can and to the best of my ability.

The arguments & questions I present indicate that **the June 2020 Emergency Operations Center (EOC) order to open the Old Cathedral Boys' School (OC) temporary emergency men's shelter was a dangerous precedent that opened today the OC location for the HSD staff-recommended 100-bed low barrier shelter.**

HSD presented Dec.09 2021 their recommendation to ECS without offering to the community a meaningful consultation. HSD did not present in their recommendation the Stinson Poverty Index or a study of the social disruption that the Stinson neighborhood experienced in the period Sept 2020 until Dec 10 2021. HSD also failed to present ECS with a projection of how this 100-bed low barrier shelter will impact the surrounding area.

There are indications that perhaps C.Nann, the ECS Chair, may have participated in the early stages of the process to open the Low Barrier Mega Shelter in a manner that may constitute “breach of trust” and may even present failure to fulfill her fiduciary duties to Stinson stakeholders. This needs to be clarified.

The Housing Services Q&A pdf I received Dec 24 2021, does not answer appropriately the questions that were asked by community members and it feels like the language employed is a bureaucratic tool used to "deflect" the concerns and issues that we posed without clearly and directly addressing them. We received this Q&A pdf Dec 24 2021, after the HSD recommendations had been presented to ECS and Council, thus further impeding the meaningful impute of the community. Is this fair?

A 100 bed Low Barrier Mega Shelter would add novel stressors and safety hazards to ANY neighborhood.

The Housing Services Q&A pdf reinforces my view that the process of ghettoizing Stinson continues instead of being remediated as we were promised over one year ago. It makes me feel that Stinson is expendable.

Stinson has been historically ghettoized and burdened by City Hall Power House, e.g., we have the greatest concentration in the City of for-profit RCF's, some very poorly managed e.g. Emerald Lodge (a “house of horrors” that finally closed at the end of Oct 2020 under the pressure that the community reports to City Hall placed on the owners) & Victoria Manors I&II (that finally sold & changed management under the pressure of our advocacy)

City Hall ghettoization of Stinson increased in 2020 during the pandemic with the opening of the "temporary men's shelter" and the debacle of City Hall "permitted" encampments.

It is part of **Edward John's job description to be aware of the conditions of the location he recommends**. I did not see anything in the Q&A or in the Report that Staff presented to Council that reflects how Stinson was impacted by the opening of the 2020-2021 OC "temporary" men's shelter nor how the OC shelter PLUS the food distribution at St Patrick Church attracted 7-8 encampments to our neighborhood + the “hidden” Stinson escarpment (rail tracks) encampments.

City Hall had 20 months, since the pandemic began, to come up with alternative temporary emergency responses to the shelter crisis; alternatives that would not place so much pressure in one single location and one single community.

The Stinson community was assured in 2020 that the OC temporary men's shelter will be closed at the latest by Dec 31 2021. Why & How City Hall HSD recommended this new plan overextending the legal boundaries of an “emergency order” now **needs to be investigated by Council** with the assistance of City Hall lawyers, the Ombudsman and the Integrity Commissioner. We need to see the documentation and reports and the data regarding the chosen location used by staff that lead to their recommendation which *de facto* will impact & erode the Stinson stakeholders safety as enshrined in our Charter of Rights. The boundaries of an order given during an Emergency State exist to protect the citizens Rights once the Estate of Emergency is lifted.

(C) NOTE 1: The April 11, 2020 Makeshift homeless shelter in **First Ontario Centre** was designated for **50 men**, but had room for 75 men in case of a surge. This shelter was a "true temporary emergency shelter" as it was the only rapid solution when the pandemic began and the Ontario State of Emergency was declared. This "makeshift homeless shelter" became necessary due to the historical neglect shown by City Hall to care for our Hamilton marginalized population. When the State of Emergency was lifted, this homeless shelter was cleared. And then the OC temporary shelter was open, under EOC order, with a mandate that could only be extended to Dec 31 2021, or so we were told. The new recommended **OC Low Barrier Mega Shelter is for 100 persons and this was recommended on the 20th month of the pandemic but not under an Ontario Emergency State.**

REALITY CHECK:

Fact 1: A 100 bed shelter is a "Mega Shelter".

Fact 2: A "low barrier shelter" indicates that the shelter will accommodate a high percentage of high acuity persons, with high acuity needs and high acuity behaviors. A shelter is not a prison or a mental hospital, therefore all clients, including the high acuity persons, have a Charter protected Right to freely move unsupervised through the neighborhood; this may manifest in unleashing two kinds of high acuity behaviors in our streets: Individual high acuity behaviors & group high acuity behaviors. These 2 types of behaviors were present in Stinson during 2020-2021.

Fact 3: The 100 persons temporarily sheltered at OC Low Barrier Mega Shelter present the potential to attract to the building's vicinity an additional 100-200 persons per day from all walks of life: Loving & caring family members/ husbands/ boyfriends/partners/ friends/ " business associates "/rough men & women/Ne'er-do-wells & drug dealers & drug users and so on, including those persons who due to their unruly and/or violent behavior are banned from the shelter system.

Fact 4: If OC temporary emergency Low Barrier Mega Shelter is permitted to open and firm & enforceable measures are not put in place now to prevent it, **there will be a new explosion of encampments in the vicinity of OC in March-April when the weather warms.**

(C) Intro Q1: Are the 100 persons that HSD recommends for the "temporary emergency shelter" at OC presently housed in other shelters and hotels?

(C) Intro Q.2: Does "Low Barrier mean High acuity clients"?

(C) Intro Q.3: Are any of those women at this moment dwelling in encampments? How many?

(C) Intro Q.4: Are long term shelters being prepared?

(C) Intro Q.5: What is the reason not to keep housing these persons in the existing shelters and Hotels where they are presently housed?

(C) Intro Q.6: Does **the "relocation of homeless services" *de facto* relocate the homeless population who needs the services** from one area of the City to another?

2. OLD CATHEDRAL BOYS' SCHOOL – LONG-PENDING QUESTIONS (LPQ)

(C) LPQ 1: What is the **date** when the 2020 Emergency Order was signed by EOC & Paul Johnson that permitted to open a "temporary men shelter" at Old Cathedral (OC)?

(C)NOTE 1: Councilor Nann informed us that this "temporary shelter" was possible ONLY because the order was signed during the period of time WHEN **Ontario** was under a historically unprecedented "**State of Emergency**".

(C)LP Q.2: I request a copy of the EOC 2020 "Emergency Order" for the creation of OC temporary emergency shelter for men.

(C) LPQ.3: We were informed by Councilor Nann that this Emergency Order, without the requirement for community consultation, was given to permit the use OC as a temporary emergency shelter until June 2021, with a provision for an extension depending on the pandemic until December 31 2021 and at this final date, the "shelter" would be closed definitely.

Is there another provision in the original Emergency Order that permits City Hall to bypass this original EOC firm and final date, Dec 31 2021, and continue to use OC as a "temporary emergency shelter" even if now it is for women and not for men?

(C) NOTE 2: In the fall of 2020, C. Nann offered the community to host zoom meetings between us & Good Shepherd to meaningfully engage in the repurposing of Old School Cathedral in a manner that uplifted the neighborhood. This didn't happen.

(C) LPQ.4: The "original Emergency Order" gave the maximum number of people to be sheltered at OC as 35-45 men. This number was changed & increased sometime around March 2021 without warning to the community. **Was it legitimate to change the original "EOC Emergency Order" and increase the number of beds without Ontario being under a "State of Emergency"?**

(C) LPQ.5: Was it ethical NOT to inform the community of this number increase of men's beds? Was it fair? Was it transparent?

(C) NOTE 2: The community was only informed of the change in the OC number of men's beds AFTER we noted & reported a new increase of the social disorder in our neighborhood. At this point, Good Shepherd finally took some limited measures to protect at night the immediate vicinity of OC but not all the area affected. We appreciated **this minimum security**, it was no doubt **better than nothing but I believe that the cost of**

securing the area should be borne by the City and the security should have been improved and expanded to a 5 block radius from OC, and 24/7 because the social disorder we experienced in that zone also occurred during the day.

3. Housing Services Division Q&A final pdf Dec 24 2021.

Housing Services Division (HSD) Paragraph 1: "On December 6th, 2021 the Housing Services Division hosted a public meeting with a question and answer portion about the temporary emergency shelter located at the old Cathedral School Boys School location. The question and answer document addresses the questions asked by the over 50 community members who registered and attended the online meeting by webex or via the call in feature."

(C) NOTE: The communication & announcement of this meeting was sub-standard and the *bona fides* as to how this was handled is questionable and it should be investigated as a suspicion exists that it may be **purposefully done in this manner to prevent the legitimate & timely input and/or push back from the community**. To my knowledge, only a handful of Stinson residents were informed. Several community members are "surprised" by the number "over 50" as it seems too high and does not reflect our experience.

(C) Q. 6.1: Can you document that those "over 50" community members Housing Services affirms participated in the public meeting do indeed not only exist but they reside within the impact zone of the 5-block radius around Old Cathedral?

(C) Q.6.2: Is there a possibility that the public meeting was "padded" with persons, e.g. "activists" and "political friends" who do not live in the vicinity of OC and whose safety and well-being are not directly impacted?

(C) Q.6.3: Were both, the announcement and the meeting, held in a fair manner?

(HSD) Q&A pdf: "**Why did the City plan for a public meeting so close to the recommendation report going to Emergency and Community Services Committee on Dec 9th?**"

"Throughout the pandemic Housing Services has worked to communicate with stakeholders and community members about issues that impact their community. The recommendation to continue operating Cathedral Shelter as a temporary shelter could not be communicated publicly before the report was posted on the City's website as per the City's governance model."

(C) Q. 7.1: If indeed, as they affirm that "Throughout the pandemic Housing Services has worked to communicate with stakeholders and community members about **issues that impact their community**" then I assume that **Housing Services was fully aware of the social disorder, stress, trespassing, vandalism, crime,**

open drug use and so on, that manifested in Stinson when the temporary men's shelter opened in 2020.
Despite this, what is the rationale to recommend the plan anyway?

(C) Q.7.2: Was Housing Services aware that the encampments manifested in Stinson as soon as the OC men's shelter was announced in public Aug. 2020?

(C) Note 1: The answer to Q.7.2 is YES because I was in constant contact with James O'Brien and I mentioned this several times. I also mentioned to Councilor Nann and many others.

(C) NOTE 2: Several encampment dwellers told me on separate occasions that they wanted to set their tents near St Patrick food distribution and near OC Shelter, or as they called it, "Motel Cathedral". They also said that any enforcement of rules by the police was a "joke", and there was nothing we could do about it. Other neighbors also received the same "bold & rough" statements.

(C) Q.7.3: Was Housing Services aware that soon after the OC men's shelter opened and the encampments set in the vicinity, to the best of our knowledge, the number of meals distributed by St Patrick Church increased from around 100-200/per day to around 400-500/per day?

(C) Q.7.4: The community believes that this increase of meals per day represents the increase of the transient population in Stinson. Did Housing Services look into this data?

(C) NOTE 2: This correlation between the # of meals at St Patrick, the OC men's shelter residents and the Stinson encampments dwellers was brought to the attention of Ward 3 Councilor Nann and of City Hall repeatedly by many community members. The relation between the clients of OC shelter and the encampments dwellers was also brought to the attention of City Hall and C. Nann, e.g., the "bicycle-selling outlet" at OC proceeding from the "alleged stolen bicycles shop" at the Beemer Park encampment.

(HSD) Q&A pdf: "The recommendation to continue operating Cathedral Shelter as a temporary shelter could not be communicated publicly before the report was posted on the City's website as per the City's governance model."

(C) Q. 7.5: Considering that Staff had 20 months prior to this recommendation to study & resolve the issue of the historical "urgent" need for temporary women shelters it is odd that the recommendation came near the end of 2021, shortly before the EOC contract with Good Shepherd to run the "temporary shelter for men" came to an end; and considering that by the time the recommendation was made, the negotiations with Good Shepherd had been completed and the new contract was ready, why did Housing Services wait until the last moment to post? Could they have posted that they were considering the location and thus meaningfully engage the community?

(C) Q.7.6: Was this fair? Was this transparent?

(C) Q. 7.7: Why were we not consulted when the process was initiated? Did Housing Services Division and other City Hall Staff expect push back from the community?

(C) Q.7.8: **When (date) was the option of using again OC as a “temporary shelter” first contemplated by HSD?**

(C) Q.7.9: **When was Ward 3, Councilor Nann first informed of this plan?**

(C) Q.7.10: **Was this delay by HSD a bureaucratic strategic move to avoid and suppress the legitimate input and/or push back from the community? And was this fair and transparent?**

(C) Q. 7.11: Was this proper & fair “due process”? And is it ethical?

(HSD) Q&A pdf: **"How did the City promote the December 6th public meeting, and why were the timelines so short?"**

“Housing Services wished to hold a public meeting on this important recommendation report but was not able to provide any public details on the topic until the report become public as per the City’s governance model. Given this, the City did not want to confuse public perceptions of the shelter without the ability to clarify what the meeting would be about in a reasonable amount of time. Based on this understanding the City did not publicly post about the planned meeting until mid November.

Housing Services promoted the public meeting through existing neighbourhood email contacts, via the City’s website and with a community flyer drop."

(C) REALITY Check 1: Housing Services Division Staff was aware before the pandemic of the urgent need for “women’s shelters”; Staff had 20 months of pandemic experience and data to act and provide "temporary women shelters" “. So that Staff waited to the end of Nov 2021 to inform the community of their recommendation seems out of place. We, the impacted public, were indeed confused when they informed us; we **were also shocked and distressed by the imminence of the plan**. Was this transparent and fair?

(C) REALITY Check 2: The first announcement was not received by us “mid Nov” but almost 2 weeks later. I **received the FIRST email Nov 29, 2021** and it could be that I was one of the first neighbors to be contacted because when I ask others if they had received the HSD email they responded they had not receive emails nor flyers. Even if I live 2 blocks from OC I did not receive any flyer yet.

(C) Q 8.1: How many emails to residents in the vicinity of OC were sent and on what dates?

(C) Q 8.2: How many flyers were delivered and to what streets and when?

(HSD) Q&A pdf: **"Was the public meeting well attended and can I view a recording of the meeting? How did the City try to accommodate those with difficulties attending virtual meetings?"**

"The public meeting had over 50 individuals attends who registered through the Eventbrite online meeting organization platform. The City hosted the event on our Webex platform. The webex platform allowed for those who could not attend the meeting by virtual attendance to call in and listen to the meeting. The online meeting was not recorded staying with the practice of how public meetings were conducted pre Covid. City staff did record questions provided and have committed to creating this Q and A document that address the questions raised at the meeting.

Information for a call in option was distributed through the online portal. The City recognizes the challenges some residents may face with virtual engagement platforms. We continue to work to improve the engagement options that are impacted by the pandemic response."

REALITY Check: The "call in option" did not work. Some neighbors tried to connect without success. The voice of Daryl, manager of OC men's shelter came through so poorly that I could not understand a word he said.

(C) NOTE 1: I spoke not only with Stinson's homeowners, but also with other stakeholders such as superintendents and renters of the many low income apartment buildings in the vicinity of OC and I was told that nobody reached out to them; therefore, I feel, and I share this feeling with others, that it is difficult to believe the number of "over 50" participants, legitimate participants whose safety and well-being will be directly impacted by OC new temporary Low Barrier Mega Shelter, is correct.

(C) Q. 9: Can the host of the event, Housing Services Division, document that this number "over 50", reflects Stinson/Lansdale participants within a 5-block of OC and who will be truly impacted by the Low Barrier Mega Shelter they recommend?

(HSD) Q&A pdf: **"Did the City purposely promote the meeting with short notice, and through a virtual platform the minimize resident voices?"**

"No, the City encourages robust public feedback on all matters. The Housing Services Division understand the importance of public dialogue on programs, and infrastructure that supports the meaningful work of affordable housing and the homelessness serving system. The Webex platform used for this meeting is the corporate platform used by the City of Hamilton. Notice for the meeting was done in as comprehensive manner as time allowed."

(C) NOTE: This affirmation does not ring true. Not only was the announcement of the meeting time-frame extremely short and the communication weak, but the time given to the shocked community for the meeting was only 60 minutes (SIXTY MINUTES) and most of that precious time was used for opening words and the introductions of the panelists. When we asked if we could have another meeting before the plan was brought to ECS and to Council, the answer was a short: **NO. Is this fair?**

(C) Q.10.1: Robust? Please document and prove that it was "robust".

(C) Q 10.2: **Why were we only given 60 minutes, such a short time, for an issue that will impact our well-being and safety so gravely?**

(C) Q.10.3: **Was this fair?**

(HSD) Q&A pdf: **"Is it ethical the way this recommendation process has been handled, which has led to a perception of secrecy?"**

"Yes, the City and partners have tried to approach this process and decision in an ethical and transparent manner. We understand the concerns around timelines expressed by the community and understand that some may view our discretion as secrecy. It was a decision based on the evolving needs of the housing system that have changed significantly through the pandemic."

(C) NOTE 1: **The Hamilton crisis of homeless shelters precedes the pandemic. The pandemic has lasted so far 20 months. I infer that City Hall & Housing Services Division had plenty of time to come up with other temporary solutions that would not burden so heavily ONE single neighborhood.** Therefore, the way the process was handled may be in accordance with the letter of the City Hall bureaucratic rules (but I am not sure if this is so, this would be a matter for investigation) but not with the spirit, and therefore not with the ethics (also a matter for investigation e.g.the Ombudsman and Integrity Commissioner). There is a **fundamental difference between "secrecy" and "discretion" and transparency is in question.**

I, and many among the community members I spoke with, feel that it was not fair & transparent because Housing Services and City Hall had 20 months of pandemic to deal with the temporary shelters crisis and they kept this "recommendation" under wraps until it was too late for the community to offer a legitimate & meaningful input and/or push back, thus, the optics of "secrecy".

(C) Q.11.1: Did Housing Services know **that the community was "robustly" lead to believe by Good Shepherd and Councilor Nann that there would be community consultations *a priori* in preparation for the re-purposing of OC** after Dec 31 2021 when the "temporary emergency shelter for men" was expected to close as per the 2020 EOC order?

(C) Q.11.2: Did C. Nann tell HSD to expect push back from the community and why?

(C) Q.11.3: Did Good Shepherd staff think that there would be push back from the community and why?

(C) Q.11.4: Did any of the Good Shepherd Staff communicate to HSD staff to expect push back from the community and why they expected a push back?

(C) REALITY Check 1: In 2020 C.Nann and Good Shepherd Director Carmen Saliccioli, affirmed robustly that the OC temporary shelter will close at the latest on Dec 31 2021. C.Nann offered to host the zoom meetings for location re-purposing dialogue. C. Nann announced the first consultation for Jan 21, 2021 and she

cancelled it Jan 18, 2021: “I look forward to this discussion about adaptive re-use of the Former Cathedral Boys School once community and stakeholders are better able to focus on the future of this site. Once a Spring date is confirmed, you will receive details via email.”

We waited for Spring. The community was forced to focus on the problem that the Stinson encampments presented but periodically, after May, I emailed C. Nann and Director Saliccioli requesting the zoom community meeting that they had promised, without receiving response. Their silence was not a cause of concern as we were lead to believe that the shelter will close definitely; we just thought that both players were too busy and we were also busy, consumed by writing emails requesting help for the encampments crisis. Finally:

1. SATURDAY NOV 27 2021 I sent another short email to C. Nann and Director Saliccioli titled “Long Pending: Old Cathedral UPDATE”: “...today is Nov 27, 2021 and that the contract with Good Shepherd at OCBS ends Dec 31, less that 33 days from now. **We have requested multiple times an update regarding the shelter and OCBS from Ward 3 Office and we have received none.** Please, **correct this shortcoming now.**”

2. C. Nann did not respond to this email but curiously, the following MONDAY, (Nov.29) I received a surprising email from Housing Services Division titled “Invitation to Cathedral Shelter Virtual Community Meeting” that simply read:

“The City of Hamilton Housing Services Division is hosting an online community conversation about the Cathedral Shelter (378 Main St East). City staff and community partners will provide an overview of future plans for the site, and answer questions from the community. Please see the attached invite with the registration link for the online meeting.”

3. Nov 29 2021, I immediately emailed Housing Services requesting information about the “overview of future plans for the site” prior to the meeting so that the community could have a chance to digest the news & to prepare questions.

4. Dec 2 2021, I finally received the information revealing the temporary Low Barrier Mega Shelter. This was a shock.

(C) REALITY Check 2: Sometime Aug-Sept 2021 a “staff person” had a slip of the tongue when speaking to me on the phone. This person revealed that C. Nann and Director Saliccioli had a meeting about the use of OC post Dec 31 2021. I thought then that this was a positive thing and their meeting was to move forward the process of re-purposing the building as we had been promised and they were preparing the zoom meeting with the community. When I learned about the new HSD recommendation for OC Mega Shelter, the red flags were raised. **The specter of secret dealings appeared** and I felt that the community had been intentionally blindsided and our trust was breached and we were betrayed.

(C) Q.11.5: We trusted Councilor Nann's word. Does Councilor Nann, our Ward 3 Councilor and ECS Chair, failure to inform the community constitute a lack of transparency, a "fiduciary failure" and/or "breach of trust"?

(C) Q.11.6: **Does this failure to inform the community (considering that C.Nann had given her word to host the information meetings and we believed her and trusted her word) constitute a "breach of trust"?** And if so, what are the remedies for this breach?

(C) Q.11.7: **Does it also constitute fiduciary failure and a disregard for transparency?**

(C) Q.11.8: If the answer to Q.11.3 and/or Q.11.4 is YES: **How does this affect Councilor Nann's position as the Chair of ECS meeting Dec 09 2021 that accepted the HSD recommendation?**

(C) Q.11.9: In the fall of 2020, Good Shepherd went as far as to offer us to deliver fliers door to door to promote the "promised" community input meetings and this gesture of good will gained our trust. Does Good Shepherd silence and secrecy constitute "breach of trust" and/or deception? Was this fair and transparent?

(C) Q.11.10: If Councilor Nann and Good Shepherd and Housing Services Division colluded not to inform& consult with the community months ago when the plan began: Can HSD still ethically and FAIRLY present in their PUBLIC Q&A pdf their silence as "discretion" instead of "secrecy"?

(C) Q.11.11: What represents an easier work load for Housing Services Division staff: To plan and organize a Low Barrier Mega Shelter or 5 smaller low barrier shelters?

(C) Q.11.12: When 3 different groups of people, 2 of them in a "position of power", like the ECS Chair and HSD staff and a "non-for profit and respected Organization" such as Good Shepherd, come together to work on a plan that directly & negatively impacts a fourth group that was left out, my community, whom by their secret collusion is *de facto* made powerless, can this be called "discretion" or does it constitute not only secrecy but "conspiracy"? Is this fair?

(C) Q 11.13: Has Staff consulted with the Integrity Commissioner if these actions were ethical and transparent before affirming they were ethical and transparent in their Q&A pdf?

(C) REALITY Check 1: Edward John did not respond to the our questions immediately, as the short-time frame left to us to take any kind of meaningful action demanded; ideally, he should had responded before the recommendation was presented to ECS and in this manner give us even a small chance to better present our arguments to ECS.

E. John accepted to write the (HSD) Q&A during ECS Dec 09 2021 at the request of the Chair, C. Nann, but the pdf was only emailed to a few persons late afternoon Dec 24, on Xmas Eve. And this was after the Council meeting and decision of Dec 15 2021 had already taken place. Because the matter is so impactful to the Stinson residents and the time frame for any meaningful action was so short, to take 2 weeks to formulate

(HSD) Q&A pdf seems excessively long and this delay may also be a "tactic" to prevent the legitimate input and/or push back of the community and force upon Stinson the Low Barrier Mega Shelter as a "fait accompli".

(C) REALITY Check 2: I was promised by Edward John that the response (HSD) Q&A will be sent soon; yet, when by Friday Dec 17 there was no Q&A, I emailed E. John and he responded that it will be ready by the end of the following week. Finally, the **Q&A was send on Xmas Eve only a couple hours before** City hall staff left for the holidays and their offices were closed until Jan 04, 2022. The (HSD) Q&A pdf is very vague and it does not seem to present answers that require lengthy consultations with other City Hall offices or City Hall lawyers, therefore I cannot understand why it took staff 2 weeks to write it.

(C) Q.11.14: Why did it take Housing Services two weeks to write the Q&A pdf? Was this fair?

(C) Q.11.15: Considering that the (HSD) Q&A pdf was emailed only a couple hours before staff went on holidays, does this delay to provide the Q&A pdf to the community constitute another tactic to prevent the community from presenting in time any meaningful opposition to the Low Barrier Mega Shelter? Was this fair?

(C) Q.11.16: Was this tactic ethical?

(HSD) Q&A pdf : **"Has a decision already been made and the meeting on Dec 9 is simply a formality?"**

"No, while the staff recommendation has been made the authority to approve this recommendation rests with the Emergency and Community Services Committee and ultimately City Council. At the Dec 9th, ECS meeting Committee did approve the recommendation."

(C) NOTE 1: The community was informed of the plan Dec 02, 2021. The webinar was Dec 06 2021 and the ECS meeting was Dec 09, 2021. **If we consider 20 months a "short time frame" to come up with a temporary remedy for the long existing shelter crisis and by not providing earlier other alternative possibilities, de facto, their recommendation to ECS was indeed a formality.**

If they had presented their recommendation months earlier, perhaps the community would have been able to participate and perhaps ECS would not have approved it and requested alternative options. After watching the streamed Dec 09 2021 ECS, I felt that the session was just a form of legal theatre & a due-process formality. Was this fair and transparent?

(C) NOTE 2: Nobody informed us Dec 6 2021 that after the recommendation was approved by ECS, the next step of the process would be to present it to Council Dec 15 2021.

(C) Q.12.1: Why was this not mentioned during the webinar? Was this withholding of information about the process fair?

I was not aware that it would be presented to Council Dec15 2021. This lack of awareness was caused by the failure and disregard of a duty to inform an average & inexperienced but engaged citizen like me of the fact that the “recommendation” would be presented to Council so fast. I am sure that none of my neighbors were been informed of this.

(C) REALITY CHECK 1: **Councilor Nann emailed 10, Dec 2021** “Harm Reduction Futures, Committee & PH Updates & Grey Cup Weekend” where on the section “Emergency & Community Services Committee (ECS) she wrote: “I do have to state, however, it has been truly disappointing to have some neighbours in the area complain about the increased presence of people living in tents in Stinson while also opposing this shelter”

She expressed her disappointment on Dec 10, but **she failed to inform us that we had a short window of opportunity to address Council on Dec 15.**

(C) 12.2: Is it fair that C.Nann neglected to mention that due process was still ongoing and that we missed an opportunity to write to Council?

(C) 12.3: Was it fair or ethical for our War 3 Councilor to express in public her personal disappointment about those community members who work hard to remedy the conditions of our neighborhood, including the mismanagement of some for-profit RCF’s, like Emerald Lodge and The Vic Manors& the stressors that were caused by some of the clients of OC shelter & the infra-human & life threatening conditions of the encampments & the impact of encampment dwellers behaviors?

(C) 12.4: Why does reporting and asking remedy for the high acuity behaviors & crime we have experienced in Stinson from Sept 2020 to Dec 2021 cause C.Nann “disappointment”?

(C) 12.5: Does Councilor Nann, ECS Chair, view our civil duty to report on the affairs of our neighborhood as a personal disappointment?

(C) NOTE 3: It is a fact that many of my neighbors do not communicate or pursue community issues with City Hall because they have come to believe that it is useless and a waste of their time and energy.

(C) 12.6: Could C.Nann “disappointment” comments further discourage some people in the community from exercising their duty to participate in civil affairs in the future?

(C) Note 4: I believe that because of City Hall’s historical failure to provide permanent supportive housing for our unsheltered & marginalized population, there was a pre-existing critical need for temporary shelters before the pandemic. BUT, as the pandemic crisis began over 20 months ago, City Hall had an **extra 20 months of time** to provide other urgent temporary emergency solutions without further marginalizing our neighborhood.

Also, the new influx of a large number of persons that HSD recommends with the unprecedented Mega Shelter makes Stinson once again more vulnerable to community transmission of the Covid virus; I remind the

reader that Stinson became one of the Covid hot spots during 2020-2021, which surely was due to the high number of the transient population and their rough life style.

(C) NOTE: Jan 08, 2021: There is an outbreak of 8 clients at Old Cathedral.

The encampments were a lose-lose situation, endangering the safety & the lives of the encampment dwellers and the safety & the lives of the Stinson neighbors. We had expressed these 2 points clearly in countless emails:

1. The infra-human conditions of the encampment and the risks that this presented to their lives, including lack of sanitation, drug abuse, emaciation, violence and fires.
2. The antisocial behaviors that these rough population displayed in the Stinson neighborhood.

We had already expressed that **we are relieved that the encampment dwellers' life-threatening conditions were alleviated by clearing the encampments & housing them in shelters. On the other hand, we also expressed as soon as we were informed about it, that a 100-bed Low-Barrier Mega Shelter in Stinson will not improve our community safety because it does not decrease the number of high acuity persons in the area; on the contrary, the number of rough people may increase because a large number of rough men may be attracted to the vicinity of a low barrier women's shelter. This is reality. This is NOT the win-win solution we were seeking and expecting. And that is why we oppose both, the encampments and the Mega Shelter.**

(C) Q.12.7: Why did Councilor Nann cancel a scheduled zoom meeting on the subject of the future use of OC with Good Shepherd & the community (meeting announced for Jan 21, 2021 and cancelled Jan 18, 2021) and never re-scheduled for the spring as she promised Jan 18 2021?

(C) Q.12.8: We were informed that Ward 3 Councilor Nann, ECS Chair, held a private meeting with Director Saliccioli. What was the date of this meeting?

(C) Q.12.9: What was the agenda of this meeting and what was discussed behind closed doors?

(C) Q.12.10: What other contacts between the Chair of the ECS and Good Shepherd staff took place in 2021?

(C) Q.12.11: Did Councilor Nann, Chair of ECS, acquire knowledge of the intended use of OC location as a Low Barrier Mega Shelter prior to Housing Services presenting their recommendation to ECS?

(C) Q.12.12: Who initiated the recommended plan for the new Old Cathedral Boys School Low Barrier Mega Shelter and when?

(C) Q 12.13: Why didn't the ECS Councilors question the Housing Services Division recommendation of opening an unprecedented 100-bed Low Barrier Mega Shelter at OC?

(C) Q 12.14: **Why didn't the ECS Councilors ask questions regarding the impact the Low Barrier Mega Shelter will have in the Ward 3 Stinson neighborhood?**

(C) Q.12.15: **Was ECS fully informed of the 2020-2021 Stinson's social disorder crisis?**

(C) Q. 12.16: **Would have any other ECS Councilors approved a Low Barrier Mega Shelter in ONE of their Wards' neighborhoods? Who volunteers?**

(C) Q 12.17: **Why didn't the ECS ask Housing Services for alternative smaller emergency shelter models, instead of the UNPRECEDENTED Low Barrier Mega Shelter with 100 beds?**

(HSD) Q&A pdf: **"Does the City have the legal authority with Good Shepherd to continue to operate an emergency shelter at the old Cathedral High School location?"**

"Yes, under the emergency order provision the City has the legal authority to open and operate this temporary emergency shelter location."

(C) REALITY CHECK: In 2020 Old Cathedral Boys School was pending of denomination as **"heritage building"**. The study reflected that **ASBESTOS** was present. There was a Spec article that mentioned that because of the asbestos and of the cost of its remediation [over \$4.000.000.00] & of the pending heritage denomination, there were **no "developers" interested in the building and that the maintenance of the building was a great burden to its owner**, the Roman Catholic Diocese of Hamilton, (CHD), under the stewardship of Bishop Crosby.

We were told that the selection of the location for the "temporary emergency men's shelter" **was facilitated and fast tracked** because **in 2020 Good Shepherd H. staff came forward and proposed the Old Cathedral Boys School location to City Hall EOC and Paul Johnson**. Good Shepherd's proposal of OC for the men's shelter shortened the City Hall normal study of other locations & fast tracked the due process of the **temporary** emergency shelter's location selection.

We asked for information & it was not produced, but we heard that the Roman Catholic Diocese of Hamilton gave GSH a lease for \$1/per year for the use of OC as an emergency shelter. \$1 per year would be a great financial incentive for Good Shepherd to continue to run all kinds of "shelters" from this location, especially when **City Hall (taxpayers) pay for the renovations of the building each time**, with money set apart from the contract monies to run the shelter.

We were told when the "temporary shelter for men" was opened at OC using an extraordinary order made possible by the Ontario State of Emergency and it was signed by Paul Johnson and EOC. This order permitted the temporary shelter to function until June 30, 2020 and depending on the pandemic, the use of the building as a temporary shelter could be extended **ONLY until Dec 31, 2021**.

The community expressed in 2020 our concern that this "temporary emergency use" may become a "legal precedent" for future uses of OC. We expressed the concern that the money invested by City Hall in the renovations may be an incentive to keep using the building as a shelter after Dec 2021. When the community asked, in 2020, if there was a possibility that OC may continue to use OC as a shelter AFTER Dec 31 2021, we were told that this could not happen as per the EOC Emergency Order. We were told that this order was only possible because the Province was under a historically unprecedented "State of Emergency". Even if the pandemic continues, **another State of Emergency has not been declared in Ontario** and the answers given in the Q&A pdf by Housing Services are "confusing" and they do not seem accurate.

(C) Q.13.1: Is it legal for City Hall to open now this "temporary shelter" at OC?

(C) Q.13.2: According to HSD Q&A "Yes, under the emergency order provision". **What emergency order provision is Housing Services Division invoking here?**

(C) Q.13.3: How can be this new order signed NOW under the 2020 emergency order provision if Ontario has not declared NOW a new State of Emergency? If there is a NEW order, please forward a copy of this NEW order in addition to the original emergency order signed by Paul Johnson in June 2020.

(C) Q.13.4: City Hall was well aware of the need of shelter beds BEFORE the pandemic and for the 20 months of the pandemic, why has Housing Services Division staff waited until Dec 09 2021 to make a recommendation for a low barrier women's shelter to ECS?

(HSD) Q&A pdf: **"Were the issues of poverty, crime, and the community impact of the extension of the temporary shelter at this location on the neighbourhood considered as part of the recommendation?"**

"For the staff recommendation to Council several factors were considered. These factors included Stinson and Landsdowne specific community concerns but also the physical space realities of alternatively available spaces and other operational considerations.

In partnership with the Good Shephard the City is committed to continuing to address any neighbourhood impacts caused by the operation of this temporary shelter location. The City will be hosting another public meeting in the first quarter of 2022 where issues can be addressed."

(C) NOTE 1: **It does not feel like the issues of poverty, crime and community impact and the community experience and concerns have been considered in this "recommendation"** even if I am aware that the community has flooded City Hall for over one year with emails requesting assistance. Is this fair?

(C) NOTE 2: **Housing Services did not recommend alternative smaller shelter models but instead recommended only ONE UNPRECEDENTED Low Barrier 100-bed Mega Shelter. Housing Services did not present in their recommendation a model of how this Low Barrier MEGA SHELTER would impact our community. They did not forecast in their recommendation the large number of persons that are expected**

to be "hanging out" in the vicinity of the shelter but not be housed in the shelter, like family/ husbands/boyfriends/partners/ friends/rough men & rough women/ "business associates"/ne'er do wells & drug dealers & drug users and so on, including those persons whose aggressive behaviors are so extreme that they are barred from the low barrier shelter. Is this fair?

(C) Q.14.1: Document how the issues of poverty, crime & the impact on the community & the community concerns were considered before the recommendation was made.

(C) Q.14.2: Was Bishop Crosby, head of the Roman Catholic Hamilton Diocese, and owner of Old Cathedral Boys School, informed of the negative impact that this Low Barrier MEGA SHELTER would present to our community?

(C) Q.14.3: Would smaller low barrier shelters spread out through the City have less impact on the surrounding communities?

(C) Q.14.4: Would not be smaller barrier shelter more conducive to support the complex issues of their residents?

(C) Q.14.3: Has Housing Services prepared data projections of the expected number of persons that the Low Barrier Mega Shelter will attract to the vicinity of the shelter in our neighborhood and how this number will impact our community?

(C) Q.14.4: Is the cost of running a Low Barrier Mega Shelter lower than the cost of running 5 small low barrier shelters?

(C) Q.14.5: What is the cost of providing security for the impacted zone of 5 blocks radius around the Mega Shelter, 24/7?

(C) Q.14.6: Why did not Housing Services Division include in their recommendation the cost of the neighborhood security?

(C) Q.14.7: Is the money saved by running a Low Barrier Mega Shelter worth the safety and security of Stinson residents?

(C) Q.14.8: Is a Low Barrier Mega Shelter less conducive to the well-being & the safety of its clients than a smaller shelter?

(C) Q.14.9: Does a Low Barrier Mega Shelter present more risks to the safety of the staff?

(C) NOTE 3: We were promised during the webinar another meeting for Jan 2022; the date for this meeting is announced by (HSD) Q&A pdf now with a vague "first quarter". This allows extra time for the Low Barrier Mega Shelter to move ahead (e.g., renovations and move in the new residents) and it means that the meeting with the community will occur after the Low Barrier Mega Shelter has been functioning for 3 months. By the

time the next meeting takes place, the Low Barrier Mega Shelter will be a “fait accompli” and it will be impossible for the community to argue. Is this fair?

(C) Q.14.10: Will you keep the promised consultation webinar date for January 2022 as it was first promised during the webinar Dec 06 2021?

(C) Q.14.11: Will the renovations of OC go ahead before our voices are heard and our arguments considered?

(C) Q.14.12: Will this first Jan webinar be followed by another webinar at the end of the first quarter?

(C) Q.14.13: If the Low Barrier Mega Shelter opens, will a webinar be held at the end of each quarter?

(C) Q.14.14: As per Jan 9, 2022, are there women already shelter at OC?

HSD Q&A pdf: **"Were other locations/ options considered?"**

"A number of options were initially considered which evaluated matters such as location, access, availability, size and staffing model. The ability to staff and operate Cathedral in a short timeframe as well as other advantages resulted in the decision."

(C) Q.15.1: What other "advantages" and to whom?

(C) Q.15.2: Does a Low Barrier Mega Shelter favor the needs of high acuity clients and how?

(C) Q. 15.3: Does a Low Barrier Mega Shelter present any advantages for the Stinson Community and how?

(C) Q.15.4: Does the **Stinson Low Barrier Mega Shelter favor the billion-dollar mega real estate development of "downtown" and how?**

(C) BRUTAL REALITY Check:

9 July 2021: Hamilton Spectator: “What about the Salvation Army men’s shelter across the street?”

"It's a very delicate question" says Hamilton Urban Precinct Entertainment Group partner and director of the area renovation project, Jasper Kujavsky. The question really comes down to whether that facility and the work it does for the **homeless and transient men is an ideal fit with the vision of the area as a fashionable spot** that will draw people from around the city and beyond to hang out downtown.

(C) Q.15.5: What are your thoughts about Mr.Kujavsky’s words? How did this example of the views of the mega investors affect the City when evaluating the locations of the mega shelter?

(C) Q.15.6: "Evaluated the location"? Does HSD mean: In a historically burdened neighborhood that has just experienced over one year of stressors caused by the presence of the "temporary shelter for men" and the City Hall "permitted encampments"? Is this fair?

Q.15.7: Are 20 months of pandemic a "short time frame" to come up with a temporary emergency plan?

(C) Q.15.8: How many empty buildings across the city does City Hall own?

(C) Q.15.9: How many of those City properties could have been prepared as temporary shelter for women in the last 20-month time-frame?

(C) NOTE 1: The answer given by HSD is vague. It favors City Hall Staff work load & Good Shepherd & the Hamilton Catholic Archdiocese & the downtown Real Estate Developers at the cost of Stinson: **Historically, a Low Barrier Mega Shelter is unprecedented in Hamilton. I do not believe that a Low Barrier Mega Shelter favors the needs of high acuity homeless clients while it impacts negatively the safety of the neighborhood.**

(C) Q.15.10: **Are 20 months of pandemic, in the opinion of Housing Services, a "SHORT TIME-FRAME" to plan & prepare emergency "temporary shelters"?**

(C) Q.15.11: When did Housing Services start the process of seeking a solution to remedy the shortage of beds for homeless women?

(C) Q 15.12: When was the "evaluation" of the new Low Barrier Mega Shelter at OC location initiated? Is there a report "which evaluated matters such as location, access, availability, size and staffing model?" I request the "evaluation" report.

(C) Q 15.13: What other options were considered?

(C) Q.15.14: When was the contract for the new OC Low Barrier Mega Shelter with Good Shepherd formulated?

(C) NOTE 2: The initial contract of \$ 1.000.000.00 for this mega shelter takes us to March 2022:

(C) Q.15.15: Is there a clause to extend the contract with Good Shepherd until June 30 2022?

(C) Q.15. 16: What will be the cost of the extended contract to June 30 2022?

(C) Q.15.17: **Is there an OC shelter exit plan already in place for June 30 2022?**

(C) Q.15.18: Is Housing Services Division ACTIVELY seeking & preparing other locations for smaller shelters?

(C) Q.15.19: When will the OC "shelter" close definitely?

Q&A pdf: **"During the pandemic in Nov 2020 Good Shepherd made a submission entitled Women's Shelter & Support Investment Option to the Housing Service's RFP Process and was successfully funded. Does this RFP mean that this location will become permanent?"**

"The City issued an RFP for Federal homelessness funding in Nov 2020. This RFP was for system related solutions and provides funding over multiple years. This proposal will not create a permanent shelter at Cathedral, this funding will be part of the solution that helps eventually close this temporary shelter. Housing Services is not aware of proposals previously submitted related to shelter operations at this site."

(C) REALITY Check 1: We also requested information about why **other 2 Good Shepherd SPECIFIC grant proposals for the use of OC were denied PRIOR to 2020**; one of these 2 grant proposals was for a "senior's hub". This information is RELEVANT now because it will **explain why Old Cathedral Boys School was not deemed a suitable site for these 2 grant proposal uses**. This Question was not answered in 2020 and it is not answered in the (HSD) Q&A pdf. I request copies of the 2 grant proposals and the 2 denials.

(C) Q.16.1: **Why were these 2 Good Shepherd grants proposals for the use of OC prior to the pandemic denied?**

(C) Q.16.2: **Does the Now 2020 Good Shepherd submission Women's Shelter & Support Investment Option include any future Good Shepherd uses of the OC building?**

(C) Q.16.3: **Did the Nov 2020 Good Shepherd submission Women's Shelter & Support Investment Option include the "temporary emergency use" of Old Cathedral Boys School as a 100 beds, temporary low barrier women's shelter as recommended now in 2021 by Housing Services Division?**

(HSD) Q&A pdf: **"This was to be a temporary shelter, the timeline for close this location has now been extended and part of the cause is the ongoing pandemic. How will the City close this temporary shelter if the pandemic restrictions continue?"**

"The City's on going work to end homelessness in Hamilton and create more affordable housing solutions has been impacted by Covid. Over the last 2 years the Housing Services division has worked to adapt plans and timelines to work within a range of pandemic response scenarios. Investments such as the 2020 request for proposal process are part of the range of solutions being implemented to transform the system. These transformations will provide the increased capacity needed within the affordable housing spectrum that will allow the outflow from the system needed to close the temporary emergency shelter located at the former Cathedral school site."

(C) NOTE 1: The bureaucratic language of the answer above is vague & evasive. It sounds as if Housing Services Division has no idea when the Low Barrier Mega Shelter they recommended will close. This is a matter of serious concern and it questions their ability to plan & prepare ahead.

(C) REALITY Check: I remind the reader OC men's shelter was not just a normal pre-pandemic "temporary shelter" and **we question how the timeline for closing the location can be legally extended again.** This "temporary emergency shelter for men" was opened under a SPECIAL Emergency Order by EOC and as far as we know, the legitimate final date for the building use as a "temporary emergency shelter" was Dec 31 2021.

(C) REALITY Check: The "men from this location [OC emergency shelter] will be accommodated within the men's serving system", means that the use of the building as a "temporary emergency shelter for men" as per the original June 2020 emergency order signed by EOC P. Johnson, is completed.

(C) Q.17.1: **Are the powers of ECS as unlimited as the powers of EOC when EOC is activated by an Ontario Emergency State?**

(C) Q.17.2: **How do the powers of ECS and EOC differ?**

(C) Q.17.3: **Can ECS accept a HSD recommendation that alters & changes & modifies an EOC order?**

(C) Q.17.4: **Is the opening of a Low Barrier 100 person capacity shelter now at Old Cathedral Boys School legal if Ontario is not under a State of Emergency even if the pandemic is ongoing?**

(C) Q.17.5: If the pandemic is ongoing but Ontario has not declared another State of Emergency, could this mean that during this last 20 months many measures have been implemented and there is no need to activate the extreme and unique powers of a State of Emergency?

(C) Q 17.6: Why is not the social responsibility of sheltering our Hamilton high acuity homeless & marginalized population shared equally by other Wards and neighborhoods?

(C) Q.17.7: Will there be a shelter of one kind or another functioning at the OC location until suitable homes are built for ALL our homeless & marginalized population?

(C) Q.17.8: When will Old Cathedral use as a shelter END? **DATE?**

Q&A pdf: **"I believe it is imperative to spread facilities across all of Hamilton and not just concentrate them in the downtown core. When will the current residents be relocated and to where?"**

"The homelessness serving system has had pressures for many years. These pressures were exacerbated by the global pandemic and Housing Services with the support of many established service providers to significantly expand the shelter bed capacity. This expanded capacity continues today and men from this location will be accommodated within the men's serving system, including the currently expanded capacity within the hotel system."

(C) NOTE 1: Staff stitched together 2 very different community questions and they answered none. **Staff Q&A pdf re-formulates our question with a general "downtown core" instead of the particular "Stinson neighborhood" that was asked. This feels like a "deflection" of the real issue.**

(C) **REALITY Check: The downtown core is presently engaged in a \$ 1.000.000.000.00 (One Billion Dollars) real estate renovation & development. Stinson is adjacent to the "downtown core" but not included in the real estate investment plan. It appears that there may be a financial gain and/or advantage for the real estate developers & investors if the Mega Shelter is opened in Stinson instead of in the "downtown core".**

(C) Q. 18.1: **Was any location in the Hamilton "downtown core" considered?**

(C) Q.18.2: **Does the relocation of our Hamilton marginalized population to Stinson benefit and/or facilitate the one billion dollar mega real estate downtown development project in any way?**

(C) Q 18.3: Why does Housing Services recommend a single Low Barrier Mega Shelter for 100 persons in STINSON instead of smaller facilities spread throughout the downtown core or other areas of the city?

(C) NOTE 2: This new Low Barrier Mega Shelter for 100 persons is unprecedented in Hamilton. Plus, the 100 OC residents will naturally attract to the vicinity of OC another 100-200 non-residents per day and therefore the total of persons moving through the 4-5 blocks radius will be extraordinary. We feel like a social experiment and **we feel that Stinson's safety and well-being is been compromised by this high concentration of persons. And since so much correspondence has been sent to City Hall during 2020-2021 regarding the artificial increase of the marginalized population in our neighborhood we are now inclined to infer that this is intentional.**

Given the one billion \$ development of the "downtown core" we feel that the original OC emergency shelter for men 2020 and now the 2021 new Low Barrier Mega Shelter in the same location are part of the plan to facilitate the "downtown" renovation & development plans and that the **"pushing" our Hamilton marginalized population out of downtown by locating services into our neighborhood** may have been a calculated move and that Stinson is sacrificed in the process. **This may constitute intentional ghettoization of our neighborhood and directly impacts our safety and infringes directly on our Rights under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Is this fair?**

(C) NOTE 3: HSD Q&A pdf: "Even if men from this location will be accommodated within the men's serving system": The neighbors know now that the 2020-2021 OC male residents will not be relocated at 46 West Ave; we figured out by ourselves after the webinar meeting Dec 06 2021, without the help of City Hall staff, that the 46 West Ave. building was already re-purposed "temporarily" for homeless families with children. We had to find out the new use of 46 West Ave through observation and there were no "courtesy flyers" or emails announcing the change. Was this transparent?

(HSD) A&Q pdf: **"The City is clearing encampments without adequate shelter space for people. Emergency shelters are no long term solutions. What is the City's plan?"**

"The City continues to work to address encampments. Part of this solution continues to be the exemplary work of the street outreach team who works to engage those in encampments and work towards a supportive solution. It is recognized that safe, accessible permanent supportive housing is the solution required to address homelessness"

(C) NOTE: I agree that Emergency shelters are not a long term solution. I believe that the solution to the rough encampments dwellers is "SUPPORTIVE HOUSING". The high acuity persons I have met 2020-2021 lived in infra-human conditions and they needed urgent medical care that they did NOT receive while in the encampments. The Stinson encampments were a **lose-lose situation: The rough encampment dwellers were on the brink of death and the Stinson community's Charter Rights to safety was compromised. This was caused directly by City Hall action & inaction.**

(C) **REALITY CHECK-2022 ENCAMPMENTS:** As soon as March- April arrive, the rough high acuity persons who are now in hotels and shelters will feel overwhelmed by the rules of behavior they had to abide by during the winter months. There will be **a new explosion of encampments.** Stinson has become particularly vulnerable to encampments as we experienced from Sept 2020-Dec 2021.

The new Low Barrier Mega Shelter that HSD recommends for OC will attract in 2022 even more encampments in our neighborhood that we experienced last year.

If OC is housing 100 females, their partners, husbands, boyfriends, friends, " rough business associates", abusers, drug dealers and others, who may be inclined to set up tents in the vicinity of OC to have access to the women and to St. Patrick Church food distribution, and in **2022 the encampments will take over Stinson again.**

We have witnessed how slow & difficult & costly & painful the process of clearing an encampment was. There is no doubt in my mind that to prevent an encampment is better for everyone, for the City, for the taxpayers, for the neighborhood and for the high acuity encampment dwellers.

(C) Q. 19.1: **How will CITY HALL prevent new encampments from setting up in Stinson?**

(C) Q. 19.2: **Can you guarantee NOW, that special measures will be put in place NOW so that NO ENCAMPMENT may be permitted not even for ONE DAY or ONE NIGHT in a 5-block radius from OC?**

(HSD) A&Q pdf: **"What services will be available for both community use and for the shelter residents to ensure fewer problems during the day? Can the community have input on these?"**

"Supports for residents will be provided within the building in order to address their health and housing needs. There will not be community space available to the public within the building."

(C) NOTE 1: We expect that the shelter clients will receive health and housing support. **The questions that we asked were about the problems that the SHELTER RESIDENTS may present to our SAFETY and well-being during the day, when 100 shelter residents, a percentage of whom will be high acuity, may freely move throughout the neighborhood.**

REALITY Check: We are in the midst of an opioid epidemic. Some of the high acuity residents may have chronic drug health conditions; and they will be compelled to "hassle" to obtain street supplies. The compulsion to "hassle" to obtain cash will affect the safety of the neighborhood; the "intoxicated behaviors" will impact the community; the street supply may cause overdoses and/or death.

(C) Q.20.1: Is the mega shelter prepared to address chronic substance abuse?

(C) Q.20.2: Will there be "harm reduction" in situ?

(C) Q.20.3: Will there be "safe supply" in situ?

(C) Q. 20.4.: Will City Hall reduce the 100 number of residents at the first indications of social disorder OUTSIDE OC?

(C) Q.20.5: Will be the persons that break the shelter safety rules be barred from OC? And where will be those persons housed?

(C) QUESTION 20.6: **Will our green spaces and private properties and alleys be allowed to be used for drug/alcohol consumption/sex acts/latrines, like we have experienced already during 2020-2021?**

(C) REMINDER -REALITY CHECK 1: 100 persons Low Barrier Mega Shelter in OC has the potential to attract outside the building at least 100-200 persons: caring family members / husbands/ partners/ boyfriends/ friends/"business relations& associates"/ rough men& women/ne'er do wells & drug dealers & drug users etc plus those clients whose aggressive behavior cause them to be barred from the shelter.

(C) REALITY CHECK 2: **During the Dec 09 2021 ECS meeting it was affirmed that one of the reasons why hotel shelters for COUPLES was discontinued and why couples will be separated into women shelters and men shelters was DOMESTIC VIOLENCE. Therefore, this also supports our projections of violence in the vicinity of OC and the need for extraordinary 24/7 security. We request this security for the 5-block radius around the Low Barrier Mega Shelter while it remains operative. This will be fair.**

(C) Q. 20.7: **How will this great influx of potential rough people "hanging out" in the vicinity of OC, day and night, be prevented?**

(HSD) A&Q pdf: **"What is the City's Plan for medium and long term future for this building? The community would like input on long term plans."**

"The City does not have plans to utilize this site as an emergency shelter location post pandemic and any long term uses for the building would be subject to standard City planning practices."

(C) NOTE 1: Post pandemic! The pandemic may last in one form or another several years, therefore **this answer is disingenuous, open-ended and intentionally vague** because I feel that City Hall is more than aware of this scientific fact. The response conceals the possibility that the City may continue to use OC for a long time while presenting it as an emergency "temporary" short plan.

(C) Q. 21.1: How many months does the City consider "short-term use"?

(C) Q. 21.2: How many months does the City consider "medium term"?

(C) Q. 21.3: **When will OC close as an emergency shelter of any one kind or another, definitely?**

(HSD) Q&A pdf: **"What are the plans for ongoing community involvement in the future of Cathedral — for example, will there be positions on a board or advisory committee for neighbourhood residents?"**

"There is not currently a unique advisory committee for neighbourhood residents related to Cathedral shelter, but it is recommended that interested residents remain involved through the Stinson community association, or with direct contact to Ward 3"

(C) REALITY CHECK:

1. To date, Ward 3 Office has poorly responded to our emails regarding the "future use" of OC, and Councillor Nann cancelled the last scheduled e-meeting many months ago with a promise to re-schedule it that never took place. We requested a new date for this meeting again and again and there was no answer to any of those emails. **This silence is one of the factors that make me feel that the Low Barrier Mega Shelter has been in the works for a long time.**

2. **"The Stinson community association" is *de facto* non-functional and Councillor Nann was informed of this irregular situation in 2020.** Their website was last updated in 2018. It will be welcomed if the presently "absent" Stinson Community Association becomes active again and begins robustly ADVOCATING for the safety and the well-being of Stinson residents, including the residents of the local RCF's who are part of my community.

(HSD) Q&A pdf: **"How can you possibly safely house 100 people in a COVID safe way?**

Good Shephard Centres has a long track record of operating large shelter spaces and will continue to implement a best practices approach to best serve the clients needs while also balancing the impacts on the community."

"Through best practices approaches as provided by Public Health's direction the Good Shephard Centres have been operating with enhanced IPAC measures and will continue to evolve and implement these recommend and mandatory approaches. Through this approach we are confident a 100 person shelter can be operated in a safe manner for clients, staff, and the community at the Cathedral Shelter."

(C) REALITY Check 1: When Director Saliccioli invited me to inspect OC Dec 2020, I found out that the new Air System filters that had been installed were ONLY #8 while scientific data recommends #13 for the corona virus. I was very pleased recently when Staff at 46 West Ave mentioned that staff was aware that it was I who recommended Hepa filters for the self-isolation site at 46 West Ave, and that G.S followed my recommendation & purchased the filters.

With an OC increase from 35/45 clients to 100, and considering the fact that the Omicron variant is more contagious, and that during the winter the windows are closed, the filters in place at OC are NOT SCIENTIFICALLY ADEQUATE.

(C) REALITY Check 2: The "covid test" of shelter' clients is on a "volunteer basis" and in 2020 the OC nurse informed me that the # of clients accepting to be tested was ONLY 7 out of 10.

Vaccination is also in a volunteer basis, some of the **encampments dwellers who I have come to know affirmed to me that the "virus is a fake" and some went as far as affirming that "their chronic drug use made them immune to the virus"** and given their high acuity I was not able to convince them otherwise. I have witness in numerous occasions some residents of OC and dwellers of the Stinson encampments sharing cigarettes, bottles and drug paraphernalia and this is of great concern.

(C) Q. 22.1: Will the OC Air System filters be upgraded to #13?

(C) Q.22.2: Will covid testing be mandatory?

(C) Q.22.3: Will vaccination be mandatory?

(C) Q.22.4: Will the shelter clients who agree to be tested be housed in the same dormitories as those who refuse to be tested?

(C) Q.22.5: **Will be the vaccinated clients sheltered in separate dormitories from those who refuse vaccination?**

(C) Q.22.6: **Will vaccinated clients be obliged to share washrooms with the non vaccinated individuals?**

(C) Q.22.7: **Will vaccinated and non vaccinated shelter clients share common rooms, for eating or for other activities (e.g., tv, counseling rooms, crafts, etc.)?**

(C) Q.22.8: **Will Hepa filters be immediately installed in the dorms, washrooms and other shared spaces?**

(C) Q.22.9: **Will be the covid positive asymptomatic clients and the covid positive mild cases housed at Old Cathedral?**

(C) REALITY Check: **As per Dec 30 2021, a covid outbreak was declared at Old Cathedral with 8 clients infected.**

(C) Q.22.10: **If the men residents of OC were transfer to other locations at the end of the temporary men's shelter's mandate Dec 31 2021, why does Good Shepherd Cathedral Boys School still appear in the City web site as an ongoing "outbreak" on Jan 8 2022? Was the building not disinfected and renovations made in preparation for the women?**

(C) Q.22.11: **Are these 8 covid positive OC shelter clients male or female?**

(C) Q.22.12: **When did the work start to prepare for the increase of clients? Date?**

(C) Q.22.13: **When was the work to prepare OC for women's shelter completed? Date?**

(C) Q.22.14: **When will the OC temporary shelter for women open? Date?**

(HSD) Q&A pdf: **"Why is this number so high and why City Hall decided to shelter 100 persons in one single building & in one single neighborhood?"**

"The 80-100 capacity expansion of the Cathedral location is a maximum occupancy for this temporary emergency shelter location. With transitioning this location from the men's to women's system the focus is on maximizing the Cathedral location to best accommodate pressures in the shelter system. The 100 person maximum was concluded after careful consideration of the physical layout of the Cathedral location and also the impact on the surrounding community."

(C) Q.23.1: This answer does not make any sense. Perhaps **the size of any old school building is ideal for a MEGA SHELTER** but how could this be considered appropriate if **the impact on the surrounding community is taken into consideration as Housing Services affirms?**

(C) Q.23.2: **What data was collected to project the impact that any Low Barrier Mega Shelter during a pandemic will have in the surrounding community?**

(C) Q.23.3: Present the “community impact data” “and “Stinson covid data” that HSD collected and used to make the recommendation.

(HSD) Q&A pdf: **"How is the City adapting the emergency shelter system with the reality of Covid?"**

“Housing Services and community partners continue to plan for a variety of scenarios including the ongoing pandemic, a return to normal services, and many alternative scenarios. Housing Services continues to adapt to the changing situation and will respond to any changes faced within the system to do changes in the global pandemic.”

(C) NOTE 1: This answer appears trite. In reality, the City is adapting the emergency shelter system with the reality of Covid very slowly & poorly; it appears City staff are playing “catch up” instead of foreseeing and planning the future after 20 months of Covid. Scientist project that we must learn how to live with & how to manage the virus long term.

(C) Q. 24.1: Have you already planned and are you preparing other shelter locations?

(C) Q.24.2: Document “variety of scenarios”.

(C) Q.25.3: Document “many alternative scenarios”.

(C) NOTE 2: We are on the 5th wave and the 20th month of the pandemic and by now we know it may last years. We feel that City Hall staff and Good Shepherd are disingenuous when they affirm that the \$1.000.000 contract is until March 30 2022. We have a feeling that there is a clause (even if we have not seen the contract) for the Low Barrier Mega Temporary Shelter to function until June 2022... And then...???

(C) Q.24.4: This is a repeat question, please be direct: When will this new “Temporary” OC Low Barrier Mega Shelter close?

(HSD) Q&A pdf: **"46 West Ave is a location already run by Good Shephard, will it be housing any residents of the current Cathedral shelter location?"**

"The use of 46 West Ave remains fluid as we consider how best to use it as part of the emergency pandemic response. To date it has been utilized as both overflow for families entering the shelter system as well as isolation use for those that have tested positive (each use at separate times)."

(C) REALITY Check 1: **The community learned that the site was designated as a covid positive isolation site when a patient escaped by jumping from the balcony in the first week; a couple days after that 911 was called when a second clients escaped the mandatory isolation and he was “acting out” in front of the**

building and had to be restraint and removed by first responders. After that, a flyer was dropped on the ground in front of my back door, not even placed inside the front door mail box. When we made inquiries, we were told that 46 West Ave would be used as a "temporary isolation **surge site** for homeless men". Was this transparent?

Nobody mentioned then that this specific use of the site could be fluid, meaning "multiple purposes" at different times. In the sparse replies we received on the matter, we were told that the site would only be used as "a surge site" for covid positive homeless men, and that 46 West Ave. would only be used when the main self-isolation site, in another location, was full. Was this transparent?

When we asked to see the "original order" and contract and the "safety protocols" in place, we were denied but I was able to gather "un-official information". I was glad to learn that other safety measures were implemented in the site e.g., **private security and "harm reduction-safe supply"**. After the initial hiccups, we did not experience further trouble from this site; on the other hand, **the site experienced trouble from the dwellers of the Claremont Access encampment that was set up directly behind the 46 West Ave. building.**

The HSD Q&A pdf affirms that the designation for the use of 46 West Ave is fluid; or this "fluidity" was concealed from us in the summer 2021 or the original designation of 46 West Ave as a "surge isolation covid site" has been tampered with now. I request the documentation that reflects the designated use of 46 West Ave. is indeed "fluid".

(C) Q.25.1: What does "FLUID" mean? As this may include uses of the site that are detrimental for the community, give examples of other possible uses of 46 West Ave and what is the date for closing this site?

(C) Q.25.2: Who is the owner of 46 West Ave? How long is the lease? Who hold the lease, the City or Good Shepherd? How long is the contract of the City with Good Shepherd to run this location?

The community learned the present use of 46 West Ave as a family shelter by ourselves when we saw children. Was this transparent?

So far, we had not experienced problems manifesting from the use of this site as a shelter for homeless families in transition. **At the moment, we like it and support it.** It feels safer that the use of the site for the self-isolation of homeless high acuity men or sheltering high acuity persons. Still, the fact that we were not informed about the change, feels disrespectful and it adds to the mistrust we feel for City Hall.

To top this, Housing Services Division missed an opportunity to inform us of the new use of 46 West Ave during the webinar Dec 06 2021. This omission of information during the webinar supports the perception of City Hall's culture of secrecy.

(C) Q.25.2: Was their silence when we inquired about the use of 46 West Ave during the webinar ethical and transparent?

On both occasions, the surge covid positive isolation use & the homeless families' shelter use of 46 West Ave. City staff failed to exercise "courtesy" and transparency and to inform the community. In my eyes, this goes beyond lack of transparency and I feel that it constitutes arrogant behavior. This type of arrogant behavior is historically deployed by those exercising Absolute Power.

(C) Q.25.3: Were these 2 incidents of lack of communication ethical and respectful?

(C) Q.25.4: May the facts stated above contribute to prove City Hall staff culture of secrecy?

(HSD) Q&A pdf: **"Is there a plan to transition from this "temporary" location to a more permanent solution given the realities that COVID isn't going away?"**

"Yes, there will be a transition to a more permanent location. The system plan does not include a permanent emergency shelter at this location. Long term systems planning is on going"

(C) Q.26.1: **If there is indeed an ongoing plan, then when, according to this plan, will the "temporary" OC Low Barrier Mega Shelter close forever? Date?**

(C) Q.26.2: HSD Q&A: "The system plan does not include a permanent emergency shelter at this location." **This affirmation is not clear** because a shelter is a permanent shelter or an emergency shelter: Does "the systems planning" include ongoing shelters of one kind or another at this location?

(C) Q.26.3: HSD Q&A: "Long term systems planning is on going": Does this "long term system planning" include another future use of OC?

(HSD) Q&A pdf: **"Has there been any indication from Federal or Provincial Govt to invest in permanent, suitable housing solutions?"**

"The City regularly advocates for upper level government investment in the homelessness serving system and affordable housing. During the pandemic the Federal and Provincial governments have support various funding programs including Rapid Housing Initiatives, and Covid support funding that has contributed to the City's response. The City of Hamilton continues to encourage these investments to support much needed solutions to our local housing crisis.

The Federal government plan can be found here:

<https://www.placetocallhome.ca/>

(C) NOTE: Good. BUT **unfortunately this can take many years.**

(HSD) Q&A pdf: **"What can we as residents do to support the residents in the site. Are there items of need? How can we best engage to make sure this is as successful as it can be for the community and shelter residents?"**

"Residents around the temporary Cathedral shelter location are encouraged to contact Good Shephard directly around ways to donate and support the residents at this site. Furthermore residents are welcome to engage Good Shephard around ways to support the residents. Lastly the City of course encourages all neighborhood residents to approach each other in a welcoming and supportive manner."

(C) NOTE 1: During 2020-2021, I actively supported the OC staff and the staff of the covid isolation site. But I did not remain silent nor diminish the gravity of the incidents of antisocial behavior my community experienced and I supported and encouraged my neighbours to report in their own words, these incidents to City Hall while always reminding my stressed neighbors of the heroism of the shelters front line workers and the gratitude & respect they deserve and we own them.

I welcome, support and respect those people less fortunate than me yet I expect the same respect from them. The experience with some of the temporary shelter for men residents AND with some of the rough men and women of the encampments was lacking when it comes to respect flowing both ways. Unfortunately & sadly, the lack of respect from many of those high acuity persons towards the community where they took shelter was extensively documented. I personally only received respect from 2 men, "Bradley" residing at OC and "John", resident of the Claremont Access encampment.

(HSD) Q&A pdf: **"Will be the community members be barred from visiting the shelter?"**

"When the temporary shelter was first established community members were invited to visit the site prior to opening to better understand what a temporary shelter would look like. With the transition of the service from the men's system to the women's system there will not be the ability to again extend this opportunity. Community members who find themselves in need of utilizing the services of an emergency shelter are welcome to connect with the Good Shephard Centre, but due to Covid protocols and to respect those experiencing homelessness and currently accessing the supports available through the Good Shephard Centres no visits or tours will be available of the facility at this time."

(C) CORRECTION: **Councillor Nann was invited to tour the temporary OC shelter for men prior to its opening, and she did so without risk to her health and life.** GS invitation to the community was delayed until after the opening of the shelter and it took a lot of courage to accept it then because the vaccine did not exist yet and my health is fragile. If I was invited then, and if I follow the same strict Covid protocols, I should not be barred now.

(C) NOTE 1: We were told during the webinar Dec 06 2021, that there will be a period of time after the men are relocated and the shelter is prepared for the women. Therefore, if I abide by strict covid safety protocols:

(C) Q. 27.1: **Why are representatives of the community barred from inspecting the shelter before the new clients arrive?**

(C) Q.27.2: **What are Good Shepherd and HSD hiding?**

(C) Q.27.3: Does barring the community from inspecting the shelter BEFORE the new clients arrive infringe on the shelter's clients privacy?

(C) Q.27.4: Did my guided tour of Old Cathedral and of the Mary St. shelter infringe on the rights of privacy of the clients who were *in situ*?

(C) Q.27.5: Does this refusal constitute "transparency" or good will?

(C) Q.27.6: Will it not be a positive thing to engage with the community at this minimal level?

(C) NOTE 2: I was one of the only 2 women who had the courage to accept the invitation to inspect OC when it was already in use and there were unvaccinated clients *in situ* and I was not vaccinated. I also was invited to inspect Mary St Good Shepherd men's shelter and I did (alone). I was in full covid gear, mask shield, head cover and cover-ups. This tour was seminal in my appreciation of the courage and professionalism of the GS front line staff. This became extremely helpful to Staff when "troubles" outside OC manifested.

(C) REQUEST: **I have received my BOOSTER SHOOT and I request to inspect how OC is being prepared for the increased number of clients. I would much prefer, given the RISK TO MY HEALTH, to inspect the building before the new 100 clients are brought in. I believe, and share this belief with others in my community, that this is important. I consider that to make the effort to inspect the new adaptations of the building for 100 clients is my civil duty and since there is a precedent and there is no valid reason to bar me from it, I expect to be invited very soon. Director Saliccioli is my witness that my report of the tour 2020 was fair and useful and the community trusts my attention to detail.**

(C) Q.27.7: **Is it fair to bar me now?**

(HSD) Q&A pdf: **"Will Good Shephard increase to 24/7 the security patrols? Will the security increase to a 5-block radius around the temporary shelter location?"**

"Enhanced security has been contemplated for the site however details of this are still being finalized."

(C) REALITY Check 1: **It is the City's obligation to protect my neighborhood, my family and my safety and security, as it is enshrined in the Charter of Rights, especially when it is the City's actions that jeopardize our safety and security.**

(C) Q. 28.1: **Do you understand that the enhanced security 5 blocks radius, 24/7, is not a suggestion, but a condition in the case that the City goes ahead with this ill conceived & unprecedented Low Barrier Mega Shelter plan? Is this demanded condition to protect our security and safety fair?**

(C) REALITY Check 2: It took many months for Good Shepherd to contract only NIGHT security to patrol the 1-2 block vicinity of OC.

(C) Q. 28. 2: Will the City provide 24/7 for a 5-block radius as soon as the Mega Shelter opens?

(C) Q. 28.3: Or will Good Shepherd provide the 24/7 security for the 5-block radius?

Since "lower cost" is the main City argument to open a Mega Shelter:

(C) REALITY Check 3: I was informed by the gentlemen in charge of the renovations at 40 West Ave that the cost to hire Paladin Security to protect the building until the Claremont Access encampment was cleared following the encampment fire, was \$10,000.00/per month.

(C) Q.28.4: What is the monthly cost for the outdoor security for 46 West Ave?

(C) Q. 28.5: What is the monthly cost of the OC security that Good Shepherd contracted for the immediate vicinity of OC?

(C) Q.28.6: What will be the monthly cost to hire a fair 24/7, OC -5 block radius security?

(HSD) Q&A pdf: **"Will the City host another public meeting on this temporary shelter location?"**

"Housing Services will be promoting and hosting another public meeting in the first quarter of 2022 on the transition of this location from a men's system emergency shelter to a shelter serving the women's, trans, and non-binary community.

This meeting on the temporary Cathedral shelter location will be planned by City staff with every attempt made to provide a reasonable amount of notice and to utilize a diverse range of communication methods."

(C) REALITY Check: **We were told Dec 06 2021 that this meeting will take place in Jan 2022.** Now Housing Services back tracks and offers a vague "first quarter", which may mean the end of March. **This change is not acceptable.**

(C) Q.29: Will Housing Services organize the NEXT meeting before Jan 30 2022 as promised?

Attentively,

Carmen

PS: Can HSD Staff please stop using the spelling Good **Shephard**? It is annoying for me as a reader. The correct spelling of the name of this organization is Good **Shepherd**.

Addendum I & II

Addendum I : The Nov 28 2021 Ontario emergency orders and the questions I pose. As it is difficult for an average elder to comprehend all the ramifications of this legislature, I request that City Hall staff explains how it applies to the present case.

Addendum II: The CTV article November 23 2021 explains simply to the average citizen, the implications of the extended government powers in a manner that we can understand. And the questions I pose.

ADDENDUM I

(C) Q 1 Addendum I: Considering that the "Current consolidated laws are usually current to the e-Laws currency date. **Today, January 9, 2022 the e-Laws currency date is November 28, 2021.**" are Hamilton City Hall HSD staff in their Q&A pdf invoking the **Reopening Ontario (A Flexible Response to COVID-19) Act, 2020 to open a NEW TEMPORARY EMERGENCY SHELTER FOR WOMEN AT the OLD CATHEDRAL BOYS SCHOOL LOCATION?**

(C) Q 2 Addendum I: **If the men who were housed at the "temporary emergency shelter for men" at OC, have been/ are being moved to other existing locations, does this mean that the June 2020 EOC emergency order mandate to open the temporary emergency shelter for MEN was completed?**

(C) Q 3 Addendum I: **Is the order to open a "temporary emergency shelter for women" a different order that the June 2020 EOC order to open a "temporary emergency shelter for men" in the said location? How can this be justified under the Ontario emergency order Nov 28 2021?**

(C) Q 4 Addendum I: **I read in the Nov 28 2021 Ontario Emergency Order, that it applies to Long term care facilities. Does a "temporary emergency shelter " constitute long term care"?**

(C) Q 5 Addendum I: **If most of the 100 women who the City intends to move to the new OC LOW BARRIER temporary emergency shelter are presently housed in hotels and other shelters, is there an "emergency need" to stretch the boundaries of the power of the "emergency order" to open this NEW shelter?**

(C) Q 6 Addendum I: **There are a few women still dwelling in now illegal encampments. e.g. the couple dwelling at Myrtle Park. Was this woman offered an hotel room or shelter and she declined the offer? or was she told to wait because the new "low barrier shelter" was about to open?**

Reopening Ontario (A Flexible Response to COVID-19) Act, 2020

[S.o. 2020, chapter 17](#)

Consolidation Period: From October 1, 2020 to the [e-Laws currency date](#).

Last amendment: [2020, c. 23, Sched. 6](#).

CONTENTS

[Interpretation](#)

[1.](#) Definitions

[Orders](#)

[2.](#) Orders continued

[3.](#) Time limit on application of orders

[4.](#) Power to amend orders

[5.](#) Power to revoke orders

[6.](#) Delegation of powers

[7.](#) Provisions applying with respect to orders

[8.](#) Expiry of power to amend, extend orders

[Enforcement](#)

[9.](#) Proceedings to restrain contravention of order

[9.1](#) Temporary closure by police, etc.

[10.](#) Offences

[10.1](#) Offence for occupier of premises

[Reporting](#)

[11.](#) Reports to public

[12.](#) Reports to Assembly committee at 30-day intervals

[13.](#) Report to Assembly after one year

[General](#)

[14.](#) Protection from action

[15.](#) Action not an expropriation

[16.](#) Crown bound

[17.](#) Termination of COVID-19 declared emergency

Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, enacts as follows:

Interpretation

Definitions

1 In this Act,

“continued section 7.0.2 order” means an order continued under section 2 that was made under section 7.0.2 of the *Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act*; (“décret pris en vertu de l’article 7.0.2 et maintenu”)

“COVID-19 declared emergency” means the emergency declared pursuant to Order in Council 518/2020 (Ontario Regulation 50/20) on March 17, 2020 pursuant to section 7.0.1 of the *Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act*. (“situation d’urgence déclarée en raison de la COVID-19”)

“occupier” has the same meaning as in the *Trespass to Property Act*; (“occupant”)

“premises” has the same meaning as in the *Trespass to Property Act*. (“lieux”) 2020, c. 17, s. 1; 2020, c. 23, Sched. 6, s. 1.

Section Amendments with date in force (d/m/y)

Orders

Orders continued

2 (1) The orders made under section 7.0.2 or 7.1 of the *Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act* that have not been revoked as of the day this subsection comes into force are continued as valid and effective orders under this Act and cease to be orders under the *Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act*.

Exception

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply to the order filed as Ontario Regulation 106/20 (Order Made Under the Act — Extensions and Renewals of Orders).

Clarification

(3) For greater certainty, an order that is in force is continued under subsection (1) even if, on the day that subsection comes into force, the order does not apply to any area of the Province.

Time limit on application of orders

3 (1) An order continued under section 2 ceases to apply 30 days after it is continued under section 2, subject to extension under subsection (2).

Extension of orders

(2) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may by order, before it ceases to apply, extend the effective period of an order for periods of no more than 30 days.

Power to amend orders

4 (1) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may, by order,

(a) subject to subsections (2) and (5), amend a continued section 7.0.2 order in a way that would have been authorized under section 7.0.2 of the *Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act* if the COVID-19 declared emergency were still in effect and references in that section to the emergency were references to the COVID-19 pandemic and its effects;

(b) amend an order continued under section 2 to address transitional matters relating to the termination of the COVID-19 declared emergency, the enactment of this Act or the continuation of orders under section 2.

Limitation on amendments

(2) An amendment may be made under clause (1) (a) only if,

(a) the amendment relates to one or more of the subject matters listed in subsection (3); or

(b) the amendment requires persons to act in compliance with any advice, recommendation or instruction of a public health official.

Same

(3) The subject matters referred to in clause (2) (a) are the following:

1. Closing or regulating any place, whether public or private, including any business, office, school, hospital or other establishment or institution.

2. Providing for rules or practices that relate to workplaces or the management of workplaces, or authorizing the person responsible for a workplace to identify staffing priorities or to develop, modify and implement redeployment plans or rules or practices that relate to the workplace or the management of the workplace, including credentialing processes in a health care facility.

3. Prohibiting or regulating gatherings or organized public events.

Definition of “credentialing process”

(4) In paragraph 2 of subsection (3),

“credentialing process” means the activities, processes, procedures and proceedings for appointing and reappointing health care staff and determining the nature and scope of privileges assigned to them.

Orders that may not be amended

(5) Amendments may not be made under clause (1) (a) to the following orders:

1. Ontario Regulation 75/20 (Drinking Water Systems and Sewage Works).
2. Ontario Regulation 76/20 (Electronic Service).
3. Ontario Regulation 80/20 (Electricity Price for RPP Consumers).
4. Ontario Regulation 114/20 (Enforcement of Orders).
5. Ontario Regulation 120/20 (Order Under Subsection 7.0.2 (4) of the Act — Access to COVID-19 Status Information by Specified Persons).
6. Ontario Regulation 129/20 (Signatures in Wills and Powers of Attorney).
7. Ontario Regulation 132/20 (Use of Force and Firearms in Policing Services).
8. Ontario Regulation 141/20 (Temporary Health or Residential Facilities).
9. Ontario Regulation 190/20 (Access to Personal Health Information by Means of the Electronic Health Record).
10. Ontario Regulation 192/20 (Certain Persons Enabled to Issue Medical Certificates of Death).
11. Ontario Regulation 210/20 (Management of Long-Term Care Homes in Outbreak).
12. Ontario Regulation 240/20 (Management of Retirement Homes in Outbreak).
13. Ontario Regulation 241/20 (Special Rules Re Temporary Pandemic Pay).
14. Ontario Regulation 345/20 (Patios).

Amendments may change requirements, extend application

(6) For greater certainty, an amendment made under clause (1) (a) may do the following, subject to subsection (2):

1. Impose more onerous or different requirements, including in different parts of the Province.
2. Extend the application of the order being amended, including the geographic scope of the order and the persons it applies to.

Amendments may be retroactive

(7) An amendment, if it so provides, may be retroactive to a date specified in the amending order that is on or after the day subsection (1) came into force.

Regulations to define “public health official”

(8) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations defining “public health official” for the purposes of clause (2) (b).

Power to revoke orders

5 The Lieutenant Governor in Council may by order revoke an order continued under section 2.

Delegation of powers

6 The Lieutenant Governor in Council may by order delegate to a minister of the Crown any of the powers of the Lieutenant Governor in Council under section 3, 4 or 5.

Provisions applying with respect to orders

7 (1) Subsections 7.2 (3) to (8) of the *Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act* continue to apply, with necessary modifications, with respect to orders continued under section 2, including any amendments to such orders made under this Act.

Same

(2) Subsections 7.0.2 (6) to (9) of the *Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act* continue to apply, with necessary modifications and the modifications specified in subsection (3), with respect to continued section 7.0.2 orders, including any amendments to such orders made under this Act.

Modifications

(3) The modifications referred to in subsection (2) are the following:

1. The reference, in paragraph 1 of subsection 7.0.2 (7) of the *Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act*, to the emergency is deemed to be a reference to the COVID-19 pandemic and its effects.
2. The reference, in paragraph 2 of subsection 7.0.2 (7) of the *Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act*, to when the declared emergency is terminated is deemed to be a reference to when the order in relation to which that paragraph applies is revoked or ceases to apply.

Expiry of power to amend, extend orders

8 (1) The following powers cease to apply on the first anniversary of the day orders are continued under section 2:

1. The power under subsection 3 (2) to extend orders.
2. The power under section 4 to amend orders.

Extension by Assembly resolution

(2) The Assembly, on the recommendation of the Premier, may by resolution extend the expiry date mentioned in subsection (1) for additional periods of no more than one year.

Same

(3) If there is a resolution before the Assembly to extend the expiry date, the powers listed in subsection (1) shall continue until the resolution is voted on.

Effect of orders after expiry of power to amend, extend

(4) An order extended under subsection 3 (2) continues in effect until the date to which it was extended, even if that date is after the time the powers listed in subsection (1) cease to apply, unless it is revoked before that date.

Enforcement

Proceedings to restrain contravention of order

9 Despite any other remedy or any penalty, the contravention by any person of a continued section 7.0.2 order may be restrained by order of a judge of the Superior Court of Justice upon application without notice by the Crown in right of Ontario or a member of the Executive Council and the judge may make the order and it may be enforced in the same manner as any other order or judgment of the Superior Court of Justice.

Temporary closure by police, etc.

9.1 (1) A police officer, special constable or First Nations Constable may order that premises be temporarily closed if the police officer, special constable or First Nations Constable has reasonable grounds to believe that an organized public event or other gathering is occurring at the premises and that the number of people in attendance exceeds the number permitted under a continued section 7.0.2 order. 2020, c. 23, Sched. 6, s. 2.

Compliance with order

(2) Every individual who is on the premises shall comply with the order to temporarily close the premises by promptly vacating the premises after being informed of the order. 2020, c. 23, Sched. 6, s. 2.

Same

(3) No individual shall re-enter the premises on the same day that the premises were temporarily closed under subsection (1) unless a police officer, special constable or First Nations Constable authorizes the re-entry. 2020, c. 23, Sched. 6, s. 2.

Exception for residents

(4) Subsections (2) and (3) do not apply to individuals residing in the premises. 2020, c. 23, Sched. 6, s. 2.

Section Amendments with date in force (d/m/y)

Offences

10 (1) Every person who fails to comply with subsection 9.1 (2) or (3) or with a continued section 7.0.2 order or who interferes with or obstructs any person in the exercise of a power or the performance of a duty conferred by such an order is guilty of an offence and is liable on conviction,

(a) in the case of an individual, subject to clause (b), to a fine of not more than \$100,000 and for a term of imprisonment of not more than one year;

(b) in the case of an individual who is a director or officer of a corporation, to a fine of not more than \$500,000 and for a term of imprisonment of not more than one year; and

(c) in the case of a corporation, to a fine of not more than \$10,000,000. 2020, c. 17, s. 10 (1); 2020, c. 23, Sched. 6, s. 3.

Separate offence

(2) A person is guilty of a separate offence on each day that an offence under subsection (1) occurs or continues. 2020, c. 17, s. 10 (2).

Increased penalty

(3) Despite the maximum fines set out in subsection (1), the court that convicts a person of an offence may increase a fine imposed on the person by an amount equal to the financial benefit that was acquired by or that accrued to the person as a result of the commission of the offence. 2020, c. 17, s. 10 (3).

Exception

(4) No person shall be charged with an offence under subsection (1) for failing to comply with or interference or obstruction in respect of an order that has been amended retroactive to a date that is specified in the amendment, if the failure to comply, interference or obstruction is in respect of conduct to which the retroactive amendment applies and the conduct occurred before the retroactive amendment was made but after the retroactive date specified in the amendment. 2020, c. 17, s. 10 (4).

Section Amendments with date in force (d/m/y)

Offence for occupier of premises

10.1 (1) A person is guilty of an offence if the person hosts or organizes a public event or other gathering at residential premises or other prescribed premises and the number of people in attendance exceeds the number permitted under a continued section 7.0.2 order. 2020, c. 23, Sched. 6, s. 4.

Presumption that owner, etc. is hosting or organizing

(2) If the owner or occupier of premises at which a public event or other gathering is held is present at the event or gathering, the owner or occupier is presumed, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, to be hosting or organizing the event or gathering. 2020, c. 23, Sched. 6, s. 4.

Penalties

(3) A person who is convicted of an offence under subsection (1) is liable,

(a) in the case of an individual, subject to clause (b), to a fine of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 and for a term of imprisonment of not more than one year;

(b) in the case of an individual who is a director or officer of a corporation, to a fine of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$500,000 and for a term of imprisonment of not more than one year; and

(c) in the case of a corporation, to a fine of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$10,000,000. 2020, c. 23, Sched. 6, s. 4.

Applicable provisions

(4) Subsections 10 (2) to (4) apply, with necessary modifications, with respect to offences under subsection (1). 2020, c. 23, Sched. 6, s. 4.

Regulations

(5) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations prescribing premises for the purposes of subsection (1). 2020, c. 23, Sched. 6, s. 4.

Section Amendments with date in force (d/m/y)

Reporting

Reports to public

11 The Premier, or a Minister to whom the Premier delegates the responsibility, shall regularly report to the public with respect to the orders continued under section 2 that continue to apply.

Reports to Assembly committee at 30-day intervals

12 At least once every 30 days, the Premier, or a Minister to whom the Premier delegates the responsibility, shall appear before, and report to, a standing or select committee designated by the Assembly concerning,

- (a) orders that were extended during the reporting period; and
- (b) the rationale for those extensions.

Report to Assembly after one year

13 (1) Within 120 days after the first anniversary of the day orders are continued under section 2, the Premier shall table a report in the Assembly concerning,

- (a) orders that were amended under this Act;
- (b) orders that were extended under this Act; and
- (c) the rationale for those amendments and extensions, including how any applicable conditions and limitations on the making of the amendments were satisfied.

Report, if extension under s. 8

(2) If the expiry date mentioned in subsection 8 (1) is extended under section 8, the Premier shall, within 120 days after the end of each extension period, table an additional report in the Assembly concerning,

- (a) the rationale for recommending the extension;
- (b) orders that were amended during the extension period;
- (c) orders that were extended during the extension period; and
- (d) the rationale for those amendments and extensions, including how any applicable conditions and limitations on the making of the amendments were satisfied.

General

Protection from action

14 Section 11 of the *Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act* applies, with necessary modifications, with respect to orders continued, amended, extended or revoked under this Act.

Action not an expropriation

15 (1) Section 13.1 of the *Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act* applies, with necessary modifications and the modification specified in subsection (2), with respect to this Act and orders continued, amended, extended or revoked under this Act.

Modification

(2) The modification referred to in subsection (1) is the following:

1. The reference, in subsection 13.1 (2) of the *Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act*, to the emergency is deemed to be a reference to the COVID-19 pandemic and its effects.

Crown bound

16 This Act binds the Crown.

Termination of COVID-19 declared emergency

17 Unless it has been terminated before this section comes into force, the COVID-19 declared emergency is terminated and Ontario Regulation 50/20 (Declaration of Emergency) is revoked.

18 Omitted (provides for coming into force of provisions of this Act).

19 Omitted (enacts short title of this Act).

ADDENDUM II

CTV News November 23, 2021:

"Ontario has extended the government's power to keep all emergency orders in place under the Reopening Ontario Act until March 2022.

The emergency orders, which were set to expire on Dec. 1, will be extended after a motion by Solicitor General Sylvia Jones was passed at Queen's Park on Tuesday.

The motion gives the Doug Ford government the power to extend emergency orders until March 28. Each order under the ROA must be extended by cabinet in 30-day increments.

A spokesperson for Jones told CTV News Toronto the extension of emergency powers aligns with the government's plan to lift all remaining COVID-19 restrictions by March.

Without extending the ROA, all public health measures currently in place would have expired on Dec. 1.

There are currently 28 orders in effect under the reopening act, including the proof of vaccination system.

The ROA gives the government the power to implement rules on public gatherings, business closures and managing outbreaks in hospitals or long-term care homes.

Earlier this month, Ontario paused the next step of the reopening plan because of an increase in COVID-19 cases.

On Nov. 15, capacity limits were supposed to be lifted in remaining high-risk settings where proof of vaccination is required.

That step was been delayed at least 28 days.

The next step of the reopening plan, which is scheduled for Jan. 17, would see capacity limits gradually lifted in places where proof of vaccination is not required. The province's vaccine certificate system could also be gradually lifted at this time.

On Feb. 7, the government plans to lift proof of vaccination requirements in high-risk settings, including night clubs, strip clubs, bathhouses and sex clubs.

On March 28, Ontario plans on lifting the remaining public health measures, including wearing face coverings in door public settings. Proof of vaccination would also be lifted for all settings.

Ontario MPP Gurratan Singh, critic for the Attorney General, told CTV News Toronto in a statement he has "serious concerns" about the extension of the emergency orders.

"The NDP has serious concerns about what Doug Ford could use these powers to do, such as further cuts to important services and more backroom decisions that serve Ford and his developer buddies, not the public interest."

ADDENDUM II Questions:

(C) Q 1 Addendum II: Do Ontario MPP Gurratan Singh's concerns about how the emergency powers could be use for "backroom decisions" mirror the City of Hamilton process to mandate the new "temporary emergency shelter for women" at OC?

(C) Q 2 Addendum II : Do Ontario MPP Gurratan Singh's concerns about how the emergency powers could be used for cuts to important services, mirror the City Hamilton plan to open now a new "temporary emergency shelter" for ONE HUNDRED women because the City claims that this is a "cost cutting measure"?

(C) Q 3 Addendum II: Upon reading the "reader's digest" article CTV News November 23, 2021, I have the impression that the emergency order addresses the need to extend heath protocols e.g. mask use; vaccination proof; limitation of the number of patrons in restaurants, gymnasiums; limitation of visitors to the long care homes and so on. I did not read anything that reflected the City emergency power to open a "new temporary emergency shelter at OC" . I am wrong