

Designated Encampment Sites Consultation Results

Background

The City undertook a two-phase consultation process to inform the development of recommendations related to designated encampment sites. The first phase was in late 2025 and focused on engagement with front-line services providers, Indigenous leadership and community organizations, and people with lived experience, as directed by the City's *10-Part Enhanced Encampment Response Plan* (10-Part Plan). Building on this foundation, the second phase in March 2026 both deepened engagement with these same groups and expanded outreach to include additional perspectives, such as the broader community and local businesses.

Together, these efforts reflect a wide range of qualitative and quantitative feedback on site locations, potential impacts, safety considerations, and service suggestions. This feedback has informed staff analysis and shaped the recommendations being brought forward to Council, with the sections below providing more detailed summaries of each engagement activity and the key themes that emerged.

Phase One Consultation – 2025

In alignment with the 10-Part Plan's direction to collaborate with community partners, people with lived and living experience, and Indigenous leaders and representative organizations on designated sites, Administration engaged with the stakeholders below in December 2025:

- 50 people with lived and living experience of encampments;
- 33 front-line workers participating in the local Outreach Workers Network; and
- 18 community partners, including Indigenous leaders and representative organizations, involved in direct encampment-related service delivery.

People with Lived and Living Experience

The City engaged directly with approximately 50 people with lived and living experience of homelessness and encampments, facilitated by the City's Encampment Response Team. Outreach was conducted in person through existing connections, including engagement while riding the Care Bus, allowing participation that was accessible and grounded in lived experience.

Generally, access to nearby supports, ease of movement, and personal safety were top priorities. Areas situated closer to services were generally seen as more workable for meeting daily needs, while more remote locations were described as creating added challenges. At the same time, some participants expressed a preference for more secluded settings, noting that increased privacy can contribute to a greater sense of comfort and dignity.

Front-line Workers

The City engaged with 33 front-line outreach workers through an online survey distributed primarily via the Outreach Workers' Network and by attending an Outreach Workers' Network meeting for direct engagement. This engagement captured perspective from workers with direct, day-to-day experience supporting people living in encampments, providing practical insight into site considerations, safety issues, and service delivery needs.

Overall, participants emphasized that proximity to services, accessibility, and safety are the most critical factors to consider when identifying designated encampments. Locations closer to existing service and social support networks were generally viewed as more feasible from a service delivery perspective, while sites further removed from supports were identified as presenting additional challenges.

Service Providers and Indigenous Leadership

In December 2025, City staff convened an in-person facilitated engagement session with representatives from eighteen community organizations, with director-level or equivalent participation from Indigenous leadership and agencies providing direct services to people living in encampments. The feedback summarized below reflects the input related to the early site review, as well as discussion on services and supports required to make designated sites safe and functional.

Feedback from this session also contributed to refining and validating the Guiding Criteria for site selection, which were subsequently presented to and approved by City Council. Participants reiterated key priorities such as proximity to services and transit, access to sanitation and outreach support, operational and emergency access, compatibility with surrounding land uses, and the importance of safety, dignity, and manageable site size. While this input helped confirm the overall criteria framework, the primary focus of the session was applying the criteria to a set of early potential locations, all of which were carried forward into the most recent round of consultation, with one additional site added at that later stage.

Participants reviewed the early identified sites through an operational and lived-experience lens, highlighting relative strengths, risks, and trade-offs rather than

expressing final preferences. Sites that were already established or located near clusters of services – such as Freedom Park and Simpson Street – were recognized for their accessibility, proximity to outreach and health supports, and familiarity to both service providers and people currently living in encampments. At the same time, concerns were raised regarding safety, visibility, proximity to rail infrastructure and busy roadways, accessibility for people with mobility challenges, noise, and potential conflicts with nearby public uses or events. Other locations, including parks or more isolated areas, were viewed as presenting challenges related to distance from services, lack of infrastructure, or heavy competing recreational use.

Across all sites, participants consistently emphasized that the success of designated encampments depends on the availability of coordinated services and support. There was strong agreement on the need for access to sanitation infrastructure (washrooms, showers, garbage collection, potable water), harm reduction supplies, medical and mental health outreach, cultural supports, and clear, reliable mechanisms for contacting emergency services. Participants also stressed the importance of coordinated service delivery among agencies to reduce duplication, improve safety for both residents and workers, and for enhancing consistency. Many noted that designated encampments should be understood as temporary, harm-reduction responses within a broader housing crisis, with careful attention to language, dignity and community impact.

Phase Two Consultation – 2026

Building on 2025's efforts, the City deepened and broadened consultation. These expanded efforts, presented in alphabetical order, included surveys seeking input on six potential designated encampment sites from:

- Members of the broader community, including business owners through targeted survey questions;
- People with lived and living experience of homelessness; and
- Staff of homelessness service providers.

Activities also included a public drop-in session, and targeted outreach to companies and business representative organizations. The City also promoted and collected open feedback via its Encampment Response Office email at encampments@thunderbay.ca.

Across all surveys, the response rate was over 1000. This level of participation represents one of the highest response rates across recent City survey engagement efforts. While results are not statistically significant and should be interpreted with caution, each response has been carefully reviewed and considered. The feedback reflects a range of perspectives from those who chose to participate and has been considered alongside technical analysis and policy considerations to inform staff analysis and recommendations.

Survey Results – Broader Community

The broader community survey was available from March 2 to March 15, 2026. It was administered online through the City’s Get Involved platform, with paper copies also available at City Hall and all four branches of the Thunder Bay Public Library. A total of 864 surveys were completed. A high-level overview of key findings is presented below.

Postal Code Distribution

Respondents were asked to provide their postal code (optional) to help understand how perspectives may vary across different areas of the city. This information was analyzed to explore whether levels of agreement with each site differed geographically.

A total of 641 respondents provided a postal code. The distribution is summarized below:

- 26% of respondents did not provide a postal code
- P7A – 24% (generally north and northeast areas)
- P7C – 23% (generally south-central areas)
- P7B – 11% (generally central and north-central areas)
- P7E – 9% (generally south-central and southern areas)
- P7G, P7J, & P7K – 7% (generally semi-rural and rural areas)
- P0T & B1P – suppressed due to low response rate

Analysis indicates a general pattern where respondents expressed lower levels of agreement with sites located closer to their area of residence, and higher levels of agreement with sites located farther away.

For example, the Current River Park Site (north side) received lower agreement from respondents in northern postal codes (28% in P7A and 31% in P7B), compared to higher agreement from respondents in southern postal codes (65% in P7C and 53% in P7E).

A similar pattern was observed for the Simpson Site (south side), where agreement was lower among respondents in southern postal codes (56% in P7C and 46% in P7E), and higher among respondents in northern postal codes (76% in P7A and 67% in P7B). This pattern was generally consistent across sites, except for *Site E – McKellar & Vickers*, which had lower levels of agreement across all postal code groups.

Indigenous Identity

Respondents were asked (optionally) if they identify as Indigenous, recognizing that Indigenous peoples are overrepresented among those experiencing homelessness and

living in encampments in Thunder Bay. This information was used to explore whether perspectives on potential sites differed based on Indigenous identity.

A total of 62 respondents identified as Indigenous. Analysis did not identify any meaningful differences in levels of agreement or disagreement between respondents who identified as Indigenous and those who did not. Differences observed across sites were 10% or less.

Levels of Agreement by Site

Respondents were required to indicate their level of agreement with each potential site. This question was mandatory to ensure consistent feedback across all locations and to allow for direct comparison of responses between sites. Results are summarized below based on combined agreement (agree/somewhat agree) and disagreement (somewhat disagree/disagree).

- The Kam River Heritage Park Site and Simpson Site received the highest levels of agreement (61% and 61%, respectively) and lowest levels of disagreement (32% and 30%, respectively).
- The Current River Park Site (42% agreement; 51% disagreement) and Island Dive Park Site (38% agreement; 49% disagreement) received mixed responses.
- The Freedom Park Site received lower levels of agreement (34%) and higher levels of disagreement (59%).
- The McKellar & Vickers Site received the lowest level of agreement (21%) and the highest level of disagreement (64%).

Neutral responses ranged from 7% to 15% across all sites, indicating that most respondents expressed a clear position.

Summary of Site-Specific Comments

Respondents also had an optional opportunity to provide comments on each site. A total of 2639 comments were received, averaging 449 comments per site. Open-ended responses underwent a codified analysis.

Overall, feedback reflects that perceived proximity to services, nearby land uses, and potential impacts on public space were the most influential factors shaping views.

- Sites with higher levels of agreement (Kam River Heritage Park and Simpson) were more often described as having good access to services, fewer impacts on surrounding uses, and existing encampment activity that suggests feasibility.
- Sites with lower levels of agreement (Freedom Park and McKellar & Vickers) were more frequently associated with proximity to sensitive uses (e.g., residential

areas, tourism, or businesses), concerns about public space impacts, and overall site suitability.

- Sites with more mixed responses (Current River Park and Island Drive Park) raised a broader range of concerns, including distance from services, environmental conditions, and proximity to schools, recreation areas, or residential neighborhoods.

Across all sites, respondents consistently identified the need for clear management measures, including waste management, physical separation (e.g., fencing), and defined rules.

A portion of comments reflected broader views on encampments, including general opposition to encampments, preference for alternative solutions (e.g., housing or shelter), and beliefs that encampments lack cleanliness and order.

Ranking of Sites (Strongest to Weakest)

Respondents were required to rank all six sites from strongest to weakest based on overall preference. This approach supports each site being considered relative to the others and allows for consistent comparison across responses. The sites were ranked as follows, showing consistency with the level of agreement results:

1. Site F – Simpson
2. Site D – Kam River Heritage Park
3. Site C – Island Drive Park
4. Site A – Current River Park
5. Site B – Freedom Park
6. Site E – McKellar & Vickers

Summary of Open Comments

At the end of the survey, respondents were provided with an opportunity to share additional comments. A total of 494 responses were reviewed and coded into key themes to identify common perspectives and areas of concern.

Because individual responses could raise more than one issue, comments were coded across multiple themes where applicable. As such, the percentages below reflect the proportion of coded responses within each theme, not the proportion of all 494 survey responses.

Several consistent themes emerged:

- **Sentiment toward designated encampments (120 coded responses):** A majority of sentiment-related comments expressed opposition (54%), while

smaller proportions reflected support (9%) or support with concerns (2%). A fifth expressed a preference for existing encampment locations (20%).

- **Location and land use compatibility (157 coded responses):** Nearly half of coded responses related to proximity to sensitive uses (48%), followed by impacts on businesses and tourism (27%).
- **Safety and security concerns (98 coded responses):** Most comments referenced general health and safety (58%), followed by safety of vulnerable populations (32%) and crime-related concerns (22%).
- **Community and neighbourhood impacts (74 coded responses):** The majority of comments related to cleanliness, garbage, sanitation, and discarded paraphernalia (65%), with 38% referencing neighbourhood disruption.
- **Service access and infrastructure (45 coded responses):** Most comments emphasized that access to services such as health supports, outreach, and transit is important (91%).
- **Philosophical or policy perspectives (194 coded responses):** The largest number of comments referenced alternative solutions such as housing, shelter, or treatment (36%) and the need to address root causes (28%).
- **Suggestions and mitigation (69 coded responses):** Comments most often referenced policy or process measures (41%) and infrastructure improvements (38%).

Additional comments included site-specific feedback, suggested alternative locations, and broader considerations such as trust in decision-making, urgency, and communication.

Business Owner Insights

A total of 109 respondents identified as business owners or operators, of which 61 respondents (55%) reported concerns about a site impacting their business.

Of the 61 respondents, when asked to identify all sites causing concern (select all that apply), the Freedom Park Site (50%) was most frequently identified, followed by Kam River Heritage Park Site (40%), Simpson Site (38%), McKellar & Vickers Site (36%), Current River Park Site (36%), and Island Drive Park Site (24%).

Across all sites, concerns were consistent in nature. The most frequently identified concerns were crime (95% average), property maintenance (91% average), and customer perceptions (85% average). Employee safety (82% average) and property value impacts (74% average) were also regularly noted.

Respondents were also asked to identify what would help address their concerns (select all that apply). A notable finding is that a significant portion of the 61 respondents indicated that no measures would address their concerns, particularly for the Simpson Site (73%), Island Drive Park Site (71%), Current River Park Site (67%), and Kam River Heritage Park Site (65%). Where mitigation measures were identified, the most frequently selected supports were regular monitoring (31% average), enhanced cleanliness (29% average), and security features (28% average).

Survey Results - People with Lived and Living Experience of Homelessness

In parallel to the broader community survey, a paper-based survey was conducted with people with lived and living experience of homelessness (PWLLE). It was administered in person by the City's Encampment Response Team to support informed participation. The team initially sought to engage individuals directly at encampment locations during daytime hours. However, as individuals were often not present, the approach was adapted to improve access to meaningful participation. To that end, the team conducted surveys at homelessness service organizations, including the Salvation Army and Dew Drop Inn on the north side, and PACE, Grace Place, and Shelter House on the south side.

A total of 92 surveys were completed. Of those who participated, 66% reported direct experience living in an encampment, while 34% did not. In addition, 57% of respondents identified as Indigenous and 44% as non-Indigenous. Analysis did not identify any significant variation in responses based on Indigenous identity.

Levels of Agreement by Site

Results from PWLLE respondents are summarized below based on combined agreement (agree/somewhat agree) and disagreement (somewhat disagree/disagree).

- The Current River Park Site received the highest level of agreement (79%) and the lowest level of disagreement (20%).
- The Simpson Site also received strong support (71% agreement; 25% disagreement).
- The Freedom Park Site and McKellar & Vickers Site each received 66% agreement, with disagreement at 32% and 26%, respectively.
- The Kam River Heritage Park Site received 62% agreement and 33% disagreement.
- The Island Drive Park Site received more mixed responses, with 48% agreement and 46% disagreement.

Overall, PWLLE responses show majority agreement across most sites, with more mixed perspectives for the Island Drive Park site. Compared to broader community

responses, PWLLE respondents generally expressed higher levels of agreement and lower levels of disagreement across most sites.

Summary of Site-Specific Comments

Open-ended, site-specific comments from PWLLE respondents were reviewed and coded into key themes. Response volumes were low across most categories. Therefore, findings are presented at a high level.

Comments most often related to access to social supports and services, with the Kam River Heritage Park and Simpson sites viewed more positively, and the Current River Park and Island Drive Park sites more frequently identified as being farther from services. Some feedback also referenced safety considerations (including environmental conditions and proximity to infrastructure) and site suitability.

Generally, PWLLE commentary focused on practical considerations related to access and site conditions, with limited and varied input across other themes.

Ranking of Sites (Strongest to Weakest)

PWLLE respondents were asked to rank all six sites from strongest to weakest based on overall preference. Based on average rankings, sites were ordered as follows:

1. Site A – Current River Park
2. Site B – Freedom Park
3. Site F – Simpson
4. Site D – Kam River Heritage Park
5. Site E – McKellar & Vickers
6. Site C – Island Drive Park.

Compared to broader community results, PWLLE respondents showed a stronger preference for the Current River Park site and relatively higher ranking for the Freedom Park site.

Summary of Open Comments

A small number of additional open-ended responses (n=12) were received. Given the low response rate, findings are not reported quantitatively. Comments generally reflected considerations related to proximity to sensitive uses, the importance of access to services, and suggested mitigation measures such as infrastructure improvements.

Survey Results - Staff of Homelessness Service Providers

An online survey was distributed to local organizations that serve individuals living in encampments, resulting in 79 responses. Of these, 22% identified as working for an Indigenous organization. When analyzed by Indigenous organization status, no significant differences in responses were observed.

Most respondents were front-line staff (56%), followed by those in supervisory roles or higher (27%). Administrative staff and program coordinators made up 10% of respondents, while 7% selected “other,” which primarily included health care workers.

Levels of Agreement by Site

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each potential site. Results are summarized below based on combined agreement (agree/somewhat agree) and disagreement (somewhat disagree/disagree).

- The Kam River Heritage Park Site received the highest level of agreement (71%) and lowest level of disagreement (25%).
- The Simpson Site also received strong support (63% agreement; 27% disagreement).
- The Freedom Park Site (59% agreement; 34% disagreement) and Current River Park Site (56% agreement; 35% disagreement) received moderate-high levels of support.
- The Island Drive Park Site (30% agreement; 61% disagreement) and McKellar & Vickers Site (24% agreement; 54% disagreement) received the lowest levels of agreement and highest levels of disagreement.

These findings are generally consistent with broader community results, though service providers show comparatively higher agreement for the Kam River Heritage Park Site and clearer opposition to the Island Drive Park and McKellar & Vickers sites.

Summary of Site-Specific Comments

Open-ended, site-specific comments from service providers were reviewed and coded into key themes. Response volumes were modest, and findings are presented at a high level.

Comments primarily focused on access to services, safety considerations, and overall site suitability. The Kam River Heritage Park and Simpson sites were more often viewed as having favourable access and conditions, with the Freedom Park and Current River Park sites also generally viewed more positively. In contrast, the Island Drive Park and McKellar & Vickers sites were more frequently associated with access challenges or suitability concerns.

Safety-related feedback was limited and generally reflected site-specific considerations, while some comments noted that existing encampment activity at select locations may support feasibility.

Ranking of Sites (Strongest to Weakest)

Service providers were asked to rank all six sites from strongest to weakest based on overall preference, resulting in the following:

1. Site D – Kam River Heritage Park
2. Site F – Simpson
3. Site B – Freedom Park
4. Site A – Current River Park
5. Site E – McKellar & Vickers
6. Site C – Island Drive Park

Compared to broader community and PWLLE results, service provider rankings align more closely with the PWLLE pattern.

Summary of Open Comments

Open-ended comments from service providers were reviewed and coded into key themes. A total of 20 responses were received. Given the relatively small number of responses, findings are presented at a high level.

Feedback reflected a range of views, with comments most often focused on access to services, considerations for vulnerable populations, and broader policy or system-level perspectives. Several respondents emphasized the importance of proximity to health, outreach, and support services, as well as the need to consider impacts on individuals currently experiencing homelessness. A small number of comments referenced site suitability factors, including proximity to hazards or sensitive uses. Suggestions for mitigation were minimal and did not show consistent patterns.

Public Drop-In Session

A public drop-in session was held on March 18, 2026, from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. at Intercity Shopping Centre to provide an additional, in-person opportunity for community members to review information and share feedback.

Approximately 125 members of the public attended. Display boards were set up outlining each potential site, including site-specific information and analysis of alignment with the Guiding Criteria. Staff were available throughout the session to answer questions and provide clarification.

Participants were invited to take part in interactive activities that mirrored the survey, including indicating their level of agreement with each site, ranking sites from strongest to weakest, and providing general comments. Paper copies of the survey were also available for those who preferred to complete the questionnaire independently.

For one activity, participants were asked to place one sticker per site to indicate their level of agreement. While most participants followed this direction, results demonstrate that some individuals placed multiple stickers on a single site. As a result, findings from the drop-in session are to be interpreted with caution.

Level of Agreement – Survey Results + Interactive Activity

Due to participation limitations in the interactive activity (e.g., multiple stickers per person), results are presented together with the survey results at a high level and should be interpreted with caution.

Across both formats, a consistent pattern of agreement and disagreement emerged:

- The Kam River Heritage Park Site received the highest overall level of agreement (73% agree/somewhat agree) and lowest level of disagreement (26% disagree/somewhat disagree).
- Both the Simpson Site (50% agreement, 49% disagreement) and the Current River Park Site (48% agreement, 52% disagreement) showed mixed support.
- The Freedom Park Site (39% agreement, 55% disagreement) and the Island Drive Park Site (24% agreement, 71% disagreement) showed lower levels of agreement than disagreement.
- The McKellar & Vickers Site had the lowest level of agreement (4%) and the high level of disagreement (88%).

Summary of Site-Specific Comments

Open-ended, site-specific comments from the drop-in survey were reviewed and coded into key themes. Response volumes were modest, and findings are presented at a high level.

Comments primarily related to proximity to surrounding uses and overall site suitability. The Current River Park and McKellar & Vickers sites were more often associated with proximity-related concerns, while the Freedom Park, Kam River Heritage Park, and Simpson sites were more frequently identified as locations where existing encampment activity may support feasibility.

Ranking of Sites (Strongest to Weakest)

Participants at the public drop-in session were invited to rank all six sites from strongest to weakest through both paper surveys (n=26) and an interactive activity (n=37).

Survey results ranked sites as follows:

1. Site F – Simpson
2. Site D – Kam River Heritage Park
3. Site B – Freedom Park
4. Site A – Current River Park
5. Site C – Island Drive Park
6. Site E – McKellar and Vickers

The interactive activity showed a different pattern:

1. Site B – Freedom Park
2. Site F – Simpson
3. Site A – Current River Park
4. Site E – McKellar & Vickers
5. Site C – Island Drive Park
6. Site D – Kam River Heritage Park

Despite these differences, both formats indicate stronger relative preference for the Simpson, Freedom Park, and Current River Park sites, and consistently lower rankings for the Island Drive Park and McKellar & Vickers sites.

Summary of Open Comments

Open-ended comments were received through both the survey (n=16) and standalone submissions (n=15). These responses were reviewed and coded into key themes. Given the small number of responses across both sources, findings are presented at a high level and should be interpreted with caution.

Overall, feedback was varied but generally more critical in nature, with comments most often focused on safety and community impacts, including general health and safety, crime-related concerns, and cleanliness or maintenance issues.

Some respondents also raised location-related considerations, such as proximity to surrounding uses and potential impacts on public spaces. Policy-related perspectives were present but limited, including views that encampments may worsen existing issues, should be located away from public view, or require broader system-level responses.

Email Feedback

To provide an additional and accessible way for the public to share input, the City promoted the option to submit feedback directly to the Encampment Response Office

via email. This option was communicated through media releases, media interviews, and social media posts as part of the broader engagement approach.

A total of 26 communications were received. Given the relatively small number of responses, findings are presented at a high level. Feedback reflected a range of perspectives, including both supportive and critical views. Comments most often related to site location considerations, particularly proximity to surrounding uses, as well as safety and community impacts, including cleanliness and general site conditions. Some respondents also raised policy-related considerations, such as the role of other orders of government and broader approaches to addressing homelessness.

Further, a letter from the Thunder Bay Rowing Club Board of Directors (the TBRC Board) was received expressing opposition to the Kam River Heritage Park Site. Their submission emphasized concerns related to safety, emergency access, and the continued availability of public waterfront access. The TBRC Board noted potential conflicts with rowing activities and major events hosted at the site, as well as challenges related to unmanaged encampment activity occurring outside a designated area, given the Club's lack of control over adjacent lands. The letter underscored the importance of maintaining safe access, mitigating spillover impacts, and preserving the park's public function.

A letter was also received from Sysco Canada expressing opposition to the McKellar & Vickers Site. Their submission focused on land-use compatibility and operational considerations associated with having a designated encampment adjacent to a 24/7 food distribution facility. The company identified risks related to food safety standards, truck access and circulation, employee safety, and service continuity for hospitals, long-term care homes, and other institutions. The letter also referenced past site-related safety and security issues and argued that the location does not align with the City's stated site-evaluation criteria.

Business Owners & Representative Organizations

Due to limited staff capacity, site-specific meetings with nearby business owners were not feasible. However, recognizing that Administration's recommendation would include at least one site in both the North and South cores, targeted engagement was conducted with the Business Improvement Area (BIA) Boards representing these areas.

Additionally, the BIAs and Thunder Bay Chamber of Commerce were asked to circulate the public survey to their membership, noting that the survey included specific questions for business owners and operators. The Chamber supported this effort by distributing the survey through its newsletter and advising that City staff were available to meet and could be contacted directly at encampments@thunderbay.ca.

All public communications reinforced that business owners and organizations were welcome to provide feedback directly to staff through this email channel.

Waterfront BIA Board

Staff met with the Waterfront BIA to discuss potential designated encampment sites, with most feedback focused on Freedom Park. Members raised concerns about distance guidelines and site-selection criteria, noting the need to account for nearby tourism and waterfront businesses. Safety issues were identified around pedestrian movement and driver sightlines at the nearby roundabout, with suggestions that Current River Park may offer better visibility. Additional concerns included proximity to rail infrastructure, water, businesses, and a school, as well as the implications of locating an encampment near downtown and the marina.

The Waterfront BIA also questioned how the City would manage capacity, prevent expansion into areas like the McVicar Creek corridor, and address encampments outside designated sites. Follow-up communications highlighted operational impacts such as litter, aggressive bird activity, and occasional theft of patio furniture and plants. Suggested mitigation measures included public education, coordinated clean-ups, providing seating within encampments, and creating garden spaces. It was also noted that well-designed, shared encampment spaces could help reduce impacts on surrounding businesses.

Fort William BIA Board

A meeting was arranged with the Fort William BIA but was subsequently cancelled by the BIA due to unforeseen circumstances. The rescheduled timing conflicted with the public drop-in session, and as a result, the meeting did not proceed. Follow-up feedback was received from the Chair, who noted that the Simpson Site is an area that has historically been used as an encampment and did not see any issues with its continued presence, should that be Council's decision.

Infrastructure & Utility Companies

Given the proximity of several potential sites to rail infrastructure and one site's proximity to a hydro transmission tower, Administration undertook targeted outreach to relevant infrastructure and utility stakeholders, including Canadian Pacific Kansas City (CPKC), Canadian National (CN), and Hydro One. Hydro One did not provide comments.

CPKC provided site-specific feedback indicating no concerns with the Current River Park Site and the McKellar & Vickers Site. However, due to their proximity to active rail infrastructure and misalignment with proximity guideline setbacks, CPKC expressed

opposition to the Freedom Park Site, Island Drive Park Site, Kam River Heritage Park Site, and the Simpson Site.

CN noted that most sites are located near CPKC's infrastructure and operations, while the McKellar & Vickers site is the only one near CN's infrastructure. Due to safety concerns, CN does not recommend this site.