Safer Community Committee (SCC)
Meeting 2 - August 3, 2023
7:00 PM on Zoom

Attendees

Members in attendance:
Kathryn Adams, Sara Ehrhardt, Derek Finkle, Mike Hayles, Emily Hill, Rebecca Ho, Aparna Kajenthira, Gillian Kolla, Ashley McPherson, Andrea Nickel, Edward Speicher, Christiane Tetreault, Mike Wilson.

Meeting support attendees:
Dana Granofsky (Facilitator), Julie Grgar (SCC Administrative Support), Shannon Wiens (Convener).

Members absent:
Meaghan C., Leigh Chapman, Naureen Choudhry, Laurence DeWolfe, Nigel Fick, Scott McKean, Elana Nayvelt, Jennifer Orenstein, Angela Robertson, Kim O'Toole.

1. Welcome and recap

The facilitator welcomed attendees to the meeting and recapped what the group accomplished in Meeting 1:
- Reviewed and refined a draft Terms of Reference for the SCC
- Identified preliminary areas of concern for the SCC to address
- Identified relevant reading materials for the SCC to inform its discussions

The facilitator shared the SCC's goals for Meeting 2:
- **Solidify how the SCC works together:** Address outstanding questions and concerns about the SCC's Terms of Reference
- **Issue identification:** Identify the issues and concerns the SCC will problem solve for

2. Solidify how the SCC works together

Members sought clarification on a few items from the Terms of Reference. Specifically:

How members of the Committee may participate in the media:
- No individual member represents themselves as a spokesperson for the SCC
- Members do not publicly report on the SCC's recommendations and conclusions before they are finalized
- Members do not publicly attribute information about or specific commentary to individual SCC members beyond what is available in SCC meeting summaries.
- The SCC respects any requests of members to withhold some of their identity (such as to go by first name only) in meeting summaries or their member biography.

One member raised concern that the Terms of Reference labels certain SCC members as *neighbours* without distinguishing between those that live in the immediate vicinity of SRCHC and are more impacted and residents who live further from the SRCHC. Member requested different terms or other

form of identification to indicate proximity of business/home to the Health Centre. Conversation ensued about what level of distance to indicate, members' suggestions ranged from 'number of blocks' to '1km' to 'within the catchment area' of the Health Centre.

- Facilitator committed to giving thought to how this might be done in a way that respects members' privacy and has a supporting rationale for distance indicated.

One member requested clarification on the requirements for being a member of the SCC. The facilitator shared these requirements as outlined in the Terms of Reference. No other areas of concern regarding the Terms of Reference were raised.

Group Discussion on Trust

Members diverged from the agenda and engaged in a wide-ranging conversation, highlighting some of the issues dear to them, as well as crucial areas of discord and concern. These included:

- Breakdown in relationships and trust between residents. In particular, feeling vilified for advocating for children, frustration that some residents had been raising these concerns prior to the shooting of July 7, 2023.
- Accusations that the Health Centre was only participating in discussions with the community now for "damage control" rather than out of genuine interest in promoting the safety of all community members. One member noted as evidence of this that prior to Jul 7, 2023 only staff had participated in meetings with residents, with board directors only participating after the shooting.
- Clarification that the purpose of the July 26, 2023 Town Hall was not to discuss shutting down the SIS, but to respond to community questions and share information on consumption treatment services and how they are operated.
- Children's safety, including the dangers of exposure to sharps, drugs and drug paraphernalia, fighting, and public sex.
- The opioid crisis, which one member noted is bigger than SRCHC and necessitates a holistic approach involving multiple actors with a role to play.
- Recognition that promoting the safety of children is not at odds with promoting the safety of people who use drugs. Different community groups share many of the same concerns, and there is significant overlap in solutions to these concerns.
- Recognition that there are practical measures to improve community safety that have not yet been taken, such as the provision of appropriate sharps containers in laneways and other strategic placements around the neighbourhood.
- Appreciation for the security currently in place at SRCHC, while noting there is still room for improvement.

Several members noted that the lack of trust between different community members was apparent at the table, and constraining the SCC's ability to work constructively. The facilitator cautioned SCC members not to attribute intent or hold other members accountable for actions that were not directly taken by that member. The facilitator also encouraged members to keep in mind the SCC's mission is to not only identify problems and concerns, but to work together to generate solutions that promote the safety of all community members.

One member who is also a SRCHC board director addressed the community's lack of trust in SRCHC, first clarifying that SRCHC staff instead of directors have been present in past meetings with residents as these meetings have focused on operational matters, while the Board's mandate is focused on

governance. The Board's current participation in these community conversations is a break from normal practice to demonstrate willingness to work with the community. The Director also emphasized that SRCHC is engaging in these conversations with community out of deep and genuine motivation to address these concerns — many of which SRCHC shares. A local resident thanked the Board Director for their comments, sharing that they appreciated the exchange and had heard things in this meeting they hadn't heard before.

Facilitator encouraged members to consider the community as a whole and to take advantage of the range of expertise around the table to develop solutions that will achieve desired outcomes. In particular, the SCC will need to ensure that solutions implemented in the immediate vicinity of SRCHC or other 'hotspots' do not simply result in shifting unsafe activities to other locations in the community.

3. Issue identification

Presentation

A member, who is also part of a local resident-led group, shared a presentation based on input that group had collected from 396 residents living in close proximity to SRCHC over a five-day period in July. It did not use formal research methodologies and is the first of multiple information sources to be shared with the SCC to inform its discussions.

The presentation identified the top concerns, preferred solutions, and desired immediate next steps by residents surveyed, as well as recommendations to improve relationships between different stakeholders. The solutions put forward in this presentation will be considered as part of the SCC's work generating recommendations in subsequent meetings. A copy of this presentation included on the SCC's online folder.

Assessing the issues

The facilitator introduced an exercise asking SCC members to first note all of the problems they wanted to address on virtual post-it notes the entire group could see. After members had done so, they reviewed them together, clarifying points of uncertainty and noting where problems could be grouped together to eliminate duplication.

Members then placed these notes on a virtual whiteboard in relation to two axes:
- From lowest danger to highest danger (vertical axis)
- From a rare or low likelihood of occurring to issues that occur with high frequency or are very likely to occur (horizontal axis)

The facilitator explained the purpose of this exercise was to explore the relative ranking of the issues, noting the exercise is not quantified – it is merely to ascertain whether members understand the issues in a similar way. The facilitator invited discussion on where the issues were placed on the axes in the exercise. Members suggested that two items (assault and theft) should be moved further along the horizontal axis to recognize them as more likely to occur. There were no other amendments. A snapshot of this exercise is included on the SCC's online folder.

Wrap Up

The facilitator thanked members for their contributions and shared next steps:
- Other materials from different stakeholder groups and experts will be shared with the SCC and made accessible in an online folder to ensure the SCC has access to the information sources it needs to develop effective recommendations.
- Members will have the opportunity to review and suggest any amendments to summaries for each meeting, which will be posted on the Community Engagement portion of SRCHC's website for the purpose of transparency.
- The Terms of Reference will be reviewed to clarify terminology.
- Each SCC member will submit a biography of approximately five sentences for publication on the Community Engagement page of the SRCHC website, which can exclude all or part of a member's name if desired. Biographies will also be included in the final report.
- The next meeting is September 7 from 6:30 PM to 9:00 PM.