



Present:

CTS Supervisor: Dr. Jill Campbell

Staff: Allison Alexiou (Program Manager keepSIX), Jason Altenberg (CEO and Co-Chair), Julie Grgar (Recorder), Sarah Grieg (Dir. SUMH), Zoha Malik (Recorder)

Community Members and Organizations: Smitri Bhattarai (New Hope Shelter/Salvation Army), Aubrey Fitzgerald (Woodgreen), Mike Hayles (Toronto Police Services), Anne Kennedy (Queen St E Presbyterian Church), Hailee Morrison (Fontbonne Ministries/Mustard Seed), Patricia Melville (Community Rep), Andrea Nickel (Community Resident), Kim O' Toole (Toronto Police Services), Cathy Quinton (Leslieville Business Improvement Area), Dorothy Quon (WoodGreen/MGH), Christiane Tetrault (Leslieville Business Improvement Area), Ben Vozzolo (Co-Chair and Community Member), Jennifer Wilkie (Community Member), Christiane Tetrault (Leslieville BIA).

Regrets:

Leslieville Harm Reduction Coalition, Kathleen Dinely (Michael Garron Hospital), Morse Street Public School, Anne Simard (Community Member), Toronto Public, Health,

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

Attendees made brief introductions

**2. Land Acknowledgement**

The CEO and Co-Chair presented the Land Acknowledgement

**3. Approval of the draft agenda**

Attendees discussed the draft agenda. Given that this is the first meeting of the revised Supervised Consumption Services - Community Liaison Committee (SCS-CLC), the CEO and CTS Supervisor advised that the first items on the agenda would take up most of the time for the current meeting. The other items would be deferred to the subsequent meeting, if needed. SCS-CLC Members were asked to consider the standing items on the SCS-CLC draft agenda for future meetings.

Attendees indicated their approval of the draft agenda for the current meeting.

**ACTION ITEM: SCS-CLC MEMBERS REVIEW THE STANDING ITEMS ON THE DRAFT AGENDA (ITEMS 6 A, B, C, AND D) AND ADVISE IF THERE SHOULD BE ANY ADDITIONS OR AMENDMENTS FOR THE FEBRUARY MEETING.**





Is the committee functioning as per the process and outcomes? E.G. how many recommendations are made to the board. With focus on Terms of reference and purpose

#### 4. Draft Terms of Reference/Purpose

The Terms of Reference (TOR) document was shared via email prior to the meeting and screenshared at the meeting.

Members were asked to consider the Terms of Reference as a procedural document that informs the purpose of the committee; how the committee will function; and the desired outcomes for the committee to be successful.

The Safer Community Committee (SCC) recommendations were raised. Not all participants had the opportunity to review that report. One participant on the SCC indicated concerns about that committee.

**ACTION ITEM: SRCHC TO SHARE THE SCC REPORT WITH THE SCS-CLC MEMBERS. MEMBERS WILL CONSIDER WHICH SCC RECOMMENDATIONS SHOULD BE ADDED TO THE SCS-CLC WORK PLAN. MEMBERS WILL BE ASKED FOR THEIR INPUT AND DETERMINATION AT THE FEBRUARY 2024 MEETING.**

Members were asked to consider what success would look like for the SCS-CLC.

Attendees discussed relationships:

- between the SRCHC and the Community;
- behaviours and relationships between Committee members;
- issues of existing distrust were raised and how to move past that; and
- a “good neighbour”, two-way street” relationship between SRCHC and the community.

The purpose and the subject of what was being evaluated was discussed as a group. The CTS supervisor provided the example of security services around the CTS as an example. There was a recommendation that the SCS-CLC is not qualified to evaluate the consumption treatment services (CTS) and therefore, the Committee is only able to evaluate its own progress, and that point could be simpler and clearer.

In addition to the SCC report, it was recommended that the SCS-CLC members need to be educated on what work has already taken place for level-setting.

**ACTION ITEM: SRCHC SHARES THE RESIDENTS GROUP REPORT AND FINDINGS BE SHARED WITH THE SCS-CLC AND OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION OR REPORTS TO ENSURE SCS-CLC MEMBERS HAVE THE SAME BACKGROUND INFORMATION.**

**ACTION ITEM: SCS-CLC MEMBERS TO PROVIDE FEEDBACK VIA EMAIL TO REDRAFT THE TERMS OF REFERENCE.**





Members were asked if there was anything else missing in the purpose, such as guiding principles. There were no amendments at the time of the meeting.

A recommendation to clarify the distinct number of members within each of the community representatives to ensure there is broad coverage i.e. residents, business owners, the local church, school administration (and clarification of who that refers to), etc. Clarification of membership and numbers was requested for all of the membership listed in the TOR.

Given that the SCS-CLC is not a decision-making body, it was suggested that there be mutual accountability for the members and for the SRCHC Board in the TOR.

Accountability and protocol for turnaround times for resolving complaints and issues was raised. It was indicated that would be a matter for the work plan. It was requested that turnaround or response times be included in the TOR and the work plan.

Which members were eligible to vote was discussed. It was reiterated that the goal or desired outcome was consensus and voting only when agreement could not be reached.

It was clarified that the keepSIX advisory committee members are actually clients of the service. The importance of client participation on the Committee was discussed and the requirement for confidentiality by the SCS-CLC members was stressed.

Members disagreed as to whether SRCHC staff should have the right to vote on the committee. The CTS Supervisor advised that the lower number of SRCHC staff participants on the committee was intentional to ensure that they only represented one portion of the vote, but still had a say on the committee.

Attendees were advised that the Board Directors and elected officials would not be voting members on the committee and those participants would attend quarterly meetings. The rest of the Committee would attend monthly meetings. It was asked that the participation of the Board and elected officials be clarified on the TOR.

The Committee also needs to consider the threshold for votes. Should a simple majority vote of 50% plus one or should the threshold for a decision be at a higher percentage? Two-thirds may be the desired threshold for a recommendation.

Quorum was also discussed. The other SRCHC Committees require a 50% plus one of attendance for quorum. Members were asked to advise if they agreed with that amount for quorum.





The issue of eligibility to vote in relation to attendance was also discussed. It was felt that members who participated in the work should be eligible to vote. When and how many meetings are members required to be in attendance in order to vote. Three meetings were suggested as an example for eligibility to vote, however this was not confirmed.

The Committee was advised that the SCS-CLC will be able to make recommendations that may impact the operations of the CTS.

It was suggested that everyone who has contributed to the work of the committee in developing recommendations should have the right to vote on whether or not to implement them, if consensus cannot be reached. Members may also be allowed to register their disagreement with the vote result. However, members who did not contribute to the development of a recommendations should not be allowed to vote.

The rules of conduct and appropriate behaviour for SCS-CLC members was discussed and stressed. Over and above confidentiality, it is important that the SCS-CLC be a safe place for all of the participants. Members were asked to contribute their thoughts on preserving confidentiality and being respectful of diverse opinions.

It was suggested that the SCS-CLC collectively build those guiding principles and jointly define them. It was suggested that one participant could lead this exercise, at a later date, given the member had past experience with that process.

**ACTION ITEM: PROVIDE MEMBERS WITH ADDITIONAL TIME TO MAKE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE TOR**

#### **5. Background Material/Workplan (sustainability/mitigation)**

The background materials and work plan were deferred to a subsequent meeting.

#### **6. Standing Agenda Items:**

The standing agenda items were deferred to a subsequent meeting.

#### **7. Presentations – To discuss what people might want to see/hear in future meetings**

Topics for presentations were deferred to a subsequent meeting.

#### **8. Adjournment**

Attendees were asked if there was anything pressing that they wanted to share before the meeting adjourned, and there were no items raised.

The next meeting was discussed. The **next meeting** will take place on **Tuesday, February 13, 2024 from 6:00PM to 7:30 PM**. At that meeting, a regular monthly meeting time will be discussed.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 PM.

