



# Minutes

## Of a Meeting of the Crime Prevention and Community Well-Being Advisory Committee of the City of Kenora

Friday, July 19, 2024

9:00 a.m.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

<b>With:</b>	Denise Forsyth	Jill Hager
	Anita Cameron	Cynthia MacDougall
	Shannon Bailey	Jeff Duggan
	Logan Haney	Haley Pentek

**Staff:** Eric Shih – CSWB Coordinator  
 Kyle Attanasio, CAO (virtual)  
 Heather Pihulak, Director of Corporate Services/City Clerk  
 Heather Lajeunesse, Enforcement Services Manager/Deputy Clerk  
 Christiane Sadeler – Consultant

<b>Regrets:</b>	Darcia Curtis	Jim Neild
	Regan Dearborn	Taras Manzie
	Grant Cowles	Jared Olsen
	Councillor Barb Manson	Jodelle Maksymchuk
	Councillor Bob Bernie	

### 1. Call to Order and Land Acknowledgement

Chair Denise Forsyth called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. and she delivered the land acknowledgement.

### 2. Additions to and Approval of Agenda

- Pulse check survey
- Coordinator update and working group updates

If time permits there may be a closed session added at the end.

### 3. Declaration of Pecuniary Interest and the General Nature Thereof

There were none declared.

#### **4. Approval of Minutes from Previous Meeting Moved by A. Cameron, Seconded by J. Duggan and Carried -**

That the Minutes of the Crime Prevention and Community Well-Being Advisory Committee meeting held June 14, 2024, be confirmed as written and filed.

#### **5. Reaffirmations of Agreements to Date:**

Christiane confirmed that there was an attachment in the agenda package for each item listed. Meeting attendees broke into several groups to review the list and provide suggestions for changes before final approval.

#### **Terms of Reference – Eric & Shannon**

Shannon started by asking whether it should be recommended for Council to consider to invite more senior leaders from organizations to be at the table. “Where is our influence?” If we are going to be able to guide implementation of the plan that we create there needs to be the ability to make decisions at the table. Also, a recommendation that there may be some key organizations which are not voting members who should be part of the table moving forward, examples such as KDSB and NWHU were mentioned as they likely have good input. Additionally, some updating of names of organizations under voting members needs to be addressed in the terms.

Christiane touched on governance, whereby someone like Shannon is representing education rather than the school board. Similar for everyone else, it is an ambassador’s role for others in the same sector. Shannon added that when we recognize a key partner has an important role (e.g. NWHU) if we don’t have people at the table, we are already putting up a barrier by not having them be part of the conversation. Christiane recommended to always keep a seat at the table empty, issues will arise, and we will have to bring people forward as we might not have someone that understands the issues well enough. She suggested to invite others to come and join while the issue is happening, then as other things come up other people can come to the table, it is not always a bad thing to grow your table. Anita mentioned that with the more people you have it can be hard to coordinate and suggested they could have subcommittees. Christiane suggested a constellation governance, with a core table and other tables which will help with the complexity. This will be discussed further at the October meeting.

#### **Definition of Community Safety and Well-Being – Jill & Jeff**

This definition was determined at the very first meeting. Jill suggested that we are adding a cultural piece to include an evidence informed section to be consistent. Culturally informed and culturally relevant mirrors the other section. Regarding the goals of our work, they struggled with this as we all have such a different perception. And there are limits on what is within our realm of our control at the local level. Jeff shared that we still need to have input as to what affects our community, as larger provincial/federal/regional policies may not work for everyone. We need input into changes to policy and programs, it is not sure if our group can change these, although we can make recommendations. Christiane suggested that there are some things you can make happen and some you can’t, but you can provide input, you can advocate and make recommendations when possible. Jeff mentioned that if every community

is mandated to have a plan that is the place that the government can go for suggestions for each community. Denise shared that landscapes are changing, and we can bring issues forward as there are people at other levels that can impact policy. Jeff stressed accountability, there has to be some type of accountability to programs, or we will just spin our wheels, but this can also be put somewhere else.

### **Definition (Description) of Vulnerability – Haley and Logan**

Haley suggested that the defining vulnerability document is lengthy. It is good that it starts off with a definition and is broad but then gets into depth and perhaps is maybe too wordy. They liked the City of Toronto's definitions which were included in the document attached. Christiane asked for the thoughts on the characteristics of vulnerability as provided. Hayley mentioned that we worked hard as a group to come up with the wording and Christiane suggested that the description needs to be specific for Kenora.

### **Principles of Collaboration - Cynthia and Denise**

The committee had agreed on these principles before, on how the group works together. Denise stated there is a lot of good stuff. She touched on the capacity-sensitive item, where it says we commit to a shared understanding, it is felt that part is too big and can lead to ambiguity. Evidence informed-cultural aspect should be included in the principles. Under the process-oriented section, it says the end does not justify the means, process is as equally important as the final product. For the Restorative section it was mentioned they don't like what is there. For something new it was suggested that we need to recognize that conflict is normal, it is how we address conflict that creates challenges, and wording is yet to be determined. Another change suggested is for under the solution-focused principle, it could be changed to all challenges have solutions or work arounds, wording to be determined and should be focused on solutions, this might be a little bit more work. We each come with the lenses with different views which can be a panoramic view vs narrow perspective. Christiane confirmed that we all have interests of our own organizations at heart but that this plan is meant to take us beyond that. Eric touched on thinking of the broader part of each other's sectors.

### **Issue Selection Process - Anita and Heather P.**

These are the guidelines on how to deal with emerging issues that need attention as we are planning. Anita mentioned that there is a lot of preamble to get to the essence, she found the wording helpful to focus on the big picture. The flaw is there has been no closure on things on how the issue was resolved or disposed of, is that something that needs to change in the documentation of the process. Christiane asked what do other folks think and suggested putting in something that closes the loop as part of the process moving forward.

Christiane thanked everyone for their input and will make the suggested changes before including them in the plan, adding that occasionally documents will be reviewed to ensure they fit with who we are. She will bring the revised documents back for a final look.

## **6. Update on Development of Vision Statement**

Denise shared that a group did endeavor to meet a couple of times which included Logan, Taras, Councillor Bernie and herself. In terms of feedback, they had some ideas and came up with a sentence for a vision statement. Research questions were used such as who is the customer? What are the needs? What product do we want to market? And what is the value? They came up with ideas and made a sentence. Denise read the vision the statement proposed to the group is: "Kenora, a community rich in history, natural resources, and its people. A place where *all* people live, grow and play located on beautiful Lake of the Woods". Christiane stated that there is nothing stopping us from providing the backdrop for this rather than just have the vision as a stand alone. Shannon shared that she likes it and the process, and asked if we could add "in the Treaty 3 Territory" after Lake of the Woods. Anita indicated that there is a need to understand all the history of the area, suggesting a change in the wording from "natural resources" to "nature". Christiane mentioned that there isn't anything included in the proposed wording about safety and well-being. The group suggested that if we succeed in prevention etc. this is who we are. Eric suggested that history doesn't imply people and to take out the first "people" in the statement. Denise to send an email to Christiane with the proposed vision statement sentence.

*Break from 9:58 – 10:08 a.m.*

## **7. Overview of Plan Chapters**

Christiane provided an overview to the group on the chapters within the community safety and well-being plan. As part of the introduction, she is recommending including a letter from the Mayor and Council, as well as a letter from the Committee Chair(s) to show the City/Committee partnership. There will be an Executive Summary overview as well. A section to remind people of what we are and what we have in our community should be included. It will be good to provide an overview of what community safety and well-being planning is, who was on the committee, what was the process working together, as well as community engagement. The plan will talk about the findings and emerging priorities, the survey, consultation process, and data provided. Christiane showed an overview of supporting documents that are being used to support understanding of the plan (e.g. how the information was found for our community), this will show people that their suggestions were heard. But perhaps the documents will not be included in the plan but rather stand in support of the plan to ensure that the plan is as brief as possible and something people want to pick up and can relate to.

Eric suggested the use of a story map instead of a report. Christiane showed and explained a story map example used for the North Park of Victoria, BC, which is a map of things that have been accomplished. Steve Woolrich's work will be reflected in that story board alongside the plan. Story maps can include links to click to see detailed information/reports/videos. People can go as deep as they want or as shallow, one idea is that the working group can be featured as well. This becomes a living document of the work that you do instead of a report that sits on the shelf. Christiane is recommending this is what we should do, adding that she cannot create the actual map but will provide content and the city needs to do that piece. It is a good way of organizing and it is accessible for the person that is reading it. Committee

members liked the idea, as it is visually appealing, interactive, includes a multitude of perspectives and encompasses all the work.

Shannon asked if the City would consider hosting a session where all the key partners to attend a presentation to see it go forward into the implementation stage, which can be brought back to other organizations to deliver. Denise suggested it would be also good to present this to the ANHP. Christiane agreed that this is a great idea, it will be beyond her time here but brings up an opportunity if the City hosts it. Eric agreed this could be one of the things we do going forward and sees this as part of the celebration of the launch of the plan.

## **8. Review of Status of Data Gathering and Consultations**

Christiane indicated that she was worried earlier on that she wasn't getting what she needed for data, but it is all coming in now, she thanked the members for their work and support. She added that the notes that are coming forward are great and there is now a solid grounding, she is hearing the same things over and over. She stated that when the plan comes out, we don't want to be in a situation where someone says you didn't talk to us and so we want to be able to show that in the very least we tried. Christiane mentioned that there are still some gaps. The rainbow community is one of them which Eric has been in touch with. Adult justice and corrections is another, she is worried going forward about not being able to talk to anyone there. The City's Municipal Prosecutor has done some research and tried to provide some information on this related to our community. Jill and Logan were asked if they could investigate this based on their professional work roles in the community, as it is important not to close this gap. Christiane mentioned that it has also been hard to find any data on hate crime for the community. Jeff stated there is some data available for the area, but it won't be local to Kenora, that's how little there is being we have OPP vs. a local police service. Christiane and Jeff will chat about how to reflect this within the plan. Christiane inquired about data related to the use of recreation facilities and library. Heather Pihulak indicated that the Recreation Manager can provide current data on this, and mentioned there is also a report that is few years old. Sarah Stevenson was suggested as a contact for obtaining childcare data. Denise suggested there could be good data available from Evergreen Ski Hill on its use as well. Eric mentioned being new to Kenora he has noticed how much the volunteer sector provides opportunities for children.

## **9. Board and Committee Guidelines on Presentations and Delegations**

Heather Pihulak spoke on how to manage deputations, which this has been more about what the committee has asked for. There are guidelines in the term of reference and it was suggested that maybe we could chat in closed about those. It was suggested by the group to defer any closed discussion to August as it might not be as meaningful if all the parties are not at the table.

Christiane asked what it is that we need to talk about, whether it is committee conduct, delegations that came out of the meeting, or how long presentations and what to expect. Logan suggested that after presentations are made maybe can we talk about them in closed session as people won't always give their perspective in an open setting. Anita stated that she thinks it is good to determine specifics that we

are going to talk about. Christiane understands that some of the responses to delegates in the room at the last meeting made people in the room feel uncomfortable. It was elaborated that the conversations and questioning made some members uncomfortable, that people shouldn't feel like they must defend themselves. Christiane asked if there would be a difference depending on who presents, suggesting that some organizations are challenged publicly often, but if it was someone that shares information and personal experiences maybe it would be better to have closed conversations.

Shannon suggested asking for feedback from presenters to see how they feel. Questions were to be submitted in advance to the presenters at the last meeting, maybe we can focus on a process for all external presenters to find out their feedback for presenting. Perhaps some have felt attacked and maybe some haven't. We can then use this feedback to have a closed session to talk about the process. She thinks it is important to get feedback, we might feel like we are being protective when we don't need to be. Eric mentioned for the last meeting we had asked for questions in advance, but this hasn't always been the case, they were sent as a courtesy for the presenters to prepare. Christiane suggested we can ask them about our process for their preparation, where does the threshold of unsafe begin and uncomfortable end, and which is which? They are not the same.

Denise expressed that when we invite people we are the host, engagement should be respectful and not reactionary, she was uncomfortable at the last meeting. She asked Eric if he could write something up as to what are the goals of these presentations are. She indicated that if she goes into a space to share and if they react negative, she doesn't feel good. It is not good for building bridges and we are all human, she feels passionately about this. Christiane suggested it would be great to write something up to share it, in addition to the code of conduct. Logan mentioned that she wants to work with people and doesn't feel like this is the place. Anita stated that the presentations are learning opportunities and if we are challenging them, we are not learning. Eric asked about the process of creating a write up, if someone says something but you have something to counter that how can that information be shared? It was suggested that we should have something written up for every presenter and have them give feedback after. Shannon asked about building something into the following meeting after a presentation to debrief on the presentation. If we have an opportunity to unpack things after, then we can go back to the presenter and ask more questions as agreed to by the committee, which slows things down enough for there to be a more rational approach. Eric mentioned that we did have something established but he will go back and look at it and will share it with the Project Team.

Jeff expressed that the presentations have been all from publicly funded programs, so if the public leaves before asking the hard questions, how does the public get the info. Anita said she assumes their presentations are based on evidence, which there is a specific challenge to their truthfulness. Cynthia suggested that our need is different from presenters and if we are challenging them and they aren't prepared it isn't fair, we can ask without challenging them.

Christiane shared that this is interesting to her, as after the meeting she had thought some of those moments were very much what you would expect in collaborations, adding that she doesn't live here and may have a different perspective as a result because she is not steeped in the relationships. If it is a community of practice, we need to determine what is our process on how to deal with this.

### **10. Dialogue on Criteria for Plan Priorities and Actions**

Christiane referenced what she calls "uncovering the stinky fish", where people are uncertain and anxious, afraid to talk about something etc. She shared some items from the May workshop notes. The issues are very complex and get into many mandates. What can we possibly influence and how do we deal with all of this? These are just some of the sticky issues and wicked questions the group needs to deal with going forward such as police patrol in the downtown, needle litter, negative attitudes towards Indigenous peoples, etc.

She showed/demonstrated a way to deal with these issues going forward, including a chart with needs vs. fears. Related to needs-what is most valued and what do you most care about? What are the most significant needs? Related to fears-what are your most significant fears/concerns/worries? (don't dismiss them even if they are irrational to you) Do this process instead of talking around the table and try to answer those questions for each person affected by the issue. She referenced the four lenses, explained slides in deciphering issues.

Christiane then asked the group to do an exercise to develop 6-8 maximum criteria to support the selection of priorities, adding that 6 would be ideal. What thresholds do the priorities and actions have to meet to be included in the plan?

The lists from each group were shared and written on a flip chart:

List 1:

- no duplication
- data supports it
- broad impact
- can it change?
- advises service collaboration
- contributes to the breadth (advocacy too)
- level of actual risk
- meets vision
- heads upstream
- feasible and actionable
- decolonized approach
- consider timelines
- are we addressing the actual issue?

List 2:

- evidence supports a need
- reflects voices of community
- SMART priority (specific)

- sustainable
- creative/innovative
- multiple diverse approaches
- communication and coordination
- timely/good process (balance)
- able to operationalize
- respond not react
- equity

Christiane stated the Project Team will look at this information, condense this list and bring it back, adding that it is a great list.

Christiane suggested doing a pulse check and Heather Pihulak can send out a survey electronically to get everyone's opinion.

### **Roundtable:**

Shannon-is disappointed that not all members are here but gets it, we had some good conversations

Jill-playing catch up missed a couple meetings

Jeff-won't be here at August meeting as he has court

Haley-discussions are valuable, happy to be here

Logan-looking forward to the next conversation, sits here as a community member and finds it valuable to be able to be here and participate

Cynthia-enjoyed the conversations today, won't be at the August meeting

Anita-a good discussion, finds interesting it is easier to have these sensitive discussions when the group is smaller, but the challenge is how does everyone else share in that. This will be an ongoing issue, how do we do this good work and maintain the level of commitment.

Christiane-glad to be back in Kenora, has enjoyed working with you. Is encouraged by the committee taking on uncomfortable things. You are making progress and hopefully that will come together, thanks for having me back.

Eric-grateful for this committee, thanked members for their work. Liked today how we can talk about things that are not always easy. Needs to put out a post about the top 3 things we accomplished. Are we ok if he picks it out?

Denise-criteria exercise should be shared for priorities.

### **11. Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 11:43 a.m.