

*Community and SME  
Engagements on the proposed City  
Hall enhanced security measures*



### City Hall Security

### *A Community Engagement Report*

# Contents

Background	Page 1
Engagement Methods	Page 2
Limitations	Page 6
Session Summaries	Page 7
Emergent Concerns	Page 10
Questions to be Explored	Page 16
Recommendations Moving Forward	Page 20
Consultant Summary and Recommendations	Page 22
Appendix A	Page 24
Appendix B	Page 26

# Background

In early March 2018, freelance consultant and facilitator David Lewis-Pearl (hereafter known as the consultant) received a Request for Quotation (RFQ) for focus group facilitator services by City of Toronto's Corporate Security Division. The RFQ sought a vendor to plan, organise, lead and report on two focus group sessions held for racialised City of Toronto residents.

By early April 2018 the RFQ was formally responded to and the consultant contracted to conduct the sessions and compose the associated report. The contract was to be completed in full over a two and a half week period.

The need for facilitator services was outlined as being an opportunity for City Hall Corporate Security Division to gather much needed feedback from First Nations, African - Canadian, South-Asian, Middle-Eastern and Muslim communities who may be impacted by proposed enhanced security measures, namely the potential inclusion of patron screening (walk through metal detectors, use of wands and baggage checks) at the main entrance of Toronto City Hall for members of the public.

The proposed measures were a part of a group of recommendations made by Toronto Police Services and Public Safety Canada after the completion of two threat and risk assessments. Following the submission and approval of an amended version of those recommendations at Toronto City Council in December 2017, Corporate Security was directed through the Deputy City Manager to survey both City staff and the general public on these proposed new measures and return with a report on those responses.

The scope of the vendor services were identified as follows:

- Participate in a kick-off meeting with City of Toronto staff to ensure a clear understanding of the issues to be discussed at the focus group meetings
- Based on industry best practices, design a Toronto City Hall patron screening focus group session to be delivered solely to members of the Toronto Black community

- Based on industry best practices, design a Toronto City Hall patron screening focus group session to be delivered solely to members of the Toronto Middle Eastern, South-Asian and Muslim communities.
- Organise the focus group meetings including outreach to various community groups to promote the two separate focus groups; setting the focus group meeting dates, times and locations and other logistical requirements required to hold the focus group meetings
- Provide two reports, one for each focus group session, both in PowerPoint formats consisting of a full analysis of the data gathered during the focus group session, major findings

## Engagement Methods

An amendment replaced the in-person kick-off meeting with three separate orientation meetings by telephone held between the consultant and City staff from Corporate Security Division and Equity, Diversity and Human Rights. The consultant made recommendations on potential direction for the engagement sessions to improve impact given the short timeline.

Recommendations were as follows:

- Provide focus group participants with incentives (food, TTC tokens)
- Enlarge number of sessions to include Subject Matter Expert (SME) engagement sessions with community leaders
- Outreach for a manageable number of community engagement focus group participants per session (between 10-15 individuals)
- Locate SME sessions in a central location, schedule the sessions mid-day, and offer teleconference options to better accommodate SME participants' work schedules

- Develop tailored outreach materials to recruit community participants, and revise existing City of Toronto public consultation materials for outreach to potential SME participants

The information provided during those meetings was used by the consultant to form a project team to more effectively respond to the proposed aims of the RFO. The project team was expanded to include an outreach and engagement consultant, Dr. Fatimah Jackson-Best, and co-facilitators and community advisors Berlin Mohamed, Maged Abdallah, and Jordan-Moses Williams.

The project team met to review the RFO and the information gathered from the meetings with Corporate Security and Equity and Diversity. A decision was made to expand the outreach and engagement to include a separate focus group session targeting Black Muslim communities given this communities intersection of both faith and ethno-racial identity. It was also recommended that there be a separation made between focus groups targeting the general community and outreach and engagement of community leaders, organizers, or SMEs.

The SME sessions were to gather the overall trends and attitudes of community members as understood by these leaders and where applicable, their associated organisations and collectives serving these groups.

The community engagement sessions were organised in collaboration with community-based organisations within areas of the city that have significant populations of African, Caribbean, Black, Middle-Eastern, South-Asian, and Muslim individuals. The three agencies partnered with were Delta Family Resource Services, Thorncliff Neighbourhood Office (TNO), and the Toronto Centre for Community Learning and Development.

Focus group sessions were held between April 17 and April 19, 2018. Five sessions were held with a total of 36 community members and 28 SME focus group attendees who participated both in-person or by teleconference. In the SME sessions there were representatives from 13 different organisations and community groups, and two levels of government - both municipal and provincial. The community engagement sessions had

a range of participants from various ethnic backgrounds and lived experiences, with consideration given to gender and age. There were a significant number of elder participants in the ACB-focused consultation, and a balanced inclusion of men and women in the community sessions in the Middle Eastern, South-Asian and Muslim communities.

SMEs were identified by the project team and these individuals were mobilized to assist in further outreach to other community leaders within their networks.

Outreach efforts for the community sessions were lead by the community based agencies and designated staff members from those organisations.

\$100 per focus group was allocated for food purchase and two tokens per attendee were provided by the City. Agencies were given the option of identifying and placing orders with local caterers to better meet the dietary preferences of the communities being outreached to.

Community engagement sessions were held in-person and onsite at the partnering community based organisations (TD Learning Centre, TNO, Delta Family Resource) and each were 2 hours in length. SME engagement sessions were held at Metro Hall and were each 1 hour and 15 minutes in length. Each focus group session was audio-recorded and handwritten notes were taken to ensure the accuracy of the information. All community and SME participants gave verbal consent prior to taking part in each session and focus group, and participants were informed that only the consultant would have access to those files. The focus group content was later transcribed and reviewed for accurate quotations and identification of dominant themes.

All sessions, excluding one, were co-facilitated with the consultant and a member of the project team. Co-facilitators were matched where appropriate, for their lived experience with the communities being engaged with to ensure a fuller understanding of ethno-cultural specificities and nuance.

The consultant developed focus group questions in collaboration with the project team before the sessions. Participants at each of the five focus groups were provided with a Fact Sheet prepared by Corporate Security which outlined the specifics of the proposed security measures.

The consultant, in dialogue with the project team, reviewed the focus group transcripts, identified dominant themes, and developed recommendations based on the findings that emerged.

\*\*\*Community and Subject Matter Expert focus group questions can be found in Appendix A and outreach materials can be found in Appendix B.

## Limitations

It is important to note that while the summary and findings contained in this report are to the best of the consultants ability, an accurate reflection of the thoughts shared by participants through the community and SME consultations, that there were challenges in the process that limit the fullness of this community engagement and subsequently this report. Those limitations by way of barriers were: length of community engagement process and availability of information prior to conducting the focus group sessions.

First, the engagement process was impacted by the brief 2.5 week timeline available to the consultant and project team in outreaching to, securing, meeting with and reporting back from communities through the focus group sessions. The timeline significantly reduced our potential participant numbers, particularly in our outreach efforts to East African, BlackMuslim, youth, and young adult groups. Additionally, the limited availability of information for the consultant and project team regarding the background and rationale for the needs assessment proved to be a barrier that impacted the ability of the consultant and project team to build relationships with and gather appropriate feedback from the participants involved. Although background material was provided by Corporate Security for distribution at focus group sessions, there was an expressed need for more complete information for facilitators and participants. Both of these barriers are raised by communities and elaborated upon further in the report.

That said, the sessions that were held provided a great deal of information and feedback to the project team, and there was an overwhelming level of interest and desire for ongoing engagement and further consultation from individuals who were a part of the consultative process.

The feedback gathered from the five sessions are organized under three overarching headings; emergent concerns, questions to be explored, and recommendations moving forward.



## Session Summaries

Despite a great deal of commonalities shared among them, each focus group provided feedback that was specific to the needs, issues and perspectives of their respective group. The following summaries will speak to those specificities before expanding further in the report on their shared concerns, questions and recommendations.

### East African, Black and Muslim Community

- The intersection of race and faith and the compounded experiences of anti-Black and anti-Muslim prejudice and discrimination for members sharing those identities.
- Historic and ongoing negative interactions between members of law enforcement and residents in low income communities
- Concerns over the ongoing profiling and the over surveillance of Black youth, and identifiably Muslim individuals (particularly women) in public spaces
- The oftentimes negative experiences for community members(particularly male youth) in their interactions with both Toronto Police and security personnel
- The existing under-engagement of City Hall with Black Muslim communities and the further impact of these proposed security measures on accessing the space
- The potential for re-traumatization of individuals with histories of militarized state violence and restricted movement in their communities of origin

### African-Canadian/Black communities

- The potential for further criminalization of Black youth through the misapplication of these proposed measures

- The absence of consideration given to the Anti-Black Racism Action Plan and the lack of utilization of an ABR lens in the initial assessment and recommendations and the proposed enhancements
- The potential message being sent by the suggested measures to Black activists and community organisers involved in political actions in the city and in front of City Hall
- The perceived performatory engagement with Black communities in the consultation process and lack of transparency during the process as an example of this

#### South-Asian, Middle Eastern, and Muslim communities

- The concern for the use of anti-terror language in the report on the Enhanced Security Measures to Executive Committee being perceived as coded language directed towards Muslim communities
- The targeting of South-Asian, Middle Eastern, Muslim, Black and First Nations groups in the community engagement process, to the exclusion of all others as problematic and stigmatizing

There was an overwhelmingly clear consensus from each of the sessions that security for City Hall staff, council members and patrons was of utmost priority. This was restated by each group consistently throughout the engagement process.

There was however some difference of opinion between groups about the appropriateness of the proposed security enhancements, with ideas ranging from complete resistance on the grounds of their severity, to an acceptance of the measures with stipulations made around ensuring fairness of its implementation.

These differences of perspective appeared to be drawn along generational lines; with older focus group participants in both the ACB community session and the Black Muslim community session appearing more accepting of the proposed patron screening

measures as a necessary and reasonable response in line with what was noted as a more dangerous climate and time than in past.

Newcomer participants and residents with more recent histories in Toronto also appeared to be of the opinion that security enhancements may be necessary but that there also needed to be a clearer outlining of the limits of these changes and steps put in place to ensure their appropriate and fair implementation by security staff.

In general, younger and/or more socially and politically involved respondents in the SME sessions saw the proposed measures as extreme, disproportionate to the actual risk, and as an opportunity for potential abuse by security personnel impacting already vulnerable groups.

Both the Black community group and South-Asian, Middle Eastern and Muslim community groups shared positive experiences being in City Hall and were quite familiar with the services and events held there with some having visited recently. None had had any notable experiences with security staff and were unable to speak to that either positively or negatively.

In the focus group with Black Muslims however there were examples shared of friends and family members having challenging experiences at City Hall and in another instance for one of the participants, a family member's negative experience with secondary screening during a visit to Parliament Hill in Ottawa.

Regardless of their stance on the appropriateness of the enhanced security measures, nearly all of the groups shared similar concerns, cautions, and questions about both the process for community engagement and the proposed enhancements themselves.

# Emergent Concerns

## Intention and Motivation

“Whoever came up with this context of consultation already had some ideas (...) people already have a plan of introducing this stuff and were just trying to get us to say ‘yeah’ or ‘nah.’”

Across the focus group sessions there was re-emerging questions and concerns around the reasons for enhanced security measures at City Hall. Participants in the first two sessions only had access to the Fact Sheet provided by Corporate Security which referenced an assessment conducted by Toronto Police Services but did not elaborate on what specific events, if any, had precipitated their recommendations.

In the absence of available information many of the participants discussed what political and social events may have contributed to these local concerns. The ideas about precipitating events ranged from the attack on Parliament Hill, to the thwarted incident and arrests made in Vancouver, with a number of individuals particularly within the SME sessions attributing the proposed measures as a response to recent Black activist actions such as those led by Black Lives Matter Toronto and other groups.

“Over the last few years historically we have been seeing large groups of Black people largely around demonstrations and rallies and those types of political engagements at City Hall that policing forces have had difficulty controlling and that’s my concern in terms of how we exercise our rights to rally and organise”

There was a sense that these proposed measures were an overreaction to what was felt as being rather low-risk for attacks targeting Toronto and City Hall, and there was a reiteration of the need for evidence-based responses rather than over-reactive proposals that may cause more harm both to communities experiencing marginalisation as well as to the security of City Hall.

“The people [Toronto Police Services] they [Corporate Security] consulted with have a history of abusing marginalised groups”

“It absolutely will further criminalize Black youth. There will be confrontations and escalations and misunderstandings and all kinds of things that come with over surveillance (...) this can only be a bad thing for our youth”

Anti-Black racism, Islamophobia and age-based discrimination were highlighted repeatedly as being concerning to focus group participants. Some participants shared that these proposed measures displayed either intentional or unintentional discriminatory and antagonistic attitudes held by law enforcement and security personnel towards Black and racialised youth and those perceived as Muslim.

“City Hall is a hub and so with all of the incremental government funding that’s happening now and with the increased funding on programs geared towards youth there will be more youth at City Hall than has typically been there before (...) these different points of screening can be further used to criminalize our [Black] youth”

Concerns were voiced about these measures being another means of further ostracizing and criminalizing groups that are already unlikely to use or access City Hall space but for whom recent City initiatives such as the ABR Action Plan, have attempted to outreach to, again, namely Black and other racialized male youth.

“This whole process is about priorities. You’re prioritizing staff of City Hall and members of council with zero, zero accountability to the public (...) because the way it’s been put out there is as if it’s the public that are the threat, as if the threat couldn’t also come internally from staff, members of council or anyone else”

There was also the repeated question among participants as to who these proposed measures were meant to ensure the safety of, and which bodies were deemed to be

more of a risk to the safety and security of the City Hall space. There was a strong critique of this narrative by community members who reminded the project team that there was an assumption being made that potential threats to the space were likely to come from outside, and from non-City staff and patrons.

“City Hall is our house. It’s the taxpayers abode. It is not a privilege that politicians are giving us. We pay for this. We are your employers”

Participants repeatedly reminded the project team that municipal government spaces are intended to be shared and accessible to the residents of a city. Therefore, the securing of City Hall should not only be for the wellbeing of the public servants and elected officials but also for the general public. Respondents continually noted that accessibility and freedom of movement within the space should not be impeded by any implemented security process, as this would change the nature of the space itself and subsequently, the engagement of City residents in such a space.

“If the role of security is to maintain the security of the building, its patrons, but it also extends to members of the public. And if it extends to members of the public meaning they have a the right to access, how we define access will also determine the types of privileges and rights members of the public have to that space”

#### Timing of Process

There was a general sentiment across the focus group sessions, that the timing, or rather, the short notice allocated for community consultations was highly insufficient. The first session which was held in the neighbourhood of Regent Park, focused on East African and Black and Muslim communities and had a smaller turnout in comparison to the other sessions. Partner agency staff and those in attendance attributed this to the fact that less than week was allocated for outreach within the community.

*"I actually don't believe the process is one that's fair and balanced where everyone's opinion is actually going to be considered (...) many of my community members had no clue about it. I found about this consultation just yesterday (...) I think it's important to go back to those who have put this process together and say listen, this is more complicated than what is put on paper, there needs to be buy-in from the community"*

Participants voiced their concern that without adequate time allocated for outreach and promotion that it was improbable that the process would capture the full range of feedback from Black and Muslim communities which called into question for them, the accuracy of the consultation process overall. This perceived oversight of marginalised communities and what was seen as a "rushed process" signaled to them an undervaluing of the community's feedback and that the community engagement sessions by the City were largely performatory and not meaningful. This was echoed to varying degrees, throughout all five sessions.

*"When do we ever see any level of government move this fast? December 2017 there were assessments and literally four months later there is a readiness to move on a report?"*

Additionally it was felt that the speed with of the outreach and engagement efforts and the expected turn around between the consultation, and the completion and presentation of the report to the Executive Committee for final decision making, was unrealistic and cause for suspicion.

## Meaningfulness of consultation

*"This cake is baked realistically (...) so we're kind of here to do this shuck and jive a little bit"*

Within the majority of the focus groups held, it was mentioned that the attempt to engage with communities was appreciated and necessary given the nature of the proposed measures and their potential to impact the communities of which participants are a part of. However there was criticism directed at when and in what ways these groups were being brought into the process and to what extent their feedback and concerns would be taken into consideration.

It was felt overall that the targeted communities should have been included in the decision making process at the risk assessment phase and that it would be meaningful to have community input and advisement weaved throughout to guarantee that protocols developed would be done so with the least amount of harm to groups most vulnerable.

That absence of early involvement, in addition to the lack of presence of representatives from Corporate Security in the community consultation process led participants to feel as if they were being asked to offer thoughts at the tailend of a decision making process, and with the least amount of information to build their opinions off of. One respondent in the SME session characterized it as follows:

*"What if anything are benefits that we should expect. If I'm going to have enhanced security, by definition I should feel safer (...) and so if we don't feel safe coming into the consultation (...) we're not being told the cons, we don't know what the rationale is, and no one is telling me we will put these measures in place and this is how you as a citizen will navigate this new normal and feel safer. In fact what we're hearing from others around the table is that we don't feel safe and in fact the idea of it scares us"*

Participants also shared that even the purpose of the consultation process and the information they were being asked to provide to be included in this report was unclear to them. How, many questioned, was their feedback going to influence or inform the



direction, design and even decision as to whether to implement these patron screening measures? Many stated that they doubted the usefulness of the collecting of their recommendations and concerns as it was unlikely to be read, considered or incorporated in the end.

"This doesn't look like a proposal it's more like informing the community of decision already being made"

"It feels as if some decisions have been made and we're being quickly coordinated and referenced to give some validation to it. I'd be interested in hearing what happens to our input, what's the process. Because I'm sure it will be ignored"

"I have been involved in a number of these so called consultations with policing and security and City Hall and Toronto police and community is often asked to give this consultation with just really incomplete information, and I just feel like it's really poor practice and it's the kind of thing that makes me think that there's a decision being made here and I am very sceptical about where this is going and the level of information we have been provided to give feedback on is limited at best"

In at least one community engagement session there was a near consensus that as a result of this stated lack of information, no clear understanding of what their role was in the process, and with the recommendations as outlined in the Fact Sheet that were seen as not having been well thought through, participants requested that it be noted on record their disapproval of the measures and their request to halt the process altogether.

"I'm not going to problem solve a problem that we haven't created, and at this point I don't feel people are in agreement with it. I think it's unfair to present something that could potentially harmful to our communities and then ask us to problem solve it"

## Questions to be explored

“What’s the impetus for doing this (...) what’s the risk we’re trying to avert, and is this the best way to address those risks? Would they be willing to consider other measures than what they have listed here?”

Overwhelmingly there was a need from attendees at the focus group sessions for clarification on a number of areas. It was expressed that these questions needed to be answered before they could participate as fully and as meaningfully as the process required. The one page Fact Sheet provided by the City was seen as being wholly inadequate, and the language contained in it was deemed as being vague.

In later sessions participants were provided with some more background information thanks to the assistance of a member of staff at the Equity, Diversity and Human Rights division who sat in on SME sessions as well as a community member who participated as an ACB SME. The consultant was able to distribute some of the documents contained in the public record which gave more background about what other measures had been previously approved by council and some of the stated rationale for the requests by Corporate Security.

That said, even with the distribution of the information from the public records from Executive, due to issues of security much of the information contained within those documents were listed as confidential which participants expressed as being frustrating.

There was a great deal of disappointment at the one sided nature of the consultation and the missed opportunity to speak directly to City staff and those in decision making positions from Corporate Security about what they had read in the Fact Sheet and the other provided documents.

Questions from participants were captured by the consultant and included in this document for review and consideration in future consultations related to these proposed measures.

They are as follows:

"It feels like there's a subtext [to the proposed measures]. And there's one thing to submit a proposal to community members, but it's another thing to do that in a way as if they have all of the information (...) we're contributing to a process where there's all this hidden background information, and it doesn't feel very democratic, and it doesn't feel like an authentic consultation"

"There seems to be a lot of discretionary powers given to these people [security personnel], and a lot of what they've identified in terms of what patron screening entails is very broad, so there's no point of escalation. Whose determining what that escalation entails? What are the criteria to determine when and which this happens?"

"Let's assume there's some kind of new enhanced security (...) and they decide to stop me, what's the basis under which you've made that choice, what's the training, what's the rationale, what's the checks and balances put in place and what is my right as a citizen to refute that?"

"I have a lot of anxiety around the legal definition of enhanced security, right, and that hasn't been clarified, that's why I'm like, what's the goal post?"

"It's not really consultation because if you're asking me something and I don't understand you, how can I give it to you? I need to understand what you need from me in order to say yes or no"

- What is the rationale for these proposed enhancements?
- What is the risk trying to be averted, and is this the best way to address those risks using existing evidence and best practice?
- Is there a willingness to explore alternative security measures?

- Is there an option to halt these proposals from moving forward to Executive Committee and council until there is a more thorough community consultation process?
- How do these proposed measures relate back to the Anti-Black Racism Action Plan for the City?
- Is this proposal being evaluated through an Anti-Black Racism lens like the ABR Action Plan spoke of?
- When these security measures are being determined, who is being prioritized and protected through them?
- In the survey of City staff was there a clear concern identified by them? What were those specific concerns?
- What cultural sensitivity and other related training will be in place for security personnel to ensure fairness of implementation and to avoid anti-Black racism and Islamophobic bias?
- What will be the protocol for security personnel in determining which members of the public will require secondary screening? What will be the profile made available to them for such instances?
- What enhanced training and protocol will be in place for security personnel in their dealings with members of the public who are homeless, transient or living with mental health challenges?
- What accountability measures will be in place for the security personnel in their interactions with the public?
- How will members of the public be made aware of complaints procedures in the instances where interactions with security are unpleasant?

- How will the communities receive information about from the current consultation process? How does the City plan to report-back to the communities that have been engaged with?

## Recommendations Moving Forward

Individuals from most of the sessions gave suggestions about best practices for Corporate Security moving forward. Their recommendations focused either on potential changes to improve the process or ways of improving on, or revising the direction of, the proposal by TPS and Corporate Security.

### *Early and ongoing engagement*

The development of a community consultation process that engages members of vulnerable groups, community organisations and community leaders in the early stages of the proposed changes to City Hall procedures (inclusive of, but not limited to security). This consultation process should be formalised, ongoing and be the default check and balance in scenarios that have direct impacts on residents from marginalised groups within the city. Individuals who are a part of these processes should be provided with enough information to appropriately advise recommendations made, and there should be an opportunity for communities to directly engage with Corporate Security and have their questions and concerns responded to. Communities involved should be included in outreach and recruitment and adequate time must be given to get appropriate numbers of respondents and to report back accurately. The feedback received and suggestions made in these consultation processes should be meaningfully considered and included in the decision making.

### *Evidence-based*

*"It has to be evidence-based, not rumour based or perception based"*

The City should endeavor to ensure that all new security protocols and assessments of risks are evaluated against existing best-practices and available research. Information about the research and available evidence about new measures should be made easily accessible to members of the public for review.

### *Research and best-practices*

In the instance where research and evidence is limited, clear evaluation processes should be in place to determine best-practices, needs assessments and community surveys, and/or to gauge the efficacy of piloted security initiatives/measures implemented by the City. The clear use of an Anti-oppressive and anti-Black Racism lens must be clearly demonstrated as having been considered in any and all initiatives impacting Black and other racialized and socially marginalised groups.

Specific suggestions made in terms of best practice include consideration given to gender. complement of front-end security personnel and in the instance that patron screening does move forward that Muslim women should be given the option of being searched by female security or that X-Ray devices not be used.

Other suggestions include that in the instance that patron screening is implemented that all individuals moving through City Hall be subject to the same protocol, and this to include City staff as well.

### *Utilization of community resources*

In the case of new security initiatives, efforts need to be made to contract, hire and build the capacity of diverse city residents, particularly Black and other racialized young people, religious minorities and those living within priority neighbourhoods who experience underemployment and poverty.

Suggestions made include a targeted advertising and hiring campaign and the availability of accessible training opportunities to better ensure the enlistment - as security personnel at City Hall - of members of these groups.

### *Alternative approaches*

Outside of enhanced security measures such as patron screening there needs to be an exploration of alternative approaches and a willingness to pilot innovative, community-focused initiatives with the aim to improve security and wellbeing for City Hall, its staff and member of the public whom it serves.

Suggestions made include a targeted campaign outreaching to diverse city residents about City Hall as a public space for all Toronto residents and the inclusion of programs and services on site that encourage civic engagement by communities that historically have not engaged the space. Improved sense of ownership by otherwise marginalized groups would serve to act as a deterrent. As one participant notes:

“That’s the problem with security in general, you see it all around the world. I think people are trying to preempt with securitizing public spaces like that and it’s not based in evidence. It’s based in irrational fear. Any society has to deal with a certain level of risk (...) Most of the terrorist incidents or violent incidences that are thwarted are done through intelligence gathering, they are never done through this security stuff (...) it’s happening way before anyone even comes to that metal detector.”

## Consultant Summary and Recommendations

### *Meaningfully informed, and thoughtfully centred,*

There is an overwhelming agreement among all the individuals who were invited to be a part of the engagement process, that the security of City Hall, staff, elected officials and patrons is of course of the highest priority. That said, there was a clear sense of concern for what was felt to be a consultation process that appeared superficial and performatory, that reinscribed for individuals some of the systemic challenges and oversights experienced by racialized and other minority groups engaging government and institutions, and that left many feeling absent of information and meaningful consideration. There were clear differences of thought on the use of patron screening measures. A number of individuals expressed their approval, albeit with clear stipulations about improved training regarding racial and religious bias. There was also a strong sense - by a fairly significant amount of community - of a need for cautiousness around the use and potential misuse of these technologies and measures by security personnel. Requests for delay and further consultation by these members was quite vocal.



The limitations within the consultation process itself as mentioned repeatedly in this document, added a great deal to this sense of concern, confusion and caution for some. With that in mind, a more involved community dialogue needs to be had before any final decisions are made by council, and that conversation should expand to include not only members of the First Nations, African-Canadian, South-Asian, Middle Eastern and Muslim communities, but also residents of other backgrounds in the city, around how best to respond to issues of security at City Hall and further still, our common public spaces and significant cultural sites. That proposed expansion however should not obscure the experiences had by minority groups who experience these measures in unique and problematic ways.

It is acknowledged that this report is being submitted at a challenging time in the city as Toronto comes to terms with a recent major attack and the losses of life as a result.

Time and again respondents who were met with through this process remarked that Toronto is an increasingly important example on the world stage, and so thoughtfulness, care as well as, pragmatism are essential in any decisions being made as we move forward, weighing in measure the unfortunate new realities both here at home and across the globe.

# Appendix A

## Interview Questions: Community Members

- A. What do you know about City Hall?
- B. Have you been to City Hall?
- C. If not, why haven't you gone? If so, when was the last visit? How was that experience?
- D. What do you know about City Hall security measures?

\*\*Give participants time to review Fact Sheet

- E. What, if at all, are your experiences with City Hall security (and/or protocols) if any?
- F. How might these proposed security measures impact - whether positively or negatively - you as a resident of this city?
- G. Have you or anyone close to you been impacted?
- H. In what way? What occurred?
- I. How, if at all, might being South Asian/Middle Eastern/Black/Muslim impact your experience of entering City Hall? In what ways (be specific)
- J. What are your suggestions on how the interactions between security staff at City Hall and members of community are incident free?
- K. Are there things you need further clarified before moving forward?

## Interview Questions: Subject Matter Experts

- A. What challenges, if any might you see arising from these proposed measures?
- B. In what ways may this impact the community you serve and/or are a part?  
Please be specific.
- C. How might security go about ensuring these challenges are avoided?
- D. What suggested alternatives if any might you propose they explore?
- E. What questions could be better answered for you before moving forward?

# Appendix B



**Are you a member of the Middle Eastern, South Asian or Muslim community, and interested in being in a focus group on the proposed new security measures at Toronto City Hall?**

**Join us for a community conversation.**

*Light food and tokens will be provided, as well as childcare if needed.*

Date: Thursday, April 19th, 2018

Time: 6pm - 8pm

Location: The Neighbourhood Organization (TNO). 1 Leaside Park Dr. Unit #7, Toronto

Phone Number: 416 467 0126

Email Sadia Zafar: [szafar@tno.toronto.org](mailto:szafar@tno.toronto.org)



**Are you a member of the Black community, and interested in being in a focus group on the proposed new security measures at Toronto City Hall?**

**Join us for a community conversation.**

*Light food and tokens will be provided.*

Date: Wednesday, April 18<sup>th</sup>, 2018

Time: 6pm - 8pm

Location: Delta Family Resource Centre, 2291 Kipling Ave., Etobicoke

Phone Number: 416 747 1172

Email Farai Gore: fgore@dfrc.ca



**Are you a member of the East African community or identify as Black and Muslim, and interested in being in a focus group on the proposed new security measures at Toronto City Hall?**

**Join us for a community conversation.**

*Light food and tokens will be provided.*

Date: Tuesday April 17th, 2018  
Time: 6pm - 8pm  
Location: TD Centre of Learning, 540 Dundas St E. Toronto.  
Phone Number: 647 640 3090  
Email Berlin Mohamed: berlinabdy22@gmail.com

Call **3 1 1**

The City of Toronto holds focused consultations as one way to engage residents in the life of their city. We invite you to get involved.

## City Hall Security - SME Consultation

### African-Canadian Engagement Session

The City is holding a focused Community Engagement Session on the proposed changes to security at City Hall. This consultation is being held for subject matter experts (SME) from within the African-Canadian community to ask questions and share feedback.



**Wednesday April 18th, 2018**

Focus Group (with teleconference options), starting with presentation  
12:00pm - 1:15pm



**Metro Hall**

55 John Street, Toronto ON  
2nd Floor

City of Toronto, Corporate Security along with various partner agencies, routinely conducts security threat and risk assessments at City facilities.

In 2017 the Toronto Police Service and Public Safety Canada completed two separate security threat and risk assessments for Toronto City Hall (100 Queen Street West). Both assessments recommended a number of security improvements including the implementation of patron screening, also known as the use of walk through metal detectors and wand, at Toronto City Hall for all non-employees wishing to enter the facility.

On December 5, 2017, Toronto City Council passed an amended decision for Enhanced Security Measures at Toronto City Hall (report EX29.10). Point four of the City Council decision document directed Toronto Corporate Security through the Deputy City Manager, to survey members of the public and City employees on patron screening at City Hall and report back to City Council.

**Facilitator:**  
David Lewis-Peart



**Tel: 647-618-1701**



**Email:**

[david.davidlewis@gmail.com](mailto:david.davidlewis@gmail.com)



Call **3 1 1**

The City of Toronto holds focused consultations as one way to engage residents in the life of their city. We invite you to get involved.

## City Hall Security - SME Consultation

### Muslim Community Engagement Session

The City is holding a focused Community Engagement Session on the proposed changes to security at City Hall. This consultation is being held for subject matter experts (SME) from within the Muslim community to ask questions and share feedback.



**Thursday April 19th, 2018**

Focus Group (with teleconference options), starting with presentation  
12:00pm - 1:15pm



**Metro Hall**

55 John Street, Toronto ON  
2nd Floor

City of Toronto, Corporate Security along with various partner agencies, routinely conducts security threat and risk assessments at City facilities.

In 2017 the Toronto Police Service and Public Safety Canada completed two separate security threat and risk assessments for Toronto City Hall (100 Queen Street West). Both assessments recommended a number of security improvements including the implementation of patron screening, also known as the use of walk through metal detectors and wand, at Toronto City Hall for all non-employees wishing to enter the facility.

On December 5, 2017, Toronto City Council passed an amended decision for Enhanced Security Measures at Toronto City Hall (report EX29.10). Point four of the City Council decision document directed Toronto Corporate Security through the Deputy City Manager, to survey members of the public and City employees on patron screening at City Hall and report back to City Council.

**Facilitator:**  
David Lewis-Peart



**Tel: 647-618-1701**



**Email:**  
david.davidlewis@gmail.com