

TORONTO COMMUNITY HOUSING CORPORATION  
TENANT SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING  
MAY 4, 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

WRITTEN DEPUTATIONS

<b>AGENDA ITEM #</b>		<b>PAGE #</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Action Item List – Public</b>	
	Kathleen Doobay (re Briefing Note #11) .....	2
	Cheryl Duggan (re Briefing Note #11).....	3
<b>6</b>	<b>Lawrence Heights:</b>	
	Miguel Avila-Velarde .....	7
<b>8</b>	<b>Seniors Health and Wellness Hub at 145 Strathmore Blvd/ Greenwood Towers</b>	
	Bill Lohman .....	10
	Janet McLeod .....	12
<b>9A</b>	<b>TCHC Community Safety Advisory Sub-Committee - Update</b>	
	Cheryl Duggan .....	15
<b>9C</b>	<b>Tenant Complaints Update</b>	
	Kathleen Doobay .....	16
	Cheryl Duggan .....	17
<b>10</b>	<b>Q1 2021 Tenants First Update</b>	
	Anita Dressler .....	22
	Bill Lohman .....	24

Deputation - Kathleen Doobay  
Item 3 -Briefing Notes #11 - CCTV Cameras  
TSC Public Meeting - May 4, 2021

**Item 3 - BN 11 - CCTV Cameras**

Acknowledging at the March 24, 2021 meeting TSC requested a report back on the cost to replace a CCTV camera & the number of instances where TCHC's camera footage was used by TPS in recent years.

The information provided in the communication from William Anderson is an average cost.

On September 15, 2020 I sent an email to TCHC as the provincial government announced increased funding for surveillance. It is important that we are able to acknowledge, advocate & action accordingly.

Based on my limited knowledge; I am privileged to reside in a TCHC community that have working CCTV cameras. Why aren't all TCHC communities afforded working CCTV cameras?

On February 6, 2021 I sent a follow up email to TCHC given the increase in gun violence to please consider 27/7 security in higher risk communities. Acknowledging the limitations to existing budgets. This email was sent after our Falstaff community experienced loss & another example of our TCHC community collaborating with TPS. When will narratives shift?

It is important we are taking existing laws around vulnerabilities & sensitivities into account. Acknowledging systemic & structural issues. How are we leveraging our knowledge to ensure we are actively building back better for our TCHC communities? We've heard from past deputations that communities want less police. How are we redistributing power? How are budgets respecting communities & human rights?

Building a culture of **Respect, Care & Helpfulness** will take time.

**Thank you for holding space for this deputation & your continued work in this space.**

Kathleen Doobay

TCHC TSC – May 4<sup>th</sup>, 2021  
(Item 3 BN 11 – CCTV Cameras Final)

This document really doesn't tell me much of anything. It doesn't tell me about the process a community has to go through to get full coverage of all public areas of their community, how many cameras are installed across the entire portfolio, how many have been installed/upgraded in each of the last five years, nor how many cameras are slated to be installed in which communities over the next two years. So I guess it shouldn't surprise me that the questions that were actually asked of it weren't answered satisfactorily either.

Otherwise, if this is the “final” word on CCTV camera usage at TCHC I can see why it's so difficult to get them placed on every floor of every building. What I don't understand is why this document indicates that installation is listed under the Capital funding program. Yet I can't get near a decent discussion about getting them installed on every floor of my building? All the other categories of Capital work are up for discussion. Windows. Balconies. Cladding. The sprinkler system in the underground. Shifting garbage bins away from directly in front of the building. But not CCTV cameras.

You would figure that with all that Capital work being done that TCHC would want to protect the financial investment made by various levels of government by ensuring there was adequate surveillance of **ALL** public spaces.

It disturbs me greatly that TCHC does seem to highlight strongly on the news when it comes to CCTV footage pointing outward from our communities. Yet does nothing to prevent

situations from escalating to that point. If TCHC was monitoring situations properly from within chances are many of those incidents shown on the six o'clock news could be prevented. (I know risk prevention is not really your thing. But, if you lived here I'm sure it wouldn't take long to become your top priority.)

Keep your friends close and you're enemies closer. If you don't know your enemy how can you prevent their behaviour from impacting innocent/random civilians.

Never mind the fact that I think there is too much lip service at TCHC paid to "Tenant Engagement" but it doesn't seem as if TCHC really values or wishes to protect the tenants themselves.

What I would dearly love the answer to is how many times Toronto Police Services feels CCTV camera footage would have been a primary tool to help solve crime during a criminal investigation? I know they would have been really happy if TCHC had CCTV cameras installed on my floor prior to the murder of my neighbour last year. That would have saved them numerous hours, days, weeks, and months of investigation. (I'm curious – how many dollars does a homicide investigation add up to? Shouldn't CCTV camera's in ALL public spaces at TCHC be looked at as a cost saving measure across other city services?)

Seriously, this is like a bad game of tag. As long as the crime they commit is in their own building they're home free.

Until such a time as TCHC begins to take a tenants word with

respect to other tenants anti-social or criminal behaviour these CCTV camera systems could be a critical independent method of validation. Just because you (TCHC) didn't see it doesn't mean it didn't happen.

Pushing this dialogue even further I wonder what Toronto Police Services would say if asked how many crimes they believe could be **PREVENTED** if TCHC had adequate CCTV cameras throughout the portfolio? If TCHC is going to continue in its perceived role as “social” housing provider (aka three-quarter way house, aka mental health facility, aka substance abuse recovery centre) then maybe TCHC should give themselves permission to install the necessary CCTV surveillance to protect their own on site staff. Especially, now that we are going to be having more front line staff on site in those fancy new Hubs being built across the portfolio.

As for this report. The first answer could use some clarification. The difference between being categorized as “Demand” and “Capital”. Could this be a systemic issue that has otherwise not properly identified the need for CCTV cameras in a community, despite high incident numbers, further increasing the cost of installation? If there was an attempt by TCHC to install CCTV on every floor of every building across the portfolio wouldn't that decrease the cost per camera

Then there's “Demand” which seems to indicate that if I got the money you can install the CCTV. Somehow I don't believe that's true. What do you mean by “Demand”? What form or how do those “Demands” get made effectively from within a specific community?

That answer to the second question is somewhere in left field. How difficult is it to track how many times a Toronto Police investigation was solved with the assistance of TCHC CCTV camera footage? Maybe that new IT system could track how many times the system has been accessed. Provided they are integrated of course. This shouldn't be more difficult than pressing a button and waiting for a readout.

I don't get it. TCHC Special Constables don't embrace the old fashioned idea of doing foot patrols (without TPS holding their hand). Nor do they embrace the IT revolution. So, it shouldn't come as a big surprise if one day AI takes over their role at TCHC. Even then you would need that CCTV surveillance installed on every floor of every building. Otherwise, you'd end up teaching the AI that hallways are private space and we both know you're wrong on that point.

Deputation - Miguel Avila-Velarde  
Item 6 - Lawrence Heights: Phases 2 & 3 Tenant Benefit Agreement  
TSC Pubic Meeting - May 4, 2021

**From:** Miguel avila-velarde  
**Sent:** Monday, May 3, 2021 9:13 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Tenant Services Committee

Dear Committee Members of the TSC:

Re: Item 6 of the agenda.

I want to incorporate this following comments in RED to the TSC:

There is a huge inaccuracy ,,,,,,,,,,there is INFORMATION (partly provided) some are missing conveniently for the committee to be properly informed.:

On Page 1 (1) attachment to the report dated March 09 2021 of your report to be discussed or received for information as always:

<https://www.torontohousing.ca/events/Documents/TSC/2021%20TSC/TSC%20May%204%202021/Item%206%20-%20LH%20Phase%202-3%20Tenant%20Benefit%20w%20attachments.pdf>

at the bottom of the page it states that during phases 1, 2 and 3 of the Regent Park Revitalization **584 Jobs were secured with info from TESS since 2009** that report is not fully completed and yes we are aware of the gifts in kind to the community such as the Daniels Spectrum and other but no really job creation;

In the report provided to the Regent Park Neighbourhood Association by **Chris Phipps Executive Director to the City**

The Executive Director Report is available online: <https://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2019/cc/bgrd/backgroundfile-139392.pdf>

PAGE 5:

Page 5:

Toronto Employment and Social Services has only tracked the number of jobs created for Regent Park residents as a result of the revitalization. Toronto Employment and Social Services reports that a total of 582 jobs have been created through opportunities directly related to the Regent Park revitalization.

The jobs created were in the Construction Trades, Retail, Hospitality, Finance and Administration sectors. Two hundred and ninety (290) residents were employed between 2009 and 2013, at that time part-time and full time positions were not tracked separately.

Since 2014, 259 residents have been placed in part-time employment opportunities and **33 residents have been placed into full-time employment opportunities**. In addition to the **582 jobs** directly related to revitalization, Regent Park residents were connected to other initiatives as a result of Toronto Employment and Social Services ongoing engagement of local residents. Over the last 10 years residents have been placed in 1108 additional jobs due to employment opportunities made available through Toronto Employment and Social Services.

There is no mention if People with Disabilities have found Jobs to get them out of Poverty? I am still unemployed?

In all true we used \$1.5 Billion Dollars to create the Social Infrastructure development of Regent Park but we did not make a huge IMPACT in the Social Development of the 15 years PLUS of the Revitalization of Regent Park

**The TRUTH: 33 Residents had only benefited from Full Time Jobs opportunities in Regent Park .. SHAME!!**

I must repeat again in 2014 I applied for a job position with TCHC as a "Community Animator" I was told that I did not qualify for the job because I was overqualified.. what does it mean? exactly .. your guess is just as good as mine. I have EMAILS to probe it.

Sincerely

Miguel

Report: TSC:2021-24D  
**Attachment 1**

**SUMMARY OF CURRENT TENANT BENEFIT AGREEMENTS**

<b>Site</b>	<b>Tenant Benefit Committed by Developer</b>	<b>Number of Jobs Achieved</b>	<b>Months of Full-Time Jobs</b>	<b>Tenant Benefit Achieved (approx. value)</b>
Allenbury Gardens (FRAM)	10% of jobs on site for tenants and <b>\$0.07M</b> endowment	35 tenants employed  (11 FT & 24 PT)	397	<b>\$1.02M</b>
Leslie Nymark (Tridel)	22 full-time jobs or Equivalent and <b>\$0.1M</b> endowment	9 tenants employed in full-time jobs	178	<b>\$0.61M</b>
Lawrence Heights Phase 1 (Context/ Metropia)	<b>\$3.5M</b> in jobs & training and <b>\$0.5M</b> in scholarships	74 tenants employed (37 FT & 37 PT)	650	\$2.28M and \$0.5M in scholarships as of Sept 2020
Alexandra Park Phase 1 (Tridel)	40 full-time jobs or equivalent and <b>\$0.08M</b> endowment	116 tenants employed (90 FT & 26 PT)	1,747	<b>\$3.63M</b> and <b>\$0.15M</b> in training & scholarships and <b>\$0.2M</b> contracts to the community
Regent Park (Daniels/ Co-tenancy) Phase 1-3	10% of jobs offered to tenants and monetary commitment for community investment projects	Tenant employment for Phase 1-3 is led and reported by City of Toronto's TESS. 584 jobs secured by local residents from 2009. Plus approx. <b>\$8.3M</b> invested for tenant benefits (\$0.86M by TCHC, \$2.6M directly by Daniels, and \$5M indirectly) for Phase 1-3		

Re: Item 8- Seniors Health and Wellness Hubs

Good morning Mr. Chairman and committee members;

Thank you for the opportunity to present these concerns to the committee for it's leadership and judgment.

My name is Bill Lohman. I live in one of the 83 senior buildings and I am a member of the Senior Tenants Advisory Committee(STAC).

My voice is my own.

I participated in the 'Hub' meeting being cited in this report, and I have to say that I can appreciate we all see through different lenses that shade our perceptions. This report is skimming the cream off the top to make the story more appetizing while ignoring the spilled milk while it sours. I recall being part of a more spirited conversation; why are there only five hubs? where will they be located? Where is the list of agencies and non-profits available to serve the 83 buildings? Why wasn't STAC included?, etc. But there was one emphatic point that every tenant member agreed on and that was that these hubs should not be located in actual seniors buildings because agencies take and encroach on tenant space, plus security issues. It would be a better, safer choice for hubs to be located in Community centers.

I have the inclination to say, "Let's be honest here", but that would just be an idiot's pipe-dream. It's like we're living with two sets of books, "A tale of Two Cities". One written up and packaged nicely and in-line with expected accountabilities for bosses while the other is the growing reality for senior communities that is playing out right now at 145 Strathmore Av. What is occurring there is exactly what every senior community has said they do not want, interloping agencies in their buildings denying access and controlling the common space their leases gave them access to. It is overtly obvious that tenants were not informed clearly, if at all, of the massive intrusion and security problem and invasion of privacy that these vulnerable seniors would face from an outside agency bringing their clients into the building and drug addicted transients and criminal element of the neighborhood coming into the community's 'living space', after years of fighting to keep them out.

When I saw those hurriedly arranged seniors refresh preparedness stats pasted into the engagement refresh update, I recognized the same ghost writing style as the author who took the liberty of crafting the Community Action Plan for my building without any of us knowing it had been done. Kinda funny considering

the whole premise of the exercise is for the tenants to decide what they think is important to their communities, not the CSC exercising finger muscles in a late night cram session to meet the submission deadline. But hey, mine is just one of many senior communities who received this same special staff assistance with their CAPs. How many engagement stats have the same penmanship?

There has been a total lack of candor with the 83 buildings and their future since May 2018 when the senior separation was announced. It was nailed home when senior questions were shut-down March 2019 and concretized July 2019, when staff told seniors they were no longer part of TCHC and there was no supplemental budget made for seniors. Notwithstanding COVID-19, seniors have faced a wall of silence for 1½ years, some longer. And now after STAC members got a look at the ISM and complained that it lacked communication and engagement, senior leaders have been reporting calls from Julio Rigore's refresh team seeking introductions at the next tenant meeting and calls to follow-up and see how we are doing with our community action plans and if we need assistance with it.

As I stated to the Mayor's Executive Committee, the efforts of TCHC engagement Refresh to connect with seniors stopped in July 2019, it was not successfully introduced to the majority of senior communities and is actually implemented in only a few. That means the family building Refresh model did/has not taken root in the 83 senior communities. It stretches reason and respect to continue efforts to implement someone else's formula geared to their needs and values, knowing full well that it will soon be severed and again, no suitable, clear communication or engagement strategy in place for tenants 83 senior communities.

As members of the Tenant Services Committee, I believe you are tasked with: Overseeing and ensuring the design, implementation, and reporting of policies, strategies and initiatives by Management on community relations, tenant communications and engagement.

Don't you think you have a responsibility to follow-up on the inconsistencies between what is written in these reports and what is being reported by tenants on the ground and by those who know different?

Transparency, Accountability. Respect.

Thank you,

Bill Lohman

**Deputation, Tenant Services Committee, TCHC**

May 4, 2021

Janet McLeod, 145 Strathmore Blvd

Speaking on behalf of Greenwood Towers tenants, we seniors at 145 Strathmore have been duped.

It was a classic sales pitch. Getting the customer to say yes repeatedly makes it harder to say no. And who would say no to more services and programs and activities in your seniors building of 351 units? But at what cost? In responding to questions in the door-to-door focus group survey, responders state they had no idea that it would mean loss of recreational space we were accustomed to before COVID... OR that it would mean admitting strangers. They state vehemently that if they'd known that, they would have said "No."

Building security is mentioned as the #1 priority in every single meeting I have attended in the past 5 years to include our Tenants' Association and at 13 OUA Tenant Council meetings. Our building has successfully advocated for one security guard 24/7 (when one shows up or is not on break or lunch) to monitor two main doors a city block's distance, one on Strathmore the other on Danforth, plus 5 other entries, plus patrolling 17 floors in two buildings. Visitors jump through a unit's 1<sup>st</sup> floor window, most often piggyback behind a tenant using a fob, and sometimes are admitted by an actual tenant. Drug use is an ongoing issue. With groups of unknown outsiders coming in for programs and wandering around, no one will know who's who, and we've lost any hope of better security.

Now this so-called poll itself: It is a conflict of interest that the group who stands to benefit financially from the Wellness Hub service provider, Woodgreen, is creating the open-ended questions, asking tenants for their opinion, and making their own handwritten notes.

Woodgreen's questions were: Would you like more programs? Do you exercise? What would you like to see in the building? Responders confirm they were never told this would mean surrendering space they'd enjoyed. English speakers were interviewed at their doors; Chinese speakers were called on the phone and question how Woodgreen obtained their phone numbers. Our own experiences with Woodgreen's services indicate mixed results, and we were certainly not involved in choosing that agency. Chinese speakers state a preference for the return of the Grace Chan's Eastview Community Center programs. But they weren't asked that. The Greek community reports they were totally excluded from the focus group.

Tenants state that they prefer using the exercise equipment more privately from meeting space and having it available day and evening. We use the rec room and kitchen for such activities as tenant-run holiday parties and barbecues, building meetings, and small get-togethers when we can't invite family into our units because of bedbugs; tenants ask, "What about the pool table and our participatory budget-funded ping pong table?" They remember being on the first floor and being able to use the toilet.

As always, Housing claims tenants were involved at every step. But the reality is skewed to Housing's agenda; our role is peripheral, tenants state that they were deceived and are very upset.

As per Councilor Fletcher's building meeting May 29, 2019, we are OK with what Joan White and Jaipreet Kohli stated: staff in the former Don Valley East Beaches OUL offices, to include our new SSC Renee Sauer, plus other support personnel. Those offices are a separate, self-contained space yet accessible for outsiders as well. Additional activity and medical check opportunities that we ask for would be welcome – for people who live here.

On the grounds that there was a conflict of interest in Woodgreen doing the survey, the fact that our repeatedly-documented priority of security has been swept aside, the absence of ramifications of more activities taking up recreational space we use, and, heaven help us, more money thrown away on areas only 2 years ago nicely

retrofitted, our Greenwood Towers Tenants' Association speaking for our building has agreed that we do not want the Health and Wellness Hub in our building, coming through our entrance, at all... despite a notice posted today that the Hub is coming and will be located in the current Community Room with services offered to tenants and the region as a whole.

Respectfully submitted

Janet McLeod

Christina Stancati

Co-chairs, Greenwood Towers Tenants Association

TCHC TSC – May 4<sup>th</sup>, 2021

(Item 9A -TCHC Community Safety Advisory Sub-Committee)

I have several questions regarding this particular agenda item. They are as follows -

Is this sub-committee going to be directly available for deputations from TCHC tenants? Or is its work going to consist of discussion behind closed doors and no input from from those that any recommendations from this committee are likely to impact?

Will their agendas and minutes be made publicly available?

Will their mandate include researching community policing initiatives and their risk implications? (Even a simple Google search could provide some valuable insight.) Or is TCHC going to try to reinvent the wheel with respect to this issue?

Will the Community Safety Advisory Sub-Committee solicit contributions from the current Senior Director of the Community Safety Unit William Anderson?

Will this sub-committee communicate with Toronto Police Services with respect to the current conversations/actions with the Gang Prevention Task Force in the West End with whom the Executive Leadership Team (including Sheila Penny) has been in direct contact while working closely together on TCHC's Violence Reduction Program? (No worries. No leaks in your house. I spoke directly with a member of the Integrated Gang Prevention Task Force at Toronto Police Services.)

Deputation - Kathleen Doobay  
 Item 9C - Tenant Complaints Update  
 TSC Pubic Meeting - May 4, 2021

**Item 9C Tenant Complaints Update**

Acknowledging standardize training provided to The Solutions Team in April 2021.

Acknowledging the existing digital divide - **who** that disproportionately impacts & **why**. 55 tenants participated in 4 tenant engagement & consultation sessions. I was privileged to have participated in 1 of the 4 sessions on Wednesday March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2021 from 6:30 – 8:30 pm through WebEx. I want to thank our TCHC community for holding space to listen.

Building a culture of **Respect, Care & Helpfulness** will take time.

Acknowledging the feedback collected during the consultations will be reviewed & integrated into the refresh of the TCHC Complaints policy (projected TSC in Q3 2021). The fact that complaints have increased year-over-year to both TCHC & The Toronto Ombudsman have raised the need for further investigation & advocacy. Several communications have been sent requesting changes made to existing policies without a respectful nor responsive system. Suffice it to say, the interplay between tenants valuable feedback, data collected (including trends) & existing unfairness play a pivotal role in how we action things like anti-Black racism & other forms of discrimination &/or violence. What does the data say? Well, 25% (51) anti-social behaviour, may be ambiguous. How are we redistributing power? When will our communities lead? The implications from what is implied in today's deputation is unacceptable for The City of Toronto, a city known for diversity & yet, the mindset, narratives & heart of the matter have yet to be actioned accordingly.

Acknowledging CCC's unique role & the work towards centralized systems.

Please consider making amendments;

1. Timely Emergency Accommodation to Tenants
2. Access to Real-Time Service Disruption Info
3. Effectively Managing Human Rights Complaints
4. Integrated Team Approach to Community Safety

Contingency & emergency planning advocacy was sent several years ago (via email) without acknowledgement or response. A **responsive system with respect & urgency** in accordance with appropriate governance & oversight. Acknowledging TCHC isn't governing Human Rights Complaints. Implore TCHC & The City of Toronto integrate systems that **educate & empower** communities, especially where disparities exist which will shift from status quo in a sustainable way.

**Acknowledging the ongoing work TCHC & The City of Toronto are doing is brave.  
 That brighter future needs budgets prioritizing this work.**

Thank you for holding space for this deputation & your continued work in this space.

Kathleen Doobay

## TCHC TSC – May 4<sup>th</sup>, 2021 (Item 9C – Tenants Complaints Update FINAL)

I'm glad I get to jump on this one before you so sneakily try to put it to bed. I noticed was that you are missing my complaints about how the tenant engagement aspect of the Tenants Complaint's consultations were conducted. I'm not surprised.

We can begin with the fact that there was NO direct contact information provided for anyone facilitating these discussions. In order to RSVP we were instructed to consult with our CSC first and they would be responsible for signing us up. How many tenants know who their CSC's are or where to locate that information? This lack of direct communication with group facilitators seriously impeded tenant engagement. At this point, I can't help thinking this was a carefully orchestrated attempt to exclude tenants.

One thing that disturbs me about all tenant consultations is that there is no way to build on dialogue from one session to the next. It would be great to use the Group Think concept. To that end I would appreciate it if a) TCHC send out all slides to tenants prior to meetings in their attendance confirmation emails, and b) if TCHC could start posting the audio or video of these sessions soon after the individual consultations we as tenants could view those and come up with further suggestions as to how to fix an issue. I'm just tired of being no further ahead after four sessions than we were after the first. If we could build on ideas instead of just repeating the same ole same ole for all four sessions we'd be that much closer to viable coherent solutions.

Now we can get down to the nitty gritty. What is it with TCHC coming up with examples for case studies that don't exactly put a specific party in the best possible light? In this case Case Study #1 - "Tenant A has encountered a problem with their rent calculation. They spoke with their Tenants Services Coordinator (TSC) who referred them to the website and were told "it just is what it is." This conversation deeply upset Tenant A" ... I bet it did! It would upset you too if someone making a living off your back treated you with anything less than the full respect everyone is entitled to.

Then there is Case Study #2 – "Tenant A has noticed that Tenant B places garbage outside their unit door." This scenario shouldn't end up anywhere near "Tenant B told Tenant A to mind their own business" It's a fire hazard! At some point TCHC should have provided Tenant B with a warning letter to cease and desist such behaviour clearly stating that it is a violation of the Fire Safety Code and Toronto Fire could institute a fine upwards of \$10,000 for obstructing public areas of apartment buildings.

Again Case Study #3 (and there were only three case studies) could also be seen as a Fire Safety issue – "The side entrance of Tenant A's building has a sticky door that sometimes does not open"

Each one of these Case Studies identify an underlying staff issue. In Case Study #1 - The TSC is rude. In Case Studies #2 and #3 - The on site staff (superintendent, maintenance, and/or cleaners) are not performing due diligence to ensure the safety and integrity of the entire building.

But by far the worst trend I see with this tenant engagement process is the attempt to remove the tenant. When we used to do tenant engagement prior to COVID we would break up into small group to discuss items that TCHC staff put together. So TCHC lead the agenda. No surprise there. But what has my hackles up is that when we went back into the bigger group to bring our best ideas forward staff wouldn't allow TCHC tenants to vote on which tenant can bring the material forward. Nor were they permitted by the facilitator (in fact it was strictly forbidden) to mention any of their small group members names when it came to scenarios or solutions. Once upon a time we used to be able to vote on who would bring ideas from the small groups back to the larger group. There certainly wasn't a penalty for acknowledging which tenant came up with a feasible solution or the overwhelming support for such a solution from the other group members.

As a “service oriented organization” TCHC should be taking more of an active interest in the countless solutions I have put forth every chance I get, including these Tenants Complaints consultations, to deal with areas the accrue the largest percentage of complaints.

Beginning with contractor work within our units. For work that happens on a regular basis across the portfolio there should be a description sheet of what tenants should expect from the work. A list of items that clearly define a job well done. As well as a list of items that could mean there are inconsistencies as to TCHC expectations of contractors and the actual work performed. This should be dropped off at the same time as the 24 hour notice of entry.

Contractors should arrive on site with as many Customer Satisfaction surveys as units they will be working on on any given day. This would give them the clear understanding that TCHC tenants will be the first persons to certify a job well done. This should increase quality of work. This should also decrease the number of incidents where contractors disrespect tenants property. It would also empower tenants by putting them in a position to directly identify issues as they occur instead of after contractors have completed work and left their site.

Those ideas, as well as that Contractor Audit and the Tenant Advocacy Office both received significant tenant support during these consultations.

I can't help thinking that those four tenant consultations were perceived as having little to no value. “The following are key themes highlighted by tenants that should be addressed in the refresh of the TCHC Complaints policy:

- Transparency
- Accountability
- Communication
- Confidentiality”

What about the need to track the complaints to determine if their are trends among staff or contractors or policy application to identify any systemic issues? Another one of my ideas that got significant traction during these tenant consultations.

Otherwise, 1 – **The Timely Emergency Accommodation to Tenants** should include the Tenant Service Coordinator and the area manager as both are more likely to be on site immediately following an incident to evaluate tenant needs. Something that I

don't believe the Client Care Centre should take an arms length approach to nor the Community Safety Unit need added to their job description. 2 – **Access to Real-Time Service Disruption Information** Maybe not relying on an email stream but updating the original report with brief updates (date and time stamped) as they come in would be more efficient. 3 – **Effectively Managing Human Rights Complaints** – This document states that “not all staff possess the experience and expertise to appropriately manage Human Rights complaints” I'd question whether or not all staff could actually identify a Human Rights complaint without specifically being told it was a Human Rights complaint. 4 – **Integrated Team Approach to Community Safety** – Where are the tenants? Are there no tenant leaders in that community that sit on this “Integrated Team”. This is proof once again that TCHC tenants are only considered part of the problem not part of the solution. “[T]he team has adopted an issue driven and action oriented approach...” That sounds like triage to me. Once again prevention seems to be a dirty word. Is anyone documenting this experiment in the Dan Harrison Complex to determine what initiatives may be effective portfolio wide?

Finally, as far as I can tell from this document TCHC will continue to tweak around the edges without facilitating any real change. They sure as heck don't want to admit that some of the best solutions are coming from, and require even more active involvement from, **the tenants**.

Deputation - Anita Dressler  
 Item 10 - Q1 2021 Tenants First - Update  
 TSC Pubic Meeting - May 4, 2021

Deputation May 4th Tenants Services Committee  
 iTEM 10 Tenants First Update

Good morning, Chair, Ms Penny and other Board Members.

The Tenants First Presentations held at the end of April indicated certain things that made it appear that the Senior Unit of the 83 Buildings will not be fully established for nearly two years. In the meantime it is incumbent on Tenant Services to include the Seniors. So far we have been left out. Our engagement and funding is nil, partly because of COVID, but mostly due to the fact that Refresh is geared for Youth and Mixed Buildings and staff have put their energy toward these aims.

Tenant Services should be for all tenants and that means including us the Seniors.

You are all intelligent people. You would not accept youth having input on your future and ignoring your needs and wants. You would want input of the planning and the impacts on your life.

Tenant Services should be thinking of two systems. Refresh for Youth and Family or Mixed buildings and the second system possibly called Seniors Services for the 83 senior buildings soon to be severed from TCHC.

To date, you are passing and encouraging systems that show Seniors that we do not matter and will not for nearly two years. This is proven in the statements of Tenants First and Refresh. We have been left in limbo. What is being set up leaves many fears, whether it be the ISM negotiated for South/East Scarborough or what is going to happen with OCHE.

The model for the ISM is wrong, it gives a perception of one size fits all. But one size does not fit all because of the diversity of the City. Each area, each building has different needs and wants. We the tenants, mostly advocates have given you this information for years. But no one listens to us. Staff just plow ahead thinking that the original plan is the best for tenants. **But it is not.**

Double talk has been given regarding OCHE. Many of you recall OCHE was created for the Senior Unit of TCHC to avoid evictions for rent arrears. Instead now there is a two year agreement ,to allow OCHE staff to help Seniors and afterwards it is up to the City to devise something new. Approximately one week ago, this was emphatically stated by Tenants First at their three presentations to tenants.

Tenants in family and mixed buildings will and are the recipients of this valuable service (OCHE) and protection to tenants in need. Once again you are leaving nearly 15,000 tenants in limbo.

We are still your tenants, therefore we should get the same treatment as youth, family and mixed buildings. You have forgotten the Charter. Patricia Nairn and many tenants, mostly Seniors worked long and hard for the values, written in the Charter. Your Refresh and Tenant First have many erroneous statements and above all AGEISM is written all over it.

The Charter states Equity, Equality and Respect. Please start to include us and follow the three sections of the Charter  
Thank you

Respectfully submitted

Anita Dressler  
Chair of Senior Voice  
Chair of SAAC

**05-04-2021 Deputation to Tenant Service Committee**

Re: Item 10 - **Q1 2021 Tenant First Update**

Good morning Mr. Chairman and Committee Members,

My name is Bill Lohman. I am a senior living in one the 83 building that will become the Toronto Senior Housing Corporation. I am a member of the Senior Tenants Advisory Committee(STAC) for the Integrated Service Model and I am a long standing member of Seniors Voice

Thank you for the opportunity to present my perception and concerns to the Tenant Service Committee, today, to receive the benefit of your insight to provide the clarity of purpose and balance of judgment to ensure that due regard is given to senior tenants and their issues so that they be inclusive, respectful and transparent.

As the recently announced transfer of OCHE and complete severance of Seniors Housing from TCHC clearly states that all component of Seniors Housing; it's governance, policies and protocols, and supports like the OCHE, will reviewed and done anew. City staff, TCHC and SHU-ISM management were all consulted and involved in the calls for action brought forward. Tenants were notified 7 days before the council votes, and given no prior knowledge or input to the items or voice on the long term implication of the actions Tenants First has advanced. Why wasn't the Senior Tenants Advisory Committee(STAC) included or even alerted about these critical issues?

Let's face facts. The goals and expectations of staff for the Integrated Service Model(ISM), are clearly different than what seniors want, need and hope for. In fact, the role of seniors in this Integrated Service Model(ISM) is the customer only, not a participant and certainly not as a stakeholder in the design of their own 'Living in Place' future.

Notwithstanding the inconveniences and devastation COVID -19 has wrought to all our lives, the under-served senior population in the 83 buildings have experienced a virtual vacuum of communication silence about their housing future, since July 2019!

All of the senior councils were shut down and disbanded by Tenant Services on June 1, 2019, confining tenants to their communities and isolated from other communities, barring a free-flow of communication and exchange of information. Two years later, senior leaders, individually, start getting phone calls from

individuals and groups with a project they have for seniors claiming to be associated with the engagement Refresh... but you have to sign-on and commit to Mr. Rigores' 'one size fits all' engagement strategy before we can do anything to assist your community.

Why are seniors being denied the same level of participation and voice in relevant decision-making for the seniors Integrated Service Model (ISM) that TCHC youth enjoyed all throughout the development process of the youth 'Engagement Refresh' pilot for the family buildings

Do you not see a double standard between the privileges and approach used by Tenants First to inspire and empower TCHC youth compared to the blatant disregard for senior concerns and the wall of silence around seniors communities. It has left seniors isolated, dejected, uninformed, unaware and voiceless while empowered youth coordinate with staff on a model that empowers youth to decide how seniors will be engaged and what will be provided to their communities?

Let's be clear, without the input or knowledge of seniors in the 83 buildings, you are allowing one group of tenants to make decisions about communities where they don't live and have no understanding of the lived-experiences or needs of the tenants they are making decisions for, especially when those communities are muted seniors.

The complete silence of the Tenant Services Committee to provide honest answers to seniors amounts to tacit complicity in a scheme to deprive seniors of their 'right to know' and be involved in deciding their future engagement with the same level of staff support and then same degree of professional assistance as you have provided to youth and family buildings. It is tantamount to discrimination against senior tenants and their best interests. It is Ageism!

Do you honestly feel seniors have been treated with the same respect and consideration by city staff and TCHC as the youth and family buildings? I have attached the comments that were sent to the Mayor's Executive Committee for context and your edification.  
Thank you,

Bill Lohman

We would be quite happy to meet, explain and provide examples that show a quite different reality than what has been provided to you.

**Deputation to Mayor's Executive Committee**

04-29-2021

Re: EX23.4

Good morning Mayor Tory and Executive Committee members,

Thank you for the opportunity to present my concerns to the Executive Committee today.

My name is Bill Lohman. I am a senior living in one the 83 building that will become the Toronto Senior Housing Corporation and I am currently a member of the Senior Tenants Advisory Committee(STAC)

I have been vocal in my criticism as a long standing member of Seniors Voice, about the manner in which TCHC seniors in the 83 buildings have been mal-treated and ignored by Tenants First and TCHC Tenant Services over the past 3 years. I have deputed on these concerns numerous times before the Tenant Services Committee and TCHC Board. I have also had the privilege to address this committee on three prior occasions.

It was my expectation, and I believe that of other Senior Tenants Advisory Committee (STAC) members, that we would have input and that our advise would be part of shaping a senior-lens into the Integrated Service Model(ISM) so that it resonates with the values, expectations, and needs of seniors; one that provides the means for seniors and their communities to enjoy recreational programming and engagement opportunities, including connection with peers in other senior communities as we learn to age in place with peaceful dignity.

This Integrated Service Model(ISM) provides no method of engagement or communication for seniors and this framework offers no avenue for redress of grievance for the concerns and issues of vulnerable seniors. In fact, as written, the role of seniors in this Integrated Service Model(ISM) is that of a customer only, not a participant and certainly not a stakeholder in designing a 'Living in Place' future.

As the announced transfer of OCHE and complete severing of the SHU from TCHC clearly states, all of Toronto Seniors Housing Corporation(TSHC); it's governance, policies and protocols like the OCHE, will need to be reviewed and done anew. Why hasn't the Senior Tenants Advisory Committee(STAC) been included or even informed about these issues? Or the pertinent questions and concerns raised about why the Integrated Service Model(ISM) does not connect to the daily needs of our senior communities that are dismissed unceremoniously and valeted to an unseen parking lot where they'll be

addressed at some point in the future.

Let's face facts. The goals and expectations of staff, in regard to the Integrated Service Model(ISM), are clearly different than what seniors and Senior Tenants Advisory Committee(STAC) members want, need and hope for. Notwithstanding the inconveniences that COVID -19 has delivered to all our lives, the under-served senior population of the 83 buildings have experienced a virtual vacuum of communication, a wall of silence about their housing future, since July 2019.

Why are seniors being denied the same active participation and relevant voice in the decision-making process for the seniors Integrated Service Model(ISM) as TCHC youth enjoyed all throughout the development process of the youth driven 'Engagement Refresh' pilot for the family buildings or the funds and support Tenants First made available to the youth pilot to engage, inspire and refresh their communities to their satisfaction?

Did you tell city staff to rescind democracy, to deny senior tenants a voice or active participation and a decision-making role in their own engagement model or that 'seniors were not to know' that Tenants First youth had a direct hand in crafting the engagement Refresh that continues today. A question denied repeatedly by Tenants First and TCHC staff. The complete silence of the Tenant Services Committee to provide honest answers to seniors amounts to tacit complicity in a scheme to deprive seniors of their 'right to know' and be involved in deciding their future engagement with the same level of staff support and the same degree of professional assistance as you have provided to youth and family buildings. It is tantamount to discrimination against senior tenants and their best interests. It is Ageism!

Why is Tenants First, as the city entity acting on your behalf, supporting initiatives/schemes to provide program services for senior communities which are wholly based on what youth advocates think/feel seniors need or should have without, once, bothering to include or even consult the senior population. Not to mention a business plan with a profit-making calculus to use grant money earmarked for inter-generational seniors programs that diverts funds into other youth programs instead of back into seniors communities, the grants intended recipients?

Do you not see a double standard between the privileges and approach used by Tenants First to inspire and empower TCHC youth compared to the blatant disregard and silence for senior tenant concerns and a, 'they don't need to know' wall of silence over the 83 communities that has left seniors communities isolated, uninformed, unaware and voiceless while Tenants First newly empowered youth activists have been conspiring/coordinating with housing staff on a model where youth decide how seniors will be engaged and what will be

offered to them?

Let's be clear, without the input or knowledge of seniors in the 83 buildings, you are letting one group of tenants make the decisions about communities where they don't live and have no real interest, no understanding of the lived-experiences or needs of the tenants they are making decisions for, especially when those seniors communities have been muted... wonder why?

Do you honestly feel seniors have been treated with the same due regard and respectful consideration by city and TCHC staff as the youth and family buildings? What we are talking about here, in all honesty, is blatant ageism against the senior population in Toronto Housing. What is council going to do to address and rectify the abuse of 14,000 seniors?

We would be quite happy to meet, explain and provide examples that show a quite different reality than what has been provided to you.

Thank you,

Bill Lohman

Good afternoon,

I am connecting with you to follow-up on a written and verbal comments of my deputation to the Executive Committee on 04-29-2021.

I appreciate the privilege of being able to address Your Worship John Tory and esteemed members of the Executive Committee, yesterday. And I wish to apologize for the confusion and puzzlement my ad lib presentation and attempt to raise long standing concerns of senior tenants on item EX23.4, brought to the committee's long day of process and deliberation.

Please allow me to clarify my remarks:

First, the question by Councilor Bailao about the OCHE continuing to be available to seniors was misleading. As written and stated by Tenants First staff during two information sessions is that the OCHE will be shared with seniors for 2 years, then it will be the property of TCHC because they created it and seniors will have to make their own. If as Councilor Bailao implies, the OCHE is an independent body available to assist all Toronto tenants, then it needs to be in writing to avoid further ambiguity about OCHE's autonomy, it's mandate and who they can serve. It needs to be in the open. We need transparency.

The fact that the Tenants First and TCHC Engagement Refresh have not deviated from an agenda that encourages and provides supports, active tenant participation and decision-making model for this one group of tenants(youth) while simultaneously building and instituting a separate model for a different group of tenants(seniors) without allowing any active inclusion or input. In fact, this second group was told nothing until the model is ready to be implemented.

This does raise serious and valid questions about fair treatment and respect.

After listening to 7 ¾ hours of the more weighty issues being addressed by the Executive Committee, I realized the nature of my issues should be resolved at the department level. And that I am here because they have not.

The Mayor's visible agitation and repeated admonitions throughout the day about statements that impugn the integrity of city staff and the hour of the day, I did not want my questions and statement to come off sounding like a whiny child or raise the Mayor's ire further with my deputation so I chose to speak ad lib. That does not negate the import of the concerns expressed in my written

submission.

Despite my ad lib verbal deputation, there was not one single question from councilors about the disparate approach and treatment of seniors by Tenants First or TCHC staff that prompted the specter of the bias or ageism raised in my deputation.

Sadly, concerns about ageism toward senior tenants have been raised to TCHC on more than one occasion and received the same disinterested silence from them as the Executive Committee, yesterday.

How can the city put such focus and effort into confronting and addressing issues of racism and inclusion while ignoring and not even acknowledging that ageism occurring when it is presented to you?

Because the efforts of TCHC engagement Refresh to connect with seniors stopped in July 2019, it was not introduced to the majority of senior communities and is actually implemented in only a few. That means the family building Refresh model did not take root in the 83 senior communities. So, at this point it stretches the bounds of logic to continue efforts to implement someone else's formula geared to their needs and values, knowing full well that it will soon be severed and putting us right back where we are at this moment, no clear communication or engagement strategy in place for 83 senior communities.

As a member of the Senior Tenants Advisory Committee(STAC), I will continue my efforts to advance the call that senior tenants need their own engagement model and that the time to address this vital issue and lay a foundation to be built on, not an item to be looked into at some point down the road when other pressing issues will have immediacy.

The world famous openness that Toronto offers newcomers and the city's progressive policies of acceptance and inclusion need to include the rights and considerations of Toronto's vulnerable senior population, also.

I would look forward to being a part of addressing these and other senior specific issues.

With Regard,

Bill Lohman

Mem. Seniors Voice

Mem. STAC