

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

Risk Management at Public Events: A Case Study of a Municipality within Southern

Ontario

by

Rachael Nunes

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts in Criminology

in

The Faculty of Social Science and Humanities

University of Ontario Institute of Technology

August 2018

© Rachael Nunes, 2018

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

Abstract

Current literature surrounding risk management at public events focuses on the efforts of municipal officials to reduce the risk of terrorist activity. The literature only focuses on large municipalities that host global sporting events like the FIFA World Cup and the Olympics. The focus tends to be on a broad global view of terrorism superseding other types of mundane criminal activities that are more likely to occur at smaller municipalities and venues. In this thesis, an analysis of potential risks at public events hosted by a medium-size municipality is examined. By analyzing the responses of in-depth interviews with municipal officials, performing a content analysis of their Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), and participating in direct observation of municipal events, this study determines that differences exist between the risks outlined in existing literature and the perceptions of risk garnered from the experience of those that work in the field. Security officials of this medium-size municipality define risks as “emergencies” and consider the risk of stampedes and environmental disasters as a greater threat than terrorism within their events.

Keywords: risk, public events, risk management, terrorism, municipality

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

Acknowledgments

To my husband Sean,

Thank you for your unwavering support and love in the last 8 years. You believed in me and always showed me how to believe in my own abilities even when I was discouraged and tired. You never let me down and you were always my biggest fan throughout my education.

To my parents Marian & Valentino,

Thank you for making our life in Canada so fruitful and blessing me with many opportunities to achieve success and happiness. You have demonstrated time and time again how hard work pays off in so many beneficial ways. Thank you for being the best role models in my life.

To my thesis supervisor Dr. Christopher O'Connor & my committee members Dr. Phillip Shon & Dr. Tyler Frederick,

Thank you for your valuable insight and critique that enabled the paper to progress immensely and become a work I am truly proud to have authored. I have learned so much from you and I am grateful for the effort and time you offered to me.

To my valued participants,

Thank you for granting me access into your realm of risk management within your municipality. Your insight and narratives aided me immensely in creating the concept of my thesis and allowed me to learn more about your experiences in the field. My work could not have been a success without your support.

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	6
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	9
<i>Theories of Risk</i>	10
<i>The Greatest Perceived Risk in Modern Society: Terrorism</i>	15
<i>Policing as a Construct of Societal Risk Reduction</i>	19
<i>Public Event Management and Risk Reduction Techniques</i>	22
<i>Risk Mitigation through the Design of Public Spaces</i>	24
<i>Limitations of Theoretical Frameworks</i>	26
Chapter 3: Methods.....	29
<i>Case Study Analysis Using a Mixed Methods Approach</i>	30
<i>Content Analysis</i>	34
<i>In-Depth Interviewing</i>	37
<i>Direct Observation</i>	41
Chapter 4: Results.....	44
<i>Defining Risk through Policy</i>	44
<i>Planning and Preparing for Events</i>	51
<i>Physical Methods Used to Mitigate Risk</i>	58
<i>Police Presence as a Tool to Mitigate Risk</i>	60
<i>Terrorism as a Threat</i>	64

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

Chapter 5: Discussion & Conclusion.....	68
<i>Theoretical vs. Practical Applications of Risk.....</i>	<i>70</i>
<i>Modern Securitization and Police Cooperation at Public Events.....</i>	<i>71</i>
<i>Limitations of the Research Study.....</i>	<i>73</i>
<i>Conclusion.....</i>	<i>75</i>

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction

Public events have become an important topic in discussions about security and safety as these events have been the target of terrorist activity and other deviancy. Large groups of people congregating in one area can be a visible and likely target to individuals who wish to commit nefarious and illegal acts. In many instances public events are managed adequately with minimal disturbances or occurrences of harm. Terrorist activity in recent years has been centered in public forums where the greatest amount of harm and collateral damage can occur. However, many public events do not have instances of terrorist activity; rather other criminal acts occur more frequently. Currently the focus of the literature tends to be on a broad global view of terrorism superseding other types of mundane criminal activities that are more likely to occur at smaller municipalities and venues. It is important to analyze all risk factors associated with public events at municipalities of all sizes.

Deviant or risky behaviour can affect the safety and security of individuals and large groups of people within society (Garland, 1997). Deviant behaviour is usually curtailed through self-control, discipline, or through other techniques of socialization such as reprisal from friends and family. These techniques to curtail deviant behaviour can ostracize individuals from society as their deviant actions are abnormal to the status quo (Anderson & Brown, 2010; Beccaria, 1963). If these informal sanctions of socialization are not effective in reducing deviant behaviour in certain individuals, then government authorities must control this risk through formal sanctions. The state is responsible for the safety and security of the people it governs, based upon its purported mandate, and seeks to uphold this responsibility throughout various facets of public

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

policy and governance (Aradau & Van Munster, 2007; Garland, 1997). Increased deviancy in the form of terrorist activity post September 11th, 2001 has led to a new era of securitization and modern policing that is centered on risk management strategies and augmented surveillance when large groups of people congregate in one location (Harfield, 2012; Murphy, 2007; Onat & Gul, 2018). Literature written about public events discusses risk in relation to terrorism at large events and does not discuss events held at smaller municipalities that do not proactively mitigate for this type of threat. The focus of this study was on a medium-sized city within Southern Ontario with a population greater than 500,000 citizens and in close proximity to larger metropolises within Canada. The case study within this thesis was comparatively a smaller municipality than most cities discussed in the literature on risk at public events. The participants within the municipality hosted smaller local events rather than global events such as the Olympics and the FIFA World Cup.

My study examines how municipal officials perceive risk and how they respond to risks at their public events. By analyzing the responses of in-depth interviews with municipal officials, performing a content analysis of their SOPs, and directly observing municipal events, this study determines the perceptions of risk garnered from the experience of those that work in the field. Chapter 2 discusses the existing literature on this topic beginning with 1) the theoretical framework of risk; 2) the perception of terrorism as the greatest perceived risk in society; 3) modern policing and risk reduction techniques; 4) public event management and risk reduction techniques; and 5) risk mitigation through the design of public spaces. Chapter 2 concludes with the limitations of the presented literature and proposed research questions for the study. Chapter 3

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

begins with information about the benefits of a case study analysis and mixed-methods approach. This chapter discusses the three methods utilized in the case study – content analysis, in-depth interviewing, and direct observation. Chapter 4 presents the results of the study. Finally, chapter 5 outlines the key findings of the research study with specific reference to the literature on risk, modern securitization techniques that involve environmental design to reduce risk, and police cooperation. The chapter concludes by discussing the limitations of the study and the future direction of research into risk management.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The literature review of this thesis begins with an understanding of how risk and harm are defined and discussed in tandem. Risk is explained as a situation or event(s) where something of value is in a position of harm or the outcome is uncertain (Aven, 2007; Aven & Renn, 2009). Risk is also associated with the severity of these outcomes and how much harm can be caused. Harm can occur to humans or objects of value in instances of intentional danger (Aven, 2007; Aven & Renn, 2009) but it is the idea that the severity of the harmful outcome is uncertain that makes it a risk. The concept of risk is intertwined in many facets of society including the realms of health, the environment, and crime where the negative effects of deviant or risky behaviour is mitigated by the government (Anderson & Brown, 2010; Garland, 1997; Harfield, 2012; Patz, Gibbs, Foley, Rogers & Smith 2007; Walker, 2001). This research study analyzes risk through the realm of crime focusing specifically on what is often perceived as one of the greatest criminal risks in society – terrorism (Caponecchia, 2012; Harfield, 2012; Kondrasuk, Bailey & Sheeks 2005; Primoratz, 1990). Terrorism is defined as “the unlawful use of force for social and political objectives” (Onat & Gul, 2018, p. 5) often motivated further by a specific ideology which supports the strategies and recruitment of terrorist groups (Crenshaw & Horowitz, 1983; LaFree, 2017; LaFree, Dugan & Miller 2015; Onat & Gul, 2018). Unlike criminals who hide their activities due to fear of being apprehended by authorities, terrorists commit crimes blatantly and seek the largest events and larger audiences (Kydd & Walter, 2006; Pape, 2005). The literature on terrorism mostly defines it in relation to larger events (Boyle & Haggerty, 2012; Peek & Sutton, 2003; Selliaas, 2012; Toohey & Taylor, 2007; Toohey, Taylor & Lee 2003). Scholarship on terrorism

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

rarely considers criminal activity that incites fear and panic in smaller municipalities and at their local events (Warner & McCarthy, 2014). Scholarship on terrorism tends to focus on how governments can begin the proactive process of reducing harm to citizens and patrons of events at global venues, such as the Olympics and the FIFA World Cup (Atkinson & Young, 2012; Toohey & Taylor, 2007; Boyle & Haggerty, 2012; Peek & Sutton, 2003; Selliaas, 2012; Toohey, Taylor & Lee 2003). The following literature review outlines theories about risk in society, how risk is mitigated through technological advancements in policing such as surveillance and proactive communication strategies, and how these concepts relate to mitigating risk at public events. Gaps are identified in the literature on risk at public events when discussing the lack of research into smaller municipalities and the risks that municipal officials encounter at their local events.

Theories of Risk

Within criminology, the concept of risk is formulated through specific definitions of risky behaviour in society and how that risk is mitigated to reduce harm. In order to acknowledge when risky or deviant behaviour occurs, people in positions of authority, for example municipal officials or police, undertake an analysis to determine if the deviant or risky behaviour has negative effects on society or an individual's security and welfare (Garland, 1997). The main tenet within risk theory is to understand why individuals commit risky behaviour and subsequently mitigating the negative consequences for society (Anderson & Brown, 2010; Beccaria, 1963; Bentham, 1948; Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; Kennedy & Gibbs, 2009). Theories of risk that will be considered are ones that determine why an individual's pursuit of personal gain negatively affects those actions or freedoms of another. It is important to study these theoretical definitions of risk

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

in social settings in order to understand how individual actions can negatively affect other people in a given environment and subsequently how effective governance can mitigate these negative effects (Garland, 1997).

Classical criminological theorists define their view of risk as individual actions related to the person's pursuit of pleasure and gain (Anderson & Brown, 2010). The pleasure and gain that satisfies one individual may lead to negative effects on others or society as a whole. For example, Jeremy Bentham discusses risk to society as the negative effects resulting from an individual's poor judgment and lack of self-discipline in pursuing his/her deviant behaviour (Bentham, 1948). People who commit deviant acts can be apathetic about the negative effects of their actions and therefore are not concerned with the overall happiness and safety of other individuals. They are insensitive to the needs of others and engage in actions that have long-term costs which exceed their temporary benefits (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990). Bentham elaborates that these individuals have failed to comprehend the specific punishments for their deviant behaviour and lack the proper socialization techniques necessary to live harmoniously with other people (Anderson & Brown, 2010; Bentham, 1948). Their actions are socially damaging and can negatively affect the relationships they have with people around them (Beccaria, 1963). The individual who is convicted of these deviant acts is then considered "an irrational, morally degenerative, and non-compliant" person by societal standards (Kemshall, 2011, p. 222). They are labelled as detrimental problems within society and do not fit within the normative standards that are traditionally upheld.

In order to facilitate the inclusion of these individuals into society and reduce the chances of harm from their deviant behaviour, society has constructed ways to reduce and

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

regulate risk. The government regulates risk through surveillance of populations and seeks to reduce any risky behaviour that occurs through the implementation of laws and subsequent consequences for that behaviour (Garland, 1997). The government's implementation of laws to mould behaviour and reduce the risk of deviancy is a form of governmentality that is intrinsic in keeping citizens safe (Garland, 1997). Although risk can be assessed through different societal constructs (e.g. home, automobile, and health insurance) (Anderson & Brown, 2010) the main element of risk can be assessed through a probability of both positive and negative consequences (Kennedy & Gibbs, 2009). The assessment of these consequences relates to the effects felt on society's perceived happiness or well-being (Anderson & Brown, 2010). The assessment of society's well-being is calculated through institutional regulatory bodies (i.e. the government and those in charge of maintaining safety and security such as the police). The purpose of these institutions is to govern the state, its populations, the economy, and civil society in order to increase the security and prosperity of the people (Garland, 1997). Through these practices of maintaining safety, order and the well-being of the people, institutions can shape, guide, or affect the behaviour of people who may commit deviant acts (Aradau & Van Munster 2007). This form of governmentality seeks to predict and minimize costs and harms to society through increased scrutiny and surveillance of populations (Garland, 1997). These measures of surveying populations for deviant behaviour are essential to create stability and tranquility in an unpredictable environment.

Ulrich Beck theorized the concept of a *risk society* in which there are many unpredictable and uncontrollable dangers and risks. In this society, assurance from victimization is limited or impossible (Aradau & Van Munster, 2007; Beck, 2002).

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

Although there are increased measures such as surveillance and constant policing to reduce risk and assure the public of complete safety and security, Beck (2002) argues that risk transcends all boundaries in society: socioeconomic, geopolitical, and national. Due to the evolution of technology in our society, risk is pervasive in the global 'risk society' that Beck (2002) illustrates through his theorizing (Alario & Freudenburg, 2010). This risk consistently endangers the lives of the international community and therefore governments must feign total control over the unpredictability of risk in order to maintain order (Boyle & Haggerty, 2012). Within this paradigm, risk may seem elusive and abstract in its definition as it can manifest itself in so many forms and can affect a variety of victims.

Risk has also been described in the literature through varying levels and severity of harm to society and the subsequent mitigation of this harm by government regulatory bodies (O'Malley, 2008). The fear of impending risk and harm to the public can heighten security operations which are designed to ultimately mitigate risks at all costs. This fear can also dissuade people from engaging in certain acts because their belief is that harmful effects are more than likely to occur. Rather than act upon tangible risks that arise within the moment, people make proactive decisions based upon the uncontrollable risks and dangers they believe exist within the *risk society* (Beck, 2002). It may not be the impending harm to the public but rather the probability of harm to the public that may be mitigated. This theoretical approach to risk can be difficult to mold into practical processes as it may be impossible for security officials to prepare for a multitude of possible risks or impending harm. They may decipher the most common or probable risks to occur at an event and plan for those accordingly (Warner & McCarthy, 2014).

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

To illustrate, there are several health and environmental risks that cannot be mitigated without government intervention and initiatives. These risks include the effects of global warming as demonstrated through increased changes in temperature around the world (Walker, 2001). Health risks associated with climate change are a global hazard as different continents are disproportionately affected by the smog and pollution. Those people who are disproportionately affected may be part of poorer countries who are least likely responsible for the rising emissions levels, in comparison to other richer countries that produce the most carbon emissions such as the U.S., India, and China (Patz, Gibbs, Foley, Rogers & Smith 2007). The effects of these carbon emissions are not directed purposefully on these specific populations, rather it becomes a global risk issue when the world's poorest populations are being affected disproportionately in comparison to other global citizens. The disproportionate effect of risk and harm on these communities may be due to lack of resources such as clean water and air. The effects of carbon emissions must be reduced through global initiatives in order to benefit all members of society especially those affected by excess air pollution in heavily populated areas. That includes those people living in poor conditions who may not have access to clean water to drink or clean air to breathe and whose carbon footprint may be minute or nonexistent (Walker, 2001). Environmental risk also includes harm to the ecosystem when global temperatures fluctuate. Drastic fluctuations in temperature not only affect humans but also fauna and flora populations globally. Fluctuations in temperature inevitably affect wind and weather patterns creating concern within the community of policy-makers and scientists, regarding frequently occurring and more intense hurricane and storm patterns (Shepherd & Knutson, 2008). Governments have begun to work together to create initiatives to

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

mitigate the effects of these rapidly rising temperatures which affect so many aspects of the global society, pertaining to health, risk, and safety (Shepherd & Knutson, 2008).

When analyzing risk at public events, global weather patterns and storm warnings are important risk factors to discuss when planning an event, especially those involving outdoor activities (Plecas, Dow & Diplock 2014). Although these environmental risk factors are of grave concern to municipal officials there are more pertinent risk threats such as terrorism that have come to the forefront of public event management for global events.

In order to further conceptualize how risk has been discussed in contemporary times, the following section examines risk as it relates to terrorism which some have argued is one of the biggest risks society faces within the 21st century (Primoratz, 1990). Terrorism in itself is hard to define as it encompasses numerous motivations, participants, and victims (Kondrasuk, Bailey & Sheeks 2005). Criminologists have attempted to define terrorism within the framework of various parameters, each providing different aspects of societal risk that are encountered (Primoratz, 1990). The section below examines how terrorism has been conceived as the greatest perceived risk to modern society and how this has impacted the daily lives of all citizens.

The Greatest Perceived Risk in Modern Society: Terrorism

Although some societal risks are preventable and can be assessed by authorities prior to their occurrence, many of the modern risks in society are unforeseeable due to their size and severity (Alario & Freudenburg, 2010). These *transcendent risks* are categorized with separate response attributes and procedures appropriate to their significant magnitude. Terrorism is one such example of a modern risk that has

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

permeated throughout society within the last few decades and is categorized as a *transcendent risk* (Alario & Freudenburg, 2010; Mythen, 2017). Although it has been a present threat throughout history, terrorism post-9/11 has transformed military practices, counter-terrorism legislation, and has been pervasive in popular media and news stories (Alario & Freudenburg 2010; Mythen, 2017). Alario and Freudenburg (2010) suggest that these transcendent risks are not solely defined by their immense impact on society but also how they affect victims in different socioeconomic and geographical locations. These *transcendent risks* can be human-made risks such as terrorism or other premeditated violence that has specific political or social objectives (Alario & Freudenburg, 2010; Caponecchia, 2012; Crenshaw & Horowitz, 1983; LaFree, 2017; LaFree, Dugan & Miller 2015; Onat & Gul, 2018). Although terrorists can have explicit targets for their violent activities, there may be increased collateral damage that is unbiased in its direction and effect. Especially when there are numerous people situated within the area of terrorist activity, there can be increased personal harm and property damage that only intensifies the expectant destruction that the terrorists want to achieve (LaFree, 2017; Onat & Gul, 2018).

Terrorist activities have explicitly shaped the future of the *global risk society* as they have become some of the most disastrous forms of these *transcendent risks* (Alario & Freudenburg, 2010; Beck, 2002). Beck (2002) describes the terrorist attacks of September 11th, 2001 as a clear example of how we are now living in a *global risk society*. Caponecchia (2012) agrees that terrorism is a significant societal risk that is currently analyzed in several realms of public policy and emergency preparedness. The catastrophic effects of this specific attack were thoroughly extensive as the international

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

community witnessed these attacks in real-time and the security procedures of aviation were forever altered (Boyle & Haggerty, 2012; Bredel, 2003; Mythen & Walklate, 2006). The events of 9/11 continue to influence new anti-terrorism legislation and policy amendments and are increasingly highlighted in popular media depictions as the beginning of the *war on terror* (Aradau & Van Munster, 2007; Mythen & Walklate, 2006; Mythen, 2017).

The post-9/11 era clearly indicates that the risk of terrorism in society has significantly increased, both in perceived fears from citizens that future attacks can occur, as well as actual risks of increased violence due to vast social networks of terrorist organizations (Mythen, 2017; Ying, Klauser & Chan 2009). Modern international terrorism is characterized by globalized networks of terrorist organizations which conduct simultaneous acts of violence around the world (Fischer & Ai, 2008). Not only do the traumatic experiences caused by terrorism affect the physical and mental well-being of individuals but these attacks also create a sense of impending fear and panic for prolonged periods after they occur (Fischer & Ai, 2008; Morley & Leslie, 2007). Specifically, when analyzing the increase in terrorist activity from the 1980s to the 1990s, global terrorist bombings increased more than 15 times between decades (Morley & Leslie, 2007). In comparison to the more obvious goals of attaining public attention or political change, individual terrorist motivations can be seemingly unknown to authorities (LaFree, 2017; Onat & Gul, 2018). Therefore, it can be difficult for security officials to predict the actions of terrorists. They can only ensure they have adequately prepared with the resources and information they have (Boyle & Haggerty, 2012).

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

Governments and institutions can begin their preparations to combat the *war on terror* (Mythen & Walklate, 2006) by determining which events will be at higher risk of becoming a target event. Although terrorism has catastrophic effects on its immediate victims, it is particularly boundless in its potential victimization due to the uncertainty of its occurrence (Aradau & Van Munster, 2007). Therefore, authorities tend to have increased preparation and anti-terrorism practices to compensate for the various factors that encompass its definition (Kondrasuk, Bailey & Sheeks 2005). This includes having an over-compensation of anti-terrorism procedures at large public events where multitudes of individuals congregate. After the terrorist attacks of 9/11, several American media outlets and politicians were raising concerns that professional sporting events were vulnerable to terrorist attacks (Boyle & Haggerty, 2012). Consequently, the Olympic Games as one of the international community's leading media and consumer exhibitions, became highlighted as a high risk target for possible terrorist victimization (Boyle & Haggerty, 2012). Due to the grandeur of these events and the international competitors who are involved within its production, the Olympic Games have been projected to the forefront of terrorism prevention planning.

Terrorism prevention planning related to the Olympic Games, and other public events of comparable size, involves the coordination of multiple security procedures (Raine, 2015; Toohey & Taylor, 2007; Toohey, Taylor & Lee, 2003). However, the key to successfully preventing terrorist activities at these events is to undermine the terrorists and terminate their plans before they occur. Realistically, this would require omnipotent powers of surveillance. Therefore, officials only have the opportunity to *promise* maximum security and safety in the presence of unmanageable uncertainty, but are not

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

actually able to guarantee it (Boyle & Haggerty, 2012). The calculation of risk within this paradigm subsequently shifts from ‘what could happen’ to ‘what if this happens’ (Mythen and Walklate, 2008). Subsequently, the planning for large sporting events has been altered to account for a plethora of ‘worst-case scenarios’ and fearful predictions (Atkinson & Young, 2012; Boyle & Haggerty, 2012). The security planning involved throughout the Olympic Games held in Salt Lake City, Utah (2002), Athens, Greece (2004), London, England (2012), and other sporting events such as the FIFA World Cup held in South Korea and Japan (2002), are key examples of this planning strategy within the fearful paradigm of terrorist-related activities (Raine, 2015; Toohey & Taylor, 2007; Toohey, Taylor & Lee, 2003). These sporting event procedures were not only affected by the terrorist activities of 9/11 but also by the specific targeting of Olympic athletes during the terrorist attack at the Munich Games in 1972 (Peek & Sutton, 2003; Selliaas, 2012). Due to the specificity of the victims and the global audience it captured, these terrorist attacks forever altered risk management strategies and the event planning process of large public events (Atkinson & Young, 2012; Onat & Gul, 2018; Raine, 2015; Toohey & Taylor, 2007; Toohey, Taylor & Lee, 2003). In order to prevent future terrorist attacks and maintain social order, security and policing practices have evolved to meet the new requirements within these risk management strategies (Raine, 2015; Ying, Klauser & Chan, 2009).

Policing as a Construct of Societal Risk Reduction

The philosophical ideology of John Locke demonstrates the inherent characteristics of social contract theory when discussing the justification of policing in society (Harfield, 2012). In order to maintain social order within society and among

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

populations, governments and police must maintain certain control over society, exerting both power and domination. Conventional policing involves a large amount of time in the surveillance of populations on roadways, venues, and other areas where large groups of people congregate. The public is aware of the police being used as a viable tool of constant surveillance to maintain social order and control. These actions allow the police to instill an aspect of general deterrence on the population. Individuals may refrain from acting out their deviant behaviour and will use their own forms of 'micro-governance' or 'self-surveillance' to monitor their own risky behaviour (Kemshall, 2011; Murphy, 2007). Police presence may alter the behaviour of individuals, thus deterring them from engaging in crime for fear of legal sanctions administered by the police or other extralegal ramifications for engaging in risky/deviant behaviour (Einstadter & Henry, 2006; Williams & Hawkins, 1986). Within the paradigm of social control, increased police presence and the constant surveillance of citizens by the police reinforce the idea that the relationship between government and the citizen exists as an antagonistic one. That is, increased forms of control are structured and implemented by the government (through law and surveillance) in order to control the actions of the individuals it governs. If citizens wish to enjoy the safety of societal communal living, then a degree of their self-governance must be surrendered. In order to be protected from risks that are insurmountable by individual recourse, such as terrorism, citizens must abide by the parameters of the social contract with their government and subsequently surrender some forms of individual autonomy and privacy (Harfield, 2012).

Beck believed that the police were situated in a strategic position between the public and society's network of risk institutions. Thus, police gather security-related

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

knowledge and disseminate the information appropriately to authoritative figures involved in managing risk (Beck, 2002; O'Malley, 2015). Gathering this security knowledge is an essential part of modern policing and preventing unnecessary risks to society prior to their occurrence. As Ericson and Haggerty (1997) demonstrate in *Policing the Risk Society*, police work is increasingly dominated by surveillance, information gathering, and data-collection techniques. This vital information is shared among a wide range of agencies and institutions that can utilize the information for policy implementation and risk reduction techniques (Beck, 2002; O'Malley, 2015). Beck (2002) refers to the police as knowledge brokers who circulate the data among appropriate parties and authoritative figures to continue the proactive risk management work they set out to accomplish (O'Malley, 2015).

Conventional policing mandates were socially definable as retroactive policing models that provided information when necessary, however, maintaining public safety created a far more flexible policing mandate after the events of 9/11 (Murphy, 2007). This transition is characterized by an increased use of preventative measures of surveillance and information-gathering to maintain social control while simultaneously minimizing potential threats and risks to the public (Beck, 2002; O'Malley, 2015). Foucault (1977) analyzed the control the police held over specific populations, but his understanding of the modern state of policing shifted from a disciplinary model to one of securitization (Murphy, 2007; Reeves & Packer, 2013). Securitization of public policing involves broadening the police mandate to include proactive measures of surveillance to counter immeasurable threats and maintain safety (Murphy, 2007; Reeves & Packer, 2013). This security-based policing model was enacted post-9/11 to anticipate covert

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

threats of domestic ‘home-grown’ terrorism, by increasing community surveillance and intelligence-gathering (Caponecchia, 2012; Murphy, 2007). The risk of sporadic terrorism, rather than the risk of mundane crime, provides police with a new rationale for collection and analysis of information. Municipal police, especially in large urban areas like Toronto or Montreal, are under increasing pressure to provide increased local terrorist intelligence (Murphy, 2007). This shift explains the pre-emptive strategies used by local police and municipal officials when proactively surveying their citizens for harmful risky activity. This type of knowledge collection about potential threats includes a subsequent process of disseminating the information to other agencies and new technological inventions like surveillance that can improve risk management techniques (Aradau & Van Munster, 2007). Partnerships between police and municipal officials are intrinsic in the security preparations as both parties can benefit from increased efficiency and effectiveness at reducing threats (Bevir, 2016).

Public Event Management and Risk Reduction Techniques

In the early 21st century, periods of increased social and technological change altered the ways the police interacted with the public during communal events (Lee & McGovern, 2013). In particular, new technological advancements such as invasive surveillance techniques have increasingly been utilized by the police when large groups of individuals are congregating for a significant common event such as the Olympics (Selliaas, 2012; Toohey & Taylor, 2007). Recent policing trends have evolved from the single use of defensive materials such as batons and handcuffs to include more modern forms of proactive community policing demonstrated in new advanced technologies such as surveillance and tracking (Downing, 2011; Raine, 2015). Modern police technologies

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

have evolved since the introduction of the firearm to include a variety of offensive and information-gathering technologies such as video and audio surveillance and Global Positioning Services (GPS) (Downing, 2011). These advanced tools allow police to extensively prepare themselves with increased forms of data collection and information prior to violent occurrences at events (Jennings & Lodge, 2011; Molnar & Whelan, 2017; Raine, 2015; Ying, Klauser & Chan, 2009). Advanced technologies such as these can help facilitate the proactive position of municipal authorities and police in their ongoing attempt to create and maintain peace and security at public events. By utilizing surveillance techniques and gathering increased knowledge about specific moments/places at risk for terrorist activity, officials can better prepare for events of great magnitude (Jennings & Lodge, 2011; Raine, 2015; Toohey & Taylor, 2007; Toohey, Taylor & Lee 2003; Ying, Klauser & Chan 2009). This form of proactive intelligence-led policing is essential in a global *risk society* as vast networks of terrorists are constantly planning for attacks (Beck 2002; Mythen, 2017; Onat & Gul 2018).

As discussed previously, scholars analyzing theories of risk note the importance of labelling terrorist activities as the greatest perceivable risk in modern society, due to their propensity to cause severe collateral damage (Caponecchia, 2012). In order to prepare for this insurmountable risk, organizers of public events must increase their efforts and adjust their existing technological tools of surveillance and precautionary measures (Aradau & Van Munster 2007; Bevir, 2016). Thus, national security can no longer be seen as an exclusive battle between state institutions and the perceived foreign enemy. Now the concept has been extended to include the protection of citizens from impending daily risks, such as terrorism, that defy an individual response and require

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

increased government resources to mitigate (Harfield, 2012). Proactive planning can be extremely beneficial to police and municipal authorities when planning public events and considering potential terrorist plots that may occur at these venues. When planning public events it is imperative that municipal officials coordinate with other organisations and agencies that could potentially support their response to emergencies and enhance their security preparation prior to the event (Albrecht, 2014).

As perceived risk increases, so too does the likelihood that governments and the public will be in favour of proactive management of potential hazards (Gerber & Neeley, 2005; Raine, 2015). Although the majority of citizens are law-abiding, there is a strong violent minority that have the propensity to commit these nefarious actions (Warner & McCarthy, 2014). Therefore, the organizers of these events must be wary of all potential risks. These risks can include catastrophic terrorist attacks or smaller mundane criminal acts which also require an appropriate amount of preparation and mitigation. Preparations that fall within these parameters include deciphering the type and size of the event, how many people will be in attendance, and the subsequent interpretation and reaction to any mundane threat that can arise (Warner & McCarthy, 2014). Larger numbers of citizens can create an increased threat to public order management due to the sheer number of individuals within a designated area. However, it can also pose a significant problem if panic arises and effective emergency plans are not designated for immediate exits (Davenport, 2000; Warner & McCarthy, 2014).

Risk Mitigation through the Design of Public Spaces

As discussed previously, information-gathering by police is an essential part of the preparation process (Caponecchia, 2012; Murphy, 2007). Intelligence is the most

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

important component in preparing for security threats at public events as specific practical risk mitigation techniques are utilized based on the information received (Plecas, Dow & Diplock 2014). Specifically, the intelligence provided determines the type and intensity of the security operation required to provide a safe event and a safe venue. Raine (2015) demonstrates the use of this intelligence in pre-planning the 2012 Olympic Games in London, England as an indication they would encounter additional risks that went beyond what was normally faced. The planners anticipated threats from organized crime, protests, natural hazards (heatwaves and pandemic flus), as well as significant loss of life, property and reputation if a terrorist attack occurred (Raine, 2015). They determined based on this intelligence that crowded places and sporting venues would have the highest risk of potential terrorist activity and were able to proactively mitigate these threats (Jennings & Lodge, 2011; Onat & Gul, 2018; Raine, 2015; Ying, Klauser & Chan 2009). Intelligence provided by police is a determining factor for security operations when preparing for municipal events (Albrecht, 2014). Intelligence about potential risks or criminal activity provided by the police can lead to specific changes in the design of the venue in ways that can deter or reduce the likelihood that the risk or criminal activity will occur. Environmental criminology focuses on this dynamic between people and their surroundings with the idea that the commencement of the study of crime should begin with the environment in which the crime or risk occurs (Kinney, Mann & Winterdyk 2017). If the risk or crime is viewed as a complex setting with situational aspects, then the setting can be deconstructed to determine the riskiest aspects of the venue and determine tactics to mitigate them effectively.

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

Evidence of past risk occurrences may be beneficial to the process of determining risks at events. The smarter crime control model (Waller & Solares, 2017) uses evidence to create cost-effective strategies to reduce crime proactively. Public event venues can be assessed in this manner in order to determine the risks and mitigate them prior to the event occurring. This is a specific crime prevention tool that utilizes environmental design to reduce/prevent crime. Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) involves the modification of the physical environment/space design with the possibility of reducing opportunities for criminal activity or risk (Kinney, Mann & Winterdyk 2017). In tandem with the intelligence and information-gathering support provided the police, environmental design of venues does provide a robust security process for municipal officials. Not only is the venue clear of any aggravating risk aspects that can solicit unwanted criminal behaviour, but police officials also provide intelligence on impending threats.

Limitations of Theoretical Frameworks

Current literature surrounding risk management at public events suggests police and municipal resources are directed towards reducing the risk of terrorist activity (Harfield, 2012; Murphy, 2007; Raine, 2015; Waller & Martinez Solares 2017; Whelan & Molnar 2017; Ying, Klauser & Chan 2009). This body of literature says little about smaller municipalities that host local events. Currently the literature mostly focuses on large municipalities that host public sporting events like the FIFA World Cup and the Olympics. Also, the literature tends to focus on a broad global view of terrorism superseding other types of mundane criminal activities that are more likely to occur at smaller municipalities and venues. For instance, domestic ‘home-grown’ terrorists have

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

gradually become larger threats to municipal security, especially when considering Canadian instances of foiled ‘home-grown’ terrorist plots (Murphy, 2007). For example, in 2006 police helped to thwart the ‘home-grown’ terrorism plot of the *Toronto 18* terrorist cell in Ontario (Murphy, 2007). The likelihood of these scenarios becoming more frequent in municipal investigations has led to authorities planning for the ‘worst case scenario’ at public events in order to suppress possible attacks (Baker, 2011). For instance, protesting, rioting, criminal negligence causing property damage or bodily harm can all be factors associated with risk reduction when planning any public event (Raine, 2015). There has yet to be a substantial analysis of these factors within the risk management literature of smaller municipal events. Such an analysis would provide additional information as to the processes and practices used by municipalities to reduce risk in situations and regions where terrorist activity is not as likely to occur.

Current literature also omits discussing different event sizes and their subsequent security and emergency operations (Warner & McCarthy, 2014). A more thorough analysis of these specific policies is required to garner a more holistic idea of public event management at varying municipal venues. A more complete analysis can include defining different levels of events based on public attendance and potential risk analysis. It may be beneficial to categorize these types of events with a more specific focus on smaller municipalities that may not host large international events but still must manage risk to the public. This would allow for increased insight into the threats that are managed at a smaller municipal micro-level rather than focusing solely on larger macro-level international cities. This research seeks to answer the research questions (1) How do

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

medium-size municipalities perceive and define risk? (2) What are the practical tools that security officials use to mitigate risk in medium-size municipalities?

Chapter 3: Methods

The most beneficial methodological approach for this research was a qualitative case study analysis using mixed methods in order to review the policy documents authored by municipal officials, as well as to hear their accounts through the interview process and review these processes implemented at their events. The collection of data encompassed both the perspectives of municipal officials and the use of their practical tools in order to determine how they define the types of risks they encounter and how they mitigate these effects. The subjects were selected through purposeful sampling as they represent the municipality by working within the security and emergency management departments that organize security operations for events. I chose to interview participants only from those two departments because they create the processes for events. They also represent the interests of the municipality and were purposefully selected for this reason. Prior to the commencement of this research study, I had completed a practicum course with the municipality for my undergraduate degree. I was able to maintain a cordial partnership with the municipal officials I worked with and therefore was able to invite them to become participants for my graduate research study. I had no other partnerships or economic interests stemming from the practicum program. As a researcher there were no other identifiable conflicts of interest that would compromise the integrity of the research study.

A deeper understanding of the perceptions of risk at events and the likelihood of risky events occurring can be rendered through first-hand accounts of people who work within this industry. This qualitative study allowed for participants to engage in the research process and provide a response based on their experiences in risk management.

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

The qualitative research process was beneficial in uncovering how risk is defined by municipal officials who are responsible for reducing risk within their events. Qualitative research provides meaning and context to the analyses of subjects and provides descriptive characteristics that would otherwise be missed through a quantitative view which only interprets numbers instead of beliefs and attitudes of people (Tewksbury, 2009). An emphasis on the interpretation of perceptions is evident with a qualitative analysis. The use of this analysis provides a thorough review of risk management strategies and its intricate details versus solely reviewing numbers of occurrence of risky behaviour/events. This qualitative study provides knowledge on the definitions of risks and explanations about the specific tools utilized by municipal officials to reduce these risks. Their invaluable knowledge as a whole is determined through the case study perspective outlined below.

Case Study Analysis Using a Mixed Methods Approach

This research study was centered on a case study analysis which highlighted the specific factors associated with risk management and security operations at this specific municipality. The real effectiveness of completing a case study analysis is finding answers to ‘how’ and ‘why’ certain contemporary phenomenon occurs within real-life scenarios (Spath & Pine, 2004). It is a multi-faceted and multi-dimensional study which provides a range of personal rationales and descriptions that should be considered when dealing with a complex issue such as security (Gadd, 2012). The motivation for using a case study analysis is demonstrated in its ability to highlight the main components of risk management strategies within the municipality, which might otherwise be hidden from public view. Simple surveys or questions may not uncover the descriptive details of the

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

social group or setting that is desired by the public or research authority. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct a case study analysis that analyzes multiple levels for the purpose of gaining a deeper comprehension of the social setting and its specific processes (Yin, 1994). The researchers must immerse themselves within the chosen setting in order to comprehend the what, when, where, and how of the specific social phenomenon under investigation (Tewksbury, 2009).

By determining the main results derived from this case study, future studies can compare the phenomenon occurring in separate municipalities at their public events (Gadd, 2012). Case study analysis is beneficial in outlining the factors associated with the current context on risk management strategies within this municipality and how these factors relate to other cases (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). The main benefit of case study analysis is its instrumental role in providing insight into the issue of risk management techniques at public events and the techniques used by this specific municipality (Stake, 1995). Without this knowledge it would be difficult to create comparisons between other techniques utilized by other municipalities in future studies. Scholars have argued that theoretical inferences can be drawn from case study analyses and applied through comparative measures, not solely to other populations but to other possible theories (Yin, 1994; Gomm et. al 2000). Comparing theoretical perspectives allows the researcher the opportunity to view their research study as a sample population that can support or counter specific theories without becoming a useless anomaly within the research paradigm. Although case study research is difficult to replicate or recreate, it has many benefits in its collection of rich descriptive data. One of the most compelling motivations for utilizing a case study analysis is that it allows for the use of multiple methods and

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

sources of data to examine the specific phenomenon in question (Yin, 2003). Mixed methods also provides a more robust foundation for research studies as there are several options for learning about the phenomenon (Simons, 2014). By analyzing the phenomenon through many lenses, the researcher can acquire different perspectives about the social setting from those who work within it. The use of multiple methods allows the researcher to delve into the complexity of the social phenomenon while incorporating different levels of analysis into the study. It has been noted that mixed-methods studies provide increased benefits such as comprehensive confirmation of results as well as deeper meanings derived from the results, multiple perspectives, and rigor (McKim, 2017). Mixed methods also provide the most accurate interpretation of the findings as a common consensus unfolds through the varying methods within the study (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). Although this process can be more time consuming and tedious than survey or experimental research, it does provide rich data and multiple sources of information to use. Utilizing mixed methods also provides a better understanding of the study than a single viewpoint or method can achieve (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). The concepts are similarly reflected in the findings throughout the different methods and the researcher can make inferences about these common results.

Case study analysis within this research study focused on the municipality's motivation to host safe public events, with an analysis of the tools utilized to manage and reduce risk and the specific perspectives of the officials who use these tools to complete their job. Within this study, their collective accounts about municipal security operations for public events provided a deeper comprehension of how risk is mitigated working with the tools they have created. The case study analysis outlines how the municipality

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

chooses to organize itself (which departments are responsible for maintaining safety at events while reducing risk to the public). The case study analysis uncovers what practices the municipality has used successfully, what practices officials no longer use, and rationales behind their collective use of practical tools to mitigate risk. The case study analysis focused on a municipality chosen for its demographic qualities – a city within Southern Ontario with a population greater than 500,000 citizens and in close proximity to larger metropolises within Canada. This municipality hosts various events throughout the calendar year ranging from outdoor/indoor venues, concerts, parades, war memorial events, firework celebrations and other cultural events. The sample population ideally suited for this research study included individuals who had a strong knowledge of risk management at public events and who regularly planned for these events on behalf of the municipality.

In order to maintain the anonymity of the participants, little demographic information was compiled about their age, ethnicity, or gender. Information about their professional experience in risk management and security was obtained in lieu of this information in order to reinforce the specificity of their knowledge in relation to their municipality and how their events are planned and executed. The sample population was chosen due to their specific role as municipal employees with an institutional objective to support the city's mandate. Rather than obtain a sample population of police officers, a sample was chosen from the municipality to acquire the institutional response to risk management at public events. The literature on risk management at public events consistently discusses the collaboration between different levels of government and police (Albrecht, 2014; Davies & Dawson, 2016; Plecas, Dow & Diplock 2014); however

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

the direction of this research study was to focus on this collaboration through the processes and rationale of the institution.

The case study analysis involved a combined methods approach of in-depth interviews of the sample population, content analysis of the specific Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) they have authored and executed for their various events, and the direct observation of these practices being utilized at public events in their municipality. In combination, these three research methods provided a comprehension of risk management at this municipality and the differences in their view of potential risks at public events in comparison to those risks outlined in the literature. The use of documents such as procedures and planning guides in combination with open-ended interviews and direct observations can help provide a more complete review of the contextual factors associated with a specific case under examination (i.e. a municipality's planning and response) (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). The first level of analysis was reviewing the policy documents provided by the sample population about the procedures codified for public events.

Content Analysis

Prior to the commencement of in-depth interviews with municipal officials, a content analysis was completed to decipher some of the main operations of the risk management strategies currently authored and conducted by the participants. Most often policy documents are constructed according to the specific conventions of the institution and reflect factual information and processes about their populations. These documents specifically reflect the institution's values and uphold their self-image in some manner (Atkinson & Coffey, 2004). Usually policy documents about specific plans and strategies

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

are restricted official documents of the institution– written by the municipality and are not open for the public to view (Scott, 1990). They exemplify several criteria of validity that are essential in this content analysis: the documents are authentic and originally codified documents written by the municipality; they are credible sources of information from the authors themselves; they are representative of the typical material used for public event preparation; and they have a clear intention to provide standardized processes for public events (Scott, 1990).

The content analysis included reading through the Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) created for municipal events and summarizing the contents of these documents. The SOPs were read and given codes to identify themes within the document. The SOPs were then reread and the initial codes were refined to ensure the specificity of the coding scheme. A third read of the data produced examples from the SOPs which illustrated the thematic codes in the data. The thematic codes emerged from recurrent topics within the SOPs that had similar meanings and topics. Notes were generated on the apparent similarities between these topics and helped to create an overall idea of the research study. It is important to generate an overall idea greater than the simplicity of the data presented in order to expand theory and provide insight on the topic (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996; Gobo, 2008). The content analysis also included interpretation of how the policies can be used in cases of potential emergencies. The language and tone of the SOPs was also important to analyze as it provides additional information on who has written it and who the directives are written for. This was analyzed in how the municipality defined risk throughout the documents. The content analysis included reviewing how the definitions were formed and utilized in their procedures. In order to determine the most relevant

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

documents to analyze for this research study, the participants were asked to produce material that is circulated by the municipality to members of the committee (those in charge of planning safety procedures for events) in order to prepare security operations for public events.

Four key SOPs were provided to me for review including: SOP One: Canada Day 2016 SOP (43 pages), SOP Two: Monument Unveiling SOP 2016 (13 pages), SOP Three: Event Safety Plan SOP (5 pages), SOP Four: Event Planning Guide (Excel format). The authors of these SOPs include the emergency and security departments of the municipality and recommendations are ongoing from other key stakeholders such as paramedics, police, and fire services of the city. Several SOPs are generated for different events throughout the year and the contents of these SOPs include maps, emergency procedures, contact information for stakeholders (paramedic, fire, and police services), as well as pertinent information about the venue and emergency routes/exits. Each page is detailed with specific information about the event and the possible risks that can occur at this venue. Specific parameters to reduce risk are created and reviewed until they are approved by the safety committee as a whole. The main focus of the SOPs is to outline the processes that should be followed by municipal officials in case of emergency. The main utility of the content analysis was to gauge the specific use of the SOPs and whether municipal officials relied on the guidelines within moments of emergency or crisis. As part of the mixed methods approach, the content of the SOPs were analyzed for specific processes related to risk reduction.

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

In-Depth Interviewing

Open-ended in-depth interviews can also provide a plethora of rich information as it is the most used and well documented qualitative method (Heyink & Tymstra, 1993). In-depth interviews provide the participants the opportunity to describe their own subjective accounts of a phenomenon with their specific terminology. Therefore, data derived from in-depth interviews reflects the participant's concepts rather than the researcher's. The interviewer seeks to create a bridge between themselves and the respondent in order to imaginatively share and describe the respondent's social world (Hartley, 2011). Particular interview techniques such as asking open-ended questions and expressing empathy are utilized to allow the participants the opportunity to elaborate on their stories and subsequently share personal experiences with the interviewer. The participants agree to meet with the researcher, answer questions about their experiences, and participate productively in the research process by providing unique insight and detail (Tewksbury, 2009).

For the purpose of this research study, eight interviews with municipal officials from the security and emergency departments were conducted at their convenience, in January and February 2017 and ranged between 20-40 minutes in length. Much of the demographic info about the participants' age, ethnicity, and gender was not included in the interview questions as the anonymity of the participants was crucial to the integrity of the project. Specific demographic information published within this study could have possibly led to the identification of the municipality within the case study and subsequently the identification of the individuals themselves. Please see Appendix A for a complete list of interview questions. These individuals were selected purposefully with

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

the intent to bolster specific ideas about risk management based on the collective insight they generated (Hartley, 2011). Utilizing in-depth interviewing as part of a case study is beneficial in this scenario as it provides an extensive exploration from multiple participant perspectives about one particular experience they share (Simons, 2014). In this specific research study the intent was to analyze risk management strategies used at public events for a specific municipal government.

The analysis of risk management strategies was supported by the data collected during the in-depth interviews as participants were asked about their use of the SOPs and possible knowledge acquired from it within a practical setting. The participants were also asked to elaborate on their previous experience in the field of security and risk management, their current duties during events, and how their specific experiences and rationales enhance their ability to manage risk at public events. Background information about the participants including their professional work history in the field of security was discussed. Participants had been in the security field for several years, ranging from 5 to 22 years in hospitals, concert halls, clubs, campuses, as patrol and mobile security officers with a variety of companies. Currently their roles within the municipality encompass the responsibility of the supervision and staffing of security officers, daily investigations into security concerns, the operations and coordination of daily security activities for the municipality, and the patrol of buses and municipal properties such as recreation centres and libraries. Many of the daily security activities do not relate specifically to public events; however they do entail monitoring public areas where the municipality is responsible for maintaining a level of security and safety such as buses for public transportation. Monitoring of public transportation includes reviewing recorded

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

camera footage or any incidents on the bus and investigating the incidents by providing police with recorded evidence. Some participants described their involvement in terms of the coordination of events rather than the daily security operations, and their main priority was the coordination of the committee who plans and executes the safety plan for events. They are also responsible for authoring the SOPs and providing recommendations to the stakeholders when changes should be made to ameliorate the security procedures.

Digital recordings of the interviews were transcribed in preparation for coding and analysis to find common themes in the respondents' answers about how risk is perceived and mitigated. The interview transcripts were read and codes were assigned to identify themes within the data. The transcripts were then reread and the original codes were amended to ensure the coding scheme was accurate. Upon the third review of the transcripts, specific quotes were extracted which illustrated the thematic codes within the data. Grounded theorists approach their research studies by formulating areas of interest and specific preliminary interview questions to begin discussion on those areas (Charmaz, 2011). Common themes from the data are usually unknown to the researcher until the data is read, studied, and the themes are uncovered (Charmaz, 2011; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Glaser & Straus, 1967). This study highlights the themes found within the reflexive accounts of individuals in the field of risk management and examines their own understandings of risks at public events. By analyzing the themes within the responses of in-depth interviews with municipal officials, this study determines if differences exist between the risks outlined in current literature and the perceptions of risk garnered from the experience of those that work in this field. For this qualitative study, utilizing a

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

research method of in-depth interviewing allows me to find out more about the subjects and their perceptions of risk that are related to the public events that they organize.

An important process within the in-depth interviews included analyzing the policy documents (SOPs) that the participants used for public events and probing them to consider their use in a practical sense. Participants were asked what type of security operation greatly supports the feeling of safety and what they personally contribute to. Participants were provided with the opportunity to discuss the effectiveness of their own policies and to reflect on their specific experiences. This allowed the participants to contemplate whether the policies they follow are beneficial to the risk management process and if changes are met with acceptance or non-cooperation by the safety committee. Qualitative studies provide rich descriptive details derived from personal reflexive accounts of the respondents' activities. This important reflection process allows the respondents the opportunity to critique their own practices and policies and determine necessary changes that ameliorate their work. Interviews completed in tandem with other research methods such as direct observation and content analysis provide important context to the issue of risk management. Questions that arise within the content analysis or observation phase can be answered by the participants in the interview phase which allows the participant to elaborate on the extensive social phenomenon as a whole rather than as a specific piece to the overall picture (Noaks & Wincup, 2011). More specifically, conducting face-to-face interviews can capture a person's intonation, body language, and subtle changes in tone (Opdenakker, 2006). Therefore, conducting in-depth interviews provides a more holistic view of the research study and the perceptions of participants through their own descriptions. These descriptions and experiences can then be observed

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

in the context of public events. Direct observations of these practical applications are outlined in further detail in the next section.

Direct Observation

Direct observation generates increased information about the nature of the events, the atmosphere, and the attendees. For example, observational research at public events is necessary in order to enhance our understandings of the risk factors currently identified in theorizing on risk management as well as those risk factors that have yet to be explored (Silbey, 2003). Direct observations entailed attending public events between December 31st, 2016 and July 1st, 2017 for: New Year's Eve (Event One), the commemoration event for The 100th Anniversary of the Battle of Vimy Ridge (Event Two), and Canada Day (Event Three). The New Year's Eve event involved observing the thousands of citizens who convened on the main downtown square for an evening concert and various celebrity performances, as well as midnight fireworks. The commemoration of the Battle of Vimy Ridge was a more solemn event, but included observing hundreds of citizens and municipal council members who attended the military ceremony and laying of wreaths at City Hall. The Canada Day observation was busier than this event with multiple attractions, shows, and activities around the park, ending with nighttime fireworks. Direct observation at the events included observing the organizations that attended (fire, ambulance, police, etc.) and taking field notes on the atmosphere and the security provided by municipal officials. The mood of the event is dependent on the type of event and whether the atmosphere was sombre or lively. Each event was analyzed for the specific attractions/ceremonies that took place and who was involved in those moments – city council, celebrities, the military, or other high-profile individuals. Were there added

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

security procedures in certain areas or were certain areas blocked for security personnel only? What were possible risks that could occur at these events and what parameters were in place to mitigate this risk? Who attended this event – youth, seniors, families, etc.? Were there any risky individuals in the crowd that could pose a hazard – intoxicated or rowdy individuals? Did the official security organizations present at the event cooperate with one another? Were there multiple organizations present and who is covering what area? How are the municipal officials dealing with the other regulatory organizations present, such as the police? This covert observation allows the researcher to view both the obvious and surface level activity as well as intricate details that would be missed by common observers (Tewksbury, 2009).

An important factor in direct observation is good fieldwork relationships with the research subjects. Specific insights are provided to the researcher in advance about particular interesting avenues to continue to research. Gaining support from the ‘gatekeepers’ of the research study provides the researcher successful access to the information required (Hartley, 2011). The ‘gatekeepers’ are the participants from the security and emergency management departments that provided information to me about what events would be beneficial to observe. The events were open to the public and I did not require permission to attend them; however the insight provided by the participants was beneficial in understanding key aspects of the venue to observe.

The field notes were hand-written in a notebook throughout the events and then codified into a document. The field notes were read and themes were identified through the coding scheme. The field notes were then reread and the initial codes were refined to maintain the specificity of the coding scheme. A third reading of the data produced

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

examples from the field notes which illustrated the thematic codes that were also apparent in the other methods. Direct observation field notes were important in providing context to the fundamental risks present at these events and in helping to understand how the authorities and citizens interact (Levine, Gallimore, Weisner, & Turner 1980). Through direct observation at public events, the researcher can assume the participants have a shared common goal to maintain safety and their actions will exhibit this behaviour (Wall, 2015). Focused observation also assumes the researcher has background knowledge and access to the participants' personal perspectives, and analyzes the data with a specific research question in mind (Wall, 2015). The direct observation field notes illustrated the same thematic codes present in the methods of interviews and content analysis. These codes demonstrated that the participants' views of risk at public events was outlined within the SOPs and was practically managed at the events through the tools utilized such as fencing, appropriate communication, and visible police presence. The demonstration of this triangulation of results is facilitated through the multi-faceted mixed methods approach to the study that allows the researcher additional knowledge of the participants' perspectives from in-depth interviews.

By understanding the criteria outlined in the SOPs and knowing its effectiveness in a practical sense, this study can begin to understand how smaller municipalities utilize the tools they are equipped with. The mixed methods approach of content analysis, direct observation, and in-depth interviews with municipal officials provides a well-rounded case study analysis of the municipality and the specific risk reduction techniques implemented. The results of this case study analysis are described below.

Chapter 4: Results

Several themes about the risks at public events emerged throughout the research process and are highlighted below. These themes emerged from the results of the analysis of written procedures and the discussions of personal experiences which uncovered the types of risks that may be present at the municipality's events. Participants discussed the types of risks that are outlined in the SOPs and elaborated on which risks were of most importance to mitigate. Themes such as defining risk and the importance of using policy in practical situations evolved to form the results of the study. Other themes about the preparation for events and other practical methods used to mitigate risk, such as police presence as a deterrent, also emerged from the data collected in the study. In discussing risks at public events the participants elaborated on the sections in the SOPs related to terrorism and their opinions about the likelihood of any terrorist activity occurring in their municipality. These discussions about the prevalence of terrorism formed another theme about the likelihood of terrorism occurring at the municipality and the processes utilized by municipal officials to mitigate that specific risk.

Defining Risk through Policy

Prior to discussing the list of risks outlined within the SOPs, a thorough understanding of risk as defined by the municipality is required. Risk has been described in the literature as varying levels and severity of harm to society (O'Malley, 2008). However, risk according to the municipality may not define harm in the physical sense or encompass society as a whole. The municipality's definition of risk only encompasses their municipal staff, volunteers, patrons, and the institution itself. Before terrorism can be discussed as a definable risk, an analysis of other considerations of risk must be done,

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

such as the municipality's loss of reputation as a safe city and potential loss of finances from this change in standing. The codified risks outlined in the SOPs will be discussed within the following section with special consideration of obscure risks that are undefined in the SOPs, such as loss of finances and reputation that were specifically discussed by the participants.

The SOPs outline the risks municipal officials will potentially encounter at their events in either criminal or non-criminal forms. They categorize risks as “emergencies” with specific appendices on “non-life threatening emergencies vs. life-threatening emergencies” and detail specific procedures for their municipal staff and volunteers to follow in order to mitigate harm to attendees. These emergencies include, but are not limited to, environmental risks (storms/lightning), crowd control, slip/falls or trampling of patrons, security management for high-profile attendees (celebrities or government officials), firework (fire) safety, pick pocketing, drug and alcohol consumption of patrons, gun violence, assaults, etc. The longest and most detailed SOP was created for the Canada Day event. The SOP One: Canada Day 2016 specifically states “that the safety plan contains all reasonably foreseeable provisions to ensure the safety of participants, staff, and volunteers” (SOP One: Canada Day 2016, p.1). Any foreseeable “emergency” that they can envision happening at the event is discussed within the SOP and risk management processes are outlined. The SOPs outline step-by-step instructions on how municipal officials should prepare for these events and in case of occurrence, how they should deal with the situation. Step-by-step instructions provide officials with a municipally-approved method of de-escalating a situation or reducing the likelihood of these issues occurring in order to protect the individuals involved. Some of the

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

emergencies from SOP One: Canada Day SOP 2016 and SOP Two: Monument Unveiling SOP 2016 and a summary of their procedures are:

1) Extreme Hot Weather:

- In the case of extreme hot weather and or people becoming dehydrated they will be put in [venues] areas with A/C and given water

2) Storm/Lightning:

- Monitor weather conditions and communicate with the staff of any risks
- Communicate to the public if the event is postponed. If the event is cancelled then police will coordinate the evacuation of the site.
- Criteria for postponement or cancellation of the event will be based on the 30-30 rule: If there's thunder and lightning occurring within 30 seconds of each other, close down event. Wait 30 minutes and then resume if possible. If within the 30 minutes waiting time the thunder and lightning resume within 30 seconds of each other, the 30 minutes restarts.

3) Mass Evacuation:

- The police would implement their evacuation protocol with assistance from municipal staff

4) Intoxicated/Non-intoxicated Individual(s) Causing Disturbances (i.e. fighting, disturbing the peace, indecent exposure, vandalizing, trespassing private property, etc.):

- Proceed to defuse or control the situation and check to see if anyone is in need of medical assistance

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

- If the situation cannot be controlled or defused and/or the individual or assailant require serious medical assistance then the police should be contacted

5) Bomb Threat/ Bomb Explosion:

- If there is a bomb/suspicious package the police and security should evacuate the immediate area as soon as possible without letting the public know that there is a bomb in order to avoid mass hysteria
- The police bomb disposal unit will respond accordingly
- Fire and emergency services should immediately defuse other dangers and ensuring that all other surrounding risks are taken care of and controlled with precaution
- [Ambulance services] will assist those who have been injured if the bomb detonates
- All agencies involved are required to conduct a follow up of the occurrence to the police command centre during or after the situation has been controlled so that a report could be made for future reference

6) Stampede:

- In the event of a stampede security must notify police as soon as possible and also report to the command centre immediately
- Once the police have been notified, necessary reinforcement such as crowd control will be brought in by the police
- Paramedic services must also be contacted immediately; however the crowd must be controlled before they enter the scene

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

7) Fire:

- If you see a fire you must call 9-1-1 and inform Command immediately
- Once the fire department arrives, they will control the fire and event safety patrol volunteers, security, and police will continue to evacuate people and keep them at a safe distance away from the fire
- If anyone is injured then the paramedics must be called
- All agencies involved are required to conduct a follow up of the occurrence to the police command centre during or after the situation has been controlled so that a report could be made for future reference

8) Power Outage:

- In the event of a power outage, Command will call Hydro Once to inform them of the situation
- During this time, police and security will ensure that everything is under control by controlling the access/exit points and directing individuals towards the shuttle buses, parking lots, etc.
- If necessary for the safety of people attending the event, Fire and Emergency Services may call for back-up to bring in electric generators and spot lights

There are specific policy documents created and implemented in order to prepare for different events. SOP Four: Event Planning Guide is used to determine the level of risk at the event so the official can plan the event accordingly. SOP Four: Event Planning Guide has numeric scores (+/- 1 to 6) based on the event characteristics. The scores are based on the level of risk. The higher the score means the higher the risk. Some notable risks outlined in the planning guide include:

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

- “The number of people in attendance” rates a higher score if there are more people predetermined to attend
- “Controversial speaker/entertainment” has three scores based on: (1) May attract some vocal opposition (2) May attract some active opposition (3) May attract disruptive protest activities
- “An internationally protected person(s): Speaker with formal security protocols” rates higher on the risk assessment than someone who does not have a security detail
- “Indoor and Outdoor event and Multi-site Event” has higher scores than solely an indoor event or outdoor event
- “Alcoholic beverages served at the event” has a very high score
- “An event held at night” has a higher score than “an event during the daytime”
- “Having no security plan in place” has a very high score in comparison to having “a pre-approved proactive security plan”

SOP Three: Event Safety Plan outlines additional questions posed to the municipal official planning the event that discusses other concerns to be aware of, such as: “Have your sponsors been involved in any public controversies here or abroad? Are crowd control barriers necessary? Are any political figures attending your event? Are additional private protection services required for special guests? Have there been any injuries, deaths, and/or property damage due to weather conditions?” (SOP Three: Event Safety Plan, p. 1-4).

During the interviews, the participants were asked about previous events they had experienced and some of the biggest risks they encountered. Participants had different

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

interpretations of those risks and how to define them. Participants 2 and 6 defined risk as “anything unforeseen”. Their philosophy was that “if you identify risk beforehand then you are able to plan for it and it’s not a risk anymore. But if you don’t know and it comes out of nowhere then it’s a risk”. Participant 6 agreed that “risk is the unknown variable in anything that’s done or not done” and the riskiness is the potential lack of planning and weak response to the risk. They mentioned that each event had a different set of associated risks dependent on the type of venue, the crowd size, the location of the event, and the activities held. Other definitions of risk discussed within the interviews included harm against patrons, staff, and property/assets of the municipality, with an impending fear of loss of finances or reputation on behalf of the municipality. Participant 7 considered a potential risk to plan for as, “any opportunity of harm against patrons, staff, property and assets and anything that has the ability to cause adverse effects.” Although these risks are potentially unforeseen they can still cause grave consequences for the municipality if processes are not in place to counter the potential harm.

Municipal officials define risk within their SOPs in terms of emergencies that are foreseen such as environmental dangers, stampedes, and intoxicated individuals who may cause disturbances. The participants also noted that risk may be unforeseen and therefore cannot be labelled or proactively mitigated. Unforeseen risks described by the participants included loss of finances if emergencies occurred at their events and the subsequent loss of reputation as a safe city. The definitions of risk outlined in the SOPs differ from the definitions of risk presented by the participants as they are codified in written form and have subsequent procedures to mitigate the harm. Participants have

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

separate views of risk that are not written within the SOPs but are still considered important risks to mitigate to protect the municipality from harm.

Planning and Preparing for Events

A key finding from the interviews suggests that the SOPs also help to prevent loss of finances and reputation to the municipality which was considered a risk to the institution. The main goal of risk management from the participants' perspectives was to keep municipal events safe so that patrons and their families return year after year and municipal events can continue to generate financial growth as the population grows. The municipality's SOP One: Canada Day 2016 specifically outlines how important public events are to the growth of the city and the significance in maintaining fun, family activities. The municipality's comprehension of the sheer number of citizens attending their largest event – Canada Day – relates directly to their continued effort to uphold their reputation as a safe city so that this event can continue to grow. For example, the SOP One: Canada Day 2016 reveals the specific statistic related to attendance: "This is a family fun event with activities and entertainment for all ages. Throughout the entire event we expect anywhere from 70,000 to 100,000 people in the park" (SOP One: Canada Day 2016, p. 8). The municipality has an estimated population over 500,000 people and is in close proximity to larger metropolises within Canada. Therefore, having such a significant number of attendees in relation to the overall population of the city suggests it is an important public event to the municipal culture and atmosphere. Additional insight about the importance of reputation and finances for the municipality is discussed below in relation to the practical use of SOPs after an incident has occurred.

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

In learning about the creation of the SOPs and their potential benefits in the interview process, an important question to consider is how the SOPs reduce harm in a practical sense. The participants had many examples to provide about the use of the SOPs in their personal experiences; however the most poignant example of its utility is answered within the SOP itself. The SOP One: Canada Day 2016 details how harm is reduced through its practical implementation, as stated in both the introductory section and the purpose statement of the document. Similar sections appear in other SOPs for other municipal events. The municipality states that “the city is committed to ensuring the safety of all personnel and members of the public during official activities... It provides a framework within which city staff, volunteers and external agencies work together cohesively and strategically to ensure the safety of the public” (SOP One: Canada Day 2016, p. 2). The municipality has determined that their documented actions and pre-planning outlined in the SOP can protect the civility of the event and maintain the safety of staff and attendees. Practically, they can prepare to reduce physical harm to patrons and staff members when de-escalating a situation by “providing guidance when responding to incidents and emergencies on site” (SOP One: Canada Day 2016, p. 2). The authors of the event’s safety procedures had to ensure that the processes outlined in the SOP were demonstrative of their efforts to reduce risk, in case of an investigation or tribunal surrounding the liability of the municipality in compensating for damages to either people or property. In the event of an investigation/tribunal that is providing reparations to an injured patron or staff member, city officials can demonstrate that in terms of accountability they were responsible and had taken precautions to prevent harm and risk. Although this is not specifically stated within the SOP, the specific use of these

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

documents is discussed in detail throughout the interviews of the officials who have authored them. Participant 8 has dealt with tribunals in the past and discusses the importance of debriefing after each event and amending changes if necessary. Participant 8 described the process as “making recommendations based on what occurred so that for the next year we start with the debriefing report and say ok, what did we notice last year that might have worked or not worked”. Participant 8 noted that,

“it was also there for after-the-fact in case something happens and we get brought into court for any kind of liability suit saying we didn’t do this or that, well we can say that we have a procedure and we do train and practice and our staff know about the procedures... but as a corporation if someone wants to sue the city for an incident that happened, we can say here’s the plan and we can present it to the judge and say accidents happened even with the best prepared people. But they can’t blame us and say we didn’t have anything in place because we did”.

The SOPs need to have both preventative and reactive measures in place with regards to risks listed in the SOP, so that patrons and staff are protected. This dual-purpose is also stated in the SOP One: Canada Day 2016; the purpose in creating the SOP is outlined by the municipality in order to have guidelines for staff and patrons in case of emergency (SOP One: Canada Day 2016). This purpose was one of the most important features of the SOPs as discussed by the participants, especially in terms of defining the risks and adequately protecting against them. The participants described this purpose as one of the most important ways of being prepared at public events.

Another main function of the SOP is to provide the frontline security staff (the uniformed staff who deals directly with patrons at events) a procedure to follow that

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

encompasses both process and experience. The SOP does state specific parameters to follow but as discussed within the interviews, not all events or occurrences are the same. In many cases the occurrences are not clear-cut and there are many grey areas of how the situation should be handled, based on the complexity of the situation. Participant 2 had an interesting perspective of the SOPs and the use of them in the field. Participant 2 believed the SOPs are “there and have reasons to be there – procedure, policy and legal issues. But in the case of an event you can’t create a true SOP for it because the event constantly changes. If the SOP says I need 5 guards but at the last minute I realize that the artist that we book for the second stage has gotten more popular and we need more security there, am I breaking the SOP by moving them?” The participants were in agreement that the SOP was an important guideline for staff for many reasons such as procedure and liability. However, experience and expertise played a greater role in their actions at events.

Over the years and during the course of different public events, the SOPs are consistently updated with separate versions that were available for my review. The SOP One: Canada Day 2016 has specific creation and version dates on its title in accordance with the format of all municipal SOPs. The Canada Day SOP was initially created May 26, 2009 and the most recent version date is stated as June 21, 2016. I was provided the most updated versions of all requested SOPs in order to understand current protocols within the municipality. Previous versions of the SOP for Canada Day were available; however they do not accurately depict current and updated provisions and processes followed by the municipality, therefore they were not analyzed. Specifically, each event may include the same list of activities (food and drink stations, fireworks and concerts);

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

however an SOP is created and dated specifically for that event. Therefore, Canada Day 2016 could have the same events, security features and proactive processes in place as the newer version for 2017; however, the specific labels have been updated and the contents amended based on intuitive feedback from stakeholders.

It is understood by the security staff and municipal officials that experience plays an important role in de-escalating a situation and years of experience can assist the security staff immensely. Therefore, not all SOPs can be followed in their exact written form and changes do occur based on new situations that arise at events. Best practices are discussed post-event and the safety committee consisting of the security departments and other stakeholders (paramedic, fire, and police services) may consider changes to the specific wording related to the process outlined in the SOP. This is specifically meant to demonstrate that the city has done its due diligence in their meeting, planning, and executing of these processes to keep patrons and staff safe during public events. Most of the participants directly related their answers to the formation of the SOPs and its usefulness in providing direction and specific processes related to major risks at events. They also discussed how their personal opinions and suggestions could be used to formulate and amend the SOPs for events. Their use of policy documents relates directly to the municipality's mandate to have codified rules in place at public events in order to maintain security at times of risky behaviour or occurrences of danger.

In the interview process the participants described the meetings held prior to the event where the safety committee, consisting of the security departments and other stakeholders (paramedic, fire, and police services), may meet between 2-5 times to discuss what the event entails, the types of issues that might arise, the site, the layout, the

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

activities involved and the evaluation of where the risks may lie. Participant 8 stated that “strong recommendations are made as to what actions to take and usually because we have the expertise the committee members delegate the authority to us.” Changes are constantly made to rework the SOPs especially as things change from year to year as described by Participant 8. They mentioned that “they are constantly re-evaluating and even though we did this plan last year, it doesn’t mean we’re going to use exactly the same plan next year. We’re probably going to look at it again and say are we dealing with the same thing? Are we going to have new risks? Do we have any new parameters?” As described by the participants, the progression that occurs when authoring and amending the SOPs is a significant stage in preparing for public events, as they are afforded the opportunity to ameliorate their processes.

When discussing the preparations for public events in the interviews, the participants described physical mechanisms used to mitigate risk effectively. Proactive patrols (walking through the venue) prior to the event occurring are important steps in order to test and check the procedures that will be put in place and to see if the planning makes sense. The patrols include surveying the venue to determine whether appropriate barricades, laneways, and fencing are needed to protect the public from overcrowding or trampling. Other precautions that are used regularly by the municipality prior to an event occurring include sweeps of the venue with bomb-sniffing dogs or metal detectors searching for any suspicious items. This can also include sweeps at the end of an event, prior to the staff cleaning up the venue and restoring it to its normal functionality. Participant 1 outlined how the sweeps are coordinated before and after the event by police and security staff, in order to assure themselves and the municipality that all

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

precautions were taken to keep the event safe. Participant 1 described that “the sweep” occurs at a designated time when the police sergeant on site deems it appropriate. Police and security staff form a physical line at one end of the venue and walk towards the other end of the venue, surveying for suspicious items (prior to an event) or straggling patrons who have not left the venue (at the end of an event). This is a coordinated effort to both reduce terrorist or suspicious activity prior to an event occurring, but also an effective way to complete an event safely.

Pre-planning with other stakeholders (paramedic, fire, and police services) is also included in the process on the day of the event. A discussion with members of the committee and its stakeholders usually takes place briefly on the day of the event, as well as throughout the day, in order to reassess any immediate security changes to the schedule that may take precedence. Participant 1 explained that they as well as Participant 3 contributed heavily to “risk management and overseeing the event in hopes to find threats and mitigate their effects.” These two participants are frequently consulted by the safety committee on lighting, fencing, and the amount of security required for these events, based on their expertise and past experience. They are responsible for communicating with other agencies for threat assessments if there are impending threats and may amend their security plans based on recommendations from agencies such as CSIS and the RCMP. The participants described this preparation at the beginning of the event as an important time to discuss the event itinerary and if any recent changes have emerged. This can be dependent on any change in regards to music/entertainment or more serious changes such as security modifications based on police intelligence or recent security threats that have emerged.

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

Physical Methods Used to Mitigate Risk

Specific tools are used at the venue in order to mitigate the risk to patrons attending the event as well as to keep staff and municipal officials safe. Barricades and laneways were used around the venues at all three events in order to make the designated areas for patrons very clear. Unauthorized areas were cordoned off so that patrons did not cross into those sections (Direct Observation Notes, p. 1-3). A level of order was instilled when evacuating people from the venue in case of emergency. Appropriate concert fencing was a method frequently used at events where musical talent was invited to perform by the municipality (Direct Observation Notes, p. 1 & 3). Participant 2 described the fencing as one “that has a heavier base to withstand surges or pressure from the crowd and also allows security staff to stand above the crowd” and physically remove patrons who are experiencing a medical emergency or who are being trampled. Concert fencing is beneficial to reduce the risk of surges in the crowd where people push forward and create pressure on the front of the crowd, increasing the likelihood that people will fall and be trampled on. Concert fencing is especially useful at events where younger patrons may attend such as Canada Day (Event Three) and New Year’s Eve (Event One) where popular artists are performing. Concert fencing was used at these events in order to keep people safe when watching the show, especially when the crowd would surge forward closer to the stage. Varying types of fencing were noted at the different events, based on the type of risk that may arise at that specific activity (i.e. concerts, alcohol and food services, etc.). The venues for all three events have specific fencing that borders the zone for the event which maintains specific access points for patrons and eliminates potential risks by denying access to unwanted targets. The space is also under surveillance from

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

police and municipal officials for unauthorized behaviour thus supporting legitimate activity within the venue (Direct Observation Notes, p. 1-3). The venue is kept clean, well maintained and free of vandalism which all support the CPTED tenets (Kinney, Mann & Winterdyk 2017). The idea of a clean, well maintained and properly monitored venue that mitigates risks to the municipality and its patrons is followed by the security process of the municipality.

Efficient communication is also a beneficial tool in reducing risk at events as it provides security staff a direct way of communicating to patrons in the event of an emergency. Communication to patrons is achieved through various mediums such as megaphones, microphones, speakers, appropriate signage posted throughout the venue, social media posts updated throughout the event, and specific staff designated to provide information when requested (Direct Observation Notes, p. 1-3). The use of megaphones, microphones, and speakers is essential during concerts and musical entertainment at the venues. For Canada Day (Event Three) and New Year's Eve (Event One), concerts occurred throughout the event and specific emergency information could have been relayed to patrons via speakers if an emergency had occurred. Fortunately there were no emergencies that occurred at these events and therefore that measure was not used. However, there was appropriate signage around these venues in order to specify areas that were designated for security personnel only, areas that were designated alcohol permitted zones, and areas that were used for first aid and emergency information (e.g. lost children or to report an incident). Maps were also included in these signs in order to provide a visual representation of the venue and the layout of these emergency services (Direct Observation Notes, p. 1-4). Social media was also advantageous to security staff

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

as it provided a popular form of communication to those with smartphones. Up-to-date information about the event was uploaded to the municipality's social media portals and could have been used to provide instructions/information in case of an emergency. This information was displayed on signage at the events for patrons to view.

Information about the event was also relayed verbally to patrons by security staff and municipal officials that were specifically designated by their uniforms. They were dressed as visible officials of the municipality in order to communicate to patrons any details about the venue as well as pertinent safety information if requested (Direct Observation Notes, p. 1-4). According to the participants' assertions below, designated officials with uniforms for varying emergency services such as fire, paramedics, and police are especially effective in mitigating risk, as patrons feel secure and safe knowing there are many security officials present. It specifically reduces risk by providing visual deterrents to those who wish to commit nefarious acts at the events. According to the participants' descriptions below, the more security officials present at these events may increase the level of security felt by patrons, thus providing a safer venue for them to attend.

Police Presence as a Tool to Mitigate Risk

According to Participants 2, 3 and 5, the main tool in reducing the risk is increased collaboration with police and effectively demonstrating to patrons that there is a strong police presence at events. When participants were asked what was the security operation that greatly supported the feeling of security at events, the answer from most participants was police presence. The collaboration between police and the municipality is essential at public events according to city officials because they rely heavily on their

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

authority and uniform. The presence of a police officer versus a private security officer results in drastically dissimilar responses from the patrons. This sentiment was confirmed by the participants who believed that one of the most effective security operations that supported the feeling of safety at events was increased police presence. Participant 5 believed that “an average person on the street seeing a police officer versus a security guard may feel safer with the police officer assisting them.” It is also important to note that Participant 5 used to be a frontline security officer prior to working with the municipality and understands the special dynamic and reliance between security officers and police officers. The police have greater power and authority to physically remove someone from a dangerous or risky situation but they also have the ability to assist municipal officials in providing a safe environment just by way of wearing their uniform. Participant 5 also stated that “police officers have greater authority to charge and arrest people and take them away” in the event of an emergency. Security officials working for the municipality do not have the authority to physically remove participants from events and as Participant 3 confirmed, “the municipality has granted police officers the authority to remove anyone trespassing on city property and to act on the municipality’s behalf in those situations”. Participants 2 and 5 described their experiences with assistance from police officers and Participant 5 stated that “police collaboration occurs all the time” and in a particular event he had “flagged down police in order to make an arrest”. That is an extremely effective response to anyone causing a disturbance at events such as New Year’s Eve (Event One) or Canada Day (Event Three), where individuals may be under the influence of drugs or alcohol. Based on my observations for the New Year’s Eve event (Event One), several patrons were caught drinking in public or being drunk and

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

disorderly in the crowd. Police officers were present to remove these individuals from the event and to provide assistance to security staff where needed. I observed a police officer at the New Year's Eve event (Event One) who spoke with a patron who was under the influence and was able to communicate to the individual that the act was prohibited at the event. They were asked to leave and were escorted out by the police officer (Direct Observation Notes, p. 1).

Canada Day (Event Three) is another example of an event where police presence is vital in maintaining order, as there is a greater risk of a stampede due to the large number of people in attendance. A notable risk that occurred during the observation was at the end of the event. After the fireworks show had finished people were lighting fireworks amongst the crowd, thus inciting fear and panic as patrons shouted that the loud bangs were gun fire (Direct Observation Notes, p. 4). Police presence was beneficial in that moment as they were able to stop the perpetrators and remove/arrest them immediately. During the interview process, Participant 2 described a previous experience about the risk of stampedes where "someone hears something and says oh my God a gunshot and people start repeating it and then everyone runs." Participant 2 also described "seeing someone light a firework in the crowd and people ran thinking a gun went off." They stated, "If I see someone running then I'm going to run too. It gets bigger and bigger from there." These threats of stampedes have a higher likelihood of occurring as discussed by the participants in the interviews when speaking about fireworks and potential for people to think it is gun shots.

Participant 2 discusses storms and stampedes and how they can occur when "lightning strikes everyone runs for cover." This can create a surge of people running

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

towards the barricade. Environmental threats are also outlined in detail within the SOPs when discussing lightning and storm threats. The SOP for the Monument Unveiling 2016 states that “Event organizers and [security] staff will monitor weather conditions and communicate with event staff on any risk related to intense or extreme weather” (SOP Two: Monument Unveiling, p. 8). In the event of a surge in the crowd the SOP also states, “in the event of a stampede security must notify police as soon as possible and also report to event organizers and security staff” (SOP Two: Monument Unveiling, p. 10).

Fortunately no incidents of stampedes occurred at the memorial event for the 100th anniversary of Vimy Ridge (Event Two). However, there was increased police presence at that event due to the high number of military personnel and municipal council officials present. This event also had a more sombre tone than Events One and Three with no entertainment, festivities, or alcohol present; therefore the risk of intoxicated people causing disturbances was reduced. However, I observed police officers and security officials surveying the crowd for suspicious people and those with backpacks or larger items in their possessions (Direct Observation Notes, p. 1-4). This process could be directly linked to the SOP process for bomb threats if patrons bring weapons concealed in their baggage to the event. I witnessed an instance of this form of surveillance during this event. Two police officers, escorted by a municipal security officer, engaged in conversation with a man carrying a backpack. Sticking out of the backpack was a long wooden handle which could have been mistaken for a weapon. The police officers and municipal official asked the man to open his backpack and reveal the article which was found to be a wooden tomahawk. In further discussion I believed they concluded that the

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

item was not a real weapon and a personal article and therefore he was asked to tuck it into his backpack out of sight (Direct Observation Notes, p. 3).

Terrorism as a Threat

Participants 1, 3 and 8 consider the threat of terrorist activity as a lower level risk based on the lower probability that it will occur, however, it is higher on their scale of emergencies based on its severity and impact. The participants understood that their municipality is considered smaller than surrounding areas in Southern Ontario and therefore may be less likely a target for terrorists. Municipal officials considered their municipality as less of a desirable target for terrorist activity than other municipalities in the vicinity of Southern Ontario because it is “relatively small” (Participant 1) in comparison. Although terrorism has a high impact in terms of collateral damage and harm to those inflicted by the panic and brutality imposed by the terrorists, terrorists target specific cities that have larger crowd sizes (Kydd & Walter 2006; Pape 2005). Participant 1 describes the impact of a terrorist event occurring in their “municipal square of 5,000 people as opposed to 25,000 at Yonge-Dundas square [in Toronto]”. The SOPs created by the municipality still maintain contingencies for terrorism such as processes for bomb threats [Canada SOP for 2016 “If a bomb threat is made both police and security should practice caution at all times”]. However, as discussed by the participants during the interview process much of the intelligence about potential future attacks are vetted by higher levels of police authority, such as the RCMP and CSIS. These police agencies have the ability to garner information about potential threats and advise local municipalities of the likelihood. Participants 1 and 3 rely on “threat assessments from CSIS so they know of impending threats or something coming down the pipe”.

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

Participant 3 described their use of this intelligence in order to “increase their levels of security” if the need were to arise. The participants described their heavy reliance on information provided by police agencies in order to maintain efficient levels of safety at events.

Their response to any risk of terrorist activity is always supported by prior intelligence provided by higher levels of policing authority such as the RCMP or CSIS. The intelligence provided by higher authorities is crucial to their response at public events and is heavily relied upon when deciding whether an event is too risky to occur based on potential terrorist activity. Participant 3 discussed this in great detail as he is one of the main contacts for the RCMP and CSIS agencies in case of heightened security levels. Participant 3 in accordance with Participants 1 and 8 believed that the level of the risk of terrorism occurring in their municipality was quite low, albeit still a concern and “on their radar”. However, Participant 3 believed that if the threat was very high the event would probably not occur. This is especially true if they cancelled an event completely based on recent terrorist activity in neighbouring municipalities or larger ones within the province of Ontario, such as recent attacks in 2014 in Ottawa. Due to the threat of increased lone wolf shootings and smaller terrorist cells (LaFree, Dugan & Miller 2015; Onat & Gul, 2018), precautions are taken by the municipality to safeguard itself as would many other municipalities within Southern Ontario. Participant 3 described the municipality’s use of “benchmarking” and reviewing precautions taken by neighboring municipalities or larger ones around the world when faced with heightened terrorist activity. Last-minute precautions such as using concrete roadblocks to prevent vehicles from being used as weapons against patrons is an example of a precaution taken by the

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

municipality that is replicated from other cities. Participant 8 discussed the importance of these last-minute changes based on recent terrorist activity that may occur immediately prior to the event and how the response must be amended to reduce the risk of copycat attacks. Specifically Participant 8 mentioned the Berlin Christmas market attack in December 2016 where the terrorists used vehicles as weapons during the public event. Participant 8 explained that “although it may have never happened here it may happen so we had to bring in extra precautions”. According to Participant 8, these extra precautions included new ways of controlling and protecting the crowds by using police cruisers and police officers as roadblocks and barriers to cordon off the venue for New Year’s Eve (Event One) (Direct Observation Notes, p. 2).

According to the results of the content analysis, interviews, and direct observation of events, terrorism is not considered the greatest perceived risk within the municipality’s events. Municipal officials believe the greatest risks present at their events are the risks of stampedes due to a surge in the crowd or environment emergencies and the risk of violence or disturbances by intoxicated individuals. Participants have described the risk associated with events through terms of foreseen and unforeseen issues that arise. They discuss their practical use of the SOPs in case of emergencies when the risk of stampedes, environmental disasters, and violence occur. However, a new use for the SOPs was also uncovered- the municipality creates the SOP with the intention of providing a clear process for municipal officials to follow when de-escalating a situation and also retroactively when faced with liability claims and tribunals. The latter use is important in maintaining the reputation of the municipality as a safe city that hosts secure, family events. Continued discussion about the collaboration between police and municipal

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

officials is important, not only when discussing terrorism, but also in terms of mitigating other risks at events.

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

The mixed-methods study provided a comprehensive set of results related to the risk management of public events using multiple perspectives of participants, direct observation, and content analysis (McKim, 2017). The research study intended to determine the following: (1) How do medium-size municipalities perceive and define risk? (2) What are the practical tools that security officials use to mitigate risk in medium-size municipalities? The content analysis resulted in the initial findings of how risk was defined by the municipality and the interview results confirmed these definitions and also presented uncoded risks. A common consensus about the municipality's view of risk and emergencies was uncovered from these discussions with participants and their unique insights about the risk management tools were supported by the findings of the observation. The risks defined by the SOPs included environmental risks, the risk of stampedes, and the risk of disturbances caused by intoxicated individuals. The participants also defined risks as anything unforeseen that may occur and other uncoded risks such as a loss of the municipality's reputation as a safe city and subsequent loss of finances. Tools that were utilized by municipal officials to mitigate foreseen and unforeseen risks were appropriate fencing, signage and communication to the public, and a visible police presence.

Recently there has been growth in large-scale public events in Canadian cities, where mass numbers of people are concentrated in confined areas for hours to days at one time (Davies & Dawson, 2016). Dependent on the venue and nature of the event, people may congregate in one location for varying reasons such as protests, rallies, or public events. However, the constant reality is that a host of risks are also simultaneously

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

presented to security officials (Raine, 2015). The events of September 11th, 2001 have led to a new era of securitization and modern policing that is centered on risk management strategies and augmented surveillance when large groups of people congregate in one location (Harfield, 2012; Murphy, 2007).

Considering the literature's emphasis on the propensity of terrorism to occur at public events, the results from this research would presumably center on terrorism as the greatest perceived risk within the municipality's events (Atkinson & Young, 2012; Boyle & Haggerty, 2012) but this was not the case. Participants in this study explained that terrorism is considered a risk to mitigate at public events but it is considered less likely to occur than other risks at municipal events. Municipal officials of a medium-size municipality are required to prevent and mitigate several risks at public events which are not always criminal in nature or involve terrorist activity. These risks can include crowd control, stampedes due to environmental emergencies, and trampling of patrons. In these instances, municipal officials cannot mitigate the risk to patrons solely by intelligence provided by police but many of these risks are mitigated by proper procedure and pre-planning. Specific tools were used at venues in order to mitigate the risk to patrons attending the event, as well as keeping staff and municipal officials safe. In terms of crowd control and stampedes, municipal officials mitigated risk by utilizing specific fencing designed to withstand crowd surges and pressure against the barricade. The municipality chose to utilize specific fencing that reduces the risk of potential harm to patrons, thus changing the design of the venue in some manner to prepare for a safe event. The similarity between the risk of terrorism and the risk of a stampede is that these

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

risks must both be foreseen and mitigated by municipal officials with equal precaution and care.

However, the most important aspect in comparing the risk of terrorism and the risk of a stampede is the likelihood of their occurrence. Municipal officials believed that the risk of terrorism was less likely to occur than the risk of a stampede and therefore the results of the study found that they perceived other risks to be greater than terrorism.

Although terrorism is a significant societal risk that is currently analyzed in several realms of public policy and emergency preparedness (Alario & Freudenburg, 2010; Boyle & Haggerty, 2012; Bredel, 2003; Caponecchia, 2012; Mythen & Walklate, 2006), it is not at the forefront of the risk management plan for this municipality. It can be ascertained from the results of the study that more recurrent risks such as stampedes from environmental emergencies, crowd surges, and violence or disturbances caused by intoxicated individuals were at the forefront of their strategic planning. This result is based on the frequent occurrence of these risks as opposed to the occurrence of terrorist activity at this municipality.

Theoretical vs. Practical Applications of Risk

Another important result from the study was the development of how risk is defined by the municipality. Risk has been described theoretically as varying levels of harm to society which could entail a plethora of damages (Anderson & Brown, 2010; Beccaria, 1963; Bentham, 1948; Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; Kennedy & Gibbs, 2009; O'Malley, 2008). However, the municipality viewed risk practically through varying levels of “emergencies” at their events and elaborated on the damages of this risk as the municipality’s loss of finances or reputation. Harm against the municipality’s property

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

and assets were part of the definitional explanation of risk by the participants. The participants believed that harm against their property and buildings at events could result in financial loss for the municipality. The concept of risk is explained theoretically as unforeseen dangers to the public (Beck, 2002); however the municipality chose to create a practical term for the foreseen risks at events and labelled them as emergencies. The municipality did distinguish that unforeseen risks can still occur at public events, but labelling some of these foreseeable risks enabled their progression into tangible concepts with a corresponding written procedure for quick and effective reaction. Therefore risk as defined by the municipality is no longer explained as a situation where the outcome is uncertain and the consequences unknown (Aven, 2007; Aven & Renn, 2009). Labelling the notion of risk as a set of emergencies allowed the municipality the opportunity to theorize about the consequences of these emergencies and to create processes specific for each emergency they stated within their SOP. Labelling foreseeable risk as an “emergency” is a distinguishable characteristic of the municipality’s risk management process that enables them to define risk in their own manner and mitigate the risk appropriately, with support from stakeholders. Knowledge and prior experience assisted the participants in determining the appropriate action to take when unforeseen risks or emergencies occurred. The policy documents (SOPs) reinforced the notion that proactive plans were in place so when an emergency occurred there were subsequent procedures to follow.

Modern Securitization and Police Cooperation at Public Events

In order to mitigate the risk of harm to the public, municipal security officials are relying on partnerships with public organisations such as the police. The results from this

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

study demonstrated that municipal officials work closely with their local police officers to prepare for risks prior to the event as well as during the events for immediate support. The results of the study show that when intoxicated individuals cause disturbances or become violent, police intervention is effective in supporting the mandate of municipal officials to maintain order and keep the event safe. Police partnership with the municipality is an important result of the study which is consistent with existing literature on police intervention in community policing. Partnerships between police and municipal officials are intrinsic in the security preparations as both parties can benefit from increased efficiency and effectiveness at reducing threats (Bevir 2016). Other potential benefits that police provide to municipal officials include increased surveillance of people attending events and increased information about potential risks.

Although police officers are essential in situations where escalated force and detainment are necessary in order to maintain security and civility, they also have other crucial roles in the maintenance of safety at events. Police officers have become advisors to municipal officials and disseminate specific knowledge about criminal activity and behaviour before the event, at the time of the event, and post-event (Ericson, 1994). It is this specific communication about risk and occurrence that provides a more secure and safe event led by the information-gathering and information-sharing of police (Molnar & Whelan, 2017). Police provide specific crime-related data to municipal officials with the intention of continuing their proactive work (Beck, 2002; O'Malley, 2015). Results of this study demonstrated that municipal officials were then able to place resources and increased security processes in areas that have greater foreseeable risk based on this information. Foreseeing risk allows municipal officials to have increased support and

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

imperative security-related intelligence that enables them to maintain safe events and their reputation as a safe city. Without this collaboration municipal officials would not be able to make effective changes to their SOPs and present their risk management strategies as well-planned and exhaustive in detail.

When planning public events it is imperative that municipal officials coordinate with other organisations and agencies that could potentially supplement the response to emergencies or enhance preparation prior to the event (Albrecht, 2014). Municipal officials discussed their collaboration with other agencies such as the RCMP and CSIS when threats arose prior to events occurring. Increased communication with police on a reciprocal basis with community members is an effective way of maintaining collaboration between institutions in order to reduce risks at public events (Ericson, 1994; Gerber & Neeley, 2005). Police produce and distribute knowledge to the municipal officials and in turn the municipal officials can report suspicious activity at their events to reduce the likelihood of an emergency occurring. Increased information and intelligence from all sources greatly mitigates risk at public events and has overall benefits when preparing for public events (Raine, 2015).

Limitations of the Research Study

Although the mixed-methods approach provided a comprehensive understanding of the risk management techniques at the municipality, there were also limitations. A crucial limitation of the study is the small number of participants in the in-depth interviewing process. Unfortunately, not many individuals have the specific expertise and training on public events at this municipality, therefore the sample population is significantly reduced. Within the municipality, only two departments consisting of less

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

than 15 people deal directly with the security operations for public events. There are many people who work within the municipality who plan the activities for the events (i.e. entertainment and vendors) but did not have the specific training or experience in security operations for public events in order to participate in this research. In this study the participants' insight into public events and risk management techniques was a crucial factor in their involvement. Their involvement in authoring the SOPs was intrinsic in their capability to be a part of the study. That is the main reason why police officers were not included in the participant sample. The municipality is governed solely by the mandate set by the city council. Police officers in this area represent a particular region which consists of three separate municipalities. They do not represent the objectives or mandate of solely one specific municipality or this municipality in particular. They also do not author the SOPs and therefore cannot make definitive amendments to the policy documents researched in this study. In future research endeavours it may be beneficial to obtain a policing perspective, however in this current study their perspective does not relate to the perspective of the institution.

Although future research should focus on other municipalities, their policy documents, and their public events, obtaining specific confidential security information can be difficult. Within this study, many of the policy documents provided by the municipality were not accessible to the public. Existing literature on providing security for major events is limited due to the fact that detailed security processes and information are usually not released to the public as it may be too valuable to share (Plecas, Dow & Diplock 2014). This limitation was also applicable in this study and detailed security processes were only provided with the utmost care that they would not be released to the

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

public. The interview participants themselves were assured that the information obtained through the interview process was confidential and their names and identifying information would be removed. Some potential participants declined the opportunity to participate due to fears that the municipality and their identity would be uncovered and their professional reputation in jeopardy. Unfortunately, this trepidation reduced the number of willing participants in the interview process of the study.

Conclusion

In light of the limitations, this study did provide insightful information about risk management strategies at a medium-size municipality. Current literature omits discussing different municipalities, event sizes and their subsequent security and emergency operations (Warner & McCarthy, 2014). This research study was beneficial in commencing this perspective of risk management studies and analyzed a smaller municipality rather than a large metropolis. Current literature surrounding risk management at public events suggests police and municipal resources are directed towards reducing the risk of terrorist activity (Harfield, 2012; Murphy, 2007). However, the literature tends to focus on a broad global view of terrorism superseding other types of mundane criminal activities that are more likely to occur at smaller municipalities and venues.

The purpose of the research study was to analyze how the municipality perceives, defines, and mitigates risks at their public events. The study sought to comprehend how risk was defined by municipal officials, how they discussed risk in their policies and processes, and how risk was practically mitigated at the events themselves. The results of the study demonstrated that risk is defined by a medium-size municipality in terms of

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

foreseen risks (environmental hazards, stampedes, and disturbances caused by intoxicated individuals) and unforeseen risks (such as loss of finances or reputation of the city). The participants' specific labelling of risk as a set of 'emergencies' illustrates that the municipality has defined the term in order to adequately prepare for these 'emergencies' with subsequent security processes. The definition of risk is now tangible, labelled and defined for the purpose of proactive risk management. Specific tools are utilized by the municipality to prepare for these emergencies. These tools include appropriate fencing, communication and signage to the public, and a visible police presence to assist in risk mitigation. This research study has ameliorated the literature on risk by exploring a new set of 'emergencies' at public events that are different from existing risks on terrorism at public events. This research study also analyzed the risk management processes of a medium-size municipality which is comparatively smaller than municipalities reviewed in the literature on events such as the Olympics and the FIFA World Cup (Atkinson & Young, 2012; Toohey & Taylor, 2007; Boyle & Haggerty, 2012; Peek & Sutton, 2003; Selliaas, 2012; Toohey, Taylor & Lee 2003).

A mixed methods approach of content analysis, in-depth interviewing, and direct observation was used in order to understand how the concept of risk is defined by the municipality theoretically and practically. A mixed methods approach provides a better understanding of the study than a single viewpoint or method can achieve (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). The triangulation of these three methods, content analysis, in-depth interviewing, and direct observation was beneficial in determining aspects of the risk management process within the municipality and how these aspects worked in tandem to reduce risks such as stampedes and violent occurrences. Although it may have been

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

adequate to simply interview risk management officials about their opinion of risk at public events, it was not sufficient in comprehending the holistic process. The mixed-method study uncovered how the municipality conveyed the concept of risk to the other stakeholders (paramedic, fire, police services) in order to receive their support and resources at events. In revealing the municipality's definition of risk in their policies and how they employed the other stakeholders in their risk management strategies, the results of the study demonstrated that in order to reduce the unforeseen dangers at public events the municipality would rely heavily on intelligence from police services.

Further research should be completed into the occurrence of stampedes and violence caused by intoxicated individuals that have been determined as more probable than terrorism. A separate research study can be conducted on the liability and legality of the effects of these risks on the reputation of the municipality once they occur. Research can be conducted into the occurrence of these risks and the potential repercussions to other municipalities if they were to occur. More accessible information and sustainable strategies for risk mitigation must be transferred among smaller municipalities in order to develop the literature on this subject. These meaningful exchanges can help to develop effective strategies when policing major events by providing municipal officials the opportunity to make changes to their risk management strategies based on the experiences of other municipalities of similar size (Waller & Solares, 2017).

References

- Alario, M. V., & Freudenburg, W. R. (2010). Environmental Risks and Environmental Justice, Or How Titanic Risks Are Not So Titanic After All*. *Sociological Inquiry*, 80(3), 500-512. doi:10.1111/j.1475-682X.2010.00344.x
- Albrecht, J. (2014). Effective Planning for Major Events and Incidents: Examining the New York City Police Department Protocols and Guidelines. In J.F. Albrecht, M.C. Dow, D. Plecas, & D.K. Das (Eds.), *Policing Major Events* (pp. 179-194): CRC Press.
- Anderson, L. & Brown, M. (2010). Expanding Horizons of Risk in Criminology. *Sociology Compass*, 48, 544-554. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9020.2010.00305.x
- Aradau, C. & Van Munster, R. (2007). Governing Terrorism Through Risk: Taking Precautions, (un)Knowing the Future. *European Journal of International Relations*, 13, 89-115.
- Atkinson, M., & Young, K. (2012). Shadowed by the corpse of war: Sport spectacles and the spirit of terrorism. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 47(3), 286-306. doi:10.1177/1012690211433452
- Atkinson, P. & Coffey, A. (2004). Analyzing documentary realities' in D. Silverman (ed.). *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice* (2nd edn). London: Sage. Pp. 56-75.
- Aven, T. & Renn, O. (2009). On risk defined as an event where the outcome is uncertain. *Journal of Risk Research*, 12 (1). 1-11. DOI: 10.1080/13669870802488883
- Aven, T. (2007). A unified framework for risk and vulnerability analysis and management covering both safety and security. *Reliability Engineering and System Safety*. 92. 745-754.
- Baker, D. (2011). A case study of policing responses to camps for climate action: Variations, perplexities, and challenges for policing. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*. 35 (2), 141-165. doi: 10.1080/01924036.2011.561972
- Beccaria, C. (1963) [1764]. *On Crimes and Punishment*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Beck, U. (2002). The Terrorist Threat World Risk Society Revisited. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 19(4), 39-55.
- Bentham, J. (1948) [1780]. *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. NY: Hefner.
- Bevir, M. (2016). Decentring security governance, *Global Crime*, DOI: 10.1080/17440572.2016.1197509

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

- Boyle, P., & Haggerty, K. D. (2012). Planning for the worst: risk, uncertainty and the Olympic Games. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 63(2), 241-259.
doi:10.1111/j.1468-4446.2012.01408.x
- Bredel, R. (2003). The UN's Long-term Conflict Prevention Strategies and the Impact of Counter-terrorism. *International Peacekeeping*, 10(2), 51-70.
- Caponecchia, C. (2012). Relative risk perception for terrorism: implications for preparedness and risk communication. *Risk Anal*, 32(9), 1524-1534.
doi:10.1111/j.1539-6924.2011.01784.x
- Charmaz, K. (2011). Qualitative Interviewing and Grounded Theory Analysis. In J. F. Gubrium & J.A. Holstein (Eds.). *Handbook of Interview Research*. doi:
<http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412973588>
- Coffey, A., & Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making sense of qualitative data: Complementary research strategies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Crenshaw, M., & Horowitz, I. L. (1983). Terrorism, legitimacy, and power: *The consequences of political violence*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Davenport, C., 2000. Introduction. In: C. Davenport, ed. *Paths to state repression*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1-24.
- Davies, G. & Dawson, S. E. (2016). Spoonful of sugar or strong medicine: 'Meet and Greet' as a strategy for policing large-scale public events. *Policing and Society*, DOI: 10.1080/10439463.2016.1259317
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.). (2011). *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research (4th edition)*. Los Angeles: CA: Sage
- Downing, S. (2011). Technology and Crime Prevention. In D. Mackey (Ed.), *Crime Prevention* (pp. 163-187). Burlington, MA: Jones and Bartlett
- Einstadter, W.J. & Henry, S. (2006). *Criminological Theory: An Analysis of its Underlying Assumptions* (2nd ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield
- Ericson, R.V. (1994). The Division of Expert Knowledge in Policing and Security, *The British Journal of Sociology*, 45 (2), 149-175.
- Ericson, R.V. & Haggerty, K. D. (1997). *Policing the risk society*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

- Fischer, P. & Ai, A. L. (2008). International Terrorism and Mental Health. Recent Research and Future Directions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23 (3), 339-361. doi: 10.1177/0886260507312292
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Pantheon
- Gadd, D. (2012). In-Depth Interviewing and Psychosocial Case Study Analysis. In D. Gadd, S. Karstedt, & S.F. Messner (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Criminological Research Methods*. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446268285>
- Garland, D. (1997). Governmentality and the problem of crime: Foucault, criminology, sociology. *Theoretical Criminology*, 1(2), 173-214.
- Gerber, B.J. & Neeley, G.W. (2005). Perceived Risk and Citizen Preferences for Governmental Management of Routine Hazards. *The Policy Studies Journal*, 33, 395-418. doi: [10.1111/j.1541-0072.2005.00122.x](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0072.2005.00122.x)
- Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company
- Gobo, G. (2008). Re-conceptualizing generalization: Old issues in a new frame. In P. Alusuutari, L. Bickman, & J. Brannen (Eds.), *The sage handbook of social research methods* (pp. 193–213). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gomm, R., Hammersley, M. & Foster, P. (2000). *Case Study Method*. London: Sage
- Gottfredson, M. & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A General Theory of Crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Harfield, C. (2012). E-Policing and the Social Contract. *IEEE Technology and Society Magazine*. doi: 10.1109/MTS.2012.2185272
- Hartley, R.D. (2011). *Snapshots of Research. Readings in Criminology and Criminal Justice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Heyink, J. & Tymstra, T. (1993). The Function of Qualitative Research. *Social Indicators Research*, 29 (3). doi: [10.1007/BF01079517](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01079517)
- Jennings, W. & Lodge, W. (2011). Governing Mega-Events: Tools of Security Risk Management for the FIFA 2006 World Cup in Germany and London 2012 Olympic Games. *Government and Opposition*. 46 (2). 192-222
- Kemshall, H. (2011). Crime and risk: Contested territory for risk theorising. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 39(4), 218-229. doi:10.1016/j.ijlcj.2011.05.009
- Kennedy, L. & Gibbs Van Brunschot, E. (2009). *The Risk in Crime*. London: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

- Kinney, J. B., Mann, E., & Winterdyk, J. A. (2017). Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED). In J.A. Winterdyk (Ed.), *Crime Prevention* (pp. 375-402): CRC Press.
- Kondrasuk, J. N., Bailey, D., & Sheeks, M. (2005). Leadership in the 21st Century: Understanding Global Terrorism. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 17(4), 263-279. doi:10.1007/s10672-005-9054-8
- Kydd, A. H., & Walter, B. F. (2006). The strategies of terrorism. *International Security*, 31(1), 49-80.
- LaFree, G. (2017). The Intersection of Homicide, Terrorism, and Violent Extremism. *Homicide Studies*, 22(1). DOI: 10.1177/1088767917737809
- LaFree, G., Dugan, L., & Miller, E. (2015). *Putting terrorism in context: Lessons from the global terrorism database*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lee, M. & McGovern, A. (2013). Force to sell: policing the image and manufacturing public confidence. *Policing & Society*, 23 (2) 103-124.
- Levine, H.G., Gallimore, R., Weisner, T.S. & Turner, J.L. (1980). Teaching Participant-Observation Research Methods: A Skills-Building Approach. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 11 (1), 38-54.
- McKim, C.A. (2017). The Value of Mixed Methods Research: A Mixed Methods Study. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(2). doi: 10.1177/1558689815607096
- Morley, B. & Leslie, G.D. (2007). Terrorist bombings: Motives, methods and patterns of injuries. *Australasian Emergency Nursing Journal*, 10, 5-12.
- Murphy, C. (2007). "Securitizing" Canadian Policing: A New Policing Paradigm for the Post 9/11 Security State? *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 32 (4). 449-475.
- Mythen, G. (2006). Criminology and Terrorism: Which Thesis? Risk Society or Governmentality? *British Journal of Criminology*, 46(3), 379-398. doi:10.1093/bjc/azi074
- N.a. (2016). City of Brampton. *Brampton at a Glance*. Retrieved from <http://www.brampton.ca/en/Business/edo/business-knowledge/Pages/Brampton-At-a-Glance.aspx>
- Noaks, L. & Wincup, E. (2011). *Interviews*. Criminological Research. SAGE Publications Ltd. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781849208789>
- O'Malley, P. (2008). Experiments in risk and criminal justice. *Theoretical Criminology*, 12 (4). doi: 10.1177/1362480608097152
- O'Malley, P. (2015). Revisiting the Classics: 'Policing the Risk Society' in the Twenty-first Century. *Policing and Society*, 25(4), 426-431. doi:10.1080/10439463.2015.1031500

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

- Onat, I. & Gul, Z. (2018). Terrorism Risk Forecasting by Ideology. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*. DOI: 10.1007/s10610-017-9368-8
- Pape, R. (2005). *Dying to win: The strategic logic of suicide terrorism*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Patz, J.A., Gibbs, H.K., Foley, J.A., Rogers, J.V. & Smith, K.R. (2007). Climate Change and Global Health: Quantifying a Growing Ethical Crisis. *EcoHealth Journal Consortium*, 4, 397-405. doi: 10.1007/s10393-007-0141-1
- Peek, L.A. & Sutton, J.N. (2003). An Exploratory Comparison of Disasters, Riots and Terrorist Acts. *Disasters*, 27(4), 319-335
- Plecas, D., Dow, M., & Diplock, J. (2014). The Planning and Execution of Security for the 2010 Winter Olympic Games in Canada. In J.F. Albrecht, M.C. Dow, D. Plecas, & D.K. Das (Eds.), *Policing Major Events* (pp. 89-104): CRC Press.
- Primoratz, I. (1990). What is Terrorism? *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 7(2), 129-138
- Raine, R. (2015). Reflections on Security at the 2012 Olympics. *Intelligence and National Security*, 30. 422-433
- Reeves, J. & Packer, J. (2013). Police Media: The Governance of Territory, Speed, and Communication. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 10, 359-384. doi: 10.1080/14791420.2013.835053
- Scott, J. (1990). *A Matter of Record: Documentary Sources in Social Research*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Selliaas, A. (2012). From Olympic massacre to the Olympic stress syndrome. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 47, 379-396. doi: 10.1177/1012690211433481
- Shepherd, J.M. & Knutson, T. (2008). Teaching and Learning Guide for: The Current Debate on the Linkage between Global Warming and Hurricanes. *Geography Compass*, 2 (4), 1232-1236. doi: 10.1111/j.1749-8198.2008.00120.x
- Silbey, S.S. (2003). Designing Qualitative Research Projects. *Prepared for NSF Workshop on Qualitative Methods in Sociology*. Retrieved from https://uoit.blackboard.com/webapps/portal/execute/tabs/tabAction?tab_tab_group_id=11
- Simons, H. (2014). Case Study Research: In-Depth Understanding in Context. In P. Leavy (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Qualitative Research*. doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199811755.013.005
- Smith, D. & McCloskey, J. (1998). Risk Communication and the Social Amplification of Public Sector Risk. *Public Money & Management*, 41- 50

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

- Spath, R. & Pine, B.A. (2004). Using the case study approach for improved programme evaluations. *Child & Family Social Work*, 9 (1). 57-63. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2206.2004.00310.x
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA and London: Sage.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory and Techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2003). Issues and dilemmas in teaching research methods courses in social and behavioural sciences: US perspective. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 6, 61-77.
- Taylor, T., & Toohey, K. (2007). Perceptions of Terrorism Threats at the 2004 Olympic Games: Implications for Sport Events. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 12(2), 99-114. doi:10.1080/14775080701654754
- Tewksbury, R. (2009). Qualitative versus Quantitative Methods: Understanding Why Qualitative Methods are Superior for Criminology and Criminal Justice. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Criminology*, 1 (1).
- Toohey, K., Taylor, T., & Lee, C.-K. (2003). The FIFA World Cup 2002: the effects of terrorism on sport tourists. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 8(3), 186-196. doi:10.1080/14775080310001690495
- Toronto 18: Key Events in the Case (2008, June 4th). *CBC News Canada*. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto-18-key-events-in-the-case-1.715266>
- Walker, H.A. (2001). Understanding and Managing the Risks to Health and Environment from Global Atmospheric Change: A Synthesis. *Human and Ecological Risk Assessment*, 7 (5), 1195 – 1209
- Wall, S. (2015). Focused ethnography: A methodological adaptation for social research in emerging contexts. *Forum : Qualitative Social Research*, 16(1) Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/uproxy.library.dc-uoit.ca/docview/1674925038?accountid=14694>
- Waller, I., & Solares, V. M. (2017). Smarter Crime Control: Putting Prevention Knowledge into Practice. In J.A. Winterdyk (Ed.), *Crime Prevention* (pp. 449-476): CRC Press.
- Warner, C. & McCarthy, J.D. (2014). Whatever can go wrong will: situational complexity and public order policing. *Policing and Society*, 24, 566-587.
- Whelan, C. & Molnar, A. (2017). Policing political mega-events through 'hard' and 'soft' tactics: reflections on local and organisational tensions in public order policing. *Policing and Society*, DOI: 10.1080/10439463.2017.1282481
- Williams, K. R. & Hawkins, R. (1986). Perceptual Research on General Deterrence: A Critical Review. *Law & Society Review*, 20, 545-572.

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

- Yin, R.K. (1994). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Yin, R.K. (2003) *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Ying, Y., Klauser, F. & Chan, G. (2009). Governing Security at the 2008 Beijing Olympics. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*. 26 (3). 390-405.

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

Appendix A

Letter of Invitation

Hello, my name is Rachael Nunes and I'm a Graduate student at the University of Ontario Institute of Technology researching risk management and security operations at large public events. The purpose of this research project is to better understand how risk is minimized at public events where large groups of people gather for different festivities. There are many research projects which have analyzed security operations at larger events within central municipalities, such as the Olympics and the FIFA World Cup, but there are few projects that have examined risk on a smaller municipal scale. There is also little known about which risks are immediate and of great concern to smaller municipalities, other than the risk of terrorism, which is mentioned frequently in the existing literature. Therefore, this research project will address this gap in the literature. You have been identified as a person with important knowledge on this topic and I would like to interview you at your convenience.

The interview would last approximately 20 to 30 minutes and can be completed in person. Questions will ask about your experiences in preparing security reinforcements for these large events as well as the advantages and disadvantages of current practices. You will also be asked to make recommendations based off of your experiences on how to best modify these security reinforcements. The results could potentially help improve knowledge about security operations at these public events. Your participation is completely voluntary. The responses given in the interviews will remain confidential and no participants or municipalities will be identified in any documents pertaining to this research. I realize that permissions may need to be sought from your superiors if you choose to participate in this research project during your work hours. If so, I am happy to contact the necessary people and obtain the permissions.

If you are interested in participating in this research project or have any further questions please contact me. If you feel someone else might be better suited to participate in this research project within your organization, please feel free to forward this document to them.

Rachael Nunes
Graduate Student
Faculty of Social Science and Humanities
University of Ontario Institute of Technology (UOIT)
2000 Simcoe Street North, Oshawa, ON L1H 7K4
Email: Rachael.nunes@uoit.net

This study has been approved by the UOIT Research Ethics Board REB [14134] on [January 10, 2017].

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

Appendix B

Informed Consent Letter

Research Project Title: Observational and Analytical Research on Risk Management at Public Events: A Case Study of a Municipality within the Greater Toronto Area

Purpose of the study:

Recent research has been conducted into risk management and security operations at large public events. Most research analyzes large events such as the Olympics and the FIFA World Cup, however we know little about how smaller municipalities deal with their security operations at smaller events. The purpose of this research project is to provide a more thorough analysis of these specific security operations at varying municipal events. Current research focuses on risk management of terrorist activity which may not be the sole focus of smaller municipalities. There is also little known about how much time is spent mitigating non-criminal matters or criminal matters less severe than terrorism. Therefore, this research project hopes to fill in some of the gaps in our knowledge on this issue.

What you'll be asked to do:

You will be asked to take part in an interview lasting approximately 20 to 30 minutes in length. Questions will ask about your experiences during these public events and the security operations you contributed to. You will also be asked to make recommendations based off of your experiences on ways to ameliorate security operations at these events.

Your participation is entirely voluntary. You have the right to refuse to participate and the right to refuse to answer any questions at any given time. You have the right to withdraw at any time during the interview. Once the interview is complete the information you have provided will be retained given that it cannot be traced back to you. Should you choose to withdraw during the interview and indicate that the information provided up to the withdrawal point cannot be used, the information you provided will be destroyed.

What are the risks and benefits of participation?

The risks involved in participating in this research project are minimal and similar to what you would expect to encounter in everyday life. If you choose to participate in this project during your work hours, it is recommended that approvals be sought from supervisors to take time out of your work day to participate in this research. However, this will lead to others knowing that you participated in this research project. Alternatively, interviews can be conducted outside of work which would limit the likelihood of others knowing you participated in this research project. There is also the risk that superiors might pressure you to participate, or not to participate, in this research

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

project. Therefore, it is important to reemphasize that participation is completely voluntary and no one will know, other than myself, whether you participated or not. Therefore, any write-ups of this research will not contain any identifying information including names or municipalities thus minimizing the risk to the participant(s).

Although there are no direct benefits to you from participation in this research, you will be provided an opportunity to speak about your experiences. The information you provide will help enhance the knowledge about risk management and security operations at these public events. If you would like a copy of the final report on this research project, please leave an email with me and I will send you a copy once the study is complete (approximate date is 2017/2018). This email will in no way be connected to your responses.

What happens to the information you provide?

The information you provide will be used in presentations and publications. Interview transcripts and recordings will be stored electronically on a password protected computer to which only I and my supervisory committee have access. Recordings will be destroyed once they have been transcribed and the transcripts will be password protected. The results of your participation will be strictly confidential and no names or individual identifying information will be maintained. With the exception of the researcher involved in this study and the supervisory committee assigned to this researcher, no one will have access to any of the individual responses. Your responses will be combined with many others and reported in group form. A pseudonym will be used in place of your name.

Agreement to participate means:

You have read the above and understand the nature of this study and agree to participate. You understand that by agreeing to participate in this study you have not waived any legal or human rights. You also understand that you have the **right to refuse to participate** and that **your right to withdraw from participation at any time during the study (up until the interview has been transcribed) will be respected with no coercion or prejudice.**

Researcher:

Rachael Nunes
Graduate Student
Faculty of Social Science and Humanities
University of Ontario Institute of Technology (UOIT)
2000 Simcoe Street North, Oshawa, ON L1H 7K4
Email: Rachael.nunes@uoit.net

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

Christopher D. O'Connor, Ph.D. (Academic Supervisor)
Assistant Professor
Faculty of Social Science and Humanities
University of Ontario Institute of Technology (UOIT)
2000 Simcoe Street North, Oshawa, ON L1H 7K4
Email: Christopher.O'Connor@uoit.ca; christopher.oconnor1@uoit.net
Phone: 905-721-8668 ext. 5882

If you have any concerns about your treatment as a participant in this study, please contact:

Compliance Officer, Office of Research Services
Email: compliance@uoit.ca
Phone: 905-721-8668 ext. 3693

Participant Concerns and Reporting:

If you have any questions concerning the research study or experience any discomfort related to the study, please contact the researcher Rachael Nunes at
Rachael.nunes@uoit.net

Any questions regarding your rights as a participant, complaints or adverse events may be addressed to Research Ethics Board through the Ethics Research Coordinator – researchethics@uoit.ca or 905.721.8668 x. 3693.

This research project has been approved by the Research Ethics Board (REB) at the University of Ontario Institute of Technology (REB # 14134) on [January 10, 2017].

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

Appendix C

Interview Guide

Before interview starts: Remind participant that the interview is being recorded and go over the informed consent form including plans for transcription and the de-identification of this recorded data.

1) Can you tell me a bit about yourself? (Probe: Job description and previous experience? Previous Jobs? Education?)

2) What is your main responsibility during public events? What part of the security operations do you contribute to? (Probe: Administrative/dealing with personnel? Communicating with other enforcement agencies – police/fire/emergency management? Technological initiatives/surveillance?)

3) What type of events have you previously experienced? Can you describe some of the key details of the largest event you participated in? (Probe: What venue? Number of people in attendance? Any special attendees – mayor/celebrities?)

4) What were some of the biggest risks at these public events? (Probe: Terrorism? Gun violence?)

5) How tangible is the concern for terrorism to actually occur at these events? (Probe: Do certain recent terrorist attacks affect the security operations? How can you prepare to mitigate the risks of terrorism?)

6) What type of security operation greatly supports the overall feeling of safety at these events? (Probe: police presence, surveillance)

7) What type of security operation has drawbacks to its use in providing an overall feeling of safety at these events? (Probe: Bag searches/ body searches (pat downs), metal detectors)

8) What is the biggest risk at public events, in your opinion? What security operation would you implement in order to mitigate that risk in the future? (Probe: budgets are not considered within this paradigm)

9) Do you have any questions for me or anything further to add that I missed?

Finally, I would like to thank you very much for your participation in this research project. Your responses were very helpful. If you would like a copy of the final report on this research project, please leave an email with me and I will send you a copy once the study is complete. This email will in no way be connected to your responses. If for some reason you change emails/jobs, feel free to send me your current contact info at any time or you can track me down online to obtain a copy of the final report.

RISK MANAGEMENT AT PUBLIC EVENTS

Thanks for all of your help and insights. It's much appreciated.