

# BOWNESS FLOOD BARRIER COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP

---

## Meeting 5 – September 9, 2019 – 7 to 10 p.m. Bowness Community Association – Studio Room

### Working Group Attendees

Anne Campbell  
Sheila Clayden  
Sydney Empson  
Jacqui Esler  
Jane Kahler  
Rae McKenzie  
Patti Peck  
Hank Vrielink  
Jean Woeller  
Josie Stiles

### Working Group Resources

Judy Hoad  
Lauren Minuk  
Denise Noguiera

### Guests

Colleen Johnson  
Susan Paul  
Ralph Smith

### Apologies

Jeff Riedl  
David Burton  
Frances Welsh

## Meeting Notes

### 1. Introductions

### 2. Review of notes of Meeting 4

- Some feedback has previously been incorporated as notes were developed
- Typo on page 2 – last major bullet “KCB hast...” about halfway down the page
- Otherwise no comments

### 3. 2019 Community Survey Results (Presentation by Leger)

- Presentation to be available online, link to be sent to working group members
- Focus of presentation is on what was learned rather than how the survey was developed
- City Communications group wanted to understand the awareness in the community for communications purposes.
- These results aren't going to be used as a decision-making tool.
- Q: If this is not being used as a vote or decision making tool, how will the information be used?
  - A: Mostly to understand the story about community members' awareness of the project, attitudes, etc.

- Observation that riverfront owners are very aware and support low; rest of community low awareness and high support. Take away is that as people become more aware of The City's plans and studies to date they would be less supportive
  - Clarification: the data do not show this relationship
- Main takeaway that as a community there is a lot of work to do. From a community perspective opinions seem black and white. Struggling with how to level the playing field
- Comment: Concern with wording: using the word "barrier" people would assume that it will stop water. If non-riverfront residents were asked about an overland flood dyke that would still allow basement flooding they might have answered differently
- Comment: Concern that Bowness residents who don't understand issues with groundwater may have a false sense of security that the proposed barrier would help with groundwater flooding.
- Looking at it in terms of the role of the survey – litmus test/gauge for where people are at – need to communicate and educate, that's our opportunity
- Big gap in awareness for sure, good opportunity for The City to learn. Need to consider difference between communication/education and marketing – should be providing balanced information
- Comment: BRFM's position is that the barrier won't protect Bowness: Concern that posting survey results could further the NIMBY argument perception
- Comment: The way the project was rolled out is an issue – rather than discussing ideas, The City presented one option and riverfront residents feel the need to defend → how will we fix this?
- Comment: Concern about randomness of survey given 836 numbers and 136 responses
  - Keep in mind number of people/number of households as well as that cell phones could not be included due to time and budget
  - Suggestion to consider different methods for future (e.g. mailout)
- Q: in the non-riverfront residents survey there was a question about whether reservoirs will protect from flooding – did it specify existing reservoirs or building new ones?
  - A: Wasn't specific to either
- Q: when looking at the data for support or opposition does it include all respondents or only those who were aware?
  - A: Everyone would have been asked the question and all results would be presented in the report

- Q: any studies done in research industry about whether having only landlines skews results
  - A: Most studies look at phone vs. online and find that in most cases tend to be similarly accurate
- To bring back – main intent was to understand riverfront resident and full community perceptions, opinions, understanding, etc. to inform communications and engagement going forward. No decisions have been made but this helps The City understand what information to provide and how to make sure everyone can make an informed decision
- Suggestion to consider the group who was flooded but doesn't live right on the river as a specific audience

#### **4. Working Group Terms of Reference (ToR)**

- Version 4 circulated with the agenda
- ToR meant to focus on the why/what the group is trying to do
- City doesn't want to see some of the historical background
- Comment: Feels offended by The City removing some of the history that suggests that Engage Policy wasn't followed. City should acknowledge that this has gone forward without following the policy
  - Piece of the fallout was the need for the working group
  - Suggest removing background.
  - Suggestion to reduce the background and discuss few facts such as that there was a meeting in January, there was opposition, etc.
  - Alternative suggestion that the background needs to be kept as The City has the FMMA strategy and it is relevant that directly impacted landowners were not consulted
  - Principle issue is whether there's a statement that says The City didn't follow its engagement policy
  - Could be part of the mandate of the working group to give recommendations on The City's Engage Policy
  - Recognition that some of the historical actions in this project could have been done better
- Good ToR is a reference when group gets in the thick of things – way to hold members accountable as a group in terms of behavior and purpose
- ToR can be living documents but needed to guide group
- Go slow to go fast idea
- Are there working groups for other community barriers?

- Sunnyside has one – technical group since 2014: Initial intent was around emergency response but now provides advice to The City
  - Meet quarterly, take a position on protecting community through higher barriers
- Facilitator to lead creation of new ToR
- Overall suggestion that the working group should be able to make a recommendation meant to influence The City’s policy going forward and could be included in the advice coming from the working group
- Discussion around what the timeline should be for the working group (i.e. at what point should the working group be reviewed to see if it should still be in place)
  - Suggestion to continue until Council receives a recommendation
  - Suggestion to continue until Council until Council directs next steps
  - Going to Committee Q2 2020, at which point they could direct Administration to go in any direction they see fit
  - Suggestion to reevaluate whether working group should continue Q2 2020
- Reminder that the working group’s role is to help support The City but not to do The City’s work
- Still need to figure out how the working group and The City can work together to support the community in getting more informed
- Add The City as a member of the working group
- Need to determine how guests or subject matter experts will be decided on – facilitator will circulate requests for guests to the group
- Discussion about members having equal standing and what that means
- Suggested ground rules will be circulated
- Facilitator will redraft and recirculate next version

## 5. Engagement Plan

Presentation to be circulated.

Comments:

- Who are “impacted stakeholders” - More important for more affected stakeholders to be prioritized
- Understand there are limited resources, should also consider people who use the area for recreation who might be interested/affected
- On goal 3 on presentation – will anything be done on this area?
- Q: How are the results of the studies communicated?
  - A: Open houses, riverfront residents meeting
  - Will be providing findings to the working group and on the website

- October meeting will be about the studies and focus on groundwater
  - Request the AE Report should be unpacked in this meeting - link to the report isn't enough
  - AE Report recognizes that each community will need individual studies and some of the studies in other communities have already found differing information compared to the AE Report
  - Discussion around whether it's better to wait for more specific, more accurate information or use the best available information to date
  - Want to be able to make informed decisions – help synthesize the information for the community
  - Need to present open house content ahead of time
- Excellent groundwater presentation by Dr. Cathy Ryan – facilitator will send out
- Can let neighbours know about door knocking
- Suggestion to put a flag on the website for people who live in homes that the AE Report suggests would be flooded by groundwater
- Q: (to working group) – knowing that there isn't a lot of new information, should The City have some kind of larger session in the fall for people or should we wait until we have more results from the studies?
  - Need to have some kind of meeting or if not need to manage expectations - say what's been done and what is being worked towards
  - Shocked to see Feb. 2020 as the date where more information will be available
  - Last public meeting was Oct. 2018 so could be a year and a half after – City has never gone that long in Sunnyside

## 6. Final Items

- Last meeting brought forward idea of peer review – KCB and peer review person will come and discuss process with working group
- City Decision-making process – deferred to next meeting
- Next meeting – October 7 – focus on groundwater

## Attachments

- i. Links to documents
- ii. AE Report