

**BOWNESS FLOOD BARRIER  
COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP MEETING**

---

**Meeting 7 - November 4 2019 - 7 to 9:30 p.m.  
Bowness Seniors Club**

**Working Group Attendees**

Anne Campbell  
David Burton  
Jacqui Esler  
Jane Kahler  
Jean Woeller  
Josie Stiles  
Patti Peck  
Rae McKenzie  
Ralph Smith (Cllr. Office)  
Sheila Clayden  
Sydney Empson

**Working Group Resources**

Amy Stansky  
Frances Welsh  
Judy Hoad  
Mariel Higuerey

**Apologies**

Hank Vrielek  
Jeff Riedl

**Meeting Notes**

**1. Review of Meeting 6 Notes**

No changes. Meeting notes will be posted online.

**2. Ratification of the Terms of Reference (TOR)**

The group discussed the TOR making remarks for clarification on the following sections.

- Membership – if the working group members would like to bring a guest, they should advise the rest of the group on the meeting prior or send email to Facilitator with a request for consideration
- Roles & responsibilities – the working group is not a decision-making body but can put forward recommendations. The TOR says if a recommendation were beneficial, it would be achieved by consensus, not by vote. As an advisory body, the Working Group is able to speak as a knowledgeable group of residents on what they have observed – present facts rather than opinions.  
If the group considers a process is needed for internal operational discussions, a separate decision-making process can be developed at that time. The group expressed they would not like the default to be by vote but actually working through the issues in order to make a recommendation with a clear explanation

of the percentage results. If there are opposing or divergent opinions, meeting notes should reflect the different comments even if a decision is not reached.

At the end of the discussion the group accepted the TOR and agreed to post on their website.

### **3. Community Information Event**

Mariel Higuerey provided an update on the scheduled public event. The event will take place on Tuesday, November 26, 2019, from 4:30 to 7:30 p.m. at the Irish Cultural Centre (6452 35 Avenue N.W.). The main purpose of the event is to provide the community with an update on progress, where the different studies are at and the next steps in the engagement process.

The group then proceeded to review the draft display board content and provide suggestions:

#### **Board 1 – Welcome**

- Reword – ‘The barrier would work in conjunction’ with ‘The barrier would function in conjunction with upstream mitigation’
- Clarify – the potential barrier is in an alignment already identified/chosen by The City (on private property). No consultation on the location of the barrier
- Clarify – the barrier will not protect to the 2013 level. The 2013 level was 1:75, 1:20
- Reword – not ‘developing potential barrier options’ – sounds like different alignments – maybe refer to ‘barrier designs’ instead

#### **Board 2 – Why is Bowness vulnerable to river flooding?**

- Clarify – the Map used in the board shows unattenuated flooding conditions (no upstream). Maybe some wording about what unattenuated means would be helpful for people to understand what is realistic – the agreement for the Ghost reservoir is in place. Explain what it means – no reservoir and water programs.
- Highlight – make the font bigger for the note on the map that states ‘Without upstream and barriers’
- Question – why is the chosen map unattenuated. Can you clearly indicate why? – It is the worst-case scenario.
- Add - Include the source of the map
- Clarify – the text says ‘800 m<sup>3</sup>/s’ most people won’t know what that equates to. Use normal flow, 2005 level or 2013 level for comparison
- Clarify - Legend states 1:200 is The City’s target – can you explain how that level is achieved – what is the ‘full protection package’?
- Consider – having a Glossary of terms maybe on a separate board

#### **Board 4 – How do reservoirs and barriers work together to prevent flooding?**

- Reword – change subtitle ‘Why not build bigger reservoirs?’ to something like ‘Factors that impact reservoir volume/size/capacity’
- Include – upstream reservoir timeline information – approx. 11 years to start
- Include – add info that explains the two different upstream reservoirs. Most people only know about SR1

#### **Board 5 – Proposed Bowness Flood Barrier Timeline**

- Review - Make sure information aligns with decision-making flow chart

#### **Board 7 – What is groundwater?**

- Clarify – the groundwater source is not only from the river, it comes from various places like for example the Paskapoo slopes
- Include - Kyle’s diagram from the groundwater presentation
- Add – information about when Bowness gets flooded (800 m<sup>3</sup>/s)

#### **Board 8 – Exploring groundwater mitigation**

- Clarify – Why are we doing this? explain prior to this project there wasn’t much data specific to the community

#### **Board 10 – River modelling**

- Question – is the overtopping risk included in the model? If yes, clarify the potential risk
- Clarify - Why prevent to 1,230 m<sup>3</sup>/s? Why was that number chosen? Where does it come from? What were the assumptions?
- Add - Can we have a visual for this event?
- Request – can the groundwater model also include the higher areas in the community (low/no barrier residences)

#### **Board 11 – Maintaining proper drainage in the community**

- Include – if possible a map showing drainage points in the community

#### **Board 12 – Understanding and mitigating environmental impacts**

- Clarify - indicate that the BIA is governed by City and is not the same rigour of an EIA
- Question – can you add more information about how the BIA will be used – sent to Province to determine if it triggers a full EIA?

#### **Board 13 – What are we doing?**

- Expand – on the methodology, what do the surveys consist of?
- Explain – how you will use the final assessment – construction, remediation – what do you do with the findings?

#### **Board 14 – Studies and community engagement process**

- Clarify – the feasibility is being done with a predetermined alignment (on private property)
- Clarify – the barrier on its own will not protect for a flood of the 2013 magnitude
- Change the title – it should more relate to the timeline of the process, not the engagement process

#### **Board 15 – Studies and community engagement stages**

- Add – ‘Existing’ to the landscape features bullet

### **4. Working Group Website**

Website is now live and available for all the public to see:

<https://www.bownessfloodmitigationworkinggroup.ca/>

Maril Higuerey asked the Working Group members to review and advise of any errors or omissions. She also asked for the link to be shared with their networks and members.

### **5. City of Calgary Decision-making Process**

The group reviewed the updated decision-making flow chart. The following edits were suggested:

- Add – that public input is welcomed during Council Direction in Summer of 2020 in the Graph
- Reword – ‘devastating events’ for ‘flood events’ in the Purpose text
- Add – ‘Existing’ Landscape features in Data Gathering +Analysis 01
- Clarify – that the TBL analysis takes into account the barrier within the city. It is not a stand-alone analysis (Next Steps - 05)
- Clarify – land acquisition as part of Phase 2, is it only easement negotiations or could it also be expropriation? (Next Steps - 06)
- Reword – Council Direction should read Committee Direction. Also considered explaining how Committee and Council are related (Graph and Next Steps 06)

### **6. Next Meetings**

The December 4, 2019 meeting was discussed, and the group agreed to cancel it. Meetings will resume in the new year and will take place at the Bowness Seniors Club on the second Monday of the Month, starting January 13, 2020.

Topics for the new year:

- The City’s Triple Bottom Line process

### **7. Other questions and comments**

- If, at the end of the preliminary design, the recommendation is not to proceed, what happens to the Working Group? Sense of what happens if the project continues is clear, but if the project stops, can we continue? What is the guidance?
  - Working Group could put forward a recommendation to become an advocacy group for upstream mitigation. Will need to discuss with the BCA
- Working Group asked if it was possible to get updates/info about the results of the budget deliberation. Specifically, they would like the team to inform the group if they know the project will stop and would not move to Phase 2. Property owners need to know
- BCA would like assistance with language to promote Nov 26 event – it will be used on Facebook and website to draw people into the event
  - The team will prepare and share with BCA, BIA, BRFM
- What is the cost-benefit of just the barrier without the upstream?