

BOWNESS FLOOD BARRIER COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP MEETING

Meeting 13 - June 1, 2020 - 7 to 9:30 p.m. Online via Microsoft Teams

Working Group Attendees

David Burton
Jacqui Esler
Jane Kahler
Jolene Moran
Patti Peck
Josie Stiles
Hank Vrielink
Jean Woeller

Working Group Resources

Mariel Higuerey
Judy Hoad
Amy Stansky
Frances Welsh

Guests

Colleen Manion
Chuck Slack

Apologies

Anne Campbell
Sheila Clayden
Sydney Empson
Rae McKenzie
Jeff Riedl
Ralph Smith

MEETING NOTES

1. Flood Modelling

Summary of discussion:

- A member asked if the hydrology model included the flow from the aquifer. Aquifers get recharged during the rainy season, and that will affect flow.
 - The groundwater study and associated model will show the magnitude of flow rate and volume of the aquifer compared to the flow and volume conveyed by the river. It will give information about the yield and fluctuation.
- A group member asked about Slide 41 and if it was possible to see the flows downstream with the conceptual or road barrier model?
 - Downstream flow shows no change with the barrier models. Looking at the flow model with the 1,212 m³/s hydrograph there is no change in discharge. If the number was less than 1,212 m³/s, it would show how much water flow was reduced.
- A few members asked about the erosion findings. Do the results consider that the barrier will be higher in the outside? Will erosion not increase with higher flow rates from how TransAlta operates the dam?
 - Flows impacted by the barrier model are not making a difference in the hydraulics.
 - Information about the operation of the upstream reservoir and associated mitigation will be part of the Province's work. The City does not have that information.
 - Unclear is high flow rates more often will impact erosion.

- A member asked if there were any changes or impacts to the river flow velocity and level downstream in the community (east side) if there was a decision not to do any flood mitigation upstream or further west in Bowness?
 - No, the hydraulics are different. Upstream in the community water moves slowly, the flows are small, but that doesn't mean they are not devastating. Downstream we see more current. If we didn't touch upstream, it would not impact the hydraulics in the east down portion of Bowness.
 - Downstream communities don't benefit from a barrier in Bowness or from no barrier and flooding in Bowness.
- A member asked if KCB knew to what extent the speed with which the 2013 flow rates increased was due to how TransAlta handled the flood flows and volumes?
 - The flood modelling report shows the naturalized hydrographs. The Bow River with topography and catchment doesn't show as much volume as it came in 2013.
- A group member asked about Slide 10 and what 1:200 flow rates with "upstream mitigation" in place meant.
 - Amy - wording is from river engineering – attenuated.
- A member asked if the third-party consultant reviewed this study
 - The City explained the third-party review was only for the hydrogeological study as there are no experts in-house. It does not apply to all project studies.
- There was a question on dewatering. Will dewatering increase the flow to the river?
 - Unclear

Next steps: the finalized report will be shared with the Working Group. Once comments are received and incorporated, the report will be shared broadly with the public. The group's facilitator will include a debrief in a future meeting's agenda after the group has reviewed the report to discuss the results further. If possible, The City would like to have questions ahead of the meeting to have as many of the responses available as possible.

2. Project and Engagement Update

Social Criteria input

- Context has sent the survey links to guests and the majority of the Working Group members. All members will have the survey link by the end of the day.
- The survey will be open until June 15. After that Context will summarize input and bring it for discussion to the June 22 meeting.

Summary of discussion:

- A group member mentioned that the June 22 meeting is scheduled during what is usually a time of high water. If Bowness gets flood risk, the meeting may not be well attended.

Technical reports – schedule

- The groundwater study results presentation has been moved to July. There will be two meetings for this topic. The first meeting will be the presentation of results, and

the second meeting will be a debrief after the Working Group has had some time to review the report.

Summary of discussion:

- A group member asked if Advisian – the third-party reviewer – will attend the groundwater Working Group meetings.
 - Advisian will attend one, if not both, groundwater sessions.

Public engagement timeline

- The City has reviewed and rescheduled engagement, so it is not rushed. The City wants to do engagement properly, giving it the necessary time. Changes in the schedule represent what we hear from the Working Group and the community. While the recommendation is now shown in November-December of 2020, if we feel additional engagement and discussion is needed, Administration can reschedule it into Q1 2021.

Summary of discussion:

- Several group members asked for clarification about the opportunities to influence the recommendation to Committee. There were also questions about the role of the Working Group in assessing/commenting on the recommendation.
 - The TBL engagement survey shared with the Working Group and guests includes a more detailed explanation of opportunities to participate and influence the process.
 - There will be an additional meeting with the Working Group sometime in early November to discuss the TBL evaluation and recommendation. The facilitator will ask the group about availability for the Fall meeting schedule soon.
 - Context will add the engage framework levels to the timeline tactics for further clarity on the level of influence.
 - The role of the Working Group is to advise The City on engagement and communication. The group needs to discuss whether it is within the Terms of Reference to state an opinion on the recommendation, as opposed to whether there was adequate engagement and communication. It is not a formal group that is established to make a recommendation on The City's report.
- A couple of members asked about the process and timeline to prepare the recommendation to Committee. Does the process require pieces to be submitted in a certain time?
 - The timeline presented accounts for that process, but as we move into disseminating the results broadly with the public and gathering feedback we will adjust the timeline as needed.
 - The City Clerk provides details on submission and presentation to Committees. The process is defined in Council procedure bylaw. The facilitator will find and share the information with the Working Group. The

City will also include more of this information in the timeline and schedule as the project moves forward.

- A member asked about the items included in the parking lot section of the timeline. If those were not going to be shared with the group?
 - The parking lot list was included to show items The City will be sharing but have not been slotted in yet. We will change the label in the graphic to avoid confusion.
- A group member further asked about the timing needed to include all necessary information into the Committee reports and recommendations. The specific example was related to the November public event. If the event's goal is to collect additional input, is there enough time to review and incorporate the information before going to Committee?
 - The City is not pushing for a report before the end of the year. It can be moved to Q1 of 2021 if needed. We do know community members are waiting for answers, so we also don't want to delay if there is enough time to review and incorporate the results and feedback into the recommendation. The project team is looking to balance both ends while keeping the project moving.

3. Working Group Business

- Meeting 10 notes and meeting 12 Notes - edits or additions.
 - Discussion rescheduled to June 22.
- Letter to City Council: response to UCS discussion on April 15
 - BRFM member proposed two changes (to be shared with the group via email) to clarify the reason for resistance to the project.
 - The original letter intended to introduce the Working Group to Council. If the letter is to talk about disagreement in community, it is a different letter and needs to be redrafted.
- Working Group Discussion - what is the purpose of a barrier?
 - Discussion rescheduled to June 22.

4. Tracking system for questions

The City will be using the tracking sheet developed by Jean. The team is updating the file with answers to the questions and will share with the group.

5. Additional comments/questions from working group members included:

- Adding to the engagement timeline the project milestones to show as project milestones shift how engagement shifts.
- Given November is budget time for The City, if the recommendation is to move ahead, how and when will funding be decided – is it from fees or capital funding?
 - The City will provide this information in future meetings

- The group would like more details about the decision process from Committee to Council. Is there a decision tree that clearly shows the different opportunities for the public to participate?
 - The facilitator will find and share information about consent and debate differences that move recommendations from Committee to Council
- Cllr. Sutherland has noted many reports to Committees have been delayed due to COVID-19. The agendas and calendars may be impacted and shift in the Fall.
 - Those changes are out of the project team's control, and timelines will need to adapt.
- Part of the Working Group's mandate speaks to equitable protection. It is important to understand what is happening in other communities.
 - The project manager will bring a summary of other communities and projects to share with the group in the June 22 meeting.
- BRFM hosted a tour/groundwater demonstration. Several working group members were in attendance. There was discussion around the water table in the community, especially for houses under construction. BRFM has a video showing the groundwater levels in the property where the tour took place.

6. Next Meeting – June 22, 2020

The meeting will start earlier to allow the TBL discussion to take place between 6:30 to 7:30