

BOWNESS FLOOD BARRIER COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP

Meeting 15 – July 6, 2020 – 7 to 9 p.m. Online via Microsoft Teams

Working Group Attendees

David Burton
Sydney Empson
Jacqui Esler
Jane Kahler
Patti Peck
Josie Stiles
Hank Vrielink
Jean Woeller

Working Group Resources

Mariel Higuerey
Judy Hoad
Frances Welsh

Apologies

Anne Campbell
Sheila Clayden
Rae McKenzie
Jolene Moran
Jeff Riedl
Ralph Smith
Amy Stansky

NOTES

1. Working Group

a. Discussion follow-up

- No concerns with the membership recommended changes by Judy.
 - The Working Group discussed their expectation that The City resources still clarify and rectify any misrepresentations
- Roles and responsibilities – TOR say ‘formally aligned with Bowness Community Association (BCA) planning committee’. Working Group doesn’t have a position, BCA has expressed they don’t have a position, but Bowness Responsible Flood Mitigation Society (BRFM) does. The statement gives special standing to the BCA, and all parts play the same role and importance in the Working Group.
 - Sydney will take back the concern to BCA and have a discussion to provide some alternative language.
- Roles and responsibilities – if City staff are resources and not members, who manages the recommendations and questions and timely responses?
 - The facilitator and engagement resource will update questions as part of notetaking. This responsibility will be included under meetings and scheduling or sharing information sections in the TOR.
 - Judy will update the TOR.

b. Trust rebuild invitation from last meeting – Hank request for discussion

- More involvement on the technical level will help build trust with BRFM and riverfront residents. Having concerns actively addressed, not feeling rushed for feedback after a study is received. Answered inquiry documents.
- Hank sent a list of recommendations to members. He feels there is a lack of objective information on the table, and that is making this process much more difficult and riskier. The time for the recommendation is getting shorter, and that affects trust.
- There is a critical juncture coming up. The community needs technical information in layman terms. The process is the outcome, and it is not only the Working Group that needs to be informed. Go beyond information out. Opportunities to ask questions and understand. Flood affected area needs to be educated - that implies exchange, not information out only.
 - We need to inform and educate residents, so they understand the real implications. Virtual engagement doesn't work the same as in-person for the community.
- BRFM Board and steering committee want to understand how The City went from conceptual to preliminary design. "The reason we are asking is to make sure The City is using procedural fairness – a rationale for the decision. "
 - While this impacts trust, should the Working Group put energy in procedural fairness in the future?
- BRFM would like to engage with the Third-party reviewer separately and not as part of the Working Group. Can that happen? The City will consider the request as it is not part of the contract.
- The Working Group has seen presentations, and members have outstanding questions, but we have received no reports. The Working Group expects to discuss with the experts once members have had time to review reports.

2. Unfinished Business

- a. Meeting 13 Notes
 - Missing outstanding response from KCB for Hank.
 - One other missed question not tracked in minutes.
 - Judy will update and ask WG to acknowledge receipt online to post on the Working Group's website.
- b. Meeting 10 Notes
 - Judy will send notes again and ask WG to acknowledge receipt online to post on the Working Group's website.
- c. Record of June 22 discussion
 - Judy will share notes with Working Group. Ask to review and confirm
- d. Introductory letter to City Council
 - Judy suggested, and the Working Group agreed that the timeline to send the letter has passed.
 - BRFM sent separate letter with their grievances to Council.

- The BRFM members asked that the project team speak to Council instead of City staff not involved with the project and engagement.
- The Working Group agreed to delay the letter as long the Group was introduced at a later date. It is important to recognize and respect that time and commitment that people in the Working Group have given. Suggestion for timing and approach included:
 - At the time Administration is ready to present the recommendation to Council.
 - At a time that matches with a Sunnyside event as it was Cllr. Farrell who commented on the Bowness community difference.
 - Get some advice from Ralph on the best approach

3. Triple Bottom Line – Social Criteria

Mariel presented a summary of the feedback received and how it is being used to revise the Social Criteria. Next steps:

- Mariel will send a new version of the criteria to the Working Group through email for feedback. Some time could be set aside next meeting to discuss.
- Group expressed concerns with the language used by other consultants as they have not been as involved in the Working Group discussion. The Group requested an extra layer of scrutiny – for objectivity and red flag words.

4. Engagement Update

Mariel presented the updated engagement timeline. Each meeting The City takes the feedback from the Group and update the calendar to be flexible and consider community concerns and study timelines.

At this time, the plan is to have an in-person event in the fall. The City maintains August 31 as the guideline for no in-person engagement. Still, the Engage Resource Unit has expressed we might need to build a case for in-person even after that date as public safety continues to be a key priority.

The Working Group had the following comments and questions:

- Add confidential watermark to timeline as per TOR
- What level of detail will be presented to the Working Group during the future stormwater discussion?
 - The mitigation options when the barrier is in place. Information will include localized lot options, and larger options such as pumping or diverting via pipe.
- What is driving the whole timeline? Why not wait until the reports are done?
 - Through engagement, The City heard the community wanted to be more involved in the process. The timeline balances the sharing of information and engagement opportunities, with study timelines. They heard the community didn't like just being presented information at the end, so they are looking for opportunities to engage as the project moves forward.

- The riverfront and flood fringe residents need sufficient time to engage one on one

5. Next Meetings

- Is there an option to record the August 17 meeting?
 - Mariel will follow up with the Engage Resource Unit and Amy

6. Other

- Did not have a chance to discuss Amy's letter "why the barrier?" due to time. Discussion postponed to the next meeting