

BOWNESS FLOOD BARRIER
WORKING GROUP MEETING October 5 2020 – 7 to 9 p.m.
Online Meeting – Microsoft Teams

Working Group Attendees

David Burton
Jane Kahler
Jolene Moran
Patti Peck
Hank Vrielink
Jean Woeller

Apologies

Anne Campbell
Sheila Clayden
Sydney Empson
Jacqui Esler
Rae McKenzie
Jeff Riedl
Ralph Smith
Josie Stiles

Guests

Karen Matharu

Working Group Resources

Mariel Higuerey
Judy Hoad
Amy Stansky
Frances Welsh

Meeting Notes

1. TBL discussion

The City of Calgary presented the Sunnyside Flood Barrier TBL evaluation process. After the Sunnyside example, the Bowness Flood Barrier Project Manager showed the updated TBL criteria for the project, including social, environmental, and economic criteria. Discussion comments and questions included:

- WG - For the Sunnyside TBL evaluation, who did the scoring of the criteria for each service level?
 - A - It was conducted by The City's technical team and the project's consulting team
- WG - For the Sunnyside TBL evaluation, how were the weights to the criteria assigned?
 - Weightings were assigned by The City's technical team and the project's consulting team. The weights were later presented to EPARC, and their feedback was taken into consideration for the refinement of the weightings.
- WG - For the Sunnyside TBL evaluation, did the evaluation team discuss each criterion to develop the scoring? Can you elaborate on how the scores were determined?
 - A - For the social criteria, the scoring was determined mostly from what we heard from the community. For example, 1:20 for mental health was not enough. The social criteria scoring reflects a lot of what we heard from the community. As we evaluated the social criteria, the evaluation team checked with the engagement team to make sure all voices were considered. When it came to the environmental and economic criteria, it was City staff and the consultants from all the various disciplines who helped with the scoring.
- WG - For the Sunnyside TBL evaluation, did you do a sensitivity analysis?

- A - The sensitivity analysis included three different scoring or evaluation exercises. All three came back with 1:100 as recommended results. The sensitivity analysis helped in understanding the difference.

- **City team: the community will determine the weighting of the social criteria**

- WG - The TBL evaluation process sounds subjective
 - A - It is subjective. That is why we rely on all the information from the technical studies and the feedback from the community
- WG - TBL is meant to start a conversation. The weights are subjective and can change the recommendation. Some of the criteria are built on hard facts, but many intangible criteria are being discussed. It is hard for the process not to be subjective.
 - A - Agreed. That is why, for Sunnyside, we took time with the community, EPARC, and other groups like pathway users to understand the different perspectives. We used anecdotal information to understand the diverse points of view. EPARC wanted the 1 in 200-year flood protection, but we had to explain other voices were saying that they did not want a massive wall in front of their front door. For some of the criteria, it is clear-cut scores, while for others, we have to explain why we scored the way we did.
- WG - Was the discussion Sunnyside TBL evaluation minuted and made public?
 - A - The matrix was made available to EPARC, and we discussed some of the scorings, but the evaluation process was not minuted or made public.
- WG - How many options are being evaluated in Bowness? There were 8-9 options in the groundwater results presentation
 - A - We will only be presenting the options that The City and consultants determine to be feasible and asking the community to provide feedback
- WG - Regarding the new Bowness Social criterion #4, "increased property value" wording is misleading.
 - A - That is excellent feedback. The idea here is to understand those concerns now and to revise the criteria wording.
- WG - Sunnyside has groundwater mitigation as part of the flood barrier recommendation.
 - A - In Sunnyside, groundwater mitigation was not promised to the community. The seepage trench included in the recommendation is to address the groundwater issue impacting the barrier's stability.
- WG - Would like to see an option that includes groundwater protection and another option that suspends the construction of the barrier to focus on advocating with the Province to provide increased upstream mitigation.
 - A - The City is doing studies to understand what is feasible. Some of the groundwater mitigation solutions are damaging to the community fabric. We continue to discuss upstream mitigation with the Province, but the community must also advocate for it.
- WG –All options should be presented to the community regardless of the cost to be transparent and gather the community's perspective. If you are eliminating something based on cost,

shouldn't that come after the TBL? If the option is expensive, but it is valuable to the community, why would you eliminate it early? It is more transparent to evaluate an option if it is technically possible, even if expensive.

- A - The options presented to the community have not been determined, but we will move forward with what can be funded.
- WG - We think we should see the list of options before they are considered by City administration.
- WG - Given that residents don't know much about the groundwater situation, they are not informed. They will not be able to evaluate the financial implication without being informed about the groundwater impacts.
 - A - They are not informed yet, but groundwater information will be included in the Community Booklet. We will clearly explain the difference between overland and groundwater flooding.
- WG - Having contamination as part of the environmental criteria is misleading. There is contamination coming through groundwater (underground parking). Criteria needs to be clear in how it is worded. If a proposed option is causing groundwater flooding, it will make contamination worse. Some contamination comes from the water from the basement and flows into the river.
 - A - We will clarify the criterion language for contamination coming from the Bow River.
- WG - How can you set criteria that are meaningful and relevant without understanding the options?
 - A - Criteria should be developed independently of the option. It should speak to what is important to the community, regardless of the option.
- WG - If you build an overland barrier and it is overtopped, the contaminants will be on the other side of the barrier. Does that matter?
 - A - The feedback is helpful and we will look at this further. Some of the criteria can be addressed in the design and as part of an emergency response.

The group requested additional time to review the criteria because the draft was received too close to the meeting to have sufficient time to review and provide meaningful feedback. Members can send feedback to Judy, Mariel or Amy. The City will bring back the Social criteria conversation for input at a later meeting.

2. Engagement Update

The group discussed the draft letter to the Project Manager that will be used to support the report and recommendation be moved later into 2021. Comments and suggestions included:

- Rephrase to meeting with the project team, not just the current project manager.
- There hasn't been sufficient time for dialogue to date. That is the rationale for pushing things out.
- There should be more dialogue around the questions and answers to understand the studies. Many times, questions have been cut off because of time constraints.

- There should be time to provide feedback to the people and staff doing the studies before they are complete so it can be addressed. Studies can reflect on those questions – interactive and proactive (not reactive).

3. Working Group

The group discussed a new protocol and agreement on using the two recorded groundwater presentations and discussion.

- The recordings are not publicly available and should be kept for the use of the Working Group members only.
- Recordings allow members to review the presentation for further understanding and should not just be available for those who could not attend only.
- Two new timelines were agreed upon for the availability of the videos:
 - The August meeting recording will be available till the end of October
 - The September meeting recording will be available for two months until mid-November

4. Other comments

- Meeting 18 Notes
 - Revise Model comment in notes (comment came from Jean? Amy knows where the change is needed)
 - Pumping very intrusive (KCB) page 4
- Member requests
 - Question and answer tracking sheet will be circulated to the group and updated after each meeting
 - The "Why the barrier (letter from Project Manager)" was not sufficiently discussed on August 17 and should be brought back to the group.