

**BOWNESS FLOOD BARRIER  
COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP MEETING  
6422 35 Ave NW**

---

**Meeting 8 - January 13 2020 - 7 to 9 p.m.  
Bowness Seniors Club**

**Working Group Attendees**

Anne Campbell  
Hank Vrielek  
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**

David Burton  
Jacqui Esler  
Jeff Riedl

**1. Introductory remarks**

- Remarks – Amy Stansky introduced herself as the new project manager for the Bowness Flood Barrier project. She explained Denise has transitioned into a new role with Water Resources
- Introductions – Hank Vrielek was the only member absent the last couple of meetings, so he introduced himself and spoke about his role with the BRFM

**2. Review of Meeting 7 Notes**

- No changes. Meeting notes will be posted online.

**3. Working Group debrief on process and topics**

The group shared their observations on the Working Group role from the past year experience

- Positive – members appreciate the opportunity to comment on what is being shared with the community. An area for improvement is to build some additional time to circulate back and see how feedback was represented in the materials' edits

- Neutral – members are not sure how effective the group is when it comes to broad outreach. It seems that a lot of people not directly affected are still not informed. Is the Working Group the right avenue?
- Improvement – there is no clear distinction in regards to the authorship of articles in the Bowestner. Some articles submitted by BRFM have been wrongfully attributed to the Working Group (the CA and BRFM now have a mechanism in place)
- Improvement – communications from The City don't speak about dissent in the community. Could it be more transparent and include a sentence or message admitting disagreement? This might drive people to pay attention
  - Should something be included in the Working Group website that speaks to the dissent?
- Improvement – there needs to be more frequency of engagement with opportunities for discussion and multiple voices in the room
  - As an example, the Olympics clearly showed a difference in opinions and people paid attention
  - Can we do updates and post them all over the community? Use community boards (church, senior club). The updates should talk about the different points of view and look less 'City'
- Positive - if the working group is making a difference to The City and their process then it is worthwhile
- Improvement – so far, it has been a lot of information sharing. When reports become available, will the meeting frequency increase in order to consume, understand, question and share them?
- Positive – community representative members value the opportunity to learn more about the different aspects of the project

#### 4. Engagement update and proposed activities

Mariel Higuerey provided an update on the various engagement activities that took place over 2019 fall period:

**Community Information Event:** 88 participants, with the majority being riverfront property residents. The event display boards are available online on the [project's engage page](#). The City received over 55 comment forms. The feedback from those comment forms has been included in an event What We Heard Summary. A printed draft of the summary was provided to the group for comments before it is published to the wider community.

**Door knocking:** The City had over 100 interactions (conversations, quick chats, delivery of materials in-person, show ups at the public event) with non-river-front residents (Bow Crescent) in the fall of 2019. In addition, over 120 information packages that include and info sheet and public event invitation were left at houses (in the mailboxes).

- Next steps: The City will be updating the information materials and doing a second round of door knocking. Materials will be shared with both riverfront and non-riverfront residents.
  - The group suggested expanding the scope into Bow Green, immediately adjacent to the rail tracks (upstream of 79 St)

**Pop-ups:** The City had two pop-up opportunities in the fall of 2019. One at Cadence Coffeeshop and one at the Bowness Library.

- Next steps: in 2020 The City will change the format to Coffee and chats. These opportunities will take place once a month, from February to June, and will have a specific topic. The City asked for suggestions and the group listed the following options:
  - Groundwater
  - Environment
  - Upstream mitigation
  - Decision-making process – including cost and transparency
  - Flood preparedness
  - Stormwater

Other considerations provided by the group were:

- Have a Working Group member always present
- Consider opportunities for opposing discussion/interpretation
- Switch up the coffee and chat days - start at 4 p.m., move the event location
- Location options could include parks: Bowness Park, Dale Hodges Park, area playgrounds, Shouldice park during spring

The City will develop a workplan with dates, locations, and topics to share with the group. Once that is available the group will be able to identify a representative for each day

**Working Group Website:** the group’s website has had 23 unique visits since its launch in October 2019. The highest traffic was during the period of December 16 to December 20. The group discussed opportunities for improvement:

- Many community members are unaware of the website. BRFM has added the link to their site, and the Community Association do the same.
- Is there an opportunity to announce the website on the Community Association’s bulletin board?
- Group asked for some additional documents to be shared even if it through links to other webpages
- When conducting a Google search, the site does not come up – is it possible to improve the search functionality?
- In the contact page, we should add an invitation to join the group along with available representative positions open

## 5. Update from Project Manager

Amy Stansky provided an update for work and key milestones that will be taking place in the next months:

- Preliminary cost estimates for the alignment options
- Finishing some of the project studies: groundwater, environmental, stormwater
- Developing a detailed schedule for the next 6 months to share with the group

The group had comments and questions about:

- The difference between public input opportunities at the Committee vs Council presentations.
- BRFM expressed a need to have enough time to digest and understand the information before being able to provide comments at the public hearings.
- BRFM reminded their group of their ask of Committee and Council last year – get one year to review reports, enough time to engage the BRFM experts.

## **6. Agenda items for the next five months**

The group discussed the topics for the next Working Group meetings:

- Feb 3 – Triple Bottom Line (TBL) analysis PART 1: Intro to TBL and what goes into the Social criteria – this would be an information session prior to the group’s discussion about the social criteria that will be developed for the project
  - The group would like to learn about all the criteria (environment and economic as well). It should be clear what the group has the ability to influence
- Mar - Stormwater discussion
- Apr - Groundwater studies results
  - BRFM said this study is driving design and should come before storm and sanitary
- TBL PART 2: development and discussion of social criteria where the working group can provide feedback – workshop approach
- Flood modelling
- Emergency response
- Final TBL analysis (evaluation) review and recommendation summary

Group asked to include a session about the environment studies results and summary of findings. They also asked for an agenda of topics and the possibility to submit questions or/and guests' requests.

## **7. Next Meeting – February 3, 2020**

Agenda to be determined

## **Attachments**

Meeting 7 notes

Other:

- Member asked if it was possible to get information about the cost of the Inglewood barrier?
- BRFM indicated they are developing a document about the river modelling and what they are expecting to see
  - Can The City share the modelling scenario with the working group to see if there is anything else the group would like to see include if possible?
- BRFM asked about the Technical inquiries memo submitted in 2019, and if it was possible to revisit it – what is still outstanding, what can The City address now, what is out of scope in this phase? (March meeting topic?)