

BRFM Meeting with Councilor Ward Sutherland

Summary of Meeting

On November 8, 2018, Jean Woeller and Frank Mele met with Councilor Ward Sutherland and his Chief of Staff, Ralph Smith. The purpose of the meeting was twofold: first, to outline the concerns about the Bowness Barrier Project (i.e. Process, Fair & Equitable Community Flood Protection and Project Economics); and second, to outline requests we had of Councilor Sutherland (refer to attached presentation which was discussed and copied to leave behind for each of Councilor Sutherland and Mr. Smith).

Provided below is a very brief summary of the meeting.

Concerns

- Sutherland acknowledged that the City did not follow its own engagement policy and that its initial brochure notice to the community was poorly planned.

- In respect of Fair and Equitable treatment and Project Economics, Sutherland responded by indicating that the design was still in its early stages of development and based on what he referred to as “Tier 5” estimate (I believe he was referring to a “Class 5” estimate which is a conceptual estimate with very low project definition).
 - He indicated that he would be more concerned when they reached Tier 2 level (Class 2 cost estimate is when the project is up to 70% finalized).
 - Simply put, Sutherland was of the view that regardless of what costs were used or not included, at this early stage of design, it is too early to put much weight to them.
 - Sutherland did indicate however, that if the project cost estimate of \$24.65MM were exceeded, it would have to go back to Council for approval.

- We learned that the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) of less than one for any one of the recommendations of the Flood Mitigation Measures Assessment Report (FMMA) would not necessarily prevent the recommendation from moving forward.¹ Instead, all recommendations when considered in aggregate, would have to

¹ There were 27 recommendations from the FMMA.

Bowness Responsible Flood Mitigation Society

exceed a defined threshold to proceed (Sutherland was not aware of what the BCR would be but undertake to provide it to us.

- Implication of this methodology is that if construction of the Bowness Berm (being one of the recommendations of the FMMA) is less than one, i.e. uneconomic, it would not terminate the construction of the berm.

Requests

- With respect to our request to be consulted as part of the City's engagement policy, Sutherland indicated he would inquire. We asked to be consulted before exiting each stage of design.
- In respect of receiving fair and equitable treatment, Sutherland indicated that the City's protocol in undertaking any mandate is universal and that it would not be different for one community relative to another.
 - Based on the above, we should expect similar treatment to the residents of Inglewood.
- Sutherland undertook to provide us each of the major decision points for the implementation of the berm.

Conclusion

- Although the meeting was scheduled for 30 minutes, it lasted for approximately one hour.
- We believe that Sutherland came away recognizing that we had serious and credible concerns and that the BRFM was a legitimate, credible and professional organization.
- The most important information that we learned is that the ultimate decision of whether the berm will be built will reside with a majority vote of City Council.
 - Our focus is convincing 8 of the 15 Council Members (14 + 1 Mayor), that the berm in Bowness is not technically sound or financially feasible.