

The following 7 comments were received online between June 7-21, 2016 for distribution at the June 28 CAG meeting.

<b>What community do you live in?</b>	<b>What do you want to share with the Flood Mitigation Option Assessment’s Community Advisory Group?</b>
Rosscarrock	Spending billions of dollars to prevent the once a century flooding of rich peoples basements is not a wise use of tax payer money. If people decide to live beside a river and their finished basement gets water in it once every one hundred years then they will just have to replace their own drywall and basement carpet. Please spend 0 dollars on this flood mitigation boondoggle.
Sunnyside	I’d like to communicate to all the people in Calgary who do not believe that public funding should protect the people of Sunnyside. Could you try to put yourself in the position: of being afraid that rainfall can throw your life into upheaval for a year or more? That this has happened repeatedly (not just in 2013) without us being able to fully understand why this is happening? That inadequate storm water drainage can inundate a community (a community in which the City of Calgary has encouraged development) and that inundation takes such a physical, financial and emotional toll on the people of that community that years later we are still asking for storm drainage improvements (projects like the Upper Plateau Separation) because we are afraid of rainfall? That we are paying our taxes and drainage fees and not getting the proper level of service to protect us from storm water flooding? That insurance companies no longer want to cover basic protection because our risk of storm water flooding is too high? Should City (or Provincial, or Federal) funding not be spent to improve drainage to protect the citizens from storm water flooding?
Sunnyside	At the heart of ANY discussion with respect to flooding, is the standards by which the government defines the risk of a flood occurrence. Presently the Province of Alberta lags behind its neighbours by living by an outdated flood mapping program and an woefully low flood design standard. British Columbia has a design standard of 1:200 years, Saskatchewan 1:500 years and Manitoba has utilized 1:700 year standard for the Red River Valley. Many people think the 1:100 standard means a 1% chance every year which is great, if you move to a different location every year. In statistical terms, a 1:100 standard means that over 10 years there is an almost 20% chance of another occurrence. So the citizens of Calgary can reasonably expect another major flood event, especially with global warming, sometime over the next SEVEN years. Citizens and Civil servants must be made aware of theses risks, because if another major flood should occur and shut down the city core again, major corporations will leave the city in droves, thereby creating an "economic Tsunami" for the City.

<p><i>(blank)</i></p>	<p>Whatever is being considered in your sessions, please make sure that your review includes the upgrading of infrastructure. Many Canadian Cities are now embarking on aggressive programmes to avoid the \$2 Billion of damages that Canada incurs every year from Urban flooding. Please see the paper at <a href="http://www.iclr.org/images/CITIES_ADAPT_DIGITAL_VERSION.compressed.pdf">http://www.iclr.org/images/CITIES_ADAPT_DIGITAL_VERSION.compressed.pdf</a>. Please be aware that the cost of funding these changes are expensive and ways to fund them must be creative and fair. For example, protecting downtown, our economic heart, may cost those property owners more than say, a two bedroom home in Hillhurst.</p> <p>The City only spends \$12 million a year in upgrading or repairing the storm and sanitary sewers in this City of almost 2,000,000 people. That figure was only \$8 million a year until the 2013 Flood. Funding measures must be found and the cost that should be spent should be supported from an independent source engaged in "best practices" for City infrastructure. The City cannot continue to delay and obfuscate their responsibility with new engineering studies every year (which take at least two years to complete) and then subject these studies to the "triple bottom line" analysis for ranking in importance. They need a comprehensive program which drives decisions from a sustainable foundation for long-term success. The current program looks, smells and works like a small town making decisions with a "dressed up" dartboard.</p>
<p>Downtown</p>	<p>We're talking about some big projects that will affect lives for the next 100+ yrs. Let's take the time to do this right for the long-term future of Calgary and all Albertans.</p> <p>I'm all for mitigation efforts and applaud many of the localized improvements to date, but Springbank - or any other - "dry" dam project which temporarily diverts flood flow off-line, leaving behind a sludge cesspool, should be eliminated from the options list. We need to look at the bigger picture, Patterns in the last few years strongly indicate we should be preparing for more frequent extreme events at both ends of the spectrum. Funding should be invested in projects that serve in both times of drought and flood.</p> <p>A dry dam also has potential detrimental effects on our air quality as the sludge left behind dries and is transported by prevailing winds - towards Calgary. The Springbank one in particular leaves downtown, and other Bow River communities unprotected, (not to mention our upstream neighbours in Bragg Creek, Tsuu T'ina Nation, and surrounding areas).</p>
<p>Sunnyside</p>	<p>After 3 years we are still recovering from the flood. Basement still gutted. Minimal insurance payment and no help from DRP. Love the area, love our home. Please protect what is left of our historic neighbourhood.</p>
<p>West Springs/ Cougar Ridge</p>	<p><i>(no comment entered)</i></p>