The following 19 comments were received online between June 22-Aug 31, 2016 for distribution at the September CAG meeting.

(Six instances of spam – 'robot' or randomly generated alpha-numeric/URLs with no comment, name or community – have been excluded)

What community do you live in?	What do you want to share with the Flood Mitigation Option Assessment's Community Advisory Group?
Sunnyside	I support the City policy to construct flood protection to the design flood standard plus 0.5m. The 2013 flood reached the top of the Sunnyside berm and briefly over-topped it in some places. Now that the 2013 flood has been reclassified as a 1:80 event and severe weather events are becoming more of the norm the Sunnyside berm will need to be raised by a metre or more. Please consider protecting our communities to a 1/200 level or better. 1/200 or better is the standard in other locations in Europe where there are populations existing in flood prone areas.
Sunnyside	I support the City policy to construct flood protection for the Bow River. The 2013 flood reached the top of the Sunnyside berm and over-topped it in some places. This 2013 flood has been reclassified as a 1:80 event and considering the ill-advised construction around Prince's Island causeway, the Sunnyside berm will need to be raised by a metre or more. It is only prudent to raise the berm to a more realistic standard.
Sunnyside	Increase the berm height along the north side of the Bow River. The current provincial standard for flood protection of 1:100 is inadequate. A more appropriate standard is 1:350. Flood protection standards in other jurisdictions are much higher / more realistic. We know that some climate change has happened and we must adapt. It is important for our infrastructure to be adapted to the new reality of increasingly frequent extreme events. What is a 1:350 flood today could be a 1:100 or less flood tomorrow. I support the City policy to construct flood protection to the design flood standard plus 0.5m. The devastating 2013 flood reached the top of the Sunnyside berm and briefly over-topped it in some places. Now that the 2013 flood has been reclassified as a 1:80 event and considering the ill-advised permanently buttressing of the Prince's Island causeway the Sunnyside berm will need to be raised by a metre or more now even at the current 1:100 standard. It is only prudent to raise the berm to a 1:350 at the same time.
Sunnyside	Fully implement Hillhurst-Sunnyside Pump Station Project to lift storm water over the berm when the river is high and outfall gates are closed (per study done for the City by Associated Engineering 2015). Build consistently with designs for new communities - but unfortunately there is no room in Sunnyside for storage ponds. Four pump stations are required at river levels of only 1:20 or below – these are "no regrets" projects regardless of any upstream mitigation. These projects are shovel ready. Pump Station #1, the City's highest priority, could be

	funded in next ACRP round. Pump Stations #3 & #4 could be good projects for Federal Green Infrastructure funding. Increase Sunnyside berm height to protection standard plus 1 m freeboard. A city engineering study shows that an improved berm for Hillhurst Sunnyside has strong triple bottom line benefits.
Elboya	We note the City of Calgary is continuing to expand its ownership (East Village new acquisition) and to expand it footprint of property on the rivers' edges. Calgary's ownership of property and their corresponding protection of that property at the expense of other property owners is NOT building a resilient City. The more Calgary builds at the confluence of the Elbow and Bow Rivers the more those properties, and those already on the river, are adversely affected. The experts advise not to narrow the river. Does this committee agree with narrowing the rivers/building on the rivers which put those already on the river at greater risk. I respectfully request a response in your minutes. Thankyou.
Elboya	If Calgary continues to build in the flood plain Calgary ought to be fully liable for the increased risk to themselves and to others. Calgary must reserve funding and resources for those properties such that the protection of already existing communities is not drained or affected. That is, Calgary ought to fully pay for the risk of building and expanding on the river. No federal or provincial monies should be paid to Calgary for rescuing, repairing or restoring what Calgary owns and has built on the river e.g. east village, stampeded, zoo. Calgary's decisions to be on the river have caused the majority of flood relief monies to be spent to protect Calgary's own properties.
Elboya	SAG ought to recommend no increased density or development on the river, including downtown, East and West Villages. The experts have advised the City to commence movement off the flood plain. It may take years but it must start. Building CalgaryNEXT at the Stampede and adding more highrises in the flood plain is not consistent with the science.
(*blank*)	We have been advised by Calgary and by our Councillor (Mr. Pincott) that temporary berms and other measures will be deployed by Calgary in the future. We ask the CAG to ask Calgary to identify what those measures are, where they will be deployed and how the decisions will be or have been made.
Sunnyside	I hope you all saw the damage caused by the latest rainfall in Southwest Calgary, the submerged vehicles, the supercharged sewers. This can and is climate change, yet the City and the province continue to design infrastructure to meet an extremely low and outdated standard of 1:100. It requires YOU to start the ball rolling or we will all be feeling the effects of undersized and underfunded infrastrucure in this city for decades to come. Get with the program, 1:100 was ok for the 1970's, but how many people today are buying a '70 Chevy, so why would we let the city install a 1970 sewer system in 2016?

(*blank*)	The 100-year standard does not refer to a flood that occurs ‘once every 100 years’. In fact, for a home in a 100-year flood zone there is a greater than 26% chance that it will see at least one 100-year flood over a period of 30 years (and, similarly, more than a 74% chance over 100 years). The general formula for the cumulative probability of at least one flood of annual probability P is (1−P)^N >= C where N equals the number of years from now, and C is the cumulative probability over period N (P is assumed to be constant and events are independent from year to year). By choosing values for P and C one can compute the number of years that the cumulative probability (C) covers. So it's time to meet the challenge of establishing higher standards for a changing world.
Aspen	I notice there is water bank breach from Aspen Heights lot <*personally identifying information redacted for publication*> (new development). All the flood water is coming down to back yard of <*personally identifying information redacted for publication* >. I notice the same last year but the developer did not fix the problem. All my yard trees and grass polluted and died last year. Same thing is happening this year. Please take some action to fix the problem. I need to be compensated to replant my trees and grass. I have taken some photos but don't know how to send.
Calgary	I want you to spend as little money as possible on this.
Sunnyside	The current provincial standard for flood protection of 1:100 is inadequate. A better standard is 1:200. Flood protection standards in other jurisdictions are much better, with critical infrastructure in the Netherlands protected against a 1:1250 flood. In comparison, a 1:200 standard is a modest request. It is important for our infrastructure to be adapted to the new reality of increasingly frequent extreme events. What is a 1:200 flood today could be a 1:100 or less flood tomorrow. I support the City policy to construct flood protection to the design flood standard plus 0.5m. The catastrophic 2013 flood reached the top of the Sunnyside berm and briefly over-topped it in some places. Now that the 2013 flood has been reclassified as a 1:80 event, the Sunnyside berm will need to be raised by a metre or more. It is only prudent to raise the berm to a 1:80 at the same time.
Sunnyside	Hopefully some of the committee has experienced at least one of the heavy rainfalls during the month of July. This is only the beginning of climate change and the sooner elected officials recognize the future will only see an increase to disruption and damage caused by weather, the sooner we can be prepared for mother natures wrath. The experts in our water department continue to do the bidding of our politicians, rather than to make strong recommendations for increased capital requirements to meet the challenge of climate changes. They continue to support outdated flood protection standards in spite of the City's experience that these standards will NOT protect its citizens. In response to the 2013 flood, the water department recommended a "whopping"

	$4,000,000 a year increase to capital expenditures. That recommendation is tantamount to a serious dereliction of duty, a duty to protect the citizens of Calgary. If the city's experts do not make competent and forceful arguments to their political masters to adopt new tougher standards and to commit capital to protect the city, our downtown will be threatened and our economy will be devastated. The Boards of Directors of our largest corporations will only put up with so many disruptions to the businesses which they oversee, and then will vote with their feet and leave the city. Time to be advocates, not puppets. If the politicians say no, they will be replaced by the electorate. The civil servants are protected for a reason, to deliver solutions to the challenges we face, not waiver because of political winds.
(*blank*)	Calgary is paying to shore up the hillside in SE Calgary (Mckenzie Lake) which is slumping due to erosion. Can this advisory group please consider the difference between protecting homeowners from slumping and protecting homeowners from flooding? In the first case, the City appears to willingly accept responsibility and cost. In the second case, it is up to the homeowners to protect. What is the distinction? It is as difficult to protect one or more houses from slumping as it is to protect one or more houses from flooding. Individual homeowners cannot protect, they can only marginally mitigate.
(*blank*)	Is the work of the committee complete? If so, it is not clear from the website. If so, may be have a copy of the report on the website to review. If not, what is the next step for this committee? Are more meetings planned? Note, the land was saturated in 2012 pre winter which arguably contributed to the 2013 floods. We have saturated lands in early August 2016 which could change as the year progresses - one way or the other. We are concerned about 2017. What action is contemplated?
University Heights	I saw the devastation of the 2013 floods and I believe that no citizen of Calgary should have to experience that again. The city should install protection from floods so there is never a repetition of the 2013 disaster.

Rosedale	Our climate has changed and we must be prepared for increasingly frequent extreme weather events. Adequate flood protection measures are an essential part of this. We must safeguard our downtown core and inner city communities against future flood risks.
NE	Here is my two cent: - Stop approve man make lake or pound that does not flow anywhere. Then you approve house builder to build house or building around the area and then jack up the price So when heavy rain it floods because the water had no place to go. Plus, you creating a mosquito egg farm. The one who get profit from this are: Insurance, the house or building builder and the corrupt city council who approve this without looking at future damage Examples: over the bridge of Blackfoot there is a river suddenly they low the water and add more rock and sand and build a building right in the middle of the river where water flow. Now there is curve and that river had less room for water float so who approve of this build which did not think of flooding??? For the conclusion: when planning or approve of building make sure you plan for 20 year ahead and take into all consideration instead of building it and then try to fix. It cost the tax payer and the city more money in the long run. Do it right the first time!!! And all pound, lake all should had a floating direction which connect to a river another word point “A” should had a Point “B”