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(Proceedings commenced at 8:30 a.m.)
THE CHAIR: Good morning, everyone. Day 2, March 23rd of the hearing.

I thought yesterday went pretty well. We were pretty close on our timing, so I appreciate that. We had a couple glitches that hopefully we'11 be able to work out for today. You never know. As I say, technology is technology, but I'm hoping that we are good to go for today.

I did get a note, though, or a heads-up about speakers as we're switching between panel speakers and back and forth between counsels and then to the extra panels, that it is a little tough for both Justin to get people pinned onto speaker view and for our court reporters to get the last name for the transcript. So we'd like to get the transcripts of course as accurate as we can, so we do need your help in that regard. Sometimes I know it's a quick answer, so you might just
want to jump in, but if you could identify, even if it's just your last name, it works, and say it just a little bit slowly, pause, and then start with your answer, and that'11 really give both MNP on the Zoom side and our court reporter, who is Ms. DiPaolo, this morning -- good morning, Ms. DiPaolo -- a chance just to get the transcripts right and get our Zoom right. So I really would appreciate your cooperation with that.

Mr. Secord, are you online?
MR. SECORD: Yes, sir, I am online. And I think I worked out the audio. I think Mr. Wiebe said my sound is better this morning, so I hope -- do you find it the same?

THE CHAIR: It does sound better, yes. Thank you very much.

MR. SECORD:
So I think I've worked that out for the rest of the hearing. Thank you.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. And I did have one request.
You had an undertaking on consultation. I'm not sure if you had a chance to look at transcripts. It's not necessary right now, but I would appreciate if you had a chance to get that into Mr. Kennedy, and just so we can track those, we can number them, and then we can ensure that we have the follow-up. So if you could
have that undertaking with the -- essentially the name or the question that you had for Alberta Transportation, and then when Alberta Transportation has that answer, we'11 get that all on the record.

So at your convenience, if you could have that, and then we'll try to do a little better job keeping track if we have undertakings as we work through the day or through the week, we'11 keep track of those as we go.

So I think with that, we're -- unless there's any other preliminary matters for the morning, if anybody has any questions?

Hearing none, I think we can get started.
We had left off, and originally Mr. Williams with Calalta on our -- had not requested time for cross, but apparently Mr. Williams does have a couple of questions.

Mr. Williams, I believe you're going to be connecting via phone on Zoom, if I have that right, but are you connected now?

MR. WILLIAMS:
I am connected now. Can you hear me?

THE CHAIR: We can, very clearly. Thank you. So Mr. Williams, you had a couple of questions for Alberta Transportation. How long did you need?

MR. WILLIAMS:
Probably less than ten minutes,
five minutes.
M. HEBERT, M. SVENSON, W. SPELLER, D. BRESCIA, M. WOOD, D. SOL, J. MENNINGER, Y. CARIGNAN, M. SMITH, M. PERRET (For Alberta Transportation), previously sworn MR. WILLIAMS CROSS-EXAMINES THE PANEL:
Q. Thank you for the floor, and thank you to the Board for the participation in the hearing.

For Alberta Transportation, on your opening remarks yesterday in your presentation in regards to Cala1ta, you -- on Objection Number 3, we have three objections -- you addressed the first two, and there's no cross on them -- on the third objection on our franchise agreement and the lands, the 14 quarter sections that are sterilized, your opening remarks were that they are commercial in nature and, therefore, you're unsure if it's appropriate for the Board.

Can you just explain that statement and what you meant by it, and then $I$ just have a couple questions on that.
A. MR. HEBERT: Good morning, it's Matthew Hebert speaking.

Mr. Chairman, our view is that the matter raised
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by Calalta impacts relates to its commercial operations. As we clarified in our pre-hearing conference, it is our view that these types of matters are best dealt with between two parties involved, which, in this case, is Alberta Transportation and Calalta. We certainly invite Calalta to continue discussing this matter with Alberta Transportation. Mr. Williams and I have had a number of conferences about this issue, and as we've indicated in both our hearing submission and in the remarks $I$ made yesterday, we are prepared to continue to discuss this item with Mr. Williams and his organization.

MR. WILLIAMS: So is it my -- appropriate time to speak?

THE CHAIR:
Yes, Mr. Williams.
MR. WILLIAMS:
Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Q. Matthew, thank you for the response.

Just a question with regards to that, have you reviewed the franchise agreement which is a public document that is an agreement between the Alberta Utility Commission, the County of Rocky View, and Calalta Waterworks Ltd.
A. MR. HEBERT:

Yes, we've had an opportunity to review the document. It's a public document, as Mr. Williams references, so we have had an opportunity
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to review the document.
Q. And so, in saying that, and in establishing that the words "commercial in nature," I want the Board to understand that this is a utility, and so even though it is owned by Calalta Waterworks Ltd., that the utility in nature -- the sustainability of the utility has value to all of the stakeholders, community, school children, et cetera, within the Springbank community. We have been recognized in the area structure plan as one of the regional links to -- or the established franchise water providers for future development and for, you know -- for the area.

The utility itself has been servicing the area for approximately a 40-year period, and on that are all of the community-related, i.e., all the schools are tied onto this utility. And so even though it's structured as commercial -- and I see it as no different as if you're expropriating lands from a farmer, and a farmer, you know, has the right to earn money from that farmland, the expropriation, he's lost that right.

The same precedent that's been set with the County of Rocky View in that compensation was paid for lost tax revenue. We11, that tax revenue supports the county, which supports the community, et cetera.

So I do want to establish that, even though we
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were a private utility at one point, but in 2004, we're forced in to be more of a public/private because we cannot set our rates. Any rate structure or anything that we go forward with to increase water rates, et cetera, has to go in front of the Alberta Utilities Commission. And so we are governed by rules --

THE CHAIR: Mr. Williams --
Q. -- rules of that, and we're also governed by the franchise agreement, which is dual -- you know, it protects the county and stakeholders within the county, and ensures there's controlled regulated water for the community --

THE CHAIR:
Mr. Williams.
MR. WILLIAMS:
Sorry, Peter.
THE CHAIR:
Sorry. Sorry to interrupt.
You will have an opportunity to put all of that statement -- I mean, it's on the record now -- but during your direct evidence. Right now is really the time that you can ask the questions of Alberta Transportation under cross, and then that piece of it is probably best suited to when you're giving your direct evidence a little bit later.
Q. MR. WILLIAMS: Perfect. Yeah, I just wanted to understand from Alberta Transportation the comment of "commercial in nature," and I guess Matthew, if you
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 Cross-examined by Mr. Williamscould just state it one more time that you believe that it's commercial and it's not appropriate to be standing in the Board review?
A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Chairman, as we submitted in our pre-hearing conference submission, our view is that these are matters that are best dealt with between the two parties, being Alberta Transportation and Calalta waterworks.

As I've indicated to the Board, and to Mr. Williams, Alberta Transportation has an interest in continuing discussing this matter with Calalta Waterworks. We've had some preliminary discussions to understand the issue in greater detail, and we would look forward to continuing those discussions into the future.
Q. That's excellent, thank you.

MR. WILLIAMS:
Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

THE CHAIR:
Sorry, my space bar sometimes works and sometimes doesn't to unmute, so my apologies.

Thank you, Mr. Williams, and you are up later on for direct, so if there's other things you wanted to add in your direct evidence, you're welcome to do so then. So thank you.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.
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THE CHAIR:
Okay, Mr. Wagner. Is Mr. Wagner on?

MR. WAGNER: I am here. Good morning.
THE CHAIR:
Okay, good morning.
Mr. Wagner, you had questions on cross-examination for Alberta Transportation?

MR. WAGNER:
I do. I have a few.
THE CHAIR:
Okay.
MR. WAGNER CROSS-EXAMINES THE PANEL:
Q. MR. WAGNER: If I could get Document 1701, Appendix B pulled up?

THE CHAIR:
Which exhibit number is that, by chance? Do you have the exhibit number?

MR. WAGNER:
I've got Document 1701,
Appendix B.
MS. FRIEND:
This is Laura. That's actually the application number for the old review, Springbank. That isn't an exhibit number, Mr. Wagner.

MR. WAGNER:
Oh dear.
MS. FRIEND:
Is it one that you submitted?
MR. WAGNER:
No, it's -- this is the Natural
Resources Conservation Board. It's basically their rebuttal.

THE CHAIR:
Alberta Transportation's --
MR. WAGNER:
Yeah, AT's.
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1 THE COURT:
-- response? A response to the

4 THE CHAIR: paragraph numbers, is that the one you're thinking?

6 MR. WAGNER:
Yes.
7 THE CHAIR: Okay, is -- Ms. Kaminski, are 8 you --

9 MR. FITCH:
Mr. Chair, it's Mr. Fitch. If he's referring to Appendix $B$ to the rebuttal submissions of Alberta Transportation, that should be Exhibit 325.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you.
MR. WAGNER: Just one moment. I'm going to get a pen.

MR. FITCH: Sorry, or 327 , which would be the appendix.

THE CHAIR:
Ms. Kaminski, you can -- yeah, leave that active, and then he can grab the other one, 327.

MR. WAGNER:
Yeah. It's the landowner map.
MR. SECORD:
Yeah, Mr. Wagner, it's
Richard Secord here. Are you wanting the landowner -the current map of the --

MR. WAGNER:
Yes, it's Appendix B.
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1 MR. SECORD: page 8.

MR. FITCH:
Q. MR. WAGNER:

MR. FITCH:

MR. WAGNER: stated that 25 percent of the lands are acquired. I'm struggling to total that up given this map. Is there an update to this map?
A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Chairman, the estimate of approximately 25 percent is calculated with the parcels that are in green on the map. So there are Parcel 11 -- just bear with me as I pull up the screen -- Parce1 38, 37, 25, 22, 36, and 29. It represents the area within the black lines which is the project area itself and represents approximately 25 percent of the lands needed for the project development area.
Q. If I could get page 55 on this document brought up. No, that doesn't appear to be the right page. Paragraph 211 is what I'm looking for.

MS. FRIEND: That might be in Exhibit 325.
That's what $I$ was wondering.
MS. FRIEND: This is Laura. Can you repeat the paragraph number, please, Mr. Wagner? 211.

MR. SECORD: Yeah, PDF page 60.
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Q. MR. WAGNER: In this paragraph, it states:
(as read)
"Such transactions require a wiliing seller and a willing buyer."

Can the AT describe what the position is of the government as being a wiliing buyer?
A. MR. HEBERT: So willing buyer in this case would mean that Alberta Transportation is prepared to acquire properties needed for the SR1 project within the project development area consistent with the terms of the land acquisition program.

The terms of land acquisition program, which is an appendix in our submission -- I won't refer to it, but I'11 just flag for the benefit of the panel that it's Appendix A at Exhibit 327. And it describes the principles in which AT pursues negotiations. And those negotiations are rooted in the principles around acquisition in the land -- in the Expropriation Act which describe the principles relating to fair compensation for land, exploration of damages, and covering appropriate costs.

So in that case, that would be the definition of "willing buyer" in these circumstances.
Q. Would you describe the government's position as being a wil1ing buyer?
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A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Chairman, subject to the ability to negotiate with the landowners within the project development area, we would view ourselves as being a willing buyer. As the paragraph states, Transportations's required to assemble lands within the PDA for the operation of SR1, should it be approved.
Q. Can we go back to the map again. Can you describe which parties that land is being acquired of being willing buyers -- or willing sellers, sorry?
A. MR. HEBERT: Sorry, Mr. Chairman, I was muted.

In the case of the properties that are labelled in green, I would define those as willing sellers as they entered into agreements with Alberta Transportation pertaining to the sale of the properties.
Q. With regards to Parcel Number 25, 22, and Number 11, were those willing sellers?
A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Chairman, I would say they were -- they were willing sellers. They entered into agreements with Alberta Transportation.
Q. Were these distressed properties?
A. MR. HEBERT: Sorry, Mr. Wagner, can you define "distressed"?
Q. I would say that the -- in this particular case, the banks were involved, and they were in difficult situations which required the liquidation of the
property.
A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Chairman, I would -- I would still submit that the -- if the transactions occurred between Alberta Transportation and the -- and the parties involved, those would constitute a willing buyer/willing seller negotiation -- or transactions.
Q. Let's deal with properties 20 -- or 36,37 , and 38.

Can you give me the exact time that that announcement was made?

MR. FITCH:
Sorry, Mr. Chair, it's Gavin Fitch speaking.

I'm struggling a little bit with the relevance of this question and, indeed, this 1 ine of questioning. The date on which Alberta Transportation announced the acquisition of any particular piece of property does not seem to me to be relevant to the Board's public interest jurisdiction unless Mr. Wagner can perhaps clarify why he thinks it is relevant.

MR. WAGNER: I go back to the statements of the of Alberta Transportation of a "willing buyer" and a "willing seller." I believe that those were the only properties that there was a willing buyer and a wiliing seller.

And the timing of that was weeks before the last election. I find the timing very odd.
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Q. And my follow-up question to that is, that was, to all my knowledge, a willing buyer and a willing seller. And my question is, has the Alberta government offered that deal, or any similar dea1, to any of the other landowners as a wiliing buyer and a wiliing seller?
A. MR. HEBERT: Wel1, Mr. -- sorry, I heard some crosstalk.

THE CHAIR:
Mr. Hebert?
A. MR. HEBERT: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, as is described within our 1and acquisition principles, Alberta Transportation is prepared to enter into negotiations, willing buyer/willing seller, in an effort to assemble the project development -- or the land for the project development area.

My -- our position is that each of those negotiations is rooted in the -- in the reality of each particular landowner. We acknowledge and respect the fact that the circumstances of each landowner is distinct. Some landowners -- some of the landowners own straight land, some landowners have residences, some landowners have cultural operations.

So I think it would be fair to submit to the Board that each of those particular negotiations will be
unique to the particular circumstances in question.
MR. WAGNER: No further follow-up questions.
THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Wagner. So Pane1 and Board staff may have a few questions.

Mr. Kennedy, Ms. Vance, we've got -- the floor is yours, and then we' 11 move to the Panel.

MR. KENNEDY: Thank you. Coming through good?
THE CHAIR: Yes.

MR. KENNEDY QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. Mr. Hebert, I think these questions may be answered by you.

Interesting when we looked at the aid to cross filed by SCLG, it identified various flow rates between SR1 -- sorry, I'm told my video is not...

THE CHAIR:
There you go.
MR. KENNEDY: There we go, sorry. Let me start that again.
Q. The SCLG Aid to Cross 1 identified various flow rates as between the diversion at -- of -- for SR1 and the G1enmore Reservoir.

Can you advise what communications Alberta Transportation's had to advise the communities in both Springbank and the City of Calgary about the project and the effects on those communities?
A. MR. HEBERT: One moment, Mr. Kennedy.
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Mr. Kennedy, I would offer that Alberta Transportation has communicated the flow rates of the project's operation as part of its public communications through open houses, through communications with the municipalities involved throughout the development of the project.
Q. And in terms of reaching out to those communities specifically, how did Alberta Transportation do that?
A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Kennedy, if you're comfortable, we can certainly take that away and provide that specific information, if that's -- if that's useful, if you're looking for specific instances where we would have provided that information. Would that -- would that assist?
Q. So, specifically, perhaps I think that's -- that's the case -- specifically, you had mail-outs at various times that Alberta Transportation did?
A. MR. HEBERT: $\mathrm{Hm}-\mathrm{hm}$.
Q. And I assume those -- is it fair to assume that those mail-outs went to specific postal codes?
A. MR. HEBERT: Yes, it did. We can confirm those postal codes, if that's helpful.
Q. And if you could confirm which communities those mail-outs went to and what information those mail-outs included specifically about effects from the project as
opposed to public houses --
A. MR. HEBERT: Right.
Q. -- public open houses and those kinds of things --
A. MR. HEBERT: Right. Certainly.
Q. -- that would be most helpful. And I know the question is a bit general, but there was a fair bit of discussion yesterday.

UNDERTAKING - TO CONFIRM WHICH
COMMUNITIES SPECIFICALLY ALBERTA
TRANSPORTATION SENT MAIL-OUTS TO AND
WHAT INFORMATION THOSE MAIL-OUTS
INCLUDED SPECIFICALLY ABOUT EFFECTS
FROM THE PROJECT
Q. MR. KENNEDY:

And this question may not be for you, Mr. Hebert. Does Alberta Transportation have any sense of the ongoing need for berms within the City of Calgary upstream of the Glenmore Reservoir?
A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Kennedy, no. And as I -- as I described yesterday, that would fall within the jurisdiction of the local authority involved in terms of what those needs might be and location, timing, et cetera.
Q. So I take it from that, you have not had discussions with the City about the potential need for berms upstream of Glenmore Reservoir within the City of

Ca1gary?
A. MR. HEBERT: Just conferring with the pane1.

One moment.
Mr. Chairman, on conferring with the pane1, I'm advised that the City of Calgary's mitigation plans considered the flow rates of SR1 upstream of the Glenmore project -- sorry, the G1enmore Reservoir.
Q. So, Mr. Hebert, I take it from that, you are suggesting that my question might be better posed to the City of Calgary?
A. MR. HEBERT: I would suggest that. As indicated yesterday, the decisions around the local mitigations are within the jurisdiction of the local authority.
Q. Good. Thank you.

MR. KENNEDY:
Mr. Chair, those are my questions.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Kennedy.
Ms. Vance?
MS. VANCE: I have no questions. Thank you.
THE CHAIR: Pane1 members. Mr. Ceroici?
MR. CEROICI QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. Yes. Good morning. I had a question about the Bragg Creek -- I think yesterday we -- some of the responses we heard that the berms are capable of, we'11 cal1, dealing with a 1 in 100-year flood; then I also
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Questioned by Mr. Ceroici
heard, I just want to confirm, that the berms have been increased, the heights recently, and now it's able to handle a 1 in 200-year flood; is that correct?
A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Ceroici, according to the information we have from Rocky View County, who are responsible for the Bragg Creek berms, our understanding is that they're designed to 1 in 100-year flood, with a freeboard that provides a level of protection and a level of mitigation equivalent to a 2013 event.

I'm not exactly certain whether that would be -constitute as a 1 in 200, but our understanding of the -- of the height of the berms is that it would be equivalent to a -- to the 2013 leve1 event.
Q. To the design flood?
A. MR. HEBERT: If you're comfortable, Mr. Ceroici, Mr. Speller has some further details he could share on the topic.
Q. Yes. Please.
A. MR. SPELLER: And I would just add, Mr. Ceroici -- you may want to pull this up -- it's Exhibit 275. It's the Springbank Community Landowners Group Appendix W, and on PDF page 116 is a presentation from AMEC and Rocky View County about those berms where it describes -- they're designed for a 100-year
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floodwater leve1, they have a freeboard of .6 metres, and at the bottom says, their estimates indicate that the 2013 flood was approximately 20 percent 1 arger and that a 2013 flood would be contained by the proposed freeboard zone.

So that information $I$ just spoke to is on that slide and at the bottom, so.
Q. Okay, thank you.

And Redwood Meadows, they also have some berm works taking place. What are they capable of? Is it similar to the Bragg Creek with the freeboard 1 in 200?

You're on mute, I think.
A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Chairman, the Panel isn't aware of that answer specifically. Sorry, we're not -we're not in a position to confirm that response.
Q. And, again, for the -- for the Bragg Creek County is responsible for those works, I can't recall from yesterday's discussion, does the same apply for the Redwood Meadows?
A. MR. HEBERT: In the case of Redwood Meadows, that falls within the lands of the Tsuut'ina Nation, and they would be responsible for the flood mitigation projects on their 1 ands.
Q. Okay. Then yesterday we heard about the emergency spillway. It was estimated that 70 percent of water
flowing over the spillway would make its way to the Elbow. And I'm assuming that was overland flow?
A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Ceroici, Mr. Wood on our pane1 will assist with that answer.
A. MR. WOOD: Thank you. Yes, it is overland flow.
Q. So 30 percent essentially is via groundwater; is that correct?
A. MR. WOOD: My apologies. Mr. Ceroici, would you mind repeating the question? I was just adjusting my headset there.
Q. Right. If we have 70 percent surface water flow, I'm assuming that 30 percent would be infiltrating to the groundwater?
A. MR. WOOD: If I may, I'm just going to defer to Mr . Menninger for the specifics on that modelling and the exercise.
Q. Sure.
A. MR. MENNINGER: Good morning. So I believe -- so you were referring to the emergency spil1way for SR1?
Q. Right.
A. MR. MENNINGER: Correct. So the emergency spillway, as we discussed before, would typically -would not operate for SR1. The intention is that we would close the -- we would close the gates to the
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channel before water would enter -- before it would overtop the emergency spillway.

So, in that scenario, I think what we described was that the probable maximum flood is approximately 2,800 cubic metres per second. If you took 600 cubic metres per second to divert it to the reservoir, then you would have 2,100 going downstream.

So that kind of gives you that -- it would stay in the river, in essence. And so given that scenario, you would be looking at rough -- yeah, roughly, that's about 70 percent stays. So that other 30 percent is stored in the reservoir in that consideration.

Even with the gates closed -- or even with the gates open scenario, if the gates were failed open and water went over the emergency spillway, you would still store that same amount of water within the reservoir, and then the water would be a mix of that coming out of the emergency spillway and that's staying in the river.

But either case, you're about 70 percent or so of the peak.
Q. Okay. And, Mr. Menninger, yesterday, maybe I misheard, but in one of your responses, you were referring to the SR1 reservoir, and maybe diversion channel, you mentioned a hundred -- I thought I heard a $100 \mathrm{mili} i o n$ cubic metres?
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Because I understand the reservoir is 70 , but then a safety affect of 7 is 77 . So when I heard 100 , I kind of was wondering what that means.
A. MR. MENNINGER: Sure, sure. So -- so what we have in the reservoir is that the elevation of the emergency spillway, which is 12 -- which is -- I know these are a lot of numbers -- but 1210.75 elevation, that is the total storage capacity of 77 million cubic metres, so that's what we have available to store in the reservoir without letting anything out of the uncontrolled spillway.

If you were to have a dam -- so that's a 1210.75, so I'11 repeat that again, close to 1211. The top of the dam is actually a 1213.5.

So if we were to have an issue with water still coming into the reservoir beyond what our designed storage capacity is or intended storage capacity is, there is that volume to act as surcharge and store additional flow.

And so when I was referring to that $100 \mathrm{mili} i o n$ cubic metres, it's the difference between the 1212 , which is our kind of surcharge pool for the probable maximum flood, and the 1210.75. So it's that additional, you know, 30 -- or 23 to 25 or so that would be that surcharge pool to allow to handle that
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kind of inflow from the -- from a probable maximum flood/accidental increase.
Q. I guess I was just wondering if the crest of the spillway essentially is the limit of the 77 --
A. MR. MENNINGER: That's correct.
Q. -- how would you put in the reservoir without it spilling over the spillway?
A. MR. MENNINGER: Correct, yeah. That's perfectly correct. And that's -- that's -- the spillway is there to prevent overtopping of the dam. And so that's -the whole point there is, is that you -- the 77 is the cap, as you said, of intended operations.

The spillway is there only in case of an emergency to prevent overtopping of the dam, and so it would discharge flows to safely convey them back to the river and prevent that -- that other -- that other potential option. So that is -- your understanding is correct.
Q. Okay. Thanks, that's all my questions.
A. MR. MENNINGER: You're welcome.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Ceroici.
Mr. Heaney?
MR. HEANEY:
Yeah, just want to follow up with
Mr. Menninger.
MR. HEANEY QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. So this surcharge, if there's a surcharge, so the

AMICUS
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outflow through the emergency spillway is less than the full inflow through the -- through the gates?
A. MR. MENNINGER: That's the case, that's correct.
Q. Okay. So you have this surcharge. Where does that surcharge end up in the -- end up in the reservoir? Like, what parts of the reservoir are flooded to a higher level than your $70-70$ miliion cubic metres?
A. MR. MENNINGER: Sure.
Q. -- or 77 million cubic metres?
A. MR. MENNINGER: So, again, this is in the case of a failure or malfunction, so this is a backup, not intended operations.

But, in that case, it would utilize the full extent of the reservoir up to the 1212 contour within the reservoir. So it would basically expand.

Those -- those reaches and components are within the PDA. They're defined as part of the project limits and boundaries, and would be part of the operational limits of the reservoir for the -- and reserved for that storage capacity.
Q. So none of the water from this -- if there was a surcharge, none of the water would extend, or the flooding would extend, beyond the PDA?
A. MR. MENNINGER: That's correct.
Q. And then the second question $I$ had had to do with waves
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yesterday.
A. MR. MENNINGER: $\mathrm{Hm}-\mathrm{hm}$.
Q. You know, you had -- you had said that the -- you know, the armoring on the wet side of the dam against wave action wouldn't be required because the water level would be dropping.

So when you were doing your assessment of that, you know, what happens if the dam is -- you know, at full capacity, and you -- the water isn't released. There's a delay in water release? How long can the dam in its -- without armour ing, how long can it tolerate wave action without some serious erosion?
A. MR. MENNINGER: That would depend, I believe.

So we did not look at -- it wasn't a time sensitive -- we looked at it was more of a risk-associated calculation in terms of the likelihood of having that level stay for an extended period of time.

My apologies. One second, I'm sorry.
I'm sorry, I had some audio difficulty there. Can you hear me now?
Q. Yes.
A. MR. MENNINGER: Okay. There we go.

The calculation was not time dependent in terms of the volume. I would say that, you know, we anticipate
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that the turf will sustain wind attack, but also will state that, you know, during an event and when the reservoir is in operations, operating staff will be on site observing the dam and observing potential effects to the reservoir while it's in the storage mode; and that if they do -- if they were to observe erosion at locations along the reservoir, they could take mitigating impacts -- mitigating measures to prevent such scenario in a case of that kind of rare scenario where we hold it for a longer period of time.
Q. And what would those mitigating impacts be?
A. MR. MENNINGER: They would primarily be the addition of erosion protection, in the instances of adding riprap at locations that were experiencing erosion at the time of that occurrence.
Q. So back to my original question, are we -- in terms of the erosion protection from the turf and sustained wind action, are we talking days, weeks, months?
A. MR. MENNINGER: I would say we would be -- I don't have a perfect answer for you on that. Like I said, the calculations aren't dependent on per se a sustained element for long period of time. They were based off of a particular event-based analysis. And so my apologies, I don't necessarily have an answer for the extended period of time. But I think
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within -- within a couple months we're comfortable with that -- with that level of protection.
Q. Okay, thank you. I have no further questions.

THE CHAIR: Ms. Roberts?

MS. ROBERTS QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. Yeah. Yesterday, there was a quite a bit of discussion about the diversion channel design capacity, and, you know, just looking at our topics, I'm not sure if this is best addressed under Topic 3, but it was mentioned yesterday. So I will ask it now.

I'm curious as to why design capacity for 80 cubic metres per second was chosen with allowance for 25 percent additional up to 600 cubic metres per second.
A. MR. MENNINGER: Sure. So the 480 is the bare minimum necessary to mitigate against the 2013 flood event for -- you know, basically, we have to send a certain volume of water to SR1 to mitigate the 2013 flood event and, in particular, to meet our stated goal of that 170 downstream of G1enmore.

So the 480 cubic metres per second would take off that volume over the length of the design flood event.

The operations during a flood event have some inherent give and take, so you're not going to be constantly hitting a perfect 480 cubic metres per
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second.
We also acknowledge that there be entrainment potentially of sediment and debris and other components. So given those uncertainties, we increased the capacity of -- we made sure that we could have that fluctuation go from 480 all the way up to 600 cubic metres per second and allow for scenarios. If we divert slightly less for a period of time, we get increased diversion to catch up, or if they wanted to operate it slightly differently and, as mentioned before, increase capacity during that peak to offset further.

So that's why there's that larger range. 480 is required to meet our goal, but we use 600 to design our channe1 and our structures to make sure that we had flexibility and operations, as well as some of these other elements that were mentioned previously in terms of potential needs for, you know, changes to the flood frequency and other elements of various forms and things like that in the future. So it provides us with kind of a buffer.
Q. Okay. And again, what I'm wondering is in 2013, the documents state that the peak was 1,240 cubic metres per second, I believe.
A. MR. MENNINGER: Hm-hm, that's correct.
Q. So with that, if 480 is what's required to be diverted, then 1240 minus -- 1240 minus 480 is then what has been determined to be acceptable peak flow downstream?
A. MR. MENNINGER: So that's -- in particular, the 480 is based off of that -- meeting that criteria downstream of G1enmore.

So yes, that would be an acceptable operation range to meet the stated project goal of mitigating downstream of G1enmore. But as stated, that we can go up to 600 and can mitigate to a higher level than is required by the stated design goal and purpose.

Apologies. Just one second. We can call up a figure if it will be helpful. If we could, Exhibit 102.

THE CHAIR: I think Ms. Cundliffe is working on it.

Ms. Cundliffe, are you accessing that exhibit?
MS. FRIEND:
Peter, this is Laura. She has to go to the main exhibit list. It's not preloaded, so.
A. MR. MENNINGER: I mean, and we can -- yeah, so the exhibit that we're trying to call up shows the hydrograph of the 2013 flood and how we segmented it into pieces.

So page 22, please.
THE CHAIR:
PDF page or is that --
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A. MR. MENNINGER: I'm sorry, this is not -- this is not the exhibit $I$ was looking for. It was 102. Should be pretty quick.

THE CHAIR: Quicker than the old days when we had to all snoop into our binders.
A. MR. MENNINGER: Okay, there it is.

So this is -- this is for the 600 cubic metre per second diversion, but it does demonstrate the same performance as what would happen with either scenario where -- so the -- all-encompassing lines shown here on the graph is the hydrograph for the 2013 flood event. The -- the bottom of the line, that hatched area, is the flow that basically safely passes through Glenmore, that 160 to 170 cubic metres per second. So none of that is stored by the G1enmore Reservoir.

So the intent here is to then divert up to that 600, which is the -- kind of the lighter hatched area. That's the -- that's the bulk of the volume that goes into SR1. And then the remainder, which is the squared hatch that's a little bit darker is what passes downstream of the project to G1enmore and is stored.

So as seen in this image, there's a portion of that flow that goes downstream basically, 160 , plus -well, basically in this scenario 640 cubic metres per second at the peak, but there's that slug of water that
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continues downstream and then at the end, after the reservoir -- after the SR1 is completely full, then there is a secondary piece that then is stored at the end of the event.

So in this case, it uses the 10,000 dams cubed at Glenmore, both in the front and backside of the flood event for storage.

But that's, in essence, how the system works in combination where it does allow some peak flow to come through past SR1, but then uses -- stores the bulk of the hydrograph within the reservoir.
Q. MS. ROBERTS: So -- so then, as you have explained, is your -- your primary criteria, then, for -- for the design and for the numbers that you've chosen has to do specifically with what is allowed downstream of the G1enmore Reservoir which is the 170 ; is that correct?
A. MR. MENNINGER: That - that is correct. That's been the communicated criteria and goal stated for the project from the start. So I've been involved since 2014, and that was to this date -- this document's actually from April of 2015. And I believe a version of this figure has been in the majority of our communications on the project with -- with the communities.
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Q. Okay, thank you. That's al1.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Roberts. I have a couple of questions.

## THE CHAIR QUESTIONS THE PANEL:

Q. One in relation to the benefit cost analysis. We -you know, there's been a lot of discussion on the benefit cost, how it was conducted, and then different time periods between the early -- the first benefit cost in 2017, 2019, and it's been characterized as some apples to oranges because of the time sequencing, of how much information was known about SR1 later versus conceptual design of MC1. But I guess I'm wondering about even back in the early days on the benefit cost analysis, it was one piece of information that was used, I presume, to select sites, but how much weight was given to the benefit cost analysis. So there was a number of factors from what we are hearing in terms of environmental impacts of the different projects, taking of private lands versus Crown land, in situ, in river versus off-stream. So there's these factors, but what weighting of the benefit cost analysis was given when you were looking at site selection?
A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Chairman, it was -- it was one component of several that the government of Alberta looked at in making its determination.
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I'd invite Mr. Speller to provide some of the methodology and background of where the benefit cost analysis ranked -- fit into the decision made by the government of Alberta.
A. MR. SPELLER: So, Mr. Chairman, it's

Wayne Speller. We talked about this specific item in SIR previously. I'm just going to -- you don't have to pull it up, but I'll point to it for the transcript. So it's Exhibit 138, and it was -- it's on PDF page 38 of Exhibit 138. And that -- we looked yesterday at one point at the AEP 2015 recommendations for Elbow River flood mitigation document, and it -- and Mr. Secord was asking us questions about different pieces. That actually, I have found so far going through all of the decision-making documents and in talking to folks that were involved in the decision-making, is the best summary of the issues at play in the decision-making. So they were project effectiveness, environmental impacts, construction and operation risks, social and recreational values, commercial and tourism values, construction cost estimates, and construction timelines.

The benefit cost analysis is a subset of the construction cost estimates piece. So it was one piece of those seven factors.
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In talking to the folks involved in the decision-making, there wasn't a specific scoring system put together, but in terms of weighting, in terms of importance, they indicated that the project effectiveness discussion of will it work was the primary -- it was almost more like a gate than the decision factor; it was the top. Followed after that in terms of prioritizing, environmental impacts, construction and operation risks, construction timelines, and then construction costs. And those are kind of the top four of the -- of the six remaining with social -- social recreational values and commercial tourism values as being the last two.
Q. And both MC1 and SR1 were determined to, in terms of your initial gate, they both worked in --
A. MR. SPELLER: Yes.

THE CHAIR: -- at that initial gate.
A. MR. SPELLER: They both met the project effectiveness gate.

I mean, the one thing that I think is important, in the selection process, even though it was identified there was potential challenges with construction, maybe the geology tied to MC1, there was never a point where it was said that MC1 was not a feasible project. It just wasn't the selected project. SR1 had a number of
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advantages that made it the front runner out of those two .
Q. Okay, thank you. And one other question related to I guess construction costs which you say was one of the main determining factors that went into $B C$, but it wasn't the BC that was -- PCA perhaps that was the determinative factor, it was mentioned in both in submissions to the hearing about the initial estimates on 1 and costs, which went from $I$ think 80 miliion -and Transportation clarified the SCLG submission was 80 million to 140 million -- was the initial cost estimate 1and -- were professional land appraisals used to give you an idea in terms of what that land cost might be, or what was the main reason behind the relativity large discrepancy between the initial estimates of 80 miliion and 140 miliion?
A. MR. HEBERT: Bear with us one moment,

Mr. Chairman.
Mr. Chairman, Mr. Sol is able to provide an answer to the question.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Sol.
A. MR. SOL: Thank you. I'm with the IBI group, and we did the original land estimate. And we worked with an appraiser for that, and we did a number of detailed analyses; it was all desktop,
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though. And we looked at first parcel out and other entitlements, and weren't basing it on land use entitlements. And so that was where the original estimate was arrived from.

Subsequently after AT had undertaken negotiations, that's when the revised number came in.

So the answer is yes, the original estimate was -was a due diligent appraisal.
Q. Thank you. And one last question $I$ have is related to the -- wel1, I suppose Bragg Creek, as well; but, primarily, the area between SR1 and Glenmore, we've talked a bit about that this morning, there was some other questions from the Panel on that, as well, Transportation has indicated that, within the city limits of Calgary the area between -- or, I'm sorry, Glenmore and the city limits is sort of the responsibility of the City of Calgary has been your answer in terms of what potential residual funding might still occur on any impacted lands there.

So I guess I'm curious about, how do you differentiate between that 1 and and whose responsibility it is, and the City of Calgary land that is downstream of Glenmore, which is also the responsibility of the City of Calgary, how is that differentiated between your response to the flood,
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which is all that occurring -- well, or the main piece of the project was for the City of Calgary downstream of Glenmore -- how did you differentiate between those two areas and say what is City of Calgary's jurisdiction versus yours?
A. MR. HEBERT: So, Mr. Chairman, that's a good question.

So, as a matter of operating principle, the local authorities are responsible for flood mitigation. The distinction with the SR1 application with the response to Bragg Creek, with the response to Redwood Meadows, al1 related to the impacts of the 2016 -- sorry, the 2013 flood, their magnitude, impact on people, the communities, the economy.

So it would appear to be a bit of a contrast, but the projects, SR1, Bragg Creek, response to Redwood Meadows, constitute the response to the 2013 flood.

The general operating principle on mitigation projects in the normal course are -- are matters of responsibility of the local authority involved, determination of whether they're needed, whether they're practical, whether -- whether resources are available to proceed with those types of projects, and that's -- that's the distinction in this case.
Q. So just to follow up then, I'm not sure I totally have,
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you know, sort of the -- I'm not sure if it's a numerical analysis that's done, but if you look at Canmore, which also has damages and Bragg Creek and in Calgary, how does the government decide, then, when it is the government responsibility, provincial government responsibility versus local responsibility?
A. MR. HEBERT: No, that's a fair -- fair question, Mr. Chairman.

In this case, the Government of Alberta took a decision in the aftermath of the 2013 flood to provide or to advance flood mitigation projects in direct response to the event that occurred in 2013.

And that -- that is the distinguishing factor that the government of the day, and as they've advanced the projects and provided funding to Bragg Creek and Redwood Meadows, all links back to the need to -- to respond, to prevent the recurrence of the damage and the impacts that were experienced in the 2013 event.

And that's -- that's the -- that's the rationale even though we're now almost eight years out, the government has -- has had a mandate of ensuring that the areas the communities most significantly impacted in the 2013 event have appropriate mitigation going forward.
Q. Thank you. Mr. Kennedy or Ms. Vance, anything in
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follow-up?
MR. KENNEDY:
Nothing from me, thank you, Mr. Chair.

MS. VANCE:
Nor I, thank you.
THE CHAIR:
Okay, thank you, Mr. Hebert, and to the Panel of Alberta Transportation. So we are complete on cross.

We can now move onto the City of Calgary direct...I think I have that right, I hope I have that right.

So we could change panels now and have Ms. Senek. Are you online?

MR. FITCH:
Sorry, Mr. Chair, it's Gavin Fitch.

I think this would now be the opportunity for Alberta Transportation to do any redirect should we want to for this Pane1, but I can advise that we do not have any redirect.

THE CHAIR:
You do not. Okay, thank you. And you're quite correct. I'd like to say I just guessed right --

MR. FITCH:
That's quite all right, sir.
THE CHAIR:
So, Ms. Senek, City of Calgary.
MS. SENEK: He11o, Mr. Chairman, I'm here, and we've got Mr. Frank Frigo with us as well today.
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For the record, my name is Melissa Senek. I, along with my colleagues, David Mercer and Sara Munkittrick are counsel for the City of Calgary.

I'd like to start with a brief introductory statement before introducing our witness.

The 2013 floods were devastating across southern Alberta. In Calgary, specifically, thousands of Calgarians were displaced or their homes were destroyed. Calgary's downtown core, the economic centre of Alberta, was virtually cut off from the rest of the City.

The city suffered hundreds of millions of dollars of damage to public infrastructure. More than one-third of the damage suffered in Calgary was directly attributable to overland flooding on the Elbow River.

As you'll hear throughout this hearing, a flood like the 2013 floods or worse could strike again at any time. The city is unable to fully mitigate a flood of that magnitude within city limits.

SR1 is critically needed to provide that mitigation on the Elbow River. If approved, SR1, in combination with the G1enmore Reservoir, will virtually eliminate overland flooding from the Elbow within the City of Calgary for a 2013 level flood. It will
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mitigate and minimize overland flooding for floods of higher magnitudes, and it will provide additional flood mitigation for the Bow River below its confluence with the Elbow, protecting not only billions of dollars of private property and public infrastructure, but also the physical and mental well-being of the tens of thousands of Calgarians.

As will be further detailed by the City's witness, the social and economic benefits of SR1 are staggering. Given its off-stream design, any impacts will be temporary and short-1ived, and any operational risks are remote.

The City looks forward to providing evidence and answering questions related to the anticipated effects of SR1 on the city of Calgary and it's overwhelming benefit to Calgarians.

It is the City's view that SR1 is necessary, clearly in the public interest, and should be approved as soon as possible.

At this point, it is probably a good time to swear in Mr. Frigo.

Mr. Frigo, are you there?
THE CHAIR: Mr. Frigo, is perhaps your microphone on your headset muted? We can't see that part.

## ALBERTA TRANSPORTATION TOPIC \#1 PANEL <br> Questioned by The Chair

1 MR. WIEBE: your headphones.
MS. FRIEND:
This is Laura, ensure that your headphones aren't plugged into your laptop.

THE CHAIR:
Then you may need to go to where your mute button, that little arrow is there, and reset to "same as system."

So that little arrow by your mute, and you can select a microphone. It may be still be selected to "headset," you need to select to "same as system," if you're working on a laptop.
MS. SENEK:
Perhaps we can take a minute for Mr. Frigo to sort out his -- maybe it's a good time for the break?

THE CHAIR:
It's a little early --
MR. FRIGO: Mr. Chair, Mr. Chair, we've got it now.

Good morning, can you hear me now?
THE CHAIR:
Yes.
MR. FRIGO:
Is that audio quality acceptable?
THE CHAIR:
It's definitely loud enough. Can everyone hear Mr. Frigo? If someone cannot, please -MR. KENNEDY: I think our court reporter is struggling, so.
THE CHAIR: Try again, Mr. Frigo.

Folks, let's take 5 minutes. Watch your screens, though, because if we get it rectified, we'11 start up right away; otherwise, five minutes.
(ADJOURNMENT)

FRANK FRIGO (For The City of Calgary), sworn
MS. SENEK EXAMINES THE WITNESS:
Q. Mr. Frigo, can you please confirm that the summary of your education and experience provided at page 4 of Exhibit 229 is accurate?
A. Yes, I can. Confirmed.
Q. Thank you. And you are employed with the City of Calgary as "Leader, Watershed Analysis" in the Water Resources Business Unit; correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Could you please describe for the record your education and experience?
A. I can. I am a hydrotechnical water resources engineer
with 24 years of experience. The last 13 of those years, so since 2008, I have been leading hydrotechnical teams within the City of Calgary, focusing again on various elements of water resources management including: Applied hydrology, hydraulics, morphology, water quality, water supply, floodplain mapping and inundation mapping.

The teams that $I$ oversee encompass various flood resilience and flood response measures including: The annual monitoring and forecasting of floods; working with our team at water treatment at Glenmore Reservoir to manage water levels at Glenmore Reservoir to mitigate floods; and various related work.
Q. Thank you. And can you please describe for the record your role and involvement in the 2013 flood?
A. Certainly. At the time, I was the leader of river engineering, a team within water resources, responsible for the preparation and planning of flood response activities within the city of Calgary; also responsible for the monitoring and forecasting of floods on the Elbow River to again inform the operation and management of the G1enmore Reservoir.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Frigo. And, finally, can you please explain the history of your involvement in this specific application?
A. Certainly. Again, prior to 2013, having led the river engineering team and leading a team of hydrotechnical engineers within the City, it was also a very core role after 2013 for me to be involved in directing my team around many of the hydrotechnical, morphologic, economic, and engagement activities that the City undertook to address, build, and implement a flood resilience strategy for the city of Calgary.
Q. Thank you. And I understand that you have a presentation prepared for the Panel this morning, and that has been provided in advance to -- to Ms. Friend. So if that presentation could please get loaded.

And Mr. Frigo, please go ahead with your presentation. Thank you.
A. MR. FRIGO: Thank you, Ms. Senek.

Good morning. And can we please advance, document manager specialist, to the next slide? Thank you very much.

As noted by Chairman Woloshyn during his opening address, Calgary was founded at the confluence of the Bow and Elbow Rivers. Both rivers drained land dominated by steep, high elevation mountain terrain are subject to widespread heavy rainfall and have limited natural lake or reservoir storage. This creates potential for flooding that, among Canadian population
centres, is unique in its combined speed and severity. The City grew up around the confluence before the risk was widely understood in the manner that it is today.

What is perhaps notable to many hydrologists who review flood records for the Elbow River is not that floods occurred in the late 1800s through to the early 1930s and again in 2005 and 2013, but that it did not flood more often, especially while Calgary and region evolved between the 1930 s and 2005.

Next slide, please.
This risk translates to flood inundation mapping that is stark. One in 200-year flood event mapping shows that within the hydraulic benefit area of SR1, 8.9 square kilometres of dense high-functioning urban fabric would be inundated. This includes 4.5 kilometres squared along the Elbow River encompassing the Beltiline, Mission, downtown, East Village and other communities that contain over 3,100 buildings with a net assessed value in the range of $\$ 86$ billion.

Since the 1980s, land use has been regulated to provincial flood hazard maps and policy; however, the community-wide flood exposure creates evacuation, utility, and transportation risks, and very importantly, economic disruption that remains severe,
especially for events more rare than the regulatory 1 in a 100-year flood.

Next slide, please.
Sadly, the risks are far from theoretical.
June 2013's flood event punctuates that the risk that Calgary and region live with as an artifact of the beautiful river basins that they are part of.

In 2013, net losses in the range of approximately \$2 billion were sustained. Calgary, very unfortunately, recorded its third fatality since 2005.

2013 has left enduring health and wellness impacts. I must pause to stress to the Board that further human life safety risk is intolerable to the City, and that both emergency response and resilient strategies prioritize human life safety above other objectives that include the sustainment of critical infrastructure and operations, protection of public economic assets, and a protection of private property and the environment.

Next slide, please.
I've spoken much of the risk, and here's where the story changes.

Much has been done, and, for Calgary, an important step after 2013 was the creation of its expert management panel on river flooding which engaged
experts from across Canada.
The panel broke the topic of flooding in Calgary into six themes and created 27 recommendations across those themes to guide Calgary's pathway to a resilient future.

The panel showed us that, with the scale of the issue, resilience would be complex, involving the interaction of multiple resilience measures working together, some of which would simply not fit within the scale of the municipality. With this guidance, the City set about coordinating with the government of Alberta and other stakeholders to study, combine, and compare local and regional, structural and non-structural mitigation measures.

The City and the government of Alberta agreed that the City would lead investigation and configuration of measures within the city, where as the province, primarily Alberta Environment and Parks, would lead study and configuration of resilience elements outside of the city limits.

Next slide, please.
This led to an interactive program of investigation that involved a suite of hydrotechnical studies, economic and impact assessments, engineering and conceptual cost analyses and, very importantly,
various forms of engagement with citizens.
Engagement helped us to refine our understanding of how organizations, businesses, residents -- in a word, citizens -- were impacted by flood and how their values around watershed management could be incorporated into resilience plans.

Next slide, please.
Within this process, along with the consultant team led by Mr. Sol with the IBI group developed the object-based flood damage assessment tool that was mentioned yesterday.

The digital mapping tool combines various datasets to estimate net financial damages for floods of varying severity throughout Calgary. By accounting for the recurrence interval of the damages, this allowed us to understand Calgary's net flood exposure and also to test the performance of combinations of conceptual alternatives to see which would perform the best. With this analysis, a sustainability analysis was also completed for aspects that could not readily be monetized. Damages from events of different recurrence interval were then combined and converted into an AAD, or annual average damage, not unlike the uniform payment amount of a mortgage.

Next slide, please.

Application of the damage calculator and all of the work behind the configuration of resilient scenarios culminated in a 2017 council-endorsed flood resilience strategy. The strategy high1ighted key measures that the City would pursue and support. These included a backbone of structural mitigation measures integrated with a suite of non-structural measures that would be best configured once the residual risk remaining would be structural measures in place could be developed.

For the Elbow River, this included the G1enmore dam crest gates and the Springbank off-stream reservoir, which by then had been further studied by the province.

Next slide, please.
In reaching the 2017 resilience strategy, numerous alternatives were configured and assessed. Listed here are elements that were studied and assessed.

Importantly for the Elbow River communities, three years of modifications to the G1enmore dam were completed in 2020, roughly doubling the live storage from 10 to 20 million cubic metres and offering the ability for events up to about the 1 in 30 -year -- the 1 in 30 severity event, to be attenuated to the downstream threshold of major damage, which we've
discussed is in the 150 to 170-cubic metre per second range.

Other smaller, more local improvements were also completed during the -- including hydraulic capacity increases, drainage and lift station improvements. Numerous other measures were studied and set aside for a range of reasons that included engineering performance, operational aspects, implementation and lifecycle costs, social, and environmental aspects.

Next slide, please.
Importantly, the implementation of Calgary's resilience plan reached an important milestone in 2020 with approximately 54 percent of the net exposure that was present in 2013 averted by measures collaboratively put in place with the government of Alberta and other water management stakeholders.

Using the damage calculator, we understand that SR1 will eliminate an incremental $\$ 27.7$ million annually, eliminate most of the remaining risk associated with the Elbow River and Bow River communities downstream of the confluence.

Not accounted for in this 27.7 million is the increment in flood response flexibility that arises due to the risks averted by SR1's benefit area. This area represents over 40 percent of the emergency actions in

Calgary's flood emergency reference manual. With many of these actions averted, greater resources and time would be available to protect and secure communities on the Bow River, even upstream of the confluence of the Elbow, and outside of the hydraulic benefit area of SR1.

Next slide, please.
Together, SR1 and G1enmore provide appreciable storage relative to the basin that is serviced. Internal analysis by hydrotechnical engineers within our river engineering team show that the two reservoirs will have a dramatic impact on severe flood events beyond Glenmore's capacity alone.

As reported in Exhibit 229, the two reservoirs working together can reduce events up to the 1 in 200-year severity to damage threshold of 160 cubic metre per second or the natural 1 in 5-year flow.

From larger events, the significant storage still offers dramatic peak flow and damage reduction potential. As such, reservoir storage is adaptive to and beneficial for flood events of severity even greater than the design event.

I will pause here to clarify that communities upstream of G1enmore Reservoir within the City of Calgary were regulated at the time of development in
the late 1980s and the 1990s to the flood hazard maps and the modelling encompassing a 1 in 100-year flow rate of 883 cubic metres per second. So no barriers or other mitigation have been identified for communities upstream of the G1enmore Reservoir.

I will note that damages did occur in some of these communities in 2013, but that is because the peak flow rate above G1enmore was 1,240 cubic metres per second, not 880 , and as the system had been regulated to.

Next slide, please.
SR1's impact is perhaps even more dramatic when viewed in the form of comparative inundation mapping. This slide shows an excerpt of maps included in Exhibit 229 that show the difference in inundation for 1 in 200-year event. Red, no SR1; yellow, the river channe1 with SR1.

Again, the difference represents 4.5 square kilometres of developed urban fabric on the Elbow River and approximately 8.9 kilometres square of total incremental inundation representing an asset class in the order of $\$ 86$ billion.

For areas like Bridgeland, Inglewood, Bonnybrook, Deerfoot Meadows, Riverbend, Quarry Park, and communities downstream of Calgary, the reduction in
peak flow translating downstream would increase the apparent service leve1, mitigation and land use regulation already in place.

Next slide, please.
Again, the single event impact of SR1 is stark. SR1 will improve flood performance and limit mitigation -- or pardon me, mitigate damages for events all the way up to the 200-year event and larger.

For a single event of a 100-year severity, we would expect that over a billion dollars of direct damages would be averted. For 1 in 200-year event, the design event, almost $\$ 2$ billion of direct damage would be averted.

These values annualize to approximately $\$ 27.7$ million, of which 20 million is understood to be associated with Elbow River communities based on our work with IBI, and 7 million on Bow. So approximately one-third of the benefits are accruing to communities downstream of the Elbow River confluence on the Bow and two-thirds to communities upstream, including the downtown, Mission, Beltine area.

Next slide, please.
In terms of benefit and cost, as identified in Exhibit 229, the City of Calgary understands that that $\$ 27.7 \mathrm{million} A A D$, or annual average damage, would
extend to over $\$ 2.7 \mathrm{million}$ straight multiplied over the next hundred years. This is more than five times the estimated probable cost of the $\$ 432 \mathrm{million}$ estimate for the SR1 project.

The City believes that this approach to assessing the cost and benefit analysis is appropriate due to a number of factors that are not directly recognized or accounted for in the benefit cost analysis prepared by IBI. These include the potential for increases in averted damages due to climate change -- sorry, can we go back to the previous slide -- exclusion of aspects of averted flood damages, things like benefits outside of Calgary, which were not evaluated in the damage estimates, health and safety elements which could not be reliably monetized, and enhanced emergency response efficacy, as I spoke of earlier.

Another factor is the long design life of major elements of SR1's infrastructure.

Again, the asset that is being protected is the urban fabric of the City of Calgary. This is subject to revaluation and continual investment as the city changes and develops.

Further, the refinement of operations that may optimize operational costs could limit the operations in the future.

As mentioned, the G1enmore Reservoir can manage flow events of up to the 1 in 30 without utilizing any of the storage in Glenmore, though the backflow trigger is much higher than the 160-cubic metre per second at which the operational strategy for SR1 would begin diverting into SR1.

So, for a number of smaller events that may occur in the future, it would be possible to potentially use G1enmore Reservoir and not divert it into SR1, thereby avoiding many of the costs associated with post-flood reclamation, management, and monitoring.

Next slide, please.
This brings us to the conclusions that the City of Calgary has drawn around SR1. These are that flood risk for Calgary and the region will endure or intensify.

In the years since 2013, exposure has been drastically reduced but remains very high. Elbow River flood damages will be in the order of 2 to $\$ 3$ million over the next hundred years unless additional mitigation is undertaken.

Comprehensive technical, economic and engineering analysis, and engagement from 2013 to 2017 informed council-endorsed resilience strategy.

Local and non-structural mitigation won't be able

AMICUS
to adequately address flood risk. Watershed skil1 resilience measures are needed.

Analyses have shown that SR1 is effective, adaptive and a practical measure that will avert life safety, building and content damages, economic, business and social disruption, including for events larger than the designed 2013 event.

SR1 will avert over $\$ 1.1$ billion of damages in a single 1 in 100-year severity flood. SR1 returns regional skill benefits significantly greater than its costs.

Thank you. That concludes our presentation.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Frigo.
Ms. Senek, was there anything else in direct?
MS. SENEK: Nothing else in direct, thank you.
THE CHAIR: Okay, well, thank you.

So parties not adverse, you can start with Canadian River Communities Action Group --

MR. CUSANO: No, thank you, sir.
THE CHAIR No questions?
MR. CUSANO: None, thank you.
THE CHAIR:
Alberta Transportation?
MR. KRUHLAK: We have no questions, sir.

THE CHAIR: Mr. Rae on behalf of
Stoney Nakoda?

MR. RAE:
Yes, sir. Thank you. We do have a number of questions for the witness.

THE CHAIR:
In fact, $I$ think you've identified kindly with Mr. Kennedy earlier, you may require about an hour; is that right?

MR. RAE:
I believe that is what we requested, yes, sir.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Rae. You may proceed.

MR. RAE:
Thank you, sir.
MR. RAE CROSS-EXAMINES THE WITNESS:
MR. RAE:
I'd like to start off by asking the Panel if I could have another document added to the exhibit list?

This is a letter from Mayor Nenshi, 2018, to the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency.

I've provided a copy that letter to the Board staff and to Ms. Senek, and if it's acceptable to you, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to have that as an exhibit, and I believe it would be Exhibit 348 if that's acceptable to the Panel.

THE CHAIR: And that has already been distributed to who, sorry?

MR. RAE:
To the Board staff, as well as to Ms. Senek with the City of Calgary.

REPORTING GROUP

THE CHAIR:
Are there objections?
MS. SENEK:
The City does not have any objections to entering the letter as an exhibit, although we would remind Mr . Rae that Mr . Frigo cannot speak for the City's elected officials.

MR. RAE: Would it be possible to have that letter put on the screen? It was provided to the staff a couple of days ago. Exhibit 348 was the putative number. That's the number. Thank you very much.
Q. Mr. Frigo, do you do you recognize this letter?
A. I do.
Q. And can you explain to me, what was the purpose of the 1etter?
A. The letter was prepared in support of the Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir.
Q. And is it fair to say the letter is seeking, what Mayor Nenshi labelled as an expedited review of the SR1 project?
A. I understand that's the content of the letter, yes.
Q. And on what basis did the City of Calgary wish to have an expedited review?
A. It is my understanding, through working with both counsel and senior levels of administration, that flood resilience is a key priority, key capital investment priority, for the City of Calgary, final to its
development.
In that sense, the City of Calgary remains significantly exposed to flood risk as addressed in the presentation recent -- that $I$ just went through. My understanding is that the mayor was aiming to address the fact that the City of Calgary is very much committed to and very much in need of additional flood resilience.
Q. In the second sentence of the second paragraph of that letter, Mayor Nenshi mentions that: (as read)
"The Springbank project will protect
infrastructure, private property, and
help prevent flood damages to Calgary's
economic engine, that is, the downtown
core."
Do you see that sentence?
A. I do, sir.
Q. In the 2013 flood, was the majority of the damage to the downtown core a result of flooding on the Bow or the Elbow Rivers?
A. It was a combination, but there is a very significant component of impact in the downtown core, including east Village, portions of the downtown, that were impacted by the Elbow River.

The Elbow River has what we call "paleochannels,"
abandoned channel scrolls on the surface of the floodplain. These are locations where the river used to exist.

These exist through communities, including through Mission, through Beltiline, and, importantly, leading north from Macleod Trail toward the downtown.

So a significant amount of the damage that occurred in the downtown was directly related to Elbow River floodwater by its conveyance via these paleochannels to the north and through the downtown. If you will, we speak of the Elbow River as flooding downtown via the back door.

So certainly, sir, it was a combination of both the Bow and the Elbow River, though the Elbow River represented a very significant portion of that.
Q. So attached to the letter, I believe, on -- would be the third page, PDF page 3 , if you turn to that, is the document you see in the screen in front of you.

On that page we have in front of us, the very first paragraph refers to -- well, I'11 quote: (as read)
"The Government of Alberta's agreement
with TransAlta has further decreased
flood risk on the Bow River in Calgary."
Do you see that sentence?
A. I do, sir.
Q. What is that sentence referring to? What is the agreement it refers to?
A. In 2016, the Government of Alberta and TransAlta struck a deal to be able to enter an agreement to be able to have modified operations of the Ghost Reservoir, as well as the reservoirs on the Kananaskis system, so Upper and Lower Kananaskis Reservoirs. This allowed the Alberta government to, in advance of flood season, and prior to an event, provide direction to TransAlta in terms of setting water level at the Ghost Reservoir, allowing for additional flood mitigation capacity.

This was also considered in the -- in terms of water supply from the standpoint that the upper and lower Kananaskis reservoirs, which sit very high in their relative catchments and are not particularly useful for flood mitigation, but are useful for reservoir storage, can then refill the Ghost Reservoir.

So, in that 2016 agreement, which had a term of five years and is set to be renewed this year, was about a modified water operations that would secure both greater water -- water supply security, as well as flood resilience for communities downstream on the Bow. That would include city of Calgary, Cochrane, et cetera.
Q. Is the Ghost Reservoir, in part, located on the Stoney Indian Reserve?
A. I understand it is, yes, sir.
Q. Now, this agreement of which you speak, did it provide for payments from the province of Alberta to TransAlta Utilities?
A. My understanding is that it does, yes, sir.
Q. And have the amount of those payments been exhibited as part of this hearing?
A. I'm not certain if they have been exhibited. I do know that they have been communicated publicly in various forums.
Q. And does this agreement provide for payments from the province of Alberta to the City of Calgary?
A. No, not that I'm aware of.
Q. Does the agreement provide for payments from the province of Alberta to the Stoney Indian Band or the Stoney Nakoda Nations, whom I represent?
A. No. Not that I'm aware of, sir.
Q. Sir, would you undertake to produce an unredacted copy of this agreement for exhibiting in front of this Pane1?
A. I would suggest --

MS. SENEK:
Sorry. This is Melissa Senek again. This is not a City of Calgary agreement. I
don't know that it's appropriate for the City of Calgary to undertake to produce it.

MR. RAE: Well, the City of Calgary has expressly said that this agreement further decreased the flood risk on the Bow River. I don't see how it would be considered irrelevant to these proceedings.

MS. SENEK: We can certainly look into whether we have access to it in that -- in that fashion, and see what we can provide.

But, again, it's -- I'm not necessarily saying it's irrelevant. I just don't know that the City has access to what's being requested.

UNDERTAKING - TO MAKE ENQUIRIES AND, IF
AVAILABLE, PROVIDE AN UNREDACTED COPY
OF THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT
OF ALBERTA AND TRANSALTA AS DESCRIBED
Q. MR. RAE:

Mr. Frigo, would you be able to advise the amount of the payments from TransAlta Utilities -- or to TransAlta Utilities under this agreement?
A. My understanding is that, the public communication has been that this is in order of $\$ 5.5$ miliion per year.
Q. And have those numbers and those amounts been considered by the Calgary -- by the City of Calgary in its cost benefit analyses of the various options, flood
control options?
A. The impacts of the flood mitigation have been considered, yes.
Q. No, I'm referring to the payments to TransAlta Utilities.
A. I believe they have. I would need to verify that, but I do believe they have, yes.
Q. So I'd ask you to turn to, I believe it would be the page 5 , PDF page 5 , of this exhibit, which was page 3 of the attachment. One more page, perhaps. Oh, no, that's the right page, sorry. Back to that page. Now, sir, on the first paragraph under Figure 3, the statement is made: (as read)
"With SR1 in operation, the City will be able to focus more of its resources for emergency response on the Bow River, where around 85 percent of the City's flood risk will remain after SR1 is built."

Is it the City of Calgary's evidence that that statement continues to be accurate?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, later on in the next paragraph under "Flood Damage Reduction," thank you, reference in that paragraph is made to some 2,000 properties with buildings downstream
of the G1enmore Reservoir on the Elbow River. You see that reference?
A. I do, sir.
Q. Now, as part of the City of Calgary's advocacy for upstream storage on the Bow River, and I might add that two of the three options being considered, involve additional flooding of the Stoney Indian Reserve, in making that statement about 2,000 properties downstream of the G1enmore Reservoir, was that at all compared with the number of residents on the Stoney Indian Reserve who would be displaced by additional flooding of the Bow River through the Stoney Indian Reserve?
A. Not for any internal analyses for the City of Calgary, no, sir.
Q. Do you know if the province of Alberta has done that analyses?
A. I'm not certain whether they have done that analyses, though the City has cooperated and participated in the province's Bow River reservoir options process in its second phase of the conceptual design, I would expect that that has been address; however, I'm not directly aware and have not been involved in an analysis of that type.
Q. And the Government of Canada, given that we're talking about the Bow River, which is under federal
jurisdiction, the Stoney Indian Reserves, which are also under federal jurisdiction, and given that two of the TransAlta -- existing TransAlta hydro dams on the Bow River are also licensed federally, are you aware whether the Government of Canada has addressed that issue that I just put you?
A. I am not, sir.
Q. Now, if you turn to -- if we might scroll down to the next page in this exhibit, at the top of the page, under the bullet heading, "Source Water Protection," reference is made there to: (as read)
"Land in the upstream watershed that
would otherwise be subject to agricultural practices is retained in an undeveloped state."

And that is labelled as having a positive benefit for source water quality. Do you see that reference?
A. I do.
Q. Is the City of Calgary advocating that additional lands upstream of the City of Calgary be taken out of agricultural production?
A. Relative to the Springbank Reservoir option, we understand that the post-reservoir uses would include passive recreation and First Nations uses. These are consistent with the goals of a source water protection
plan.
Q. But does not that bullet expressly state that the City of Calgary is suggesting that taking upstream lands out of agricultural production is in fact a benefit?
A. I'm not certain that it does imply that at all. I am suggesting that reservoir operations for the likes as they have been configured for elements like SR1 would contribute to positive source water protection effects.
Q. Are you stating that, should additional lands upstream of the city of Calgary be taken out of agricultural production, that also would result in a positive benefit for source water quality?
A. Potentially, depending on those operations.
Q. Sorry, which operations?
A. The agricultural operations.
Q. Well, the statement is the City of Calgary - I presume it was referring to agricultural operations as those are presently practiced upstream of the city of Calgary?
A. Yes.
Q. Is the City of Calgary suggesting that taking those types of agricultural operations out of production would have a positive benefit for source water quality?
A. Depending on those agricultural operations, all land
uses have impacts on water systems, including impacts to quality and quantity of water. Very important to consider in overall water management plans.
Q. If we could turn to the last page of this exhibit. Thank you.

In the first paragraph at the top of that page, the statement is made that, as a result of land use regulation, other non-structural measures, what the results would be.

What's the anticipated completion date of any upstream storage on the Bow River?
A. My expectation and understanding, from participation in the Bow River reservoir options work led by the province, is that it would be a fairly protracted horizon, that we would be looking at in excess of -certainly in excess of five years and likely in excess of a decade.

As the Bow River reservoir options studies are still in a very preliminary state, that horizon is yet unclear, so certainly could be clear greater than a decade.
Q. And what is the level of protection that the city of Calgary is seeking through the construction of upstream storage on the Bow River?
A. Through the damage estimation calculations that we've
done with the IBI Group, through internal analysis, we have targeted a service level in the order of the 200-year or 0.5 percent annual exceedence probability as the objective for flood resilience for Calgary communities.
Q. Just so I'm clear, you said the 1 to 200-year flood level? Not the 1 to 100-year?
A. That's correct. So through 1 and use regulation, we would regulate to naturalize, so unattenuated flow rates for the 1 in 100-year event.

With additional mitigation, elements including structural mitigation in communities, things like local barriers in communities like Sunnyside, the downtown, we would increase that.

There is a recognition within the City of Calgary's flood resilience strategy that, where risks are greatest, that is, where population and economic resources, particularly, critical infrastructure, things like health care facilities, critical utilities are concentrated, even higher levels of service are appropriate.

So, in short, we're aiming for the highest level that we can achieve through land use regulation, we have aimed to meet the minimum standard of 1 in 100 by layering other elements of resilience on top of that,
we're aiming for much higher than that.
Again, nominally, across Calgary, 1 in 200, but we aim to have even higher than that.

We do believe that the circle of analysis and reevaluation of risks will be a continual one, that flood risk mitigation will not end with any single mitigation strategy, and that forces will change and evolve.

How land is used, how populations utilize land, economic, environmental, and other considerations will lead us to a continual re-evaluation of our process. Nominally 1 in 200, but, obviously, we're seeking to limit the risk to as great a degree as possible.
Q. The evidence provided by Alberta Transportation was based on the provincial and Alberta Transportation is arguing the federal standard of 1 to 100. Do you recall hearing that evidence from the City of Calgary?
A. I do, sir.
Q. And yet you're saying the City of Calgary is seeking a level of protection of the 1 to 200-year flood. That's what you just said.
A. That's correct. That's correct. Through the combination of layered mitigation and resilience measures working synergistically.
Q. And on what basis do you feel that the City of Calgary
is, I'11 use the word, "entitled" to a level of protection greater than the level of protection that is the provincial standard everywhere else in the province?
A. The City of Calgary does not believe it's entitled to a greater level of resilience, it believes that that resilience is warranted based on the density of human life safety, economic, and environmental risks associated with flooding in our communities, as well as the severity and speed of the flood response of our basins upstream, our natural basins upstream.
Q. And when $I$ ask this question, $p l e a s e ~ d o n ' t ~ t a k e ~ i t ~$ pejoratively, but is it the evidence of the City of Calgary that the city of Calgary, in particular, the downtown core, is more important than outlying areas, and, quite frankly, more important than the Stoney Indian Reserve?
A. No, sir. We would identify literally that the population, life safety, environmental, and economic risk associated with flooding the city of Calgary are of significant impact. We then quantify that impact through various technical studies.
Q. Would you agree, sir, though, that if an upstream Bow River storage reservoir flooded the Stoney Indian Reserve for the sake of flood protection
of downtown Calgary, would you agree, sir, that that would be based on the value judgment that downtown Calgary is subjectively more valuable than the Stoney Indian Reserve?
A. In the configuration of any flood resilience measure, we would participate and aim to ensure that impacts to any and all parties were minimized.
Q. And how would you minimize the impacts of a flood that literally flooded parts of the reserve along the Bow River? Can that be minimized?
A. It is possible, I would expect, with different reservoir designs, different operational strategies, to limit the risk and/or to look at other mitigation measures, just as in the city of Calgary, that would complement that major structural measure. That might involve various approaches.

In the city of Calgary, raising land, like I mentioned in Discovery Ridge, that community upstream of the G1enmore Reservoir, before development was approved, 1 and -- land was raised by the importation of structural fill to create a higher surface there so that the development would not be impacted by floods in a given severity. Elements like this may or may not be appropriate for various communities.

In the city of Calgary, we've undertaken to
address the combination of potential mitigation measures and derive an optimal blend or scenario of mitigation measures that can work synergistically to that high level of flood resilience we spoke of earlier.
Q. Sir, what $I$ hear you saying is you're equating flood mitigation of a natural flood, you're equating that with deliberate inundation of land for the purpose of creating a permanent reservoir. Surely, those are different things, are they not?
A. They are certainly different in many aspects; however, they are similar in that both would be -- or both sets would be aimed at flood mitigation and water resources management in general.
Q. Yes, but for the people currently occupying, using and living, and the land to be flooded, there's no mitigation possible. The land would be taken out of use and they would have to move. Is that not correct?
A. I haven't analyzed that. I wouldn't be able to comment on whether that's possible or not.
Q. Sir, could I have you turn to Exhibit 231, and if I could ask that that be put on the screen.

Sir, do you recognize this document?
A. I do.
Q. Can you tell me what it is?
A. It is a summarizing document that takes the very complex work completed for the City of Calgary by the IBI Group, and additional consultants, and summarizes that information.
Q. And does the information in this exhibit, which is dated March 30th, 2017, does this information continue to be the evidence of the City of Calgary?
A. What $I$ would advise is that additional -- additional exhibits have been provided because what the City of Calgary has done -- I mentioned the incremental evaluation of flood impacts and mitigation measures, that has been ongoing continuously.

So, since 2017, additional analyses have been commissioned by the City of Calgary, by the IBI Group, to address the changes in flood mitigation that have occurred within our area.

So though the information was correct, very much at 2017, there is information that supercedes and has been included in the City of Calgary's submission to the Board.
Q. Near the bottom of --
A. Specific --
Q. Sorry?
A. Sorry, I was just going to add that, specifically, it is Exhibit 2-3-0, 230, that summarizes some of the more
recent analyses completed by IBI on behalf of the City around damage estimates.
Q. Well, on that note, you'll see at the bottom of the page before us, at the bottom, the statement: (as read)
"Neither groundwater inundation nor
flood damage estimates were fully validated or calibrated to historic events due to a lack of data to complete such analysis."

Since 2017, has the City of Calgary, together with the work that you just referred to carried out by IBI, have you now obtained that further analysis you referred to in this document?
A. I'd like to clarify that the work that IBI did did encompass groundwater and other mechanisms of damage. It is just that the information to calibrate and validate that information was less -- was less complete than certainly for a surface inundation.

So during the IBI work, one of their subconsultants, which was Golder Associates, completed hydrogeologic assessments where they modeled groundwater levels, and that was very much part of the damage calculations that were included in all of the IBI analyses. It was just that verification with the
complexity of the impacts in 2013 of whether it was groundwater or surface inundation that reached the building first and caused the majority of damage was very difficult to discern based on the available records from 2013 and 2005.
Q. So are you saying that information continues to be absent?
A. No, sir, I'm saying the information around groundwater damages was accommodated in the IBI scenarios; it just could not be validated to the same extent that damages associated with surface flooding were.
Q. And that continues to be the case?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Now, the next paragraph, and I'11 quote it: (as read)
"The monetized costs and benefits
captured in the damage model included those impacts that were judged by the consultant to be applicable and quantifiable."

Does the City of Calgary agree with the judgment of the consultant that's referred to in that sentence?
A. Yes. We were involved with the consultant team and recognized that many aspects, for instance, life safety and environmental performance, would be very difficult to directly monetize.

Recognizing that leaving these components out would only make the analysis more conservative in that those effects were appreciable, we allowed the -- we directed the study to continue in that manner.
Q. So is it fair to say that that study has subjective analysis?
A. I would say that virtually every study does. I would say, to the greatest extent that we could, we validated the information with the rather horrible calibration point of 2013 in our direct review mirror.
Q. Were the costs of upstream reservoirs, such as those proposed for the Stoney Indian Reserve, have those been monetized?
A. They have for various components of the analysis with IBI. We recognize a number of staff with the river engineering team, including myself, do have experience in terms of the design, operation, and costing of reservoirs. These estimates were general in the orders of hundreds of millions, not dissimilar to the estimates coming from the Bow River reservoir options which again placed those types of investments in the order of hundreds of millions of dollars.
Q. And has that information been provided to the Stoney Nakoda Nations?
A. The IBI analyses are all public. All of this
information pertaining to the City of Calgary studies have been made public on public websites. I don't know that it has been directly provided to Stoney Nakoda in a direct fashion via email or some other direct transmittal.
Q. The next paragraph makes a reference to what the City of Calgary refers to as a triple bottom line analysis. Can you explain to me what you mean by "triple bottom line"?
A. Within the City of Calgary, decisions that are taken are aiming to address what we call "the triple bottom line," which is analysis that encompasses not just the economic or financial components of a project or proposal, but also the environmental and social.

So the triple -- the three prongs of the triple bottom line would be the social, environmental, and economic or financial components of a project or initiative.
Q. The concluding paragraph on this page states that the conclusions have been prepared with a specific SR1 application and within the specific regulatory context. Has that regulatory context changed since $2017 ?$
A. Since 2017, the government of Alberta has been working on a number of aspects of flood resilience, one of which is work around flood hazard area designation and
policy associated with that.
The City has worked with the government of Alberta, so that remains very much in flux. Obviously the flood events of 2013, flood events in other communities, Fort McMurray, Drumheller, et cetera, have motivated the province to reevaluate policies associated with land use regulation and flood hazard area designation, in part to inform municipalities so that more informed decisions and choices can be made around mitigation as well as land use regulation.
Q. If we could turn the page to the next page in this exhibit. And at the top of the page, the first complete paragraph, the second paragraph -- and it looks like your lawyer's got a hold of this document, Mr. Frigo. It states that any use of this report is subject to the above qualification -- qualifications and limitations. And then it goes on to say: (as read)
"The City of Calgary makes no commitment to maintaining, updating, or training on the mode1."

Can you elaborate what you or what -- what you're attempting to say about that statement?
A. What was recognized is that we're in a very dynamic time post-2013 where mitigation measures, policy
discretions, are all very much live, as is evidenced by our discussion today.

We were aiming, through that statement, to make sure that any user of this information would understand that it would be, in part, their responsibility to confirm with the City of Calgary how information might be -- might be used.
Q. Has the City of Calgary confirmed with any representatives of the Stoney Nakoda Nations in regards to this report?
A. I'm not aware of whether anyone has, sir.
Q. Does it intend to do so?
A. I'm not aware of any intention to do so or intention not to.
Q. And is there a reason why the City of Calgary is neutral in that regard?
A. Our understanding is that through the Bow reservoir operations -- or, pardon me, Bow reservoir options assessment work, again led by the province, that numerous stakeholders, including your clients, were involved. In that regard, we weren't aware that any specific communication might be warranted; however, I'm not aware of all of the communications that would occur between our organization -- the organization I work for and your clients.
Q. The City of Calgary has expressly stated that it is an advocate for an upstream storage reservoir or reservoirs on the Bow River. If you're an advocate, why would not the City of Calgary be communicating with the Stoney Nakoda people, rather than the province of Alberta?
A. Simply because we're not leading that investigation. The work on the Bow reservoir operation -- or Bow reservoir options assessment is being led by the province. It is extra municipal, and therefore, we would expect that the province would be the lead communicator in terms -- in terms of that initiative.
Q. And you say that, with full knowledge, that, clearly, the majority, the vast majority of benefits to such an upstream storage reservoir, the clear beneficiaries would be the City of Calgary, would they not?
A. I would say that a significant amount of the flood benefits would accrue to the City of Calgary, but, in that, the Bow reservoir options assessment is also aiming to meet other water management objectives, including water supply, water quality, various other water management objectives. Those would accrue to the community at large.

I'm not certain whether it'd be a fair characterization other than perhaps on flood mitigation
only due to the City of Calgary's very large exposure, again related to the density of both population, critical infrastructure and assets within the City of Calgary that could be impacted from a flood perspective.
Q. So it's your evidence there are a number of factors and a number of benefits, and presumably costs, to an upstream Bow River reservoir in addition to simple flood management; is that correct?
A. It is my understanding that the Bow reservoir options assessment being led by the province is aimed at what we refer to as total water management. So yes, very much, flood mitigation is an aspect, but it's certainly not the only aspect.

Water supply within the basin, $I$ believe, is also a significant consideration of the province and is very much an element of interest for the City of Calgary, as for all other water users.
Q. Is hydroelectric generation potential an additional factor?
A. I'm not aware of whether the province has identified that directly. I would think it would be very much a consideration.
Q. The payments to TransAlta Utilities from the province of Alberta that we were earlier discussing, are those
related to hydroelectric potential and losses?
A. I would expect that some element may be related to hydroelectric generation potential. Some element may be related to complexities in reservoir management and water licensing impacts as a result of the agreement.
Q. And is the City of Calgary's ENMAX Corporation involved in any of those discussions?
A. I'm not aware that they are, no, sir.
Q. Could you turn to $I$ believe it's PDF page 10 of this exhibit?

MR. MERCER:
Good morning, Chairman. May I just intervene for one second here? It's David Mercer on behalf of the City of Calgary.

I'm concerned that this 1 ine of questioning is going well beyond SR1. It's going into matters of electrical generation, the Crown duties to consult, which are things well beyond the City of Calgary's jurisdiction, well beyond the expertise that Mr. Frigo --

> We've given a lot of latitude. I just wanted to raise that for the Board's consideration.

THE CHAIR:
And Mr. Rae, I would agree that, you know, if there is a string or an attachment that this 1 ine of questioning brings back to the Elbow, even in terms of alternatives, I think the Board was
relatively clear in our prehearing report that we would discuss alternatives that was on the table, but primarily those alternatives were really on the Elbow. And it seems that a fair amount of your questioning is directed at the Bow. And I guess if there's some line that we can see that would attach back, I'd appreciate seeing that line, but right now, it's a little difficult to sort of connect the dots, so.

MR. RAE:
Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the point.

Part of the role of the Natural Resources Conservation Board is to examine the public purpose of the SR1 project and what is in the public interest. And I think the evidence earlier this week from Alberta Transportation to the effect that the SR1 project is part of a combined set of flood control options, together with the written evidence of the City of Calgary to date, which we would submit suggests that the SR1 project and the benefits it's going to provide are only part of the puzzle.

I think it's incumbent on this Board that it be aware in determining the public interest of the SR1 project, it's incumbent on the Board that it be aware of all the pieces in the puzzle. That's the only reason $I$ 'm developing this line of questioning in
regard to the other parts of the puzzle.
But I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, your point, and I can advise that $I$ will move on, and my remaining questions will not be pursuing the hydroelectric potential of the Bow River reservoir, I can assure you about that.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.
Q. MR. RAE: So, Mr. Frigo, the page in front of you, the very top of the page, makes -- the first sentence talks about risk reduction and mitigation later on.

Can you explain to me the distinction between risk reduction and mitigation?
A. In general terms, "mitigation" means offsetting a risk; "risk reduction" can involve other ways of changing exposure.

In general, when we talk about risk, it is the severity, the frequency that combined to create that risk, and then mitigation can opt -- or offset that.

The other component is simply reducing exposure. The City of Calgary is interested in all aspects of resilience. That has been very much a component of what we have been doing.
Q. And, further, can you elaborate on what is meant by non-structural mitigation?
A. Certainly. Things like land use regulation, things like education of our citizens. Many new Calgarians move to areas and don't have a good appreciation, have not lived in a jurisdiction where the kind of risk and the kind of speed of response exists.

So non-structural mitigation generally means things that aren't engineered and sitting in the ground; things that are, you know, related to policy, to communication, to various other processes that don't end up in engineered infrastructure being put in place.

Importantly, in the city of Calgary, this has included consideration of land use regulation. In 2014, the City of Calgary updated its land use bylaw to improve and strengthen the regulation around the 100-year standard we talked about earlier, and, importantly, it has included a significant amount of engagement which is at least, in part, represented by our annual flood awareness program by which we're trying to help Calgarians understand, businesses, citizens, organizations, understand the risk in their community and take measures proactively.

What was recognized, working with the expert management panel is that all levels of government and individual citizens, corporations, and organizations would all need to play a role working synergistically
to meet the high level of resilience the City of Calgary was aiming for.
Q. Under the heading of "Study Objectives", point Number 1 talks about the main objective of the City of Calgary and the study is to "Develop and apply a reliable, transparent and repeatable calculation process." Do you see that reference?
A. I do.
Q. Now, given our earlier discussion on the pages previous about the model not being something that third parties can rely upon and not be something that -- and not something that the City of Calgary is going to update, can you reconcile those statements for me? How can this model be repeatable if it's not going to be updated?
A. Oh, yes -- the statement on the first page was just advising that the conditions and the application of the mode1 in 2017 was representative of the best information at the time.

Of course, that information is very dynamic. The asset class itself is changing, so what is being protected is changing, its valuation is changing with economic circumstances, and certainly mitigation measures within the city of Calgary are being pursued.

So what we're trying to develop is a reliable and
robust process, but, of course, the data inputs going into that are continually changing. And, certainly, that's an aspect that comes into any consideration of costs and benefit.

But, certainly, not that the paragraph referenced earlier was aiming to suggest that the calculation process was not robust and repeatable. More so, that the inputs would be dynamic and that it would be at least, in part, the consumer of the information's responsibility to maintain or understand that that information was prepared in 2017 with the best information at the time, and that conditions were dynamic.
Q. Now, in paragraph number 2, under "Study Objectives," reference is made to the phrase "return period." Can you tell me what is meant by that phrase?
A. Certainly. We recognize that hydrologic events occur with different frequency and severity, though not unlike many other stochastic or probabilistic types of processes, floods can be, if we have a long enough record, fitted to probability distributions that allow us to make inferences about the frequency of flood events that may occur in the future. This allows us to understand, if you will, full population or range of flood events that could occur.

So a common parlance, a common way of recognizing the severity of floods is to speak in terms of the return period, and this is a very problematic terminology because what "return period" often implies is 1 in 100-year event occurs once in a hundred years. That's somewhat incorrect.

What the analysis and statistics actually mean is that the deviser, 1 over 100, or 1 percent, is the annual exceedance probability. So, in any given year, a 1 in 100-year event should be interpreted as having a 1 percent chance of occurrence in that year, similar for a 1 in 2, all the way to 1 in 200 , or 1,000 or -any return period.
Q. Thank you. That is in fact very helpful.

In that same paragraph, it's stated that:

```
(as read)
```

"The City of Calgary looked at various flood affected communities."

Now, I don't need to turn to it now, but has the City of Calgary segregated the costs and benefits for each affected community in the city of Calgary?
A. We have the ability to do that with the IBI damage model. So one of the inputs to the damage model was flood inundation mapping and modeling that the City of Calgary undertook jointly with the province of Alberta
after 2013, and that information was utilized to identify the extensive inundation for communities all throughout Calgary.
Q. But that is not -- that breakout is not part of the evidence before this Board?
A. That's correct. It is possible to utilize the IBI mode1 to segregate by virtually any geographic extent that we would choose, including by community boundaries.
Q. In bullet paragraph number 3 in that same section of Study Objectives, reference is made to "Individual or combined flood mitigation options." Is the SR1 proposal an individual or a combined option?
A. Combined very much. And so in the presentation that I recently went through, it was recognized that, for both Bow and Elbow River communities, the combination of flood resilience options would again include structural and non-structural measures both inside and outside of the city of Calgary, so local and regional.

For the Elbow River, two major elements of that structural backbone of resilience would be the G1enmore Reservoir improvements I spoke of in the presentation, working synergistically with the Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir, together to provide a high level of resilience for communities along the

Elbow River, and then again on the Bow downstream of the confluence.
Q. But the SR1 proposal was not looked at as being combined with any upstream Bow River reservoir; is that correct?
A. What we did was combine suites of mitigation measures for all communities, so including the Bow River, though we can segregate, as I mentioned earlier, we can segregate those benefits.

So for the Elbow River, and communities downstream of the Elbow River confluence on the Bow, SR1 working with G1enmore was a significant component of the total resilience, if you will, strategy or scenario, though it would combine with non-structural elements like land use regulation, insurance, education, et cetera, similar for other communities.

In other communities, what the City of Calgary has identified, for instance, in the downtown, structural barriers have been created and, really, that analysis that IBI undertook with us allowed us to identify that optimal mix from -- for each region or -- or community.
Q. So you were saying that the City of Calgary did not look at the SR1 proposal in isolation; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, in paragraph --
A. Though it's -- pardon me. I would just add that, though we did extensive work to be able to segregate out the benefits directly of SR1 so we could understand those.

So, very much, the scenarios that IBI analyzed encompassed all the suite of flood mitigation measures that were put in place or configured within that scenario, but then we could utilize, and did utilize, the IBI model to then extract the benefits.

You'11 recall my presentation, and in the City of Calgary's written submission, we refer frequently to the 27.7 milition averted average annual damage associated with SR1. That's based on our analysis of the impacts of only SR1 after layering out or pulling out the effects of things like the G1enmore Reservoir or other mitigation measures.

So, through the tool, we're able to evaluate full scenarios, but then extract the relative benefits for each of the components reasonably.
Q. In paragraph 4 of that same section, reference is made to a prioritization of structural and non-structural investments. Where does the SR1 proposal fit in amongst that priorization?
A. It's a very high priority. It offers very significant -- very significant benefits and is
critical to, again, many of the key elements within the city of Calgary that represent the greatest concentration of risk. Again, the downtown commercial areas, transportation work, bridges, C-Train, you name it. Much of the critical infrastructure and much of the very productive economic basis of our city is within that SR1 benefit area. Very definitely.
Q. What is the highest priority?
A. Our highest priority is always human life safety.
Q. But amongst the various flood mitigation scenarios, what's the highest priority in the eyes of the City of Calgary?
A. It would be -- it would be difficult to identify. And, again, this goes back to what we learned from our expert management panel is that it would take multiple measures, if you will, the airbag and the seat belt working together to provide that high level of resilience. And this is why scenarios or combinations of mitigation measures were combined.

It's perhaps more appropriate to identify which scenario or suite of -- of options worked the most synergistically together and provide that highest 1eve1.

Within that though, I can say that SR1 is a very significant priority, again, because of the exposure
and the potential for SR1 to limit damage and exposure within the communities of lower Elbow and the -- and the Bow River downstream of the confluence of the Elbow and the Bow.
Q. Is an upstream Bow River reservoir a higher priority than SR1?
A. Again, they were part of a common suite of preferred -of a preferred alternative scenario. Both have very, very significant benefits.
Q. But this document talks about the City of Calgary priorizing those options. I'm simply asking, what are the rest of the -- what's the rest of the list of the priorities?
A. Oh, in general, the prioritization was around classes of mitigation. So, if you will, local barriers and drainage improvements versus reservoirs versus structural mitigation versus insurance, for instance, as a non-structural mitigation measure.

So, yes, the individual components, there was some degree of classification of those, certainly recognized through the IBI analyses which have significant averted damage outcomes, but it is recognized that they do have to work together.

Fundamentally, the prioritization was also about identifying which of those tools in the toolbox were
appropriate to use.
For instance, many citizens approached the City suggesting that dredging rivers to increase the hydraulic capacity would be an appropriate response. This was a response that was de-prioritized, with the exception of some smaller local gravel bar modification types of work because of the extreme environmental costs, the significant ongoing operational costs, the environmental impacts, and the longevity of -- of a measure like that.

So, in general, the prioritization was around classes of mitigation response, though there was some prioritization, or at least an ability to understand the relative averted damage benefit through the IBI analysis.
Q. Is an upstream reservoir on the Bow River the City of Calgary's highest priority?
A. It is a very high priority.
Q. That's not what I asked. Is it the highest?
A. I'm not certain that it would -- it would fit within a suite of -- of alternatives that would form the City's preferred or optimal mix of mitigation measures.
Q. Paragraph 5 on that same section states that the City of Calgary's analysis can be used to: (as read)
"Provide guidance in priorizing
structural and non-structural flood mitigation measures."

Does it provide guidance to upstream communities, the model you have been using?
A. No, the model is truly aimed at addressing the impacts and averted damages or potential damages relative to flood in the City of Calgary.
Q. Now, on the -- my apologies. This document was split into left and right-sided columns, and my apologies for skipping back to the left side of the document. I believe that was done -- it's a promotional document.

The bottom paragraph on the left-hand side, sorry, the second-to-last paragraph on the left-hand side starting with the words "the G1enmore diversion tunne1" makes reference to economic efficiency. How did the City of Calgary calculate economic efficiency?
A. In general, we would estimate, as the project team for SR1 has done, the implementation costs, the operational costs, and the lifecycle replacement costs for any of the measures that were included in the analyses.

Economic efficiency was based on the ability of the investments in those various elements of cost to offset or revert damage or provide other benefits.
Q. Now, skipping back to the right-hand column under Section 1.3, the second bullet point starting with the
words "Phase 2." It talks about community consultation. Did the City of Calgary carry out any community consultation with any communities outside the boundaries of the City of Calgary?
A. With reference to flood resilience in -- in my knowledge, primarily within the city -- again, I'm not aware of all the communications that occurred through all the various business units throughout the city.
Q. If we could turn to the next page, then, which would be probably PDF page 11. Yes, thank you.

Now, the section numbered 1.4 study area refers to undeveloped land along the Elbow and Bow Rivers. What undeveloped land was included in that analysis, strictly undeveloped 1 and within the City of Calgary?
A. Within the City of Calgary, primarily the only components of the Bow River valley that are yet to be developed, and there are some smaller redevelopment areas, are toward the southeast corner. An area known as Ricardo Ranch is one example of an area that is yet to be developed.
Q. So it was simply undeveloped land within the bounds of the City of Calgary; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, in Section 2 on that same page which deals with updating the mode1, in that Section 2, it's stated that
the flood hazard area was expanded. Can you tell us why it was expanded?
A. Sorry, Mr. Rae, I'm just going to read the full paragraph. Apologies for the pause.

The model in question deals with hydraulic or incorporates hydraulic modelling and inundation mapping from post-2013.

So I think in this -- in this verbiage, what expanded to, is referring to, is the fact that the flood hazard areas relative to the new mapping, and again, recognize that 2013 was a significant event. Including it into the population of historic flood events did have impacts on the, if you will, the curve fitting for the estimation of the events of significance in terms of resilience and in terms of land use regulation.

So in terms of expanded, what we were simply trying to capture there, to the best of my understanding, was that post-2013, things had changed, river hydraulics had changed, so in addition, extents and the pattern of elevations and flows and velocities in the river would have changed, but also would have the estimates for what a, quote, "1 in 100-year," "1 in 200-year," or any recurrence interval event would have been.

This sentence is just trying to indicate that this analysis was completed with that information following the 2013 event.
Q. The section Number 3 on that same page entitled "Groundwater Flood Damage Modelling," I believe in it you state that the City of Calgary has attempted to include analysis -- an analysis of groundwater flood damage in its modelling.

Given the lack of precision and groundwater numbers that we earlier referred to, is not the City's attempt to include groundwater modelling a little bit of -- what the mathematicians would call a little bit of overprecision; in other words, the data in groundwater modelling is so imprecise that it should not be included with the more precise data you have for overground flooding. Is that a valid accusation about your inclusion of groundwater modelling?
A. I wouldn't say it is. In both the 2005 and 2013 events, anecdotal information was collected from citizens.

The issue with groundwater is that the geologic conditions within the basin can vary, and in some cases, fairly significantly, even over short distances.

So from the standpoint of estimating general groundwater exposure, I believe it was reasonable and
appropriate to incorporate this information, recognizing that we had empirical evidence from both 2005 and 2013, including studies done by other parties like the University of Calgary that suggested that groundwater was a significant mechanism.

To not include it would have likely led to greater error than including it. So we did include it and qualify it, and then in all of our work with IBI, we were careful to provide tables that would summarize and break out the groundwater component, recognizing that it would have a higher uncertainty than the damages and impacts associated with overland inundation.
Q. If you turn to page 14 , $I$ believe it is, the PDF page number, the section entitled "Triple Bottom Line Mode1 Enhancements." That's correct.

In that section, Number 4, at the very bottom, it states that the aforementioned aspects were monetized. Is there a separate dollar amount for each of those triple bottom line categories?
A. We could attempt to break it out. In genera1, what IBI was able to do was scale these factors based on other risk and exposure factors, things like population; things like the density of businesses; things like the assessed value of the infrastructure in place.

So, in general, these values were, if you will,
scaled to other factors related to the net exposure.
Q. So you haven't breaking (verbatim) out into those triple bottom line categories the numbers, but you state that you could if need be?
A. It would take significant effort to, but it would be theoretically possible, yes.
Q. Now, the section on the opposite side of the page entitled "Insurable Flood Damages." Now, in that section, you state that the insurance industry is unable to calibrate depth damage curves. Given that advice from the insurance industry, on what basis did the City of Calgary think it could do exactly that, which the insurance industry states that it could not do?
A. Primary on the basis of the expert work by the IBI group, as part of the work the damage curves associated with different real estate classes was investigated. This included an inventory. So this included, you know, staff from the consultant teams assessing and going into individual buildings and assessing the relative impact.

So very much on the basis of the professional work that the IBI group provided to the City of Calgary.
Q. Are you going to share the results of your work with the insurance industry?
A. We have met several times with the Insurance Bureau of Canada as a City of Calgary to address the trajectory of both overland and other types of insurance related to flood.

The City of Calgary aims to ensure that the insurance industry can grasp and understand the work that we have done and the characterizations of risk that we have provided.

So yes, we have also had numerous inquiries from various insurers on specific areas of the City. We always aim to respond with the best information that we can to ensure that the insurance industry is proceeding with its understanding of this important risk with the best information that we can provide.
Q. If SR1 is constructed, will those communities in Calgary downstream of the Glenmore Reservoir to the conjunction with the Bow River, will those communities no longer be considered high flood risk areas?
A. Those areas would likely remain within designated flood hazard areas. What the City of Calgary would likely pursue is a recognition that changes to the regulation of building, flood proofing, and land use would recognize the structural mitigation in place.

So those areas wouldn't be removed. They would be very unlikely to be removed from zones of risk, they
would remain identified as zones of risk, though it would be the City of Calgary's intent to ensure that that risk was communicated very clearly to all stakeholders, developers, builders, insurers, property owners, citizens.
Q. Is it fair to say, then, that you're going to be advising homeowners in Elbow Park that even if SR1 is constructed, that their property insurance premiums are not going to be reduced?
A. I am not certain that that is the case or not the case.

The status of overland insurance in Canada, particularly for low density residential, is very much at issue.

If Mr. Rae would appreciate, I could offer some background around the provincial flood hazard program and its inception in the 1980s. It was really intended to offer guidance around how provincial and federal disaster recovery of funding would be eligible or non-eligible within different communities based on land use regulations at the time.

So up until the present within Canada, there is not a very developed practice. I would say that the insurance industry around overland insurance, particularly for low density residential, perhaps a little bit different, again for commercial and
industrial types of applications is very much developing. And part of the intent of the City of Calgary, again, is to make sure that the best possible information about risk can be communicated to all stakeholders so that decisions can be made appropriately with that information.

THE CHAIR:
Mr. Rae --
MR. RAE:
Ray.
THE CHAIR:
Sorry to interrupt, Mr. Rae, just if I could. You're just over your hour that you had requested and the Board had approved. Where are you at in your questioning at this point? Are you fairly close?

MR. RAE:
Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, I'm not. The answers to the questions are -- with all due respect to Mr . Frigo, they're very informative, but sometimes they're going on longer than $I$ anticipated.

I would ask, Mr. Chairman, if I could have the Panel's indulgence that would enable me to ask my remaining questions.

THE CHAIR:
You would expect that would take us to when? It's 20 after 11 now.

MR. RAE:
I will be certain1y finished by noon.

THE CHAIR:
Okay, and let's proceed, but by
noon -- we'11 break at noon and we should -- I guess we'd expect that you do your best to get these questions completed. Thanks.

MR. RAE: I will certainly do that,
Mr. Chairman. I might add that the cross-examination of the City of Calgary will result in a less cross-examination of other witnesses, even on other sections.

THE CHAIR:
Okay.
MR. RAE:
We're covering quite a bit of ground with these questions.

THE CHAIR:
Okay, thank you.
Q. MR. RAE:

Now, Mr. Frigo, that last answer, is it fair to say that the insurance industry has not bought into the City of Calgary's protected benefits to the downstream from Glenmore dam communities, the insurance industry has not bought into your projected benefits from the SR1 project?
A. I wouldn't say that's true. I'm not -- I'm not certain what the insurance industry would -- would summarize.

I can indicate that information that the City of Calgary has developed around flood risk has been made public and has been communicated to any and all of the ask, including the Insurance Bureau of Canada and individual insurance and underwriters.
Q. But you're saying that there's no evidence to date that insurance premiums for those property owners downstream of Glenmore dam are going to realize any savings in their property insurance?
A. It's not clear, again, where, you know -- precisely where insurance exactly is going. Sorry for my long answers earlier, but there's lots of context around that, of course.
Q. Will properties values in those communities downstream of G1enmore dam increase as a result of the SR1 project in the eyes of the City of Calgary?
A. I'm not aware that we could make that -- that assessment directly. I would say property valuation is obviously going to be a function of many different factors, primarily economic factors.

I would say that a flood-protected city in general is going to have a higher resilience, and therefore, things like business continuity with lower disruption would be very much benefitted by having resilience in place.
Q. I would ask you to turn to PDF page 16 , which is a table entitled "Flood Study Area, Total Damages"; yes, that's the one. Can you tell me what this -- can you summarize what this table purports to show?
A. Yes, it's showing a summary of the total damages for
different return period of events ranging from the five-year, 20 percent annual exceedance probability, all the way up to the thousand-year based on the analysis completed by IBI back in 2017.
Q. Now, the first two damage categories are labelled "Residential" and "Commercial." Is it fair to say that those damages are private sector damages and not public sector damages?
A. No, they're a combination of both private and -- and public.
Q. Does this assessment purport to distinguish between public damages and private property damages?
A. Both were included. So it -- it evaluated both and included both.
Q. And what is the basis for including private property damages in this assessment?
A. The -- the triple bottom line policy that the City approaches aims to direct the City to evaluate risks at a societal level. So not to the corporation of the City of Calgary alone, so that is not to the infrastructure operations owned and managed by the City of Calgary directly, things like our wastewater treatment plants, our sewage treatment plants, our LRT, our road network, our bridges, et cetera, but also to recognize some of the -- or recognize the communal
impacts, that is, to society.
So the triple bottom line analysis and the financial analysis here, we're aiming to look at total damages, including both public and private elements.
Q. But that definition and utilization of triple bottom 1 ine damages, does that not bias all your assessments in favour of higher population areas? Obviously the higher the population, the higher the private sector benefits and assets involved, and invariably, that would result in a triple bottom line analysis which would always supercede the lower population areas. Is that not a fair criticism?
A. Not necessarily. There are a number of areas; you know, for instance, parks and open spaces have been recognized as the City of Calgary as critical to the well-being of its citizens and providing many direct and indirect economic benefits.

So it's entirely possible that we would have high-valued areas that would not represent high population densities that could, for one reason or another, and this is precisely why a triple bottom framework is utilized, is so that those aspects can be accounted for.
Q. I'm not quite sure I followed your answer to my question, though, is your triple bottom line tool, not
directly a function of the - - a number of people involved; it's just like assessments, economic assessments of gross national product or gross domestic product, the higher the population, the higher those numbers are. And they're inherently biased in favour of higher population figures. Is that not a correct assessment of your mode1?
A. Population would be one component. For instance, a piece of critical infrastructure like an electrical substation that might be impacted may not have a high population associated with it, but it could have a very significant impact on community resilience, everything from life safety to -- to the continuation of economic processes.

So no, not in all cases would population density be the sole or single indicator of degree of risk or severity.
Q. But the City's evidence indicated, I believe, there was 2,000 residents, sorry, 2,000 residential structures downstream of the G1enmore dam. Surely those 2,000 residents or $2,000-\mathrm{pl}$ us residents are going to trump the damage assessment for outlying areas with no people; that will invariably be the case, will it not?
A. Again, depending on what is contained. The degree of risk and exposure and degree of impact associated with
the assets and the land base within those two areas. In general, yes, areas of high population, of high concentration of infrastructure would be those that would represent the greatest potential for averted damages.

And so in this IBI analysis, as well as in other triple bottom line analyses that the City would do more generally, which is what $I$ thought you were referring to earlier, yes, that is a factor. But it certainly is recognized that things like cultural and historical assets that may have a value that -- that doesn't translate, in terms of population, would obviously be worth considering and entering into analyses like these.
Q. Let's turn to page 18 of this exhibit if we might, thank you. Now, in Section 8 on this page, "Identification and Qualitative Assessment of Flood Mitigation Options," reference there is made to studies conducted by the province and the City. Why has the government of Canada not been involved in these studies?
A. In general most because of the jurisdiction both lies at the municipal and provincial levels. It is dominantly through -- though there are aspects of federal regulation, it is my understanding that

Alberta Environment and its mandate relate to the management of our stream systems. And similarly within the City of Calgary, land use regulation, emergency operations, and certainly aspects of water supply that implicate and other aspects of water management, that implicate municipal jurisdiction are -- are there.
Q. Is it intended to bring the government of Canada into the debate going on?
A. No, sir, though it is recognized that some of the activities of the -- and jurisdiction of the federal government are salient.

For instance, $I$ have participated in a number of workshops and working groups with the -- with the federal government looking at, for instance, flood mapping standards, floods hazard area policy standards.

So very much there is a recognition that there are federal roles and responsibilities. Though primarily in the City of Calgary's case, we understand that significant responsibilities lie with both the municipality and the province.
Q. Is the City of Calgary aware that two of the hydroelectric dams in the Bow River are in fact federally licensed, not provincially licensed, and that related to that fact is the Constitution Act, 1930, which specifically refers to the Bow River?
A. I take your suggestion at face value that that is true.
Q. My question is is the City of Calgary aware of those facts?
A. I am not aware. I'm not certain whether others within the City of Calgary are or are not. I am not aware.
Q. Can we turn to the next page, please. Sorry, page 20 would be the next one I guess, yes, thank you.

Now, in this study, and in addition in the province of Alberta studies, reference is usually made to average annual savings, as opposed to total cumulative savings when it comes to flood damage assessments. Why is that measure used, annual savings, rather than the total cumulative savings?
A. For the total cumulative savings to be relevant, we'd have to choose a design life cycle.

What we find -- what we have found is that it's simply more straightforward, more practical to community in terms of average annualized values. This allows us to think in terms of what the impacts would be on a year-by-year basis.

It's entirely possible to extend those year-by-year values over a long time frame. When different mitigation measures have different design lives and different impacts across time, that becomes obviously more complex.

So primarily just for ease of communication, we have utilized in general the terminology around average annual damage.
Q. The bottom of that page, Section 9.4, discusses the City's triple bottom line criteria. Why has the City of Calgary not engaged Indigenous peoples in general, and more particularly, any Stoney Nakoda people?
A. In the context of this study, it is because the effects were largely occurring and being geographically limited to the city of Calgary. That certainly doesn't preclude, again, there are many other departments within the City of Calgary that aim to maintain a good working relationship with all of our municipal and regional neighbours, very importantly, First Nations.

So in this case of this study, the intent was to identify primarily impacts that were within the City of Calgary by way of the flood damage model.

There's no intent not to communicate, simply is that our understanding was that most of this study pertained to the City of Calgary.

It's certainly a public study, though, and we welcome anyone to -- to look at it.
Q. If we could turn to I believe it's PDF page 26 or thereabout and tables that discuss the triple bottom
line scenario ranking, and Mr. Chairman, I will endeavour to go this quickly.

Mr. Frigo, is it fair to say that the table in front of you, its Options 2 and 7 are the ones that involve the SR1 project and upstream Bow reservoir; is that correct?
A. Yes, that is correct.
Q. And do those two scenarios rank highest in this table?
A. Yes, they do.
Q. Perhaps we could turn, then, to Exhibit 233.

Actually, in the interest of time, Mr. Chairman, and since we've already touched on a number of the topics that are covered in Exhibit 233, maybe instead I could ask us to turn to Exhibit 235, which in turn is Exhibit $T$ to the City of Calgary's submission.

Yes, are you familiar with this Exhibit $T$ to the City's submission, Mr. Frigo?
A. Yes, sir, yes, I am.
Q. And if I might suggest to you that in Exhibit $T$, reference is made to data from the Seebe dam on the Stoney Indian Reserve being missing from 1962 to 1979 ; I believe it's on page 23. My question simply is are you aware of why that data is missing?
A. I am not.
Q. Would you undertake to ascertain why that data is
missing or at least to make efforts to find out why that data is missing?
A. We could do that. My understanding is that in general, a hydrometric measurement is completed by the Water Survey of Canada and in some cases by

Alberta Environment and Parks. We would need to address with those agencies what the possible reasons may be.

The most common reason why hydrometric stations are -- had intermittent record is typically that the station has been not maintained or damaged. Often this is a direct result of funding decisions and priority decisions made by those organizations.

We could undertake to do that; that will take some time.
Q. Thank you. Could I ask you to turn to Exhibit 345.

THE CHAIR: Mr. Rae, Mr. Rae, just so we can be clear there, Mr. Kennedy, Ms. Vance, do you have what you need just to track this undertaking, an exhibit number perhaps and a page number and a specific request, so just we can follow up?
MR. MERCER: Mr. Chair, if I may. David Mercer here again for the City of Calgary.

I'm really concerned about the City of Calgary endeavoring to undertake undertakings that relate to
things that are entirely within third parties such as that TransAlta agreement which was mentioned earlier, and this issue here.

This is information that the City of Calgary does not currently have or, to the best of my understanding we do not have, and it relates to agreements and things that are entirely within the hands of third parties which we probably cannot undertake undertakings for. THE CHAIR: Sorry, I was just going to say if the answer is no, that may well be what -- the answer may come back "we can't get it," but if we're going to have an undertaking, then I guess we need an agreement that'11 be undertaken and then some timelines.

Mr. Kennedy?
MR. KENNEDY: Well, I think there might be a question in advance as to how is this going to help the Panel understand and assess the public interests of SR1.

Mr. Rae, during much of the first hour that he was cross-examining the City of Calgary, was exploring flood mitigation on the Bow River upstream of the City of Calgary. But to the degree that that's relevant to SR1, it may not be obvious to the Pane1 and may not be obvious to others. And in order to be helpful for the Pane1 to assess the pub1ic interest of SR1, perhaps

Mr. Rae could focus on providing some explanation on the foundation for his questions.

The NRCB Act is pretty clear in terms of what it directs the Panel to consider, and that is the social, economic, and environmental effects associated with the renewable project. And in this case, the renewable project is SR1.

MR. RAE:
THE CHAIR:
MR. RAE: Transportation and the City of Calgary, we would submit in large part, is attributing the benefits of the SR1 project not to the benefits from that project but to the benefits from combined projects on both the Bow and the Elbow River.

We would submit that the evidence taken by itself in regard to SR1 shows minimal benefit from the SR1 project by itself. Those benefits from SR1 only arise if the other portions of the flood control on the Bow watershed are taken into account. And much of the evidence submitted by Alberta Transportation and the City of Calgary is exactly to that effect. They have put this evidence in front of this Panel in an attempt to argue that the SR1 project is in the public interest when, in fact, we submit they're arguing is that the

SR1 project as part of a combined set of flood control structures is in the public interest. That's the basis for these questions.

THE CHAIR:
So I'11 agree that the questions that I've heard you ask and others I believe in terms of splitting the benefits between SR1 -- or the annual average damage avoidance between SR1 and what might be left without SR1 or because resulting from the Bow, they've been asked, and I think you've asked those questions, and largely have been answered. If there are yet to be unanswered questions as to whether or not they've double counted, I think is your question, Mr. Rae, essentially benefits that would accrue only if there was additional protection on the Bow, then I think we ought to ask -- I mean, it would be up to you to ask those questions to clarify. But some of the other directions we're going, I don't think directly sort of zero in on that issue of how do they estimate the actual benefits or damage avoidance to SR1 alone. So, you know, if there's other questions on that line, $I$ think those are completely, you know, understandable, and it would be a benefit to the Panel. But in terms of whether or not other projects ought to have been built on other tributaries, other river systems, is not in front of the Board now.

MR. RAE:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I certainly understand your position, and that does help. I would point out that the recent questioning we just went through this morning indicating that insurance costs for those people living downstream of the G1enmore dam are not going to be affected by the SR1 is good evidence of exactly what you're suggesting, that the SR1 project by itself is of little benefit in the public interest. It's certainly of benefit to some people, but by itself, it's of little benefit.

Mr. Chairman, if it might help, I only have one exhibit to ask further questions on, and I will be fairly quick about it. And I would --

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, sir.
MR. RAE:
I would segue by saying that that exhibit, like many of the other exhibits I've been questioning on the City of Calgary on, is part of public information documents that have been prepared by the City of Calgary to promote the City of Calgary interest, which, of course, they're entitled to do, but that's the source of the confusion in that the City of Calgary is promoting the SR1 project when, in reality, it's promoting something much bigger.

In any event, I will be brief and I only have the one more exhibit to examine on. If I could have the

Panel's indulgence in that regard.
THE CHAIR: Yeah, please proceed.
Q. MR. RAE: So Mr. Frigo, if you could turn to Exhibit 345. And, as I've just undertaken with the Chairman, I'11 be quick about these questions.

First of all, what is Exhibit 345 which is entitled "One Calgary, One Water?"
A. This is a -- a general document published in January of 2020 that represents the City in the water utilities' stance and framework around water security from a water supply perspective for a municipal potable water supply for Calgary and region.
Q. And is it fair to say that the Stoney Nakoda people, notwithstanding they have three existing water storage dams on their reserve lands, is it fair to say the Stoney Nakoda people have not been involved whatsoever in the study in this framework or anything at all that the City of Calgary has been promoting?
A. I'm not aware of whether engagement that was completed in addition to the study or to support the study directly included Stoney Nakoda or not.

I do know that with the preparation of documents and policy of this type, it is generally the City of Calgary's approach to involve other stakeholders. I'm not aware of specific communications or engagement on
this.
Certainly again, it is a public document that we would invite -- the City of Calgary would invite any and all to -- to review and comment on.
Q. Mr. Frigo, if $I$ was to suggest that a summary of Exhibit 345 would simply have the statement that the City of Calgary feels that upstream riparian communities on the Bow River and the Elbow River should be sacrificed for Calgary's future water demands, would you consider that summary unfair to the City of Calgary's position?
A. I would consider it, yes, quite unfair.

The City undertakes again and the work and the division that $I$ work for very solidly embraces what is referred to as "total watershed management." We recognize that we're part of a basin that has to work together. We recognize we work under a-- under the Water Act and under the water licensing requirements and stipulations of the Water Act. We're aiming for an optimized benefit to all users, irrigation, hydropower, other municipalities and ourselves.

Sustainability across the basin is the intent, if that's not apparent from the read of this document, is very much the intent.

The City does recognize it has a very important
role, recognizing that a lot of the population, both within the city and by regional municipal customers that the City of Calgary serves, are part of our responsibility to ensure that sound water resources approach is taken forward.
Q. Mr. Frigo, would you agree with the statement that the SR1 project does not deal with total watershed management; it deals with partial management?
A. I would not agree with that, Mr. Rae. I would indicate, as Mr. Wood had indicated yesterday, that every watershed management investment, including investments like SR1, alter a great number of factors, one of which in the case of SR1 as Mr. Wood pointed out yesterday is that currently, the operation of the G1enmore Reservoir has to be seasonally adjusted to ensure optimal flood resilience.

Though the reservoir is relatively small, this puts considerable additional strain on the water supply system. With additional mitigation, whether that's SR1 or other elements, that can be alleviated, but would not agree that that's a reasonable characterization.

MR. RAE:
Those are all my questions,
Mr. Chairman. I thank you for my indulgence and for allowing me to go over my projected time.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, thank you, Mr. Rae.

We are close to the lunch hour anyway.
Mr. Secord, you did not indicate you had cross-examination intentions for City of Calgary. I think I have that right; is that correct?

MR. SECORD: Sorry, sir, I was having trouble with my cursor again.
THE CHAIR:
To get onto the...
MR. SECORD:
Yeah, so as I mentioned, as I mentioned, the -- I'm going to save my questions for Calgary for Topic -- for Topic Block 3.
THE CHAIR:
I see.
MR. SECORD:
Thank you.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. And -- and Mr. Williams, I believe you've indicated no questions. Are you on 1 ine still? I just forwarded to Ms. Friend that he has no questions.

So we would just have Panel and staff questions. Is the Panel and staff, are you ready to ask now? If so, we can probably complete by -- if we can complete by noon, we can break then. Mr. Kennedy?
MR. KENNEDY:
I only have a couple of very quick questions of the City of Calgary and am prepared to go now.

THE CHAIR:
Okay, let's continue, thank you, Mr. Kennedy .
Q. Mr. Frigo, can $I$ take you to page 11 of your initial presentation contained the chart, perhaps somebody could bring that up.

THE CHAIR:
Which exhibit, Bill?
I'm not sure the exhibit number, but it was the initial PowerPoint presentation that -from the City of Calgary.

THE CHAIR:
Ms. Cundliffe? Perfect.
Q. MR. KENNEDY:

And if we go to page 11 , this is where I want to be.

Mr. Frigo, during earlier questions of Alberta Transportation, there were a lot of questions posed about that reach of the Elbow River between SR1 and Glenmore. And what this table clearly indicates is the hundred-year flood is 841 cubic metres. Is that a correct read of the table?
A. Yes, sir. What this table encompasses is new hydrologic estimates associated with Alberta Environment and Parks' recent release of draft new inundation mapping for the city of Calgary and area.

So hydrology study that was done to support new mapping is the source of these estimates.

So these estimates vary a little bit from the
estimates made through other hydrologic analyses, but we took them into this analysis because they were the most recent estimates that we were aware of for Elbow River.
Q. And you indicated that City of Calgary has done inundation mapping for all of the communities?
A. That's correct. In fact, the inundation mapping that we have done has been done in conjunction with Alberta Environment and Parks. So again, after 2013, a dataset was produced, and again in 2019, the province has further updated that mapping.

Now, most recent 2020 mapping was the basic data source for the mapping that was included both in our Exhibit 229 and in the presentation today.
Q. And for the 1 in 100-year flood for those communities again upstream of the Glenmore Reservoir, are their developed properties flooded in the 1 in 100-year flood?
A. In general, no. The communities upstream of the G1enmore Reservoir developed after the 1980s when the City of Calgary's land use bylaw was in place in conjunction with provincial mapping that recognized a 1 in 100 -year flow of 883 cubic metres per second.

So communities like Discovery Ridge have been designed to that 883 cubic metre per second value.

Relative to this table, the centre column that reads "Flow Peak Into Glenmore" would be the same flow. We wouldn't expect to bypass or pass in front of communities like Discovery Ridge.

So for even events as rare as 1 in 350 , we would not expect that there would be impacts and appreciable inundation associated with those communities.
Q. You prefaced your entire answer to that question with "in general," you wouldn't expect it, and I'm just wondering what does the "in general" mean?
A. The "in general" means that despite the City of Calgary's best intents to regulate and maintain land use according to -- according to our land use bylaw, on occasion, unpermitted changes to 1 and happen, that is, someone might build a walkout basement where one had never been contemplated, literally remove the soil, seek new permitting from the City of Calgary, and that might occur.

So when I say "in general," I mean most of or almost all of, but $I$ cannot say "all of" because certainly there are cases where things happen where the City of Calgary's bylaw enforcement and other activities have to catch up as they're occurring in real time, sir.
Q. And yesterday the SCLG asked Alberta Transportation
about potential berming of development areas between SR1 and G1enmore Reservoir. Does the City of Calgary have any plans to berm properties in that reach within the city of Calgary?
A. No, it does not.

MR. KENNEDY: Thank you, Mr. Frigo, those are my questions. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Kennedy. Just before we go to Ms. Vance, Mr. Wagner, I don't believe you had requested time, but I just wanted to check. Would you have a question? If you're online, did you have a question for the City of Calgary?

MR. WAGNER:
Mr. Chair, person is -- sorry, you broke up there, I didn't hear my last name, but I assume it was my last name.

THE CHAIR:
Mr. Wagner, yes.
MR. WAGNER:
Yeah, no, I don't have any questions. I am quite fascinating by the questioning of the other participants, enjoying it immensely.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Wagner. Ms. Vance?
MS. VANCE:
I don't have any questions, Mr. Chair.

MR. KRUHLAK:
Mr. Chairman, it's Ron Kruhlak. I'm wondering if I could just quickly interject on a housekeeping matter. This PowerPoint presentation that
was just referred to, I don't know that it's been marked as an exhibit, and as we've referred to it now, it may be valuable.

THE CHAIR: Yes, we should mark that as an exhibit, and we've got it obviously because our document management folks are running -- that was not entered as your original submission; is that right, Ms. Senek?

MS. SENEK:
It was not entered, no. It was sent as assistance to Mr. Frigo's presentation today. So yes, that should be entered as an exhibit, thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Ms. Friend, what number are we at?
MS. FRIEND:
That will be Number 351.
EXHIBIT 351 - CITY OF CALGARY
POWERPOINT PRESENTATION
A. Mr. Chair, if I may, I would indicate that the subscripted, pardon me, superscripted annotations throughout the presentation are intending to direct to numbered exhibits.

So in the case of the table that we were just discussing with Mr. Kennedy, the 229 that appears above and to the right of the table is intended to indicate that that is the source of this information. Not every line is referenced, but important elements of the
information are referenced with the exhibit number, not with the page number but with the exhibit number.

THE CHAIR:
Okay, thank you. Okay, so we have that PowerPoint presentation submitted by City of Calgary as Exhibit 351.

Ms. Roberts, do you have any questions?
MS. ROBERTS: I have no questions, thank you.
THE CHAIR: Mr. Heaney?

MR. HEANEY:
Yes, just one quick question for Mr. Frigo.

MR. HEANEY QUESTIONS THE WITNESS:
Q. The City of Calgary, most cities are -- have plans to densify their cores. Does the City of Calgary have plans to densify the core within what would be considered the flood hazard zone now, and was that -was that densification taken into account in your cost-benefits analysis going forward?
A. In general, the City of Calgary has undertaken many planning exercises that really aim to reduce the amount of sprawl, the amount of additional watershed that the footprint of the city of Calgary would take up. Within that redevelopment and densification of many areas, including inner city areas, is proposed.

So within the City of Calgary, yes, there is an intent to have a densification of areas, including
areas with flood risk; however, all of that densification would need to meet the very minimum standard of the 1 in 100-year associated with the 1and use bylaw controls that are again tied to provincial flood hazard area mapping, as well as our overall flood resilient strategy.

So for new communities and where it's practical and feasible, we're aiming to include 1 in 200-year level of resilience for new development. Of course, there's a wide range of infrastructure and redevelopment applications down to a single lot, and in some cases, encompassing larger brownfield or other types of redevelopment.

So of course there's a range of effects that would be -- that would arise out of that, that is, that both of those general requirements, the 1 in 100 land use bylaw minimum and the 1 in 200-year standard are aimed to be met by all new development, though it's going to vary from site to site in terms of what the right mitigation is going to look like for that site.

In some places, raising land may not be the only solution; in some places that may be a component of what would occur.

Developments like the Quarry Park development represents significant brownfield redevelopments where
exactly that type of approach and 1 and was raised in hundred-year leve1, plus a metre of freeboard, before any development could occur.

So in -- I hope that does answer; I apologize, that was long.
Q. So did you have a projected increase in population in those hazard areas in the Calgary area going forward?
A. Our geodemographics department have projections of that nature. For all of the IBI work, the current -- and this is again why some of the cautions that we delved into with Mr. Rae around utilizing information imbedded in analyses, like the IB analyses of 2017 are important, we use the information available at the time. That is, none of the damage projections assume or allow for that densification.

We've evaluated on the basis of the asset class that is present at the time of the analysis, 2017.

MR. HEANEY:
Okay, thank you. That's it for me, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Heaney.
Mr. Ceroici?
MR. CEROICI:
I don't have any questions, thank you.

THE CHAIR QUESTIONS THE WITNESS:
Q. Mr. Frigo, I just have a couple. I wasn't able to
track the exact page in the note, but I think you'11 just likely just know this. But you at one slide had a I think cost of project at $\$ 432$ miliion, and over a hundred-year period I believe it was, it looked as though the benefits, then, would be I think you used the term five times higher than that construction cost.

So over that hundred-year period of potential losses that are averted, were those discounted back to today's dollars? Because the construction costs are today's dollars, so is that how that calculation was made, and if not, how was it -- how was it calculated?
A. In the IBI analyses and most of the damage, or pardon me, benefit-cost analyses that have been completed throughout not only the SR1 project but other projects, that is the usual approach is to discount back and account for a differential, if you will, between the time value of money and the time value of the asset that's being protected.

For a number of reasons that were outlined in the slide that we presented, as well as in Exhibit 229, our written submission, we're suggesting that it's very reasonable to look at undiscounted values. The reasons for this were listed on the slide, but they do include the fact that operation costs as we've learned as the owner/operator of major infrastructure, that is always
improved over time.
And so the accounting for those costs and some of the other factors, the long design life and the fact that the asset class, even with no redevelopment, so even without redevelopment, it's very difficult to project what the urban fabric, including all the cultural, historical, and economic assets embedded within it, would be worth at a hundred-year timeframe.

From that perspective, the -- the validity or I guess the relevance of discounting over these long time frames becomes much more questionable. That is why the City of Calgary considers it reasonable to take the $\$ 27.7$ million AAD, extend that straight over the 100-year period, and compare that with the capital costs.

Again, other factors like climate change and the increase in potential averted damages not only to climate change but because of the valuation changing of the asset class as being protected would be reasons to consider that that would be a way of approaching the cost benefit.
Q. So the 27 million average annual damages, I presume, and maybe I have this wrong then, I had presumed that that was a discounted sort of area under a loss group over time because you don't have damages every year, so
representing what the average annual would be if you look at a stream of potential losses floods in certain years in the future, discount that back, and then average it. Is that how the 27 miliion was derived or was it derived some other way without discounting, as well?
A. That's very close, Mr. Chairman, but it does account for only the present value. So you're absolutely correct. It is the area under the curve of the present value of the losses multiplied by the present probabilities.

So the 1 in 20-year flood damages multiplied by that probability, plus for the 1 in 50 , for the 1 in a hundred, 1 in a thousand, that creates that 27 milion. But recognize that that 27 miliion represents the average annual damages in today's value and with today's asset class. Precisely why the City of Calgary is suggesting that it's reasonable to extend over that long time frame.

And again, that that hundred-year timeframe really relates to the fact that most of the appurtances (verbatim) and components of the SR1 project would have very extended design life. The core of the damage, the diversions structure, these are earthworks that would likely remain in place for that long period.
Q. Okay. My new question related to the slide that you had the pie chart, it was a pie chart I believe where you had figures based on fairly recent infrastructure upgrades to protect certain flood damages that were implemented by the City of Calgary which brought down the average annual damages. So -- and then it was compared to the $\$ 27$ miliion which is the average annual for the Elbow. The Bow damages were there, as well, and that would be something for some future analysis and response by the City and perhaps province not part of this today.

But sort of Mr. Rae's point I guess, in terms of separating those two, my question is not such much around the separation, if you were separated on that slide, but what was the return period for those Bow River damages? Was that what the flood levels of 2013 or the potential former range of floods that could occur on the Bow and then the damages associated with those?
A. Total range, sir. So everything from the 1 in 2 all the way up to the 1 in a thousand.
Q. Okay, thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Okay, thank you, that's all my questions.

Now, does Ms. Senek, do you have any redirect?

MS. SENEK: I do have a few, Mr. Chair. And I also have one housekeeping item, as well, that I neglected to mention at the outset of our evidence.

## MS. SENEK RE-EXAMINES THE WITNESS:

Q. I sent an email to the Board and to counsel for all the parties yesterday that there were a couple of errors in the City's written submissions in Exhibit 229. Ms. Friend reminded me that this had not been mentioned throughout the hearing.

The errors were to the final paragraph on page 7 going into page 8 of Exhibit 229. There it states that 400 million in insurable losses to City-owned infrastructure would not have been incurred had SR1 been constructed and functioning during the 2013 flood. Sorry, I realize somebody is not on there.

The City referenced the wrong number here. Only a portion of the 400 million were attributable to the Elbow River. The estimated total potential damages are $\$ 600$ million for another flood equal to what was experienced along the Elbow in Calgary in 2013.

And perhaps I should have Mr. Frigo confirm that this is correct for the purposes of evidence. Can you confirm that? You're muted, Mr. Frigo.
A. Apologies, yes, confirmed.
Q. Thank you. And another point is just a minor editorial
point for ease of reference. In the footnotes of the City's submissions, where Appendix A was referenced, it should actually reference Appendix B throughout. That's the City's technical memo, and I just wanted to ensure that everybody was aware of that.

I do have a couple of questions on redirect, sorry, just let me get my place here. The first has to do with the letter that Mr. Rae submitted into evidence this morning; I think it was Exhibit 350. Where are we? And I believe he'd asked a question about the statement on page 5 of 8 of that PDF document where it says: (as read)
"The City will be able to focus more of
its resources for emergency response on
the Bow River where around 85 percent of the City's flood risk will remain after SR1 is built."

Mr. Frigo, is that 85 percent of flood risk total to the City that we're talking about here or that is referenced there?
A. Yes, it is. So we recognize that even with SR1 in place, some residual risk will occur and that some modest damages, the closure of pathways, minor erosion, will occur with SR1 in place.

So yes, the total to the City of that total, that
is what we're referring to, Ms. Senek.
Q. And is that risk directly related to the Bow River?
A. Primarily related to the Bow River. As I mentioned, no flood mitigation measures remove all risk; there is always a residual. So it's primarily to the Bow River.

There'd be a very small component associated with residual risk on the Elbow. Again for events that are occurring larger than 200-, 300-year return period, so extremely rare events which again, over time, don't -don't accumulate to a significant portion of the totals damage but are still a component that was included.
Q. Thank you.

Next question, in City reports, reports that are authored by the City, typically when community engagement is referenced, is that referring to communities within the city of Calgary's boundaries?
A. Primarily, yes. In the context of this work and these reports, it was important for the City of Calgary to understand how its citizens were first of all impacted by flood but also what the city of Calgary's citizens' values around different mitigations could represent. And we wanted to incorporate that into all the analysis.

So yes, primarily.
Q. Thank you. Sorry, just finding the rest of my
questions here. Is -- just a quick question here, are you an expert in the field of insurance?
A. No, no, I'm not. I definitely have, through my work on flood mitigation and various other risks, been exposed to the insurance industry, but I'm not a technical engineer registered by APEGA.
Q. Thank you. And my last question is is SR1 still beneficial for flood mitigation within the City of Calgary without an upstream reservoir on the Bow River?
A. Absolutely. I hope that was very clear from the presentation that was made.

The pie chart, the inundation mapping, the tables that were presented in the presentation aim to make that very clear. The impact of SR1 is very significant without the upstream elements on the Bow.
Q. Thank you.
A. They are a part.
Q. Sorry, did you have -- thank you.
A. Sorry, I was just going to again add that the City has a cohesive plan for the entire city, so we've certainly not forgotten about the other communities that would not directly hydraulically benefit from SR1.

MS. SENEK:
Thank you very much. Those are all of my questions.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Ms. Senek. Thank you,

Mr. Frigo.
So we'11 break for lunch; I just have one housekeeping. So after lunch will be the Calgary River Communities Action Group. So Mr. Cusano, are you ready to go at 1:15?
MR. CUSANO: Yes, sir, we are. And if it's helpful, sir, in managing time, we had requested 50 minutes for direct evidence. I can tell you and Board members and the parties that that actually is more like 35 minutes, and we'11 be ready to go after the break.

THE CHAIR:
Okay, thank you. And do I have it right, you have -- is it a video that you're showing or is that another group?

MR. CUSANO:
No, that's true, sir, yes. We have an opening statement and then a video which we'11 play towards the very end of the opening statement.

THE CHAIR:
Perhaps could I ask that -- and is it Ms. Cundliffe, are you on now; is it Ms. Taylor later on for our document managing?

MS. CUNDLIFFE:
Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'm on right now, but Ms. Taylor will be this afternoon's document manager.

THE CHAIR:
So perhaps we can make sure that that is running before the $1: 15$ start time. So if
there's any difficulties, I mean the video and the sound might be a little trickier, but just to make sure we have that working before we start at 1:15.


THE CHAIR:
MR. KENNEDY: tests, we got it working perfectly.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Kennedy.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you, and reconvene at 1:15.
(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 12:09 P.M.)

PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED TO 1:15 P.M.
$\qquad$

Yes, sir.
Thank you.
I can ensure the Panel in all our
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(PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED AT 1:15 P.M.)
THE CHAIR: Okay. It's just after 1:15, so I think we can get started.

Mr. Cusano, welcome, and the floor is yours.
MR. CUSANO: Thank you, sir. I believe we're ready to go.

I'm pleased, sir, and Board members, to introduce the panel for the Calgary River Communities Action Group, or as we may refer to this group on occasion, the Action Group and Flood Free Calgary, or FFC.

Seated, virtually at least, are
Brenda Leeds Binder and Tony Morris from the Action Group, and Paul Battistella from FFC.

Sir, I can confirm that our witnesses are all in separate locations, and Mr. Bruni and I are, and will continue to be, in locations separate and apart from the witnesses.

May we have the witnesses sworn, please.
B. LEEDS BINDER, T. MORRIS, P. BATTISTELLA (For CRCAG and FFC), sworn/affirmed
B. LEEDS BINDER, T. MORRIS, P. BATTISTELLA Examined by Mr. Cusano

1 MR. CUSANO EXAMINES THE PANEL:

MR. CUSANO: Thank you, Madam Reporter.
Q. Ms. Leeds Binder, may I begin with you, please? Would you please state your full name and your position with the Action Group?
A. MS. LEEDS BINDER: My name is Brenda Leeds Binder, and I am the co-president of the Action Group.
Q. And how did the Action Group come to be and what is its mandate?
A. MS. LEEDS BINDER: The Action Group was formed in the immediate aftermath of the 2013 flood following emails between friends that grew to community-wide discussions and ultimately a meeting organized by community leaders that attracted hundreds of concerned citizens.

The Action Group's purpose includes: To serve as an advocate for large-scale flood mitigation and to participate in legal and regulatory proceedings, to advocate for such projects.

Once the government of Alberta identified SR1 as the preferred project, the Action Group has worked tirelessly to engage with all levels of government and participate in both provincial and federal regulatory processes in support of the project.

We represent approximately 1,000 members and additional supporters, many of whom were affected by
B. LEEDS BINDER, T. MORRIS, P. BATTISTELLA Examined by Mr. Cusano
the 2013 flood.
Q. Now, Ms. Leeds Binder, you are coming up on eight years volunteering for this organization. Why is this cause so important to you?
A. MS. LEEDS BINDER: I live in East Elbow Park with my husband and three children. In June of 2013, our first spring living in a home we had purchased only six months prior, our lives were turned upsidedown by the flood. Our home was severely impacted, but the physical cleanup was only the beginning.

The financial, emotional, and mental toll was far more devastating and endures to some degree to this day.

When the Action Group was launched in the summer of 2013, I knew I wanted to be involved. I felt that the residents of the city needed to mobilize. I believe it's unconscionable for a city of this size and significance to the economy of our province to continue year after year to be unprotected against a foreseable and inevitable flood disaster. For that reason, I have devoted literally thousands of volunteer hours to this cause.
Q. Ms. Leeds Binder, do you have before you copies of the Action Group's and FFC's evidence that was filed on February 26, 2021 in this proceeding?
B. LEEDS BINDER, T. MORRIS, P. BATTISTELLA Examined by Mr. Cusano
A. MS. LEEDS BINDER: Yes.

THE CHAIR: Mr. Cusano, sorry to interrupt. Ms. Leeds Binder is quite easy to understand. Your voice is a bit muffled.

Ms. Vespa, can you hear him, or is it difficult? It looks like it's a little difficult for the court reporter as well. I'm not sure why. Maybe give it another try.

MR. CUSANO: Very well. I'll speak louder.
THE CHAIR:
Perfect. Yeah, that's very good.
Thank you.
MR. CUSANO: Thank you.
Q. Ms. Leeds Binder, I will ask you again, do you have before you copies of the Action Group's and FFC's evidence that was filed on February 26, 2021 in this proceeding?
A. MS. LEEDS BINDER: Yes.
Q. How is this evidence organized?
A. MS. LEEDS BINDER: We have filed a written submission, which is Exhibit 237 with four appendices filed as Exhibits 238 to 241. Appendix A, Exhibit 238, contains two documents. Document A1 is a series of calls to action by the Action Group and Flood Free Calgary to their members and other residents of affected communities to share their stories of the 2013
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flood.
Document A2 is a copy of the survey that the Action Group and Flood Free Calgary provided online where respondents were asked to provide their names, how much they were impacted by the 2013 flood, how they stand to be protected by SR1, and whether they support approval of SR1.

Appendix B, Exhibit 239, contains 218 letters and email submissions from the Action Group and FFC members and other community members who responded to our calls to action and support approval of SR1.

Exhibit C, Appendix C, Exhibit 240, contains the 393 survey responses from our online survey.

Lastly, Appendix D, Exhibit 241, contains materials referenced in our written submission.
Q. Were Exhibits 237 to 241 prepared either by you or under your direct supervision and control?
A. MS. LEEDS BINDER: Yes.
Q. Do you adopt these exhibits as the Action Group's evidence in this proceeding?
A. MS. LEEDS BINDER: Yes.
Q. Mr. Morris, if I could turn to you, please.

Sir, would you please state your full name and your position with the Action Group.
A. MR. MORRIS: My name is Tony Morris and I am
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co-president of the Action Group.
Q. Like Ms. Leeds Binder, you have devoted countless hours to the cause of protecting the City of Calgary from flooding. Tell us why you have taken this on.
A. MR. MORRIS: My wife and I and our three sons moved into the Roxboro community in 2004, and felt we were exceptionally lucky to be able to live in such a great inner city community, and we still do.

We were there for the 2005 flood, and we helped some neighbours clean out their basements.

We understood at the time that flooding was a very rare occurrence. We 1earned otherwise in 2013 and how utterly unprepared the city was for a flood of that magnitude.

Despite the loss of half of our house and most of our possessions and memories we had in basement storage, we considered ourselves lucky given what so many of our neighbours had to endure.

After two weeks of initial recovery at our home, our inner city communities gradually came together to help each other deal with myriad of recovery issues and to eventually urge our elected officials to keep this from ever happening again.

I am one of the founders of the Action Group and we've been at this work for almost eight years.
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A key reason I'm stuck with it is I've come to realize how vulnerable this city is to a preventible natural disaster, how devastating a flood can be, and a need for a strong and consistent public voice demanding action.

In my view, it is incumbent upon us, the affected, to do everything we can do to advocate for flood protection. That's why the Action Group exists, and that's why we are participating in this hearing today.
Q. Mr. Morris, were the materials in Exhibits 237 to 241 summarized by Ms. Leeds Binder prepared either by you or under your direct supervision and control?
A. MR. MORRIS: Yes.
Q. And you adopt these exhibits as the Action Group's evidence in this proceeding?
A. MR. MORRIS: Yes.
Q. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Battistella, please state your full name and your position with FFC.
A. MR. BATTISTELLA: My name is Paul Battistella, and I am the founder of Flood Free Calgary.
Q. And, sir, what is FFC, or Flood Free Calgary?
A. MR. BATTISTELLA: FFC represents over 40 businesses, business associations, community associations, and other organizations focused on protecting Calgary
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businesses and residents from flooding.
Q. And when was FFC founded and why?
A. MR. BATTISTELLA: FFC was launched in January of 2018 to advocate for timely flood mitigation for Calgary on behalf of Calgary's business community. Mobilizing business and community leaders, the group seeks to keep Calgary's flood risk top of mind of policymakers and to be the vocal advocates in support of critical upstream flood mitigation infrastructure.
Q. Sir, you've been volunteering for FFC for four years. Can you explain why you have dedicated so much of your time to flood protection.
A. MR. BATTISTELLA: I was born in Calgary, and have spent most of my adult life developing and constructing almost exclusively in Calgary's inner city.

The centre city area is not only the economic engine for Calgary but for the province. The severe impacts on the entire city that have resulted from the recession and the pandemic show how critical the central business district is to our economic we11-being.

Upstream flood mitigation that protects the central business district and the neighbouring residential and commercial areas is critical to ensure Calgary can attract and retain businesses and people to
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our city.
The flood of 2013 high1ighted the exposure of the downtown core to severe flooding events. We cannot have catastrophic flood risk on top of all of the other challenges that our city and province face when it is within our ability to address it.

At this point, a flooded downtown core could be the final nail in the coffin of it being a viable employment area. That would be devastating for the entire city and province, and it is the reason that we advocate so strongly on behalf of the business community.
Q. Were the materials in Exhibits 237 to 241 summarized by Ms. Leeds Binder prepared either by you or under your direct supervision and control?
A. MR. BATTISTELLA: Yes.
Q. Do you adopt these exhibits as FFC's evidence in this proceeding?
A. MR. BATTISTELLA: Yes.
Q. Thank you, sir.

MR. CUSANO:
Mr. Chair and Board members, the Action Group and FFC have prepared an opening statement that the witnesses will take you through, followed by a short video referenced in their written submission that has been filed as Exhibit 237.
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We understand that the video is ready for presentation, and Mr. Morris will indicate when it is appropriate to play it, if that's acceptable.

Mr. Morris, would you please proceed.
A. MR. MORRIS: Thank you, Mr. Cusano.

Mr. Chair and NRCB Pane1 members, we appreciate the Board providing us the opportunity to participate in this proceeding, and speak on behalf of our members who include individuals and businesses that were catastrophically impacted by the June 2013 flood and stand to be protected by SR1.

The key reason we exist is so that those who are most directly impacted by the 2013 floods are not forgotten.

The Action Group and FFC fully support this project and urge the NRCB to find that it is in the public interest.

We also ask that the NRCB's approval be granted as quickly as possible and without conditions that would have the effect of delaying construction and operation at SR1.

Any delay in approving this project may result in the individuals and businesses we represent experiencing another flood and the devastating social, economic, and environmental effects that come with it.
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This is not like most infrastructure projects, as lives remain at risk until this project is completed.

Calgary was built over 100 years ago on a floodplain at the confluence of the Elbow and Bow Rivers.

The City has always been vulnerable to floods, and we know that it will experience flooding again.

We have seen three floods of a magnitude greater than that of 2013. SR1 will provide significant flood risk mitigation to the city and downstream communities.

The Action Group and FFC see our role as to impress upon you the critical importance of upstream flood mitigation on the Elbow River and the cost in lives, livelihoods, and properties that is risked by not approving SR1.

It's selected by the province and supported by all three levels of government. We are the face of the affected, and we're here to tell you what it is like to endure what was then Canada's worst natural disaster so that you can appreciate the future devastation that can be avoided by SR1.

Our written submission outlines some of the quantifiable and non-quantifiable economic, social, and environmental impacts of the 2013 flood.

We appreciate that the Board has reviewed our
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evidence and we won't attempt to repeat this information for you today. However, there are certain key pieces of our evidence we would like to highlight. The quantifiable impacts of the 2013 flood are significant, and we've included in our evidence references to some of these numbers that stood out for us.

Overal1 damage estimates for the 2013 flood range from approximately 4.875 biliion to 6 -- and multiple studies conclude that the benefits of the project are greater than the project's costs.

Although price cannot be attached to environmental damage, the following facts are telling: Three years worth of garbage entered the City's landfills in the weeks after the 2013 flood; the province established a \$10 million program called the FISHES Program to mitigate the negative impacts of the flood on fish and fish habitat; and the City spent 100 miliion dollars repairing erosion damage following the flood.

Brenda will now speak to the other impacts of the flood, many of which cannot be quantified.
A. MS. LEEDS BINDER: Thank you, Tony.

When I see a natural disaster unfold on television, a flood, a wildfire, a tornado, I look at it differently ever since the 2013 flood; that is, ever
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since I myself endured and survived a natural disaster, the most costly in Canada's history at that time.

News stories come and go, and after the initial spectacle of a huge natural disaster, the media moves on to something else. But $I$ know, from firsthand experience, that the lives of so many people have been altered forever. I know that those people who are victim to whatever disaster has been reported have a very long and difficult road ahead of them. Weeks and months of cleanup, and months, if not years, of stress and worry. And they'11 never get back what they've lost; they'11 only be able to find a way to move forward.

We are participating in this process to relay those accounts to you, to help you, the Board, get an understanding of what it's like to suffer through one of these natural disasters.

Mr. Morris spoke to some of the quantifiable costs of the flood. However, many costs cannot be quantified. Let's remember that five lives were lost in the 2013 flood.

We hope that the unique perspective that the Action Group and Flood Free Calgary bring to this proceeding will help the Board in assessing this project.
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In essence, it is evidence of the experiences and the people behind the statistics of the flood. Our members are the homeowners, residents and businesses whose financial, mental, and physical health suffered, and in many cases, continues to suffer as a result of the 2013 flood.

These are the people whose lives, livelihoods, and properties stand in the cross-hairs of the next inevitable flood event.

The experiences of our members and other community members are outlined in the hundreds of letters, emails, and survey responses provided in Appendices B and C of our evidence. Included are letters from ten inner city community associations representing well over 43,000 people.

In our humble view, the only way to do justice to the personal accounts in these letters is to read each one. These accounts outline the devastation and loss in the immediate aftermath of the flood and the devastating property and financial losses experienced.

These accounts also describe the immeasurable and continuing impact of flooding and the enduring flood risk on physical and mental health. Most prevalent is the fear and anxiety of another flood. This is demonstrated from the following account of Season
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Prevost in our evidence: (as read)
"Every time it rains, my 12-year-old daughter panics and asks, is it going to flood again? She was four years old during the flood in 2013 and its aftermath. For almost eight years, she's worried about something as simple as rain."

Nearly every letter in our evidence speaks to the mental health impact of the flood and the effects that continue to linger for so many. This is demonstrated by the following account we received from Greg Clark: (as read) "Our home was devastated, but objects can be replaced and basements rebuilt. What cannot be so easily replaced is the sense of security one should feel in our own homes. The impacts on my mental health and that of my daughter's has been profound and we are still dealing with the longstanding negative impacts in our work and school lives. Even seven years later, we still dread the springtime because it brings back traumatic memories, and our anxiety rises knowing we are unprotected should
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the waters rise again."
Writing the letters we've included in our evidence was not easy for many of our members. It was not easy for me to write my own account. It dredged up painful memories.

An example is a letter written by Doris Schuh who was in her 70 s at the time of the flood, and I'll read a brief excerpt now. (as read)
"It caused serious harm to our mental
health. This was on top of the stress we had from the flood itself. For me, I suffered post-traumatic stress. I had an autoimmune disorder. The stress triggered a flare of symptoms then, as it's doing now as I write. I'm currently suffering foggy brain and
stress to have to revisit this event."
I thank Ms. Schuh for writing her letter. For others it was truly too difficult. That is why we created an online survey so that our members and other people from the flood-impacted communities who support SR1 could express that support in a way that would take less of an emotional toll. We received 393 survey responses from supporters of SR1.

Reading the many letters we received, it was also
B. LEEDS BINDER, T. MORRIS, P. BATTISTELLA
clear that the loss of items that represented memories was heartbreaking for so many. Dumping these precious reminders of lives lived into a dumpster covered in sewage-contaminated river mud was overwhelming for me. As an example, I'd like to read an excerpt from Cathy Dorrington who resided in East Elbow Park in 2013 and had basement and main floor damage. (as read)
"I waded through my yard to get to my house and see the devastation.

Unimaginable mud everywhere. Furniture had moved, built-ins ripped out of walls. The raging river had literally run through our home. We found Lego blocks stuck to the ceiling of the basement, a dead fish in our trampoline, my freezer filled with muddy water-soaked rancid meat. Destroyed irreplaceable items, including mementos of our children's lives, our wedding photos, and items passed down from parents and grandparents were lost because we never imagined that much water. The cleanup was weeks of exhausting mud hauling, cleaning, demolition, and heartbreak of watching
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our ruined belongings fill bin after
bin. I watched neighbours cry in their
front yards. My children were
traumatized."
The letters from our members also speak to the significant cost they have incurred on personal flood mitigation, such as rebuilding their homes above the 1 in 100-year flood line and moving their utilities out of their basements, all with the expectation that the City and province will do their part to protect citizens.

Now is the time and opportunity to finally put the critically needed flood mitigation in place.

Paul will now speak to the impact of the 2013 flood and the benefit of SR1 for the businesses Flood Free Calgary represents.
A. MR. BATTISTELLA: Thank you, Brenda.

Mr. Chairman, it's Paul Battistella speaking.
As the representative of Flood Free Calgary, I am here as the voice of the business community that was impacted by the 2013 flood.

The Calgary Chamber of Commerce estimates that 7,000 businesses were impacted by the flood, a third of which never reopened.

4,000 businesses were flooded and experienced
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losses. The remainder were indirectly impacted by lost business due to evacuations, power outages, street closures, and the temporary suspension of the LRT.

We have included in our evidence submissions from many business and business-related organizations including the Calgary Chamber of Commerce, Calgary Economic Development, Calgary Sports and Entertainment Corporation, the Calgary Stampede, the Calgary Municipal Land Corporation, Build Calgary Region, The Calgary Downtown Association, the Building Owners and Managers Association, and Commercial Real Estate Development Association, to name a few.

These letters all express strong support for the SR1 project and concerns about a future flood event in Calgary. They also demonstrate the clear public benefit of SR1 to businesses and the City as a whole.

SR1 is a benefit to businesses for several reasons. I would like to highlight four that $I$ have extracted from the letters we have received.

The first reason is the protection of current and future physical assets. The 2013 flood had detrimental impacts to existing assets and Calgary's economy, including $\$ 50$ million to repair the Calgary Scotiabank Saddledome, $\$ 50$ million to repair the Calgary Zoo, and \$65 million to repair the Calgary Stampede grounds.
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An estimated $\$ 1.254$ billion in residential and commercial property and city infrastructure stands to be protected by SR1.

In terms of future development, the Calgary Municipal Land Corporation notes in their letter over a billion dollars in public investment is planned in the East Village and Calgary River's District, including the new Event Centre, BMO Centre expansion, and Victoria station LRT rebuild. Flood protection is imperative to the success of these projects.

The second reason SR1 would be a benefit to the businesses is a protection of revenues which, in turn, protects the salaries of both owners and employees.

The Calgary Zoo alone lost $\$ 10 \mathrm{million}$ in revenue due to the 2013 flood.

The 4th Street Business Improvement Area also noted extensive revenue losses due to the lengthy closure of businesses.

Many small businesses were also hit hard. One example is First on Colour, a locally owned and operated copier store that was closed for 17 days because of the flood resulting in costs exceeding \$100,000, including wages paid by the company to ensure, quote "as little employee livelihood impact occurred as possible."
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A third reason SR1 would benefit businesses is because it reduced the impact on business operating costs; for example, insurance rates.

Business interruption insurance premiums increased by 667 percent for the Calgary Sports and Entertainment Corporation and by 367 percent for the Calgary Stampede as a result of the 2013 flood.

These examples really cause us to question what would be the impact of another flood on these premiums, and perhaps, more importantly, on their ability to actually secure the insurance they need.

The fourth reason SR1 would benefit businesses is to reduce the risk profile for locating and operating business in and to attract business to downtown Calgary. This is evident in the letters we received from Calgary Economic Development, Calgary Downtown Association, and the Calgary Chamber of Commerce.

Jennifer Rempe1, the general manager of the Calgary Downtown Association, writes: (as read)
"Despite severe flooding effects within
the relatively small section of the commercial core, the resulting loss of
power and street shutdowns throughout
the greater downtown area without
advance notice had caused devastating
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impacts to the economy, with more than 160,000 displaced office workers and significant disruption to the lives of around 7,000 centre city residents."

The letter from Calgary Economic Development demonstrates how imperative it is to have a thriving centre city protected from flooding.

Mary Moran, president and CEO of Calgary Economic Development, writes: (as read)
"Calgary Economic Development is the
steward of our community's economic
strategy, Calgary in the new economy. A
critical pillar of the economic strategy
is in place as we strive to be Canada's
most liveable city."
Ms. Moran goes on to state: (as read)
"We believe that a future flooding event would undoubtedly threaten the progress we have made in our city's liveability."

And Ms. Moran concludes her letter by saying: (as read)
"We simply cannot afford to have our central business district inaccessible for a week under mandatory evacuation orders, as it was in 2013."

Finally, the letter we received from the Chamber of
B. LEEDS BINDER, T. MORRIS, P. BATTISTELLA Examined by Mr. Cusano

Commerce speaks to the positive outcomes of the approval of SR1.

Murray Sigler, interim CEO of the Calgary Chamber of Commerce, writes: (as read)
"The devastating effects of the 2013
flood also provided opportunities to build back stronger and prepare for the crises of the future, ensuring we are ready for the next emergency. Today, we continue to earn similar preparedness and action regarding flood mitigation. It is imperative that we protect our community, our businesses, and our economy from another flood." I hope these excerpts and the many letters included in our written submission will assist the Board in understanding the full extent of the devastation caused by the 2013 flood, including to our businesses and economy, and will appreciate that the City cannot and should not leave itself vulnerable to a repeat of this experience or worse in the event of a flood larger than the one in 2013.

Thank you.
A. MR. MORRIS: The fact remains that nothing that individual homeowners or business owners can do will be
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enough to withstand a major flood event. In fact, even the City of Calgary can't protect itself through local mitigation. Only the province of Alberta can protect this city and southern Alberta from the next inevitable flood.

A decision that SR1 is not in the public interest is, in our view, a conscious decision to leave the City of Calgary vulnerable to flooding indefinitely, leaving residential property, commercial property and infrastructure unprotected and putting the lives, safety and wellbeing of hundreds of thousands of people living and working in this city at risk.

Not approving SR1 adopts an intolerable status quo that will likely result in future flooding of this city.

The social, economic, and environmental benefits of SR1 overwhelming support the conclusion that it is necessary, critical infrastructure. We urge the NRCB to find that SR1 is in the public interest and issue its approval as soon as possible. We ask that any conditions imposed not delay construction.

We would like to conclude this opening statement with a short video showing one of our member's experiences with the 2013 flood.

The video highlights the experience of one family
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during and after the flood and is illustrative of the experiences of many residences and businesses in downstream communities that were impacted by the flood. And to allow this video to run smoothly, I ask everyone to please mute your microphones. Thank you.
(VIDEO PLAYED)
A. MR. MORRIS: We'd like to leave the Board with one final critical thought. This city will flood again, and the only question is will it be ready?

And we thank you for the opportunity to speak to our evidence and to make available to you the accounts of our members. This concludes our opening statement. Thank you.

MR. CUSANO:
Thank you, Mr. Morris.
Mr. Chairman, the witnesses are now available to answer any questions that you and the Board may have.

I note that Ms. Leeds Binder will act as Chair of the witness panel and will field the questions and/or direct traffic as appropriate. Thank you, sir.

THE CHAIR: Okay. We11, thank you. So we'11 begin cross-examination in our regular order.

So Alberta Transportation, did you have any questions for the panel?

MR. FITCH:
It's Mr. Fitch. No, Mr. Chairman.
THE CHAIR:
City of Calgary. Ms. Senek?

MS. SENEK
No, Mr. Chairman, no questions.
THE CHAIR:
Mr. Rae.
MR. RAE:
No, sir, we have no questions.
THE CHAIR:
And Mr. Secord.
MR. SECORD:
No questions, sir.
THE CHAIR:
Mr. Williams? Mr. Williams may or may not be on.

Mr. Williams.
Hearing none. Mr. Wagner?
MS. FRIEND:
Peter, this is Laura. Mr. Wagner emailed me. He said he has no questions.

THE CHAIR:
Okay, thank you. I was just going to ask Mr. Wiebe if he was on. Thank you.

And we can proceed to Board staff. Mr. Kennedy.
MR. KENNEDY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, pane1. I have no questions.

THE CHAIR:
Ms. Vance.
MS. VANCE:
I also do not have any questions.
THE CHAIR:
And Pane1 members?
Mr. Heaney.
MR. HEANEY QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. Yes, I have just one question.

The witnesses talked about what they've done for advocating for upstream measures. Could they speak a little bit to what they've done with -- in terms of
their activities towards mitigation within the city itself?
A. MS. LEEDS BINDER: Yes, I can speak to that.

Our advocacy efforts over the past nearly eight years have actually been at all three levels of government. So we have most certainly had lots of meetings with representatives from the mayor's office as well as the mayor himself, and we have been kept well informed in terms of the local mitigation efforts that have been undertaken within the balance of the city and those have often been spoken to, for example, by City of Calgary representatives at our annual general meetings.

MR. HEANEY: Thank you.
THE CHAIR:
Mr. Ceroici.
MR. CEROICI:
I don't have any questions. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Ms. Roberts.
MS. ROBERTS: I have no questions.
THE CHAIR: Okay, and I have no questions either. But I would thank Mr. Cusano and Ms. Leeds Binder and the entire panel for the work that you've put in to the presentations and your direct evidence. So thank you very much.
A. MS. LEEDS BINDER: Thank you.
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THE CHAIR: Mr. Cusano, I don't imagine you have redirect for us, but...

MR. CUSANO: I do not, sir. Thank you for asking.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you.
Okay. Mr. Rae, with Stoney Nakoda, are you ready for your direct evidence?

MR. RAE:
Mr. Chairman, I don't
believe -- we do not intend to lead any direct evidence at this time.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you. Mr. Secord.
MS. OKOYE
Mr. Chairman, I'11 be leading the evidence for the SCLG Group. It's Ifeoma Okoye.

THE CHAIR:
Ms. Okoye, thank you. So please proceed.

MS. OKOYE:
Okay. So just a few items to bring up.

The landowner witness panel has reduced from the number that we gave previously. So we do have Ms. Karin Hunter, Ms. Mary Robinson, Ms. Tracey Feist, and an additional person Ms. Marlene Dusdal and Mr. Marshal1 Copithorne, Ms. Jan Erisman, Brian Copithorne, Lee Drewry, Barbara Teghtmeyer, and Dr. Karen Massey.

So those will be presented. If they could be either sworn or affirmed.
(DISCUSSION OFF THE RECORD)




MS. OKOYE:
MS. OKOYE EXAMINES THE PANEL:
Q. So, first of all, we'll start off with Ms. Karen Hunter. Can you answer, please?
A. MS. HUNTER: Yes, I'm here.
Q. Ms. Hunter, there has been evidence filed on your behalf in this matter; namely, the SCLG Group submissions filed at Exhibit 247, your submissions, Exhibits 253 and 254, your resume filed as Exhibit 329, and your previously filed submissions which you filed in your capacity as the president of the Springbank Community Association. And you also have here an
opening statement. Are these documents accurate to the best of your knowledge and belief?
A. MS. HUNTER: Yes, they are.
Q. Do you adopt them as part of your direct evidence in this proceeding?
A. MS. HUNTER: Yes, I do.
Q. Can you please tell the Board your role in this proceeding as a member of SCLG?
A. MS. HUNTER: So I am the president of the Springbank Community Association, and as an association, we've tried to take an interest in things that impact our community, whether something like this, like the SR1 project, or our dealings with Rocky View County on a number of fronts, new developments and developers. We have quite a wide scope at the community association, so this is just one of many things that we participate in. Unfortunately, this is the one we're most involved in at the provincial regulatory leve1, so that's new for us, but yes.
Q. Thank you. So your CV, Exhibit 329, you indicate that you're a chartered financial analyst and you're a CFA charterholder with the Chartered Financial Analyst Institute; is that correct?
A. MS. HUNTER: Yes, that's correct.
Q. Can you provide the Board a summary of your work
experience as a chartered financial analyst?
A. Most of my experience has been analysis assistant or assistance to CFO-type roles for presentations to boards, any analysis that needs to be done. I'm quite a generalist by background in terms of my expertise. So I apply finance to operations, to marketing, planning and analysis as well.

So sort of I guess what people would call a "jack of all trades."
Q. Thank you. If I may ask the document manager to pull up the opening statement that was prepared by Ms. Hunter.
A. MS. HUNTER:

And could I also while I'm - I recognize $I$ have a presentation in file or on record, for today, $I$ do have something I want to show, which is Exhibit 258, page 348, if that's possible just while I do my opening remarks.

THE CHAIR:
So that is Exhibit 258.
A. MS. HUNTER:

258, page 348; correct.
THE CHAIR:
And your opening remarks were an
exhibit?
A. MS. HUNTER: No, they were just sent in. So I don't know. I apologize for my naivete when it comes to this type of process.

So I have a PowerPoint presentation I'11 be going
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through, but while I deliver some opening remarks that are not directly attributable to that PowerPoint, I'd like to refer to this Exhibit 258.

THE CHAIR:
Ms. Okoye, you asked -- is there another document you wanted up, and Ms. Taylor, do you know that document?

MS. OKOYE: No, we'11 just start off with the opening statement, and then when it's time for Ms. Hunter to refer to Exhibit 258 , she can have that called up.

MR. KENNEDY:
And Ms. Hunter, while they're pulling that up, just so the court reporter can keep up, you speak very rapidly, and it can be a challenge.
A. MS. HUNTER: I apologize, I will do my best. And yes, that is the document I see. So it's page 258.
Q. MS. OKOYE: Do you want to start off with this, or do you want to start off --
A. MS. HUNTER: Yes, I think I do. I think I would like to start out with this, Ifeoma, and then after just a couple of minutes of remarks, I'11 move to the other document which is a PowerPoint presentation. So page -- I'm sorry, page 348 . Is that what I said?

So this is AEP draft hazard flood mapping, and page 358 , sorry, $I$ 'm just going to pull it up on my
screen. I have it in front of me. So this, the intent of this is to show Bragg Creek, and I recognize the 2013 floods were terrible for many communities along the Elbow River, so I'11 refer to this in a moment.

At any rate, thank you, Panel, for your time today, and thank you for the opportunity for the affected community of Springbank to acquire the services of independent experts.

I would like to start by saying $I$ am here on a volunteer basis. I am a mom of four kids who is concerned about the safety and viability of my community and our at-risk populations including children, the elderly, and those with compromised health.

I ask again for a little bit of latitude as this is my first foray into an NRCB hearing, and I'm sure I will, you know, maybe not be in line with all the etiquette.

So page 348 of this document, I'm just going to make sure that's page 348, yeah, that's correct, shows Bragg Creek at a 1 in 350 flood event. So 1 in 350 flood event, according to AEP and their flood mapping, their flood hazard mapping, is a rate in the river of 1,440 with a 95 percent competence interval between 891 and 2,520 metres cubed a second.

The question becomes if you can choose a project that will save this town, why wouldn't you?

The Bragg Creek berms are nearly complete up to a level of 990 cubic metres per second. 1 in a hundred plus some freeboard.

Assuming that SR1 is built, Bragg Creek berms are not built to stop overland flooding from a 1,440 cubic metre flood, and the town is effectively underwater. The centre of this diagram or image you see before you is the Balsam Avenue bridge; I highlit (verbatim) it for your reference.

So this is the only bridge linking west
Bragg Creek with an access out of the community, and as you can see, water surrounds this bridge as it happened in 2013.

So there are consequences to choosing SR1 which is downstream of this community, and there are consequences of ignoring and limiting analysis on rates that would result in a clearer comparison between SR1 and MC1.

Now, if I can just ask you to go to page 350 on this document, two pages down, and that shows the townsite of Redwood Meadows at the same 350-year flood at a flow rate of 1,450 .

So as you can see, the townsite of Redwood Meadows
would be underwater. I find it interesting that the proponent does not know what level of flood mitigation these berms are built to in Redwood Meadows; it would seem something important to know. Sorry, excuse me.

As if we're referring to SR1 as part of a system, what type of mitigation is afforded for this townsite of Redwood Meadows, which here is evidently affected in a material way by a 1 in 350 -year flood of 1,440 cubic metres a second.

I ask the same question, if you could save this community with the MC1 option, why wouldn't you? That would limit rates in the river to 830 cubic metres per second according to Exhibit 101, page 46, the MC1 conceptual design report for both communities assuming berms similarly built to 990 cubic metres a second. 830 cubic metres per second per water exiting MC1 would pass safely $I$ imagine with some groundwater flooding but no overland flooding for these communities.

I think it's easy to get lost in the focus on the city of Calgary; and I understand that, I appreciate it. No one wants to see the city of Calgary flood. That said, this is a series of communities that are impacted in perpetuity by this choice before the Pane1.

In spring 2018, I attended an open house in west Calgary for SR1 and realized for the first time that

SR1 would forever change our community. It was there that $I$ first heard of air quality issues, specifically a Board reference to: (as read)
"The potential to exceed air quality objectives for up to four days following drainage of SR1."

Up until that point, $I$ had believed it would just impact a few landowners which is how the project was presented by the Alberta government. From that point forward as president of the Springbank Community Association, our Board undertook to learn about the project and educate area residents. We did see that there was a lack of information within our community about SR1, and we felt that it was important role to host some information sessions with the information that had come out through the EIA. I have always tried, to the best of my ability, to be accurate and truthful with regard to SR1.

In December 2018, Rocky View County Exhibit 255 released a report on the SR1 project and requested that the government of Alberta halt the project until alternatives could be fairly assessed. They identified issues with the decision process, including the use of value-based judgments and the quick elimination of the Priddis diversion. The County was also concerned about the impacts of sedimentation --
Q. MS. OKOYE:

Can you slow down?
A. MS. HUNTER: Oh, I'm sorry.

THE CHAIR:
Yeah, I was just going to jump in and ask Ms. Vespa, are you keeping up?

THE COURT REPORTER: Barely, but unfortunately I can't take my hands off the keys writing to put my hand up.

So I appreciate your help and slow down.

THE CHAIR:
A. MS. HUNTER:

THE CHAIR:
A. MS. HUNTER:

THE CHAIR: you.
A. MS. HUNTER: Thank you.

The County was also concerned about the impacts of sedimentation in the reservoir. Yet, in 2020, Rocky View County, our municipality responsible for the safety and viability of our community, signed an agreement with the proponent to withdraw opposition in exchange for compensation.

Did Alberta Transportation communicate to Rocky View County at any point that MC1 was superior for mitigation at rates -- than SR1 at rates far above the levels contemplated of 1,240 in a design flood.

Meanwhile, the agreement with Rocky View County
seems to preclude Rocky View County even from working with us, their residents, to identify mitigation measures. Is this how business is done in Alberta? Secret deals, non-disclosure agreements?

I ask the Panel to consider whether this silencing of opposition will result in the best possible public interest outcomes of a project that is publicly funded and impacts hundreds of thousands of people.

From day one, we have asked for transparency in the costs of this project and its consequences. It is now clearly evident the proponent has misled the public about SR1's ability to manage large floods relative to the alternative at MC1. It has misled our community by obfuscating the fact that we are actually -- we will actually still experience flooding even if SR1 works as it should.

We implore this Panel to create this much-needed transparency as this project is paid for by our public funds and impacts generations of Albertans. The lives and property of Rocky View County and city of Calgary residents depend on this decision now and well into the future.

The proponent likes to say, "It is too late to turn back on SR1." Need I reference a common analogy for "it's too late to stop"? It is not too late. I
will contend that it is the right time to stop. At what point is new evidence that indicates the project is not sufficient to achieve its purpose relative to the alternative reviewed and considered?

The project is not under construction. I assume most land and facilitation agreements have causes that allow them to unwind. In my view, it's not the Panel's responsibility to manage the proponent's timeline. It's not the responsibility of the Panel to approve a project just because people want it built. It's not the fault of this Pane1, the regulators, or Springbank residents who have raised -- and area residents who have raised concerns that this project has dragged on for years. The responsibility for the delay falls squarely on the proponent's shoulders.

Transportation Minister likes to say that SR1 is for the greater good. I ask this Panel to consider for whose greater good? Have we established the purpose of the project is to protect the city of Calgary below the Glenmore Reservoir?

SR1 does not appear to be the project that's best if a bigger flood comes down the river than 2013. What about residents of other Elbow River communities, including Springbank, Elbow Valley, and Discovery Ridge? What about Bragg Creek and Redwood Meadows,
too? What about future generations of Albertans across southern Alberta who need to draw water, our most precious resource, from a river with deciining flows? We have a particular responsibility here. The Elbow River begins in the head waters and serves over half a million people in Calgary before joining the Bow River to serve southern Alberta. We must be utterly diligent, thorough, and objective when making infrastructure decisions.

And with that, if it's possible to pull up the PowerPoint presentation.

MS. OKOYE: Document manager, if you could pul1 up the PowerPoint presentation by Karin Hunter that was sent in yesterday. Thank you.
A. MS. HUNTER: Thank you. If you could go to the next page, $I$ will speak to four topics today as outlined here.

Project purpose and need. Briefly, the focus of this project has always been Calgary. It has taken us until now, actually now in the last couple of weeks, to fully understand the complexities and shortcomings of this unique diversion, plus temporary impoundment. In fact, I wonder if we still do not have all the information we need to make the decision that is before this Pane1.

Right off the start for our community that sits between SR1 and Glenmore, SR1 creates a level of flood mitigation that is below the 1 in a hundred standard for Canada, Alberta, and Calgary.

Yesterday, Matt Wood was kind enough to remind us, once again, that we don't count, "That's what you get for living near a river." I probably can get you the exact quote; it's later on in my speech.

Now regarding costs. The costs continue to increase. You heard yesterday pipeline cost estimates won't be available until May. The CF conditions and our own SCLG risk report, I highlighted conditions that are substantial and costly and I would argue necessary.

Does anyone think that none of these conditions will be applied? Even according to the proponent's own information in Exhibit 100, MC1 has more favourable cost -- benefit-cost ratio.

I am appalled that in a 2018 EIA, a calculation error understated certain scenarios for air emissions by a factor of two. It is only because of the participation of Springbank residents, Springbank and area residents, that this came to light.

Highlighted in yellow is the question I asked this Panel: (as read)
"What amount of time should children and
our broader community be intentionally and knowingly exposed to air quality that creates unacceptable short-term risks to human health? Why would we choose this outcome?"

AT's expert can debate our expert on the size of the issue, but they both agree it is an issue.

Regarding the alternative: McLean Creek. The proponent said even yesterday that Exhibit 101 was stil1 conceptual.

So to clarify, the 2017 report on MC1 is conceptual, and it was signed, dated, stamped by engineers. What does that make the 2014 report on SR1 that was used all the way through 2015 to arrive at the decision? I find this absurd. The fact that we see for the first time MC1 is so superior as an in-stream dam for flood mitigation long after the decision was made. Note that the 2000 -- the MC1 report was 2017 , and the decision on SR1 was made in fall of 2015.

How can a decision on flood mitigation projects be made without regard or comparing the two at various rates? MC1, according to Exhibit 101, is equal to SR1 or superior at every level of flood to at least 1 in a thousand as is in that -- or to 1 in a thousand as is contained in Exhibit 101, page 46.

Regarding engagement. We were led to believe SR1 and MC1 were equal for flood mitigation, that SR1, plus Bragg Creek berms, was equal to MC1 for flood mitigation. It is clear SR1 and MC1 are not equivalent.

MC1 is superior for flood mitigation as an in-stream dam, a conventional in-stream dam. MC1 creates more equitable outcomes and protects to a higher flow rate.

Exhibit 101 again shows an in-stream dam is superior to this unusual capped diversion. I ask when did the proponent know MC1 was superior for all of us along the Elbow River?

If you could flip to two pages actually, skip past the next one.

MR. SECORD
Ms. Hunter, it's Richard Secord here. If you would please refer to the page number of the slide.
A. MS. HUNTER: I'm sorry. Page 4.

MR. SECORD: Thank you.
A. MS. HUNTER: Thank you.

In 2015, as I mentioned, AEP chose SR1. This is from the Exhibit 252 report, "Flood Mitigation Decisions on the Elbow River," it was less expensive, more environmentally friendly, and could be developed on a shorter timeline.

I note that there has been some discussion of the Bow River. The proponent itself in Exhibit 325, page 8, referred to water management system that included the Bow and the Elbow. This statement implies the following: No. 1, AT agrees SR1 is part of a system on the Bow and Elbow Rivers to manage both flood and drought and that regulators should consider SR1 as part of a package. AT states that the Bow River will be used for drought mitigation.

No. 2, the proponent would like this Panel to ignore the reality that SR1 cannot address drought because this future reservoir on the Bow River. I may have missed a press release because in my reviews of the three Bow River options, one of which impacts the community of Springbank, the new Bow River project is not a done deal to say the least.

Should this Panel approve SR1, which has no drought mitigation capabilities, just because a future hypothetical project will bring that functionality on the Bow River.

No. 3, by referencing drought, it is clear the proponent acknowledges that drought is in fact a concern for our watershed. Given the importance of drought, the MC1 drought management capabilities referenced in Exhibit 101, although much smaller than
the capabilities proposed on the Bow, should be considered by this Pane1. If the Bow River project does not proceed or does not proceed in a reasonable timeline, isn't storage on the Elbow all the more critical?

No. 4: AT's reference to the Bow River Calgary's future drought needs highlights the bias in this process. Given declining flows in the Elbow River, climate change, and the increased risk of fire, upstream communities will be the casualties of water shortages on the Elbow River. Is the proponent aware that Rocky View County, Tsuut'ina, Redwood Meadows residents draw their water from the Elbow River, and we would appreciate some drought management capabilities as well.

Regarding the Elbow River, SR1 system includes berms, upstream berms at Bragg Creek and Redwood Meadows. When SR1 was selected in Exhibit 250 -- sorry -- geez, when it was originally announced in 2014, it was designed as a 1 in 100 flood mitigation project to protect against a 1 in 100 level of flood. And so were the Bragg Creek berms, yet in the fall of 2015, SR1's capacity and diversion was doubled. The capacity was not quite doubled; the diversion was doubled. SR1 was increased to a 1 in 200
level of flood mitigation, and here is the first break in equity.

Bragg Creek remained at 1 in 100. Why was Bragg Creek not increased to 1 in 200 when SR1 was increased to 1 in 200? This is the first clearly unequal outcome created by SR1.

Meanwhile, our community has always been under the impression that SR1 would provide equal flood mitigation for us, too. MC1 and SR1 were presented as equal by AT with both storing the same volumes. Our analysis now affirmed by the proponent in Exhibit 325 that our communities upstream of Glenmore receive a level of flood mitigation that is below Alberta's guidelines for flood mitigation projects which states a minimum standard for flood mitigation of 1 in 100.

This creates the second inequity, one in which we were not aware of until this year. If we were protected on a standalone project built to 1 in 100 , that would be similar to the Bragg Creek berms protection up to 990 metres cubed per second.

The city of Calgary downstream of Glenmore is theoretically protected up to 1,240 cubic metres a second with the view, my understanding is, to be protected from groundwater flooding. SR1 does not meet the minimum Alberta standards for flood mitigation in
our community on day one.
If it was known that these unequal outcomes were created, why was this not specifically and explicitly communicated to these communities and these residents and these businesses?

Regarding climate change, very briefly. Of note, AEP in Exhibit 265, page 5, this is AEP flood hazard mapping report, shows that a 1 in 200 level of flood can range between 727 metres cubed a second and 1,930 metres cubed per second. This is a 95 percent confidence interval provided by AEP for a 1 in 200 level of flood.

Might I add that the rate used for SR1 of 1,240, to my knowledge is lacking sensitivity analysis. How is this information used on this range, this probability of different outcomes and rates for 1 in 200 level of flood to compare SR1 to an in-stream dam like McLean Creek?

Regarding SR1 as an unusual project. In Exhibit 325, AT takes use of my terminology "radical innovation" to describe SR1. I stand by that assertion.

If the proponent had to search around for relevant guidelines outside Canada for key decisions such as the draining of the reservoir, for instance, this may
indicate there is innovation. If there's no precedent for determining whether it is better to release the water early or late, I suggest my words are appropriate.

I might say what is radical is the fact that the proponent refers to the Ohio dry dams which are 100 years old, and as reviewed and discussed in Exhibit 275, page 348 , the Bow River Basin counci1 report, that these Ohio damages have next to nothing in common with SR1.

This comparison must stop, it is unhelpful.
I refer you to the USBR Chapter 2 embankment design statement referenced in Exhibit 199, page 2.

Radica1 -- I quote: (as read)
"Radical innovations are generally avoided..."

This is regarding embankment dams: (as read)
"...and fundamental changes in design
concepts are developed and adopted
gradually through practical experience and trial. Although the practice of
gradual change through verified
prototype designs may be criticized as
being overly conservative, no better method has been conclusively
demonstrated where consideration is given to possible loss of life and extensive property damage that could result from dam failure, the major economic investment, and the importance of the stored water. Ample justification is provided for conservative procedures."

I ask this Panel to consider whether these conservative procedures referenced by USBR are being applied here with SR1, which is not a conventional dam and in and of itself is unique.

Here is the thing, we have hundreds of in-stream dams across Canada. We have many large in-stream dams in the headwaters. We know what to expect with in-stream dams. We deal with the debris, the sediment sits underwater. And as I mentioned, Alberta Environment and Parks is reviewing options for an in-stream dam on the Bow.

If you could go to page 6. Thank you.
I realize you saw this image yesterday. The proponent's main argument for Springbank seems to be "something is better than nothing." Well, my understanding is G1enmore Reservoir had its capacity increased by 10 million or so cubic metres of water. Is
that better than nothing? How about we stop there?
In Exhibit 325, page 23, the proponent responds to my critique that $\operatorname{SR1}$ creates inequities by saying, I quote: (as read)
"AT states it's not possible for every downstream property owner to be protected to an equal extent. The fact is that the extent of the flooding downstream of SR1 will be substantially reduced by the project."

This is a disingenuous and flippant response that is in keeping with the dismissive attitude toward our concerns from the start, and we deserve better.

According to Exhibit 101, which information is used to create this chart here, MC1, as presented here on this slide, is clearly superior and more equitable for all of us including Calgary.

If you have a flood of 1,984 cubic metres coming down the river, which project do you want? SR1 can skim off between 480 and 600 cubic metres a second of a raging flood. MC1 can take whatever that flood is, absorb it, its volume increases, and then you can release the water as needed through these spillways and outlets to nearly equate the water that's coming in. That gives you a lot more flexibility.

So I want to talk briefly about why these inequities are created by SR1.

First off, the only question $I$ have to ask, and it's rhetorical $I$ suppose, where was this analysis years ago?

Again, it has been crippling, this use of volumes for SR1 and MC1, and you see the real truth of effectiveness comes with rates, and an analysis of rates. Why are we the first ones to show this? This has jaw-dropping implications to Bragg Creek, Redwood Meadows, Springbank, Discovery Ridge and Elbow Valley.

While both projects have a volume limitation of 70 million $I$ 'm going to say net storage, SR1 has gross storage, including 7 million cubic metres of storage for sediment, another half a million for tributaries, for a total of 77 million. Both projects are effectively the same for volume.

SR1 has two restrictions. Number one, it has this intake restriction or cap of 480 to 600 metres cubed a second. It is this intake restriction that causes the unequal outcomes downstream. If you take away this restriction and allow unlimited water into SR1, it will not create unequal outcomes.

This cap of between -- of 600 metres a second cubed
reduces the ability of SR1 to adequately address uncertainty regarding future flood sizes and shapes. You will hear more about that in Topic 3.

If a larger flood peak comes down the river than 2013, say, 1500 or 1600 metres cubed per second, SR1 can only take between 480 and 600 at a time. Have you solved flood risk if you can't adjust to the volumes in the river?

For SR1 to equal MC1 in this scenario 3, you would have to double the intake. By doubling the intake, you could take 1200 metres per second off the river, create equitable outcomes downstream relative to MC1 of about 800 cubic metres a second.

The second restriction SR1 has, and I think is worth noting here in my presentation today, SR1 has an outlet restriction or cap of 27 metres cubed per second. MC1 doesn't. An in-stream dam doesn't. It can pass water over its spillways as needed. This limits the ability of SR1 to quickly respond to risk through rapid dewatering.

Given this structure of SR1 is less than 15 minutes away from Calgary, this would seem to be an important risk constraint. The structure itself fills up in 36 hours or so. What if something goes wrong? Where do you empty the water?

The proponent has responded to our risk experts by saying they don't think we need a second outlet, but I do think that's an important consideration.

The second effect of this cap is that that cap constrains the flexibility if you have an unusual storm situation that causes a back-to-back flood.

So, for instance, in MC1, if your volumes are full, your dam is full, you have another rain or precipitation event coming, you can dewater more quickly. You are not limited by that 27 cubic metres of water. You can dewater, somewhat reduce the volumes in the dam and prepare for some intake of storm. With SR1, those storms just will bypass the structure utterly and hit the Glenmore Reservoir and then I don't know what we've achieved.

And, of course, lastly in terms of SR1 restrictions, it has a location restriction which is farther downstream between communities rather than at the very upstream of the communities like MC1.

On the next page, please, slide 7.
Thank you. The decision to choose SR1 over MC1 when they determined volumes were equivalent, they moved onto these qualitative types of analysis between the two projects. This is where I would refer to Rocky View County's critique which was rather good. Unfortunately,
value-based judgments were used to arrive at these qualitative assessments for MC1 and SR1.

I mentioned land use in particular in the middle of that screen. There was no consideration in the original decision for sedimentation, not meaningfully for SR1. So what we know now is that sediment is a problem, and it's something that will have to be managed over the long run.

MC1 qualitative assessment seem to rely disproportionately on judgments of impact on recreation areas. At this point, based on Exhibit 101, this is just silly.

The final impacted infrastructure listed in Exhibit 101 for MC1 was a road which we acknowledge, many kilometres of road, 19 campsites, a camp store, the Ranger station and a wastewater lift station. If that one doesn't sound too bad, we don't think it is.

Opus acknowledged in 2017 in Exhibit 101 a rivering habitat would be changed to a lake habitat. The lake would be 180 acres approximately of 15 metres in depth.

Regarding SR1. SR1 was really overlooked. The impacts of the diversion and the consequences of that sedimentation were really overlooked. I cannot stress that enough. Yet now we know, after years of study, much of which has come to light in the last 12 months,
this sedimentation is a problem. It will be a perpetual management problem.

S1ide 9, please.
I'm not going to spend much time here on slide 9 . I think our attorney went through this yesterday to some degree. However, I mentioned transparency earlier.

If this project is approved, I fully expect the costs to disappear into various Alberta Transportation accounts, budgets, and projects, and we will never know the true cost of this project. So I ask the panel to, where possible, get the needed transparency on the costs of this for this publicly funded project.

The proponent replied in Exhibit 325, page 21, that the cost increases are not significant. My original assertion was this slide here, costs have increased over two and a half times.

If I had a $\$ 100$ investment that appreciated to $\$ 250$ over seven years, $I$ would consider that significant.

I ask you to consider the proponent's use of the term "not significant" because this term is prevalent. Air quality, not significant; wildiffe, not significant; water quality, not significant. If the term -- the use of the term "not significant," is it applied with the same liberal interpretation on all elements of this project?

Regarding facilitation payments. It is clear that facilitation payments were used to advance the project and I ask the Panel to, where possible, include them in the project costs. There are several unknown costs.

I don't have the inside information on the negotiations with Camp Kiwanis. All I know is that to move that camp if you need to move it will be in the tens of millions of dollars, or are they staying? This is a pretty pivotal piece of information.

I don't know what additional land compensation might be here and what's released. The pipeline information is not coming to me.

Outstanding design costs. I'm still unclear after yesterday what's happening with the emergency spillway, which will run somehow overland to the Elbow River. I'm not sure how you can have that spillway run overland to the river at 300 and some odd cubic metres a second.

Next slide, please. Page 10.
This is the proponent's information. I've submitted it before. I'm not going to speak in too much detail to it.

What I want you to know is this is all Alberta Transportation's numbers. I haven't made any adjustments. MC1 and SR1 were discussed yesterday as having both avoided damages of 27.7 miliion in the city.

I'm sure it is clear after yesterday's discussion that the avoided damages for MC1 will be much greater because it protects more communities more effectively and more effectively than berms.

What is missing, in my view, is costs for repairs to flood mitigation projects upstream when a large flood comes down the river. I'm pretty sure the rest of our panel will speak to the impact -- or some of our panel will speak to the impact on Redwood Meadows and Bragg Creek from the 2013 floods.

As Rocky View County taxpayers, we find it rather surprising we would be on the hook for repairs to berms required for SR1 when the alternative wouldn't have required those berms.

So we know two facts: The project is no longer cheaper than MC1, and the economic cost benefit is no longer superior to MC1.

The proponent says that, based on estimated costs of the 2013 flood, SR1 will more than pay for itself in a single design flood; so would MC1. However, MC1 offers a better chance for payback as, Number 1, it does not have that design intake restriction like SR1 does; and, 2 , its location which protects more communities.

In a late attempt to manage costs, the proponent appears to be pushing back on costs, including,
apparently, our community detour roads, as well as recommendations by our experts NCEA; a second outlet by our experts to rapidly de-water the reservoir in the event the main outlet is blocked; and by our experts, NCEA, erosion protection on the water side of the embankment, to name two. These are costly upgrades.

Perhaps if the proponent had not been so intent on compensating and removing opposition, they would have had budget to implement additional changes for dam safety.

If you choose to approve SR1, despite all the certain and negative outcomes that are evident, please get it right at every foreseeable safety mechanism, redundancy, and fail safe possible, regardless of cost. That will ensure it cannot fail or malfunction and cause catastrophic damage to hundreds of thousands of people and even potentially loss of life. The worst possible outcome for my community and the City of Calgary is the failure of an SR1 embankment.

Page 12, please.
Thank you. I can say with much confidence that impacts on our greater Springbank area were not considered before the project was chosen and not until 1ate 2019/20 did Alberta Transportation express any interest in talking with us as a community. I think
individual landowners had been contacted before that.
This is a massive project. I feel compelled to impress upon you the size of this footprint. And, for reference, $I$ just have some comparables. Fish Creek Park is 3300 acres or so. SR1, a direct footprint, appears to be 3600. Nose Hill Park is 2790 in Calgary. It's a huge project.

The structure is in Springbank and on the pathway to Bragg Creek and Redwood Meadows. Our communities are connected with Bragg Creek and Redwood children attending Springbank schools. Everyday they are bussed along Springbank Road, which you see here in green, to attend our schools. And this is a popular eco tourism corridor for cyclists who ride their bikes from Springbank all the way through to Bragg Creek.

The project is east of central Springbank and northeast of Elbow Valley with a combined population of 9,500 or so residents. A11 of these areas are growing and there are new developments planned just east of SR1, just by the eastern border you see there. And there's a new high school planned for Springbank.

I would like to point out winds blow from the west, and Springbank is windier than your average Alberta location, as is explained by our air quality expert Brian Zelt.

People in Springbank use wells for water or draw their water from Elbow River via water co-ops and Calalta.

Let me say, we are very sensitive to possible impacts in our groundwater, well water, and Elbow River water quality, as this is the source of our drinking water. Page 13, please.

Thank you. SR1 was chosen quickly through a high level screening process in 2014 based on an AMEC report which recommended that both SR1 and MC1 proceed to further design. Very little thought or due diligence was given to community impacts.

The proponent now acknowledges that there will be a litany of negative outcomes. In fact, by my assessment, every possible category of study highlights negative outcomes: Air, water, wildiffe, fish, biodiversity.

Now the proponent may not consider that each one is significant and adverse, but on the whole they are negative. On the whole they are negative.

These societal impacts of SR1 should be compared to the in-stream alternative at McLean Creek. For example, if there had been a meaningful discussion of how other in-stream dams west of Calgary handle this sediment and impact total suspended solid and nutrient concentrations in the water and how this sediment is managed, we'd be
better equipped to understand SR1 versus MC1.
SR1 leaves the sediment exposed to air, while in-stream dams will contain most of the sediment underwater. Surely this is an important point that has a range of environmental implications, yet there was never, not once been a full discussion of the sediment consequences of SR1 versus MC1 aside from the Deltares report in 2013--14, Exhibit 13, that states: (as read)
"SR1 was less sensitive to sediment." What does this even mean? How is this conclusion arrived at and by whom? Given that many objections of SR1 centre on the sediment deposited and left to dry following a flood, we deserve a fair discussion of this topic and its impacts on fish, air quality, biodiversity, land use, water quality, carbon storage relative to a comparable in-stream dam.

The tricky thing about SR1 is that there is no precedent to refer to that illustrates what this post-flood environment will look like. I will leave it to this Panel to determine why this is the case.

It seems possibly that dams are used for irrigation, water storage, and recreation, rather than being kept in a dry state for flood mitigation.

The reality of the matter is that AT has never provided a long-term view of the reservoir after three
floods, four, five, ten. The proponent allows for 7.7 miliion tons of sediment in the reservoir over time. What on earth does this look like? Does this become a flattened wasteland necessarily for fish rescue?

What we all agree on is that it will be used, and once it is used, you will have to cope with that sediment. It is safe to say the long-term outcomes that result from this sedimentation are unclear. If we look at an example where miliions of tons of sediment will deposit, that would be great, but they don't exist.

Regarding these uncertain outcomes, the proponent proposes to monitor the effects. This is not the same as mitigate.

Regarding the sediment, the prediction of a design flood will deposit 2.3 million tons of silt; Exhibit 93, IR 300. This wasn't relevant during the decision process. Is that an oops? Well, they'11 monitor it. Smothering of plants, including native grasses; monitor it?

One way or another, for a time, post-flood or perhaps forever, this will become a dry 1 ake bed. If we're looking for a comparable there, perhaps it's better for us to look to the dry lake beds in California where the dust from the sediment becomes airborne and creates dust storms, a possibility identified by our air
quality expert Brian Zelt in Exhibit 269.
AT's own quality experts identify unacceptable short-term risks to human health in some scenarios. Again, I ask for how much time is it acceptable for children and members of our community with lung disease, who are elderly, asthma, to be exposed to air quality that poses an unacceptable short-term risk to human health?

Now our expert can argue with their expert whether you should use air -- wind conditions from the Springbank airport or whether you should use silt from the Glenmore Reservoir because its more fine. Those are details. The fact is they both agree. Air quality is a problem.

It doesn't matter if it's used infrequently by which they have arrived at their conclusion, not significant for our impacts. All that matters is once the sediment arrives here, it's going to be a challenge. As of today, to my knowledge, the proponent has no costs for watering the reservoir. Costs for water during construction are 2.5 miliion from Exhibit 159, Appendix G.2. Our experts will say watering of seeded 1 and post-flood will be needed twice a day.

Is it possible that watering the reservoir could require water from the Elbow River? You are diverting
water for flood that creates a sediment problem that will require water to manage. Is this being thought through.

Regarding wildlife. I readily admit dams change the natural environment; however, after they're built, the ecosystem adapts. MC1, as I mentioned, would convert river ecosystem to lake system upstream of MC1. This conversion from river to lake is one time. Construction is painful no matter where, but I'm asking you to look past that.

SR1 creates an ecosystem that will be in a perpetual state of flux: Dry, wet, post-flood, reconstruct, regrow, repeat.

When the reservoir is in use, June timeline, in the spring, there will be death of birds and their nests. Amphibians, pollinating plants, pollinating insects, all at a time when this area is naturally teeming with young, dens, nests, burrows inundated. How can they not be?

Wildlife rescue operations are impractical and optimistic. How realistic is it to rescue wildife on short notice on 2,000 acres of reservoir in the driving rain over terrain that is a mix of riparian, deep grasses, shrub brush, and more. This is not the time to idealize these rescue activities.

We must be pragmatic that they will likely be ineffective, if they can occur at all for the safety of rescue personnel in the limited window before a flood.

The proponent think they can forecast floods with some accuracy; 2013 shows this is unlikely. Fish, again, rescue operations will commence post-flood. We need to be realistic on this too. This could be up to nearly 2,000 acres inundated sediment accumulation to my last knowledge on the matter up to 12 feet uneven drainage. How do you even get on the land? What are the practicalities of conducting fish rescue in these conditions?

Community benefit. There isn't any. Not a park bench, not a pathway, not a river park for the project that's on the river. All the burdens of this project fall squarely on the Springbank area community.

The proponent has been laser focused on receiving First Nations withdrawals of oppositions. It has not been particularly focused on making this project palatable for our community if it's approved.

We raise for the consideration of the Panel that should this project be approved, despite its clearly inferior flood mitigation outcomes and despite its negative socioeconomic outcomes, that there must be a condition to find community benefit.

We recognized Rocky View County accepted \$10 million for lost tax revenue. If this land were to be developed, Rocky View County would receive 10 percent of the land of municipal reserve to be used for parks. That's between 360 and 690 acres using the project area to the full impacted acres; I don't know where it's 1 anded.

Alternatively, the value for Rocky View County when a developer provides the development is cash in lieu, the value of that 10 percent. Has the proponent contemplated community benefit anywhere? I see a reference in their land use to potential public access, but that's it.

I think I can safely say now, now they have decided not to upgrade our detour routes which will be used during the construction, but perhaps we aren't high on their list.

I ask the Panel to consider that none of the outcomes of this project are positive for the greater west Rocky View and Redwood Meadows area. In fact, unfortunately, they are negative. Our burden, Calgary's benefit.

MC1 would have benefited all without these horrible and generational outcomes. In new rules, I'm not sure of the exhibit number, it's been posted, the Alberta
government requires municipalities effective Apri1 1st to pay 10 percent of damages for natural disasters in their municipality, and payouts to homeowners affected by flood are capped at $\$ 500,000$ one time. Given SR1's inequities in flood mitigation, is this just or equitable?

It is fully likely that our community will have to pay disproportionately for our unequal and insufficient level of flood protection relative to what SR1 provides for people downstream of the G1enmore.

Page 15, please.
I like to show this because it shows the illustration there of the tube, shows how the proponent has explained the project. SR1 storage in this case,
 will pass safely without damage.

When people look at this and they presented this to Springbank residents and Bragg Creek residents last fall pass safely without damage, it's easy to interpret that SR1 protects us. And it doesn't.

SR1 and MC1 have been sold as equa1 for flood mitigation; clearly this volume-based assessment is problematic. When was it determined that rates created these unequal outcomes? Just yesterday, Mr. Wood stated that rates are the cause of flooding. On page 156 of

Exhibit 350, the transcript from yesterday, Mr. Wood stated: (as read)
"It is the peak, you know, that is the most important when it comes to flood damages, not necessarily the volume."

Why was SR1 chosen over MC1 based on volumes? In my view, Alberta Transportation is not being truthful and providing full disclosure on the lack of flood mitigation provided by SR1.

In 2013 our residents in Elbow Valley, Bragg Creek, Redwood Meadows could not access their homes due to road inundation. Where is this considered by their proponent? SR1 is setting us up to repeat history in these western communities.

My last S1ide 16, please.
Did Alberta Transportation communicate clearly with Rocky View County that its residents would still flood with SR1? Where was it communicated that MC1 at any point had superior flood mitigation outcomes for communities upstream of SR1 and G1enmore Reservoir? Did Tsuut'ina Nation know that MC1 was so superior to berms for Redwood Meadows before they withdrew opposition?

In AT's response to Ian Dowsett, Exhibit 325, they replied that our analysis on these unequal outcomes is correct and that our residents receive inferior flood
mitigation than current standards. But implied is better than nothing. Is that what we're going for here? "Better than nothing"? Is the best we can do on a project that is costing over half a billion dollars "better than nothing"?

I'm concerned that there has not been full, true, plain disclosure. Was the proponent aware of these unequal outcomes and did they appropriately communicate this to impacted communities and residents?

If the proponent was not aware of these outcomes, how are we seven years in and they're not aware of these outcomes?

Briefly on history before $I$ wrap up.
The history I've provided in Exhibit 254 indicates the project became the project of choice after very little study based on the 2014 AMEC report, which is in our additional submissions.

Mr. Speller stated today upon review of Exhibit 252, the AEP decision, the primary decision was based on "Will it work?" I ask "For whom?"

The June 2014 AMEC report recommended both MC1 and SR1 proceed for further study. Yet, it was SR1 that was announced by Premier Prentice I believe in September; I could be mistaken. It's in my other document that is in evidence for funding and detail design in the fall of
2014. Why? It was SR1 that was submitted to regulators in early 2015 long before the Exhibit 252 AEP decision report in the fall of 2015. Why?

AT likes to say the project was chosen by three successive governments; rather the project was chosen twice by two governments over a period of approximately one year, and both decisions were based on the same limited analysis and generous supply of assumptions. I contend now that through a robust IR process, feasibility analysis is underway. I would also conclude that the feasibility analysis on SR1 with the information we use today results in it not being feasible.

Next page, please. I think I've just covered this. Can you go one more page, please, to page 18. Oh 19, I apologize. I'm new to this.

Conclusions. Alberta Transportation's own data demonstrates MC1 is a more effective and equitable outcome. The magnitude and changes in cost, scope of the project, the SR1 project, and the negative environmental and social outcomes have undermined the original decision. Alberta Transportation's own air quality expert states SR1 will create unacceptable short-term risk to human health. I refer to this as "the blast zone" as our schools are just east of this
project.
As I mentioned, the level of flood protection between the SR1 and Glenmore Reservoir is below stated guidelines. The questions I ask this Panel today, how is the SR1 project worthy of approval? How did it get this far?

Is better than nothing an appropriate test of public interest. Thank you.
Q. Thank you, Ms. Karen. Just a quick one on the open house that you attended. You send you attended a number of open houses. And can you give us an overview of how those open houses went.
A. MS. HUNTER: Sure. I've attended two open houses, and then both information sessions last fall that were hosted. The open houses were -- they had a small window of time, $I$ believe something like 6 to 8 p.m., and you would go and walk in the room and they had these boards up that you would walk around and look at images of SR1 and then they recommended you write down your comments about the project.

The one that $I$ attended in Springbank was packed. The room was packed because people were curious about this. There was a lot of concern about debris -- I believe this was 2016 or 2017 -- and the proponent subsequently made a change $I$ guess based on that
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feedback, but there was not a lot of opportunity for back and forth, and there was a few staff there from AT, I believe, and potentially another consultant. But you just basically went in and looked at boards.
Q. Thank you. Okay, I'11 go next to Mr. Brian Copithorne.

THE CHAIR:
I wonder, Ms. Okoye, if we may want to just take a quick sort of a natural break. Why don't we take a ten-minute break and come back. And I believe -- we had about -- I think you had allocated around 2 and a half hours in this area. So it will be likely close to finish up today, perhaps not quite, so we'11 likely need to -- or may need to go tomorrow morning, but just thought I would alert you to that.

And so we'11 be back at 3:15 and I'11 let you carry on. And who is up next?

MS. OKOYE: Mr. Brian Copithorne.
THE CHAIR:
Okay, that's great. Thank you. So let's al1 get back at 3:15 then. Thank you.

MS. OKOYE: Thank you.
(ADJOURNMENT)
THE CHAIR: Welcome back, everyone.
Ms. Okoye, your next witness, please,
Mr. Copithorne.
Q. MS. OKOYE:

Mr. Brian Copithorne, there has been evidence prepared and filed on your behalf in this
matter being the SCLG Group's submissions filed as Exhibit 247 in your submissions, Exhibit 250 at PDF 89 to 98. Are these documents accurate to the best of your knowledge and belief?
A. MR. B. COPITHORNE: Yes, they are.
Q. You adopt them as part of your direct evidence in this matter?
A. MR. B. COPITHORNE: Yes.
Q. Could you please provide the Board an overview of your concerns for this project.
A. MR. B. COPITHORNE: Yes. Today I'd like to speak about three concerns that $I$ have. Of course, I have many concerns being a landowner and being involved in this project, but today I've decided that I would like to talk about three major concerns that $I$ have around issues of health, and that's basically groundwater contamination, the blowing dust, which we've had lots of evidence on. And then the third one that I wanted to talk about was an increase in the breeding habitat for mosquitoes that carry viruses that are harmful to human health.
Q. Please proceed.
A. MR. B. COPITHORNE: Okay. The groundwater contamination issue, where I live there on the edge of the reservoir on section 25 , this is an area that has
many freshwater springs that flow year round. They flow at different rates and some of them dry up for periods of time and then some of them come back again and flow again even in a different spot often.

The three main springs that $I$ have on my property here, they flow continuously and they never stop, summer or winter. I've lived here for nearly 70 years and I've never ever known the springs to stop flowing.

So it's a major concern of mine when these springs are flooded over. I see that as a place where the -- where the contaminated floodwaters will flow backwards into the springs. They'11 contaminate the springs, in my opinion.

Where that groundwater will end up, I don't know. It will come up at wells somewhere likely, not only my wells but those wells of people in Springbank. And I know the proponent says that the -- that the effect of this is short term and it will clear up right after the reservoir is emptied, but I'm not so sure myself. When that contamination gets into the groundwater, I'm not sure what the outcome will be.

So the water table is very high in this area and there's lots of opportunity for the floodwater to contaminate the groundwater.

So that's my primary concern.

Blowing dust. The second thing is the blowing dust. We've talked about that a lot.

In Exhibit 2 in Stantec's original project description, in Section 535, they -- they talk about how the dust from the sediment that's left behind in the reservoir can be picked up by the prevailing wind. And they even mention the fact that there's a possibility that there will be raw sewage in that as we11 as other contaminants. So having lived here, I've seen what blowing dust can do.

Occasionally someone will overcultivate their fields or get the soil worked down until it's too fine, and when that wind kicks up, that dust blows for miles. You can see it just blackens the sky.

So I can foresee that happening with this Springbank reservoir. That dry dust is as fine as flour, and there's no doubt that it will blow and it will be bad.

The third thing -- the third health concern that I'm very concerned about is increased breeding habitat for mosquitoes. There was an exhibit, Exhibit 250 on page 105. It was submitted by the late Dr. Church, and Dr. Bob Church for anyone that is not familiar with who he is, he is a well-known and respected scientist that lived in the Calgary area. He's known -- well-known in
the agricultural sector for his reproductive technology that he developed in cattle.

And in his letter, Dr. Church talks about the increased breeding habitat for striped mosquitoes that are likely to result from stagnant water that's left behind after the reservoir is drained. And he warns that these mosquitoes will cause infection that's not only harmful to cattle, but the Zika virus is known to be harmful to humans as well.

And an interesting point is that nearly two years after Dr. Church wrote this letter, there was an article in the Calgary Herald and it was titled "15 Dead Rescue Birds Prompts Investigation into Source of West Nile Virus in Southern Alberta."

The story was about these birds, birds of prey mainly, that had died during the summer of 2018, and it was found that they had died of the West Nile virus. And West Nile virus is a virus that is also carried by mosquitoes.

So this story, nearly two years after Dr. Church wrote his letter, it very much verifies his concerns and the risk to human health that's posed by the SR1 project.

Those are the three main health issues that I'm concerned about. And I would request that the Panel
take very serious consideration of these types of issues.

And contrary to what the proponent may claim, there are serious health concerns, and the consequences of this project are neither temporary nor minor. And, again, I just ask the Board to take that into consideration. And that's pretty much all I have to say for now. So thank you very much.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Copithorne. Just a few more questions.

How long have you lived in the area?
A. MR. B. COPITHORNE: Do you want to know how long I've lived personally here or my family or both?
Q. Both.
A. MR. B. COPITHORNE: Both. Okay. My great grandfather came to this area in the mid 1880s. So it won't be long before it's 140 years. Myself, I've lived on the property for 70 years and we've been ranchers right from the very beginning of that. That's what we do. We raise cattle and we ranch.
Q. I'd just like you to identify the location of your lands. I'm not sure if, document manager, you're able to pull up Exhibit 249. 249, please.

Mr. Copithorne, is your land location accurate on that map?
A. MR. B. COPITHORNE: Yes, it is.
Q. So your valleyed within the off-stream storage reservoir?
A. MR. B. COPITHORNE: Yes. I also own a piece of property that is near the intake. It's down at the bottom of the map.
Q. All right. So move on to the next person.

THE CHAIR: Mr. Copithorne, thank you very much.
A. MR. B. COPITHORNE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to speak today, and thank you to you and the Board. Thank you very much.
Q. MS. OKOYE: Thank you, Mr. Copithorne. We'11 go on to Mary Robinson. Are you there?

Ms. Robinson, there has been evidence prepared and filed on your behalf in this proceeding; that being the SCLG Group submissions filed as Exhibit 247 in your submissions, Exhibit 250 at PDF pages 1 to 10, and you also have an opening presentation. Are these documents accurate to the best of your knowledge and belief?
A. MS. ROBINSON: Yes.
Q. Do you adopt them as part of your direct evidence in this proceeding?
A. MS. ROBINSON: Yes.
Q. So is your land southwest of quarter of 3-24-4, west of the fifth?
A. MS. ROBINSON: Yes.
Q. Do you own the land with any other member of your family?
A. MS. ROBINSON: No.
Q. Do you have other lands with other members of your family that are affected by this project?
A. MS. ROBINSON: Yes. My sister Janet Hawes, she owns the southeast quarter with her daughter Rhonda Gervais, and Janet and I own the north half of section 3-50-50 (phonetic).
Q. Are you speaking for yourself, your sister, and your niece in this proceeding?
A. MS. ROBINSON: Yes. They have given me permission to speak on their behalf as they're concerned landowners and opposed to the project as well.
Q. I understand that there is a correction you want to make to Exhibit 249.

Document manager, if you could pull up Exhibit 249, please. That was just the map that you'd just shown previously.

So I understand that the location of your -- your sister's lands are not accurate, towards the bottom, if you can go to the bottom of the screen, please. Is that correct, Ms. Robinson?
A. MS. ROBINSON: Yes. My property is correct, but in that where it says Range Road 42 there at the bottom, where it says "Wills" there, that should be Janet Hawes instead. So Janet and Rhonda own mutually Section 3 Block 2. It's 54.81 acres, and Section 3 Block 3 is 69.46 acres. Janet owns 76.39; Rhonda 23.61, and they only do that because Rocky View, you can only have one parcel out of a quarter. So you have to do a percentage like that.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Can you provide the Panel with an overview of your concerns for this project, Ms. Robinson?
A. MS. ROBINSON: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and the Board, for allowing us as a landowner to talk about our concerns.

I was asked to talk as just an example of a business person and a landowner within the project spectrum.

Our original home ranch was called the Elbow Park Ranch. It is under now what is the Glenmore dam, so that's a little redundant.

But our family originally bought that in 1888, and they moved to this present location in 1907. I was raised in one-room log cabin here until 1963 when our family together, we built a log house from logs that we
cut on the ranch.
I went to Springbank School for 12 years.
Just a little background, I'm a registered nurse;
I was also a guide outfitter in British Columbia and the Yukon for 25 years. So I have a great deal of experience with wildlife management, land management, conservation, and I've had numerous businesses.

All those generations have worked on this property and ranched and farmed, and we most certainly want to carry on with that family tradition.

There's been a great deal of poverty and hard times, and we've had to endure to hang onto these properties as landowners. And I think that really is something very significant.

I'm also director of the Canadian Quarter Horse Association and the director of the American Quarter Horse Association. The American Quarter Horse Association is the largest equine organization in the world, so I'm very involved in the horse world and in numerous cattlemen organizations as well.

As landowners, we really do believe in flood mitigation, which is not what sort of the aura of this presentation is. We believe in it, but we just believe that it should be for all people equally, and it should help all communities and not just Calgary.

I lease my land from my sister for agricultural purposes, but she is equally concerned about this proposed dam.

During the flood, we had about half a milition dollars' worth of damage to the family's property. We lost about 40 acres down the river, and a lot of our assets were severely damaged.

I'm going to talk now basically about my immediate family and our operation as far as the ranch and the equestrian centre. And that is my daughter and my son and his wife Courtenay and my grandson Luke who is sixth generation. So there's Jesse, Logan, and his family all involved, all wanting to carry on ranching.

As far as what we do here, we have a purebred and a commercial cattle operation. We farm this land for greenfeed and hay. SR1 project will totally obliterate my cattle operation. It's right down by the traffic circle there; it will take everything; corrals, graineries, loading chutes, all my bull corrals, heifer, it will be obliterated.

The equestrian centre is to the south of the property. Here I board horses, train horses, give lessons. I have educational clinics that are open to the public. Moose Hill is kind of an iconic community for these activities. I have educational clinics once
per month. I have equine-assisted learning programs, handicapped children programs, PTSD programs for Calgary policewomen. I have a breast cancer survival program where these people just come and spend time with horses in order to increase their mental health. The facility is truly an icon for education and recreation.

So as far as landowners, there's a lot of diversity when it comes to what we do with our land, and I think that's very, very relevant when it comes to the landowners' businesses.

Other things that we do here, I have lots of event venues. We have all sorts of wagon rides, wedding venues, sleigh rides, trap-shooting competitions, et cetera.

As far as recreation, we ride here a lot. Horses are our love. We raise purebred quarter horses here. We hunt, we fish, and we trap on this land. Mostly we love the pristine, undisturbed nature of the property. That's why you have rural property like this, and that will be all taken from us.

I've been involved with the question of the Springbank Dam validity since its inception almost eight years, and I guess as a committee member, like a lot of us, it's taken a great deal of our personal time
and our business time for the last eight years. It's quite difficult to have that time taken away from you when you're trying to defend what is rightfully yours as a landowner.

We first heard about this project on the television one night. That's where it all began, and I guess the government had been working on the project for about six months before that.

An expropriation person, expert spoke at that first meeting, so needless to say, that sort of behaviour did not sort of be a good beginning of a positive atmosphere for future negotiations or consultation.

There's been a lot of open houses, agreed, but 90 percent of those have been closed microphone; we just looked at easels and found out what they were going to do with our 1 and.

We had one meeting of exclusive landowners with Mr. McIver in Bragg Creek. That was initiated by the 1andowners and Miranda Rosen, and most of the others have been open to the public. He said he would have follow-up meetings with us which that did not transpire.

THE CHAIR: Ms. Robinson, just a real quick note. The odd time you're freezing on my feed, and I
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think it's the same for a few other folks. I don't think I'm missing many words. I just wanted to check with the court reporter, though, because I've been able to follow. I just want to make sure she's getting this. So just one second. Ms. Vespa.

THE COURT REPORTER: Yes, I've been able to get it, but I am having the same issue. Your Internet is freezing, you may have a low bandwidth.
A. MS. ROBINSON: I'm afraid our Internet here is not best so...

THE CHAIR:
But it is working, and it's just the odd freeze. So if the court reporter is getting the audio and the words, that's perfect.

So please continue, thank you very much. Sorry for the interruption.
A. MS. ROBINSON: Okay. So basically our biggest concern is that this plan is supposed to be good for both urban and rural people, and we really do feel that that's -- should not -- has not been the case to this point.

We feel that it is a community issue, I want to emphasize that, not just Elbow Park and Roxboro and Calgary and the CRCAG members. We really believe it should be a decision for all communities. One should not trump the other at the cost of other people's
lives.
Again, MC1 helps Calgary just as much SR1 in a superior way because it also, as we've discussed does drought protection, fire protection, and great recreational opportunities.

The biggest thing about landowners I guess is that all these other groups are not losing their heritages; no. The CRCAG people aren't losing their -- going to have their homes taken away from them; no.

Are they losing they are professions. No. And are they losing their livelihoods; no. Because our land is actually going to be taken from us, and that is most certainly the difference.

This decision is supposed to be based on public interest, not just on a select few, and I think that opposition has been very evident in the open houses.

As far as the project need, I would like to just say that $I$ think one thing that really concerns me is the inequity of research that's been done on each project. About 25 percent we've estimated of research has been done on MC1 compared to SR1, and the proponent admitted that a lot of MC1 research was desktop on1y.

I think anybody that does research no matter what you're doing research on, you have to have a very fair, unbiased study, and you have to study them identically.

You need to start at the origin problem which is here, the mountains, and you have to solve the problems methodically taking every bit in between into account. That's not done with SR1.

Our group requested years ago for detailed financials from the proponent. We spent thousands of dollars trying to find out a lot of financials, and we were refused due to FOIP, the freedom of information.

It really makes us suspect where this was a pre-determined decision and not one that's based on science, environment, and human social concerns.

Just an example, I'm a stakeholder in -- very close to the MC project. I have my grazing permit up there; we've had it in the family for about 70 years. And we were not discussed at all when it came to -- we were not contacted, nothing about MC1 up there, and we're a major paying stakeholder. It's, as far as I'm concerned, a perfect place for a wet dam right at the Allen Bill Pond site.

I think it also rather concerns us that the SR1 opposition groups bring to the forefront flaws that are in the SR1 project that Stantec and the proponent have made, and it seems that they're allowed to sort of amend and change and make it look good to everybody so that it will be approved. And I really don't think
that should be the pattern. I think there should be one presentation, should be approved or dismissed and not given dozens of chances to make it right or upgrade it or do anything and often without a difference of cost benefit, I might add.

And I just question, did the MC1 project get that luxury of, you know, changing their merits and benefits to make their project be passed; no.

I think Alberta Transportation greatly overuses the word "monitor." It's in a great number of their submissions, and it is used endlessly. And I just think that that is not a word that means absolutely anything. They actually need a plan for any of the problems that might be with the SR1 projects.

As landowners, we've been really treated quite disrespectfully in a lot of ways. One of the proponent's employees at one of the open houses said to me, and I quote: (as read)
"Well, you're going to be rich when we
se11 all your property and they buy you
out. Why don't you just go build another equestrian centre somewhere else, what's the big deal?"

I think that was a very flippant, ignorant, degrading comment. I think that was actually a comment that was
abusive. Obviously someone who is not self-employed who has no idea of what it costs to rebuild, time, energy, disruption of your business to rebuild, the inconvenience, the disturbance to our entire lives.

I've had six businesses in my life, and it really takes about three years to get those businesses established where they're properly fully functioning. So you can see the concern of that.

I could go build -- or buy a beautiful place in Longview if $I$ have to move from here, but the business there would not be successful because the businesses we have in the Springbank community are successful because of location, location.

My equestrian centre is successful because women can drive 15 minutes and come and see and ride their horse and take a lesson. They're not transferrable.

It's very difficult as business people with this project ending to make any long-term or short-term business plans, and it's not a nice feeling to have someone else ruling your business success or your personal lives. It's very depressing. It's not a nice way to live, and we landowners have lived with that horrible feeling for eight years.

It's the feeling of indecision and not knowing that is the most difficult, whether somebody tomorrow is
going to come and take your land. Very stressful, very psychologically draining. I've looked at the -- at property from here to the Alberta US border for a ranch that is similar; there is none. It is not comparable, and that's because these are old ranches where we live.

A lot of us landowners have employees and contractors that work directly from our facilities. I have a full-time instructor trainer, for instance, that lives in the heritage house and all these employees, and contractors will lose their jobs and their homes because most of them do live on site.

I also, as Karen said, was quite upset by the constant Alberta Transportation saying that the cost increase was not significant when it went from 230 to 432 million. I think that's significant.

I think we need to remember this isn't a road from Edmonton to Calgary that we just have to build and there is no choice. There is a choice here and there is a better one and that's MC1.

As far as Crown consultation and land use, in the last few years, $I$ have done over 32 tours of this ranch on my own time. Government officials, environment, all sorts of groups, media, et cetera. I've toured nine different Indian tribes. There are teepee rings, medicine wheels, buffalo hollows on Jan and my property
close to the heritage house.
I initially informed the Tsuut'ina of the sacred camping site that's close to the house in hopes that they would be allies to us in our opposition to SR1.

The natives weren't aware of that site at the time. They were aware of the Stoney Trail which crosses through the ranch and through a lot of the other landowners, Brian's and a lot of the other 1andowners' 1 and.

Every one of those tours, there was eight to ten people. I even toured Montana Indians.

My family gave Tsuut'ina permission to have a sacred ceremony at that site right down at the camping site there when Lee Crowchild was the Chief.

I hosted a staging site for the unity ride where people came that were opposed to SR1, and we rode from here to the Tsuut'ina rodeo grounds. After that, Roy Whitney was later elected and the opinion greatly changed. And Tsuut'ina withdrew their opposition for a payout of 32 milition.

I really question whether it's morally ethical that the government is allowed to pay people out for their silence. We question whether a decision, therefore, will be made on science, environment, and most importantly, communities if people are just allowed to
be muted by payments out.
And I guess the question if other communities or landowners have been offered the same payout for that same price.

As far as land acquisition, they are saying they're going to appraise our properties. I know there was a statement from one of them saying they were only doing desktop appraisals. I find that very unacceptable. You do not know what has gone into the infrastructure of these landowners' buildings, properties, houses, all sorts of infrastructure there is on farms and ranches. So, that, $I$ don't feel, is a fair way of doing it at al1.

I think we have to remember that money we do get will be taxed hugely, 30 percent or so. So what we really get, $I$ don't know as far as the value at the end whether we'11 be able to even relocate and reconstruct what we previously had before.

Other. As far as the design and safety, of course, my immediate family, I'm very, very afraid to live here now. Our ranch and house is going to be very close to the intake, and I'm very afraid of failure and backflow and obstruction because if that happened, we'd be the first to be obliterated.

Pipelines. I have a good friend in TransCanada

Pipeline that recently told me that the price they are thinking about the TransCanada Pipeline moving is about 24 million. Alberta Transportation estimated at the beginning 2 million.

And there's also Plains Midstream's got two pipelines. They're estimated at 10 million. So we've gone from 4 miliion what they estimated to now perhaps 34 million. I think that's, again, greatly underestimate -- that's the way Alberta Transportation greatly underestimates in order to make SR1 look superior.

Road building, utilities, those are all exceedingly expensive.

Alberta Transportation suggested that hunting will be allowed on this site. I question the legality of that. The Firearms Act states that firearm hunting must be at least 50 yards from a road and cannot hunt across a roadway -- from or across a roadway. It's illegal to discharge a weapon within 200 yards of an occupied building.

Section 38 of the Wildlife Act states: (as read)
"No person shall hunt wildlife or
discharge a firearm on or over occupied
land or enter such land for the purpose
of doing so without the consent of the
owner, the occupant."
So what Alberta Transportation was proposing is illegal.
As far as water, I think the most important thing about water is human life and safety, highly underestimated by the committee, especially of groundwater.

I'm wondering whether Alberta Transportation is taking seriously at all, in a flood event, septic tank overflow management, raw water of any sort that is not palatable. How are they going to manage that?

So let's talk about water palatability, and let me give you an example.

The Redwood Meadows sewer pump station is about 100 yards south of my property. In the flood of 2005, '6, and '13, their pump station overflowed and there was about 20 acres of my property flooded with raw sewage, grey water, and there's a gravel pit right next to the entrance of my house, it totally filled, about 40 feet deep. Then it flowed back into the Elbow and back into the Calgary water source. This contaminated water would contain breeding grounds for E. Coli, giardia, beaver fever, (indiscernible), West Nile Virus, very toxic to humans.

I had to move my horses out of that field for three weeks and feed them elsewhere.

My children and I spent two days with bovine obstetrical gloves, that's rubber gloves up to our shoulders picking up stool, tampons, condoms, and all sorts of other disgusting material that was in the waste from this. City of Calgary came and visited the site and they did nothing.

So I think this is just a prime example of what overflow can do from saturated groundwater, and how septic lines and things are not being taken into account when SR1 floods the entire meadow over there.

As far as land and air quality, et cetera, as a rancher, $I$ really would like to say that, once this land is gone to this project it's gone forever. We just cannot keep taking fertile farmland and grazing land for the benefit of urban use as it is only Calgary that benefits from this project. Let's all remember where our food comes from. We need to keep green space and we need to use viable agricultural land wisely, what it's meant for, not a monstrosity like SR1. Far better choice, it's MC1.

Up at MC1, it's a chaotic mess from the 2013 flood at Allen Bill Pond there. We could clean that up to make MC1. I'm just a real big believer that if you have any disaster in life, that you should turn it around and try to make something positive out of it. This is
something we could make positive out of it. We could clean up the MC1 and Allen Bill site, build a wet dam that would be good, again, for all those other things. There's houses there, there's buildings there, there's infrastructure already started. We can make MC1 as a far more positive alternative.

Wildiffe, again, high1y underestimated by Alberta Transportation. I was a guide outfitter for 25 years, owned the largest hunting concession in North America. My son is CEO of Bear Trust International, a group that's the largest organization for education of habitat, conservation and research of bears around the world. My children now own that Yukon Territory and very involved with wildilfe. So the thought of this project and the impact that it's going to have on wildiffe has very much disturbed them.

They have -- that Jumping Pound elk herd is very sensitive and a very high population, and I think we really need to take that into consideration on this being a much more important issue.

Alberta Transportation said they're going to move the elk. Well, I don't know how they're going to do that, whether they're going to chase them with horses or whatever, but you don't just move elk, okay?

My children have been directly involved, like very
directly involved, with several wildife transplants in Canada and the US, wild sheep and elk, and the mortality when you move wildife from helicopters, even with the best, and the best experts, the mortality is very, very high.

So, again, very little impact to low populations of wildlife at MC1, and the wildlife here is much higher population. If there was a dam at MC1, the wildlife could just move to higher elevations. Rescuing wildife, as they discussed, not realistic.

I'd like to talk about silt management, and if I could get them to look at my slides that I have on my PowerPoint under silt management, if you would, please. MS. OKOYE: Document manager, could you please pull up the opening presentation from Ms. Robinson? What page are you referring to?
A. MS. ROBINSON: It's about three pages down. They're all labelled. You'll see they're all labelled; you can just go up from there. Keep going. There's general flood damages.

I can just go over these right here. You can see some of these terrible flood damages to the ranch. That's right below the arena there; you can see the river is high as anything. This is the road down to our barn and things; you can see how terribly high the
water was.
Next slide. That was right next to the arena. You can see the river there is, you know, half a mile across.

Next slide. That's the floodwater, flooded my entire field in front of my house, and that was actually the next day. So it actually had gone down from there.

Carry on, next slide. That's just some workers that $I$ had trying to divert part the -- of the river so it wouldn't hurt the arena as much.

Next slide. And that is the field in front of my house totally covered in water. And this is the field down below; there's my feeding grounds for my cattle. Right down by the traffic circle there, that was up to the top of the banks, 10 feet water there.

Next slide. This I should just show you. When I talked about the groundwater saturation from the Redwood Meadows sewer, this is a pipe that they put from the pump station southerly trying to get rid of the water, but it just flowed south. And then it went west, and then it came back north, and it crossed my property, and it flooded 20 acres.

Next slide. And that's the raw sewage just gushing out of pipe, and there it is flooding my -- the
$\qquad$
raw sewage flooding my hayfield there.
Next slide. And there it is at the end of the field, and you can see the wildife there that are devastated by what's happening.

Next slide, please. This is where the
Redwood Meadows pump station came out of that hole there like an absolute tap. Therefore, very much exemplifying underground water and how much this project is going to contaminate all of the wells, all of the underground water.

Next slide, please. There's the hole in the ground that's full of raw sewage that did recede in about four days.

Next slide, please. I want to talk about silt and how it has high1y been underestimated by the proponent.

This is my corrals, and if you don't think there isn't silt deposits, there is an example of how terrible that was. There was silt deposits about 4 feet in a lot of areas of the property. Along the river right close to my property, I spent eight days on the Bobcat trying to find my fences and dig them out of the silt.

Next one, please. And that's the -- about four days after the flood had gone away, and that was the silt that $I$ had to deal with. Animals had to be moved
from this site. These silt deposits at the reservoir will be firstly a big bog of sticks and garbage and things. And then they're going to dry. And as you can see, that's what they're going to look like.

Because the winds are always westerly, anything Springbank below that reservoir is just going to blow terribly. And those silt particles we've talked about how small they are, they're microscopic, and they actually get into the alveoli of the lungs. That is where the carbon dioxide and the oxygen exchange actually happen. And that's what they're going to clog.

So the silt dust is going to be very harmful for respiratory function. And again, let's remember there's homes and residences downstream of SR1, and what about all the school children that are right adjacent to there? Common sense dictates that this will just be a terrible disaster.

They say they're going to truck this silt away and take it somewhere. It's going to be toxic waste, so I don't know really where they're going to put it. And again, the cost of that trucking, it will be very, very high. Again, MC1, none of that problem.

In these silt, there has been weeds that I have never seen before on the ranch: Bracteosa (phonetic)
which is poisonous to animals and cattle; Kosia (phonetic), which grows about 6 feet tall, very coarse stalk, very hard to kill; Canada thistle, all of them very difficult to kill when it comes to chemicals.

Next slide, please.
There's just some more damage that was done to our corrals on the north quarter down there. All of the infrastructure there was totally demolished.

Next slide, please. You can see here this is the back of a garbage and sticks, and you can see right there, there's shingles and plastic and all sorts of things that have backed up against our fence.

Next slide, please. And there it is the following day. Thousands and thousands of hours of work to clean up and rebuild.

So this is what 1 andowners will be -- again, going to be subject to if just SR1 is done. Okay? That's why MC1 is, in our opinion, all of this damage, you know, to houses no matter where you are, above the SR1 site, they need to be taken into consideration. Like the damage at Redwood and Bragg Creek, it was terrible. So in conclusion, I just want to say that SR1 is a one-purpose project made for one group, and that's Calgary. And it disregards everyone else.

MC1 has the benefit of multiuse project, far
better capital investment for Alberta, much greater foresight to future generations and water supply because they say we're going to be out of water in Calgary by 2040.

SR1 benefits one community; MC1 benefits all community and landowners.

MC1 encompasses positive benefits of managing flood, drought, fire, and recreation and will not destroy families or communities. It will benefit everyone fairly.

I hope these facts are the important issues that the Board will take into account seriously.

So $I$ just respectfully submit to the Board that MC1 is built instead of SR1; it is a far superior project for the public interest. And I believe it's the public interest of all communities that is the mission statement of what the Board is to make their decision on.

Thank you very much.
Q. Thank you, Ms. Robinson.

So go to Ms. Feist.
THE CHAIR:
And just before you do, thank you, Ms. Robinson, very thorough presentation, heartfelt. Thank you.
A. MS. ROBINSON: Thank you.
A. MS. DUSDAL: Yes.
Q. Ms. Feist.
A. MS. FEIST: Yes.
Q. And Ms. Dusda1.
A. MS. FEIST:
Yes.

7 Q. There has been evidence prepared and filed on your
A. MS. FEIST: Yes, they are.
Q. Do you adopt them as part of your balance evidence in this proceeding?
A. MS. FEIST: Yes, I do.
Q. Can you also have Ms. Dusdal?
A. MS. FEIST: Yes.

20 Q. Is she there?
Q. Are you both together? behalf in this matter, that being the SCLG group submissions filed as Exhibit 247; your submissions, Exhibit 250 at PDF pages 11 to 27. Ms. Dusda1 submissions Exhibit 250, PDF 53, and Exhibit 251. Are these documents accurate to the best of your knowledge and belief?
A. MS. FEIST: Yes.
Q. Ms. Dusda1, do you also adopt the evidence, the documents as part of your direct evidence in this proceeding?
A. MS. DUSDAL: Yes.
Q. Thank you. All right. So we -- you've already seen the map that was pulled up on the screen before. I don't want to waste time going over that again. Are your lands shown on that map correct?
A. MS. FEIST: They're correct.
Q. Perfect. Can you please provide the Panel an overview of your concerns with this proceeding.
A. MS. FEIST: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair and the NRCB Pane1, for hearing my testimony today. I'm Tracey Feist, fourth generation from a Springbank farming family. I hold a science degree from the University of Idaho, professional designation from the Canadian Public Relations Society.

THE COURT REPORTER: Hello.
Q. Can you slow down?

THE COURT REPORTER: Yeah, I'm sorry, I really need you to slow down. So from a fourth generation...
A. MS. FEIST: Yeah, sorry. I'm a fourth generation from a Springbank farming family. I hold a science degree from the University of Idaho, a professional designation from the Canadian Public Relations Society and am a former corporate affairs director with over 25 years of experience in agricultural communications.

I'm here today representing my family, my mother

Marlene Dusdal, and my late father Gary Munro (phonetic). We endorse everything Karin Hunter has presented.

I wish to address Topic 1: Project Need and Justification." As adjacent landowners to the SR1 diverging structure, we are gravely concerned with the lack of consultation our provincial governments have afforded us. We are hopeful that the NRCB will responsibly review the material presented and consider the social, economic, and environmental impacts of the proposed SR1 project.

My family has resided on the south half of section 11-24-4 west of the fifth, since 1965. My mother owns the north half of section 2-24-4, west of the fifth. We offer historic understanding of the 1and, Pirmez Creek and the Elbow River from 60 years of occupancy.

We are fundamentally perplexed as to why our voices are only being heard eight years later. Millions of dollars have been spent on this project to date. Both the former NDP government and the current UCP government were opposed to the SR1 project prior to being elected. Why did it take seven years for elected officials to give my family an opportunity to offer an important contextual history of our 1 and.

Landowners in this area are an important
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stakeholder group and SR1 has been the "project de jour" since the very beginning.

My southwest and southeast quarters are located directly east of the SR1 diversion structure across Highway 22. The history of my land is important as the headwaters of Pirmez Creek begin on the southwest quarter of section 11. This pristine underground aquifer flows year round, travelling two and a half miles east and empties into the Elbow River.

Pirmez Creek provides a location for environmentally sensitive brook trout to spawn. My family has protected and managed it as part of the Cows and Fish Program, Exhibit 250, page 17, to ensure its health and has prevented any degradation to the creek. A report from Alberta Environment and Parks is unsetting: (as read)
"This project as proposed will present a high risk to fish populations in reach of the Elbow River. Additionally, it is also the opinion that bull trout may eventually become extirpated from this stream, which given the unique life history characteristics of bull trout in the Elbow River."

Exhibit 187, page 3.

These facts are important because at no time did anyone from the proponent or AEP contact me or my family to monitor the fish in Pirmez Creek. I can only correlate and conclude that if the bull trout are extirpated so are the brook trout, which feed into the Elbow, which then feeds into the Bow River, giving it its blue ribbon fishing status.

I believe the proponent and Stantec are not designing the SR1 project to protect us from the possible maximum flood. In the draft environmental assessment report. It states: (as read)
"An off-stream dam failure or breach could occur due to flooding.

Additionally, overtopping could occur if the floodwater volume exceeds the probable maximum flood design and the
emergency spillway fails to operate as
anticipated (due to design error or
debris blockage), or if the diversion
inlet gates fail to shut once the
reservoir reaches maximum capacity."
Exhibit 163 page 120.
A dam breach or failure could result in inundation of surrounding areas, federal lands, lands used for traditional or non-traditional purposes, as well as
commercial and residential property and would have the potential for human injury or loss of life. Exhibit 163, page 121.

Considering that SR1 is classified as an extreme consequence dam hazard rating, and the floodplain berm is classified as a very high consequence dam, the design capacity is far below what this rating demands.

Is there any possibility that any professional engineer or government regulator would add their stamp, signed signature of approval for this project and accept the responsibilities for the consequences of dam failure. That is Exhibit 159, page 26 and 27.

In that same exhibit, seven professional engineers from Stantec provided their signature on a signoff sheet with a stamp of "Professional Engineer, Alberta Licence to Practice," but the paragraph above their signature says: (as read)
"In preparing the document, Stantec did not verify information supplied to it by others. Any use which a third party makes of this document is the responsibility of such third party. Such third party agrees that Stantec shall not be responsible for costs or damages of any kind, if any, suffered by
it or any other third party as a result of decisions made or actions taken based on this document."

Exhibit 159, page 2.
Who's going to be responsible should this diversion structure fail? Currently, due to my proximity to the Elbow River, only one insurance company, the Cooperators, will insure my farm for water damage, but it only covers up to $\$ 50,000$, and my annual policy is \$10, 000 .

Why is this important to know? Bob Sanford, EPCOR Chair for Water and Climate Security at the United Nations University Institute For Water, Environment and Health explains in his book "Storm Warning" published in 2015: (as read)
"The frequency, intensity, and duration of extreme weather events are already increasing. Disasters with insured losses of over 1 billion have occurred every year for the past five years in Canada alone."

We are also concerned about two major pipelines on our property: TransCanada, built in 1962, and the Alberta Ethane Development Company Limited, built in 1970. Both natural gas pipelines carry 900 pounds per square inch
of pressure.
In speaking with their officials in 2016, both were against the project, and both reported that if SR1 were to proceed, the company's policy would require the pipelines be moved or lowered to at least 3 feet deep. Exhibit 250, page 53.

We are in grave danger because if these 60-year-old pipelines rupture or break, it will adversely impact my 300 acres of native grassland and my mother's hayfield; it could endanger our lives, ruin houses, outbuildings, and businesses. Who's going to protect species at risk such as a brook trout or mitigate the loss of animal life, the cattle, and multiple animal species who find solace on our land? Who will repair fences and remove contaminated soil and silt?

And what about the groundwater which flows into the Elbow River? We endorse Exhibit 261 from Dr. John Fenne11. Pirmez Creek is a spring-fed creek, and the groundwater on my property could be affected if SR1 is approved and construction commences across the road from me.

During the 1967 flood, my parents' basement on the S.W. quarter of 11 had 3 feet of water in it. It was not from the Elbow River flooding solely; it was because of the water table rising.

When the proponent began excavation of the current roundabout or traffic circle at the junction of Highways 8 and 22, that construction and subsequent dugout located at Kamp Kiwanis again directly west of my property -- and this is a very small project in comparison to SR1 -- damaged the underground water flows and began to flood our homes in 2005, ' 06,2011 , and 2013. Yet overland flooding was a consequence of the roundabout.

We met with government officials in both 2014 and '16, and in both cases the government officials were dismissive of our claims related to the detrimental effects of groundwater.

The proponent reports that the potential effects of groundwater quantity and quality have been assessed in the EIA and were determined to not be significant: (as read)
"Not only is valuable agricultural land being taken out of service, but the construction of a large earthen dam
structure designed to contain up to 77.8
million cubic metres of water over 730
hectares is concerning from a
hydrogeological and geochemical
perspective, as well as geotechnical.

Unfortunately, no exploration of the geochemical aspects has occurred beyond assessing baseline groundwater quality.

The residents of Springbank obtain their
drinking water from wells mostly
complete in the underlying bedrock, yet there's been no assessment of how the existence of SR1 could impact the groundwater."

Exhibit 261, page 24.
The government of Alberta has not assessed the potential damage associated with rising or changing groundwater levels on my land, nor have they analyzed our wells for potential impacts or safety. This isn't just another little red pin on a map on a wall in someone's office. This is uncultivated native grasslands that offers significant biodiversity. My father made a living from this land and raised a family here. He observed over decades that whatever happens upstream from us aboveground affects what happens below ground. He knew from working on the land 365 days a year since 1965 that groundwater and surface water are directly correlated where one ultimately becomes the other.

What he observed is quite simple; anything we do
upstream is going to impact the amount and quality of water we send downstream. All scientific reports prove he was right.

We need to be thinking 100 years down the road. As the population of Calgary and this rural area increases and climate change quietly continues, it becomes even more important that we understand how groundwater affects the Elbow River, both the quantity of it and quality and our impact on it, but most importantly, how we protect it.

With importance of the native grasslands, Item E, train and soils in Topic 5, my property is native grasslands that offer significant biodiversity and is a threatened and endangered habitat: (as read)
"The Nature Conservancy of Canada states
they are more in danger than coral reefs
and rain forest. Grasslands hold water
during a flood. If grasslands are gone,
so is their deep-rooted natural system
of water infiltration and carbon
storage. Carbon storage and water
retention are far more effective than
pine and spruce forests."
End quote, Exhibit 250 page 235.
The SR1 project fails on multiple levels. Its
escalating costs are not being truthfully reported to Albertans. Albertans and their tax dollars are paying for this unproven untested dry dam infrastructure.

Let me be clear, no one wants to see the city of Calgary flood. However, we need to hold our elected officials at all levels accountable. They are obligated to provide infrastructure that achieves its intended objectives without creating unnecessary risks and negative consequences.

We need to preserve a safe and viable water supply for our future. Why? Because the Elbow River supplies drinking water to 40 percent of the city of Calgary. That equates to one in six Albertans.

The Elbow River is not a big river; it's just one-tenth of the size of the Bow River: (as read)
"Water is a limited resource, and our
water supply is changing due to climate
change and a growing population."
It's Exhibit 347, page 1.
What we need is a storage reservoir located upstream on government Crown lands. A reservoir would serve multiple purposes. Not only would it manage flood levels during environment events; it would offer fire and drought mitigation for Foothills communities. It would store water for a growing city of Calgary. It
would manage the appropriate water levels on the Elbow River to mitigate future flood events.

And finally, it would offer a place for all Albertans to recreate and enjoy sustainable infrastructure for multiple generations.

We must learn from extreme weather events. They disrupt lives, impact economies, alter and stress ecosystems. They also impact health, insurance, and 1iability.

Calgary must protect its upstream water sources and establish a sustainable water supply to serve its growing population for the next 100 years.

A dry dam does not make sense. This issue needs to be about water conservation, water as a resource, not waste, science, not politics, holding our elected officials accountable to serve us all, not just specific special interest groups.

Water is our most precious natural resource in this province. We should not squander the opportunity to manage it properly.

I'11 finish with a quote from noted water researcher Dr. John Pomeroy, the Canada research Chair in water resources and climate change at the University of Saskatchewan. In Colette Derworiz's article titled "Three years later - 1essons being learned from the 2013
flood" from the June 2018 -- pardon me, June 18th, 2016, edition of the Calgary Herald. Pomeroy was quoted as saying: (as read)
"The 2013 flood in Alberta shows all
signs of climate change."
And he elaborated that building a dry dam would only serve as a security blanket. Pomeroy said there's no doubt Calgary needs to be protected from future flooding due to the location of its downtown, but the big question is how.

Stil1 Pomeroy said building a dry dam to protect the City doesn't make sense: (as read)
"A dam can allow people to feel safe in
an extreme event. The dam can be overtopped and fail. Most dams have more than one purpose. If you're going to go to the trouble of building a dam, you might as well operate it year round and use it to moderate the river for droughts. That's why -- that's part of why that idea seemed like a strange idea to me."

And we couldn't agree more.
We request the Board to deny the application.
Q. Thank you, Ms. Feist. Ms. Dusdal, do you have anything

1 to add? there?
A. MR. M. COPITHORNE: I'm here.
Q. Okay. So there has been evidence prepared and filed on your behalf in this matter, being the SCLG Group submissions filed as Exhibit 247, your submissions filed as Exhibit 250 at PDF 62. Are these documents accurate to the best of your knowledge and belief?
A. MR. M. COPITHORNE: They are.
Q. Do you adopt them as part of your evidence in this proceeding?
A. MR. M. COPITHORNE: Yes.
Q. And you previously had shown Exhibit 249, which is a map showing all the land locations?
A. MR. M. COPITHORNE: Yes.
Q. Did you see that?
A. MR. M. COPITHORNE: Yes, I did.
Q. Your land location on that map, is that correct?
A. MR. M. COPITHORNE: Some of it, yes.
Q. Okay. So you have more that are not shown?
A. MR. M. COPITHORNE: Much more.
Q. Okay. All right. So can you give the Board an overview of your concerns with this project?
A. MR. M. COPITHORNE: May I proceed?
Q. Yes, please.

THE CHAIR: Yes, please.
A. MR. M. COPITHORNE: To the Chair and to the members of this Board, I wish to extend my thanks and appreciation for the privilege of being able to appear before you today.

I'm 84 years of age. I'm a proud Albertan, and I'm a Calgary booster. I've been with the Calgary Stampede since late 1960s, and I'm an honorary life director to this day, and I'm concerned with what happens in Calgary.

We have operated a historic ranch; it was established in 1886 by my grandfather, and I still live and work on that ranch with my family.

Our ranch headquarters are three miles west of Highway 22, but as you can see, we have property that adjoins some of the concerned areas.

This is not what concerns me about this dam. I'm not an environmental technician; I'm not a wildife specialist or technical expert. I haven't really got any particular formal education. I do consider myself,
though, a conservationist, a keen observer and a participant in the true history of what really makes Alberta work on the eastern slopes and especially in the area west of Calgary.

I know a lot about grass, I know a lot about trees; I know quite a bit about water management. I'm a cattleman only to the extent that $I$ know how to use cows to harvest that crop in probably the most efficient manner and convert it into topnotch human food.

My concern is that responsible agricultural practices and marketing of a truly renewable resource are completely underestimated and unnoted by many of the panelists and many of the people who speak and speak in favour of SR1.

I do not question the need for flood mitigation; nobody could. I'm totally committed to the embracement of the correct solution, which I will try to express.

As hard as it is to express to you, SR1 is a flawed project. Fresh water, potable water, and clean water is the greatest of all natural resources. Alberta and Canada are the envy of the world with this God given endowment.

Good soil and agriculture are the next greatest of a11 assets to humanity and the world's future. Why
would Alberta of all places put forward an unproven project like SR1 that blatantly ignores these former two facts?

With listening to this morning's dialogue, I recognize that, with SR1 in place, we do not protect Calgary. In fact, 80 percent of the damage could still occur in Calgary with SR1 and, to me, that's ridiculous.

The history of Alberta from the beginning denotes periods and cycles of drought and plenty of water and drought.

I think Mr. Palliser in his travels in 1850 noted that "the Palliser triangle" was a defunct area, as far as he could see agriculturally because there was no water.

Let's never forget that.
There is some things that really bother me. In the presentation this morning with regard to folks in Calgary, and it seemed to me that private land and property rights and homes in the City of Calgary are more important than private property out in the country. What are we teaching our kids these days? That bothers me. Should we let this continue in our society or should someone stand up and say this is enough?
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I'd like to advise this Board to the fact that, whether you're in business or whether you're in government, it's never too late to reverse a bad idea or an investment. It will enhance Alberta's credibility for future generations to come. Cut and move on from our suffering Alberta taxpayers' sunk costs into SR1. Excite anxious Albertans with a better, comprehensive, multiuse plan to address the longer term future of this great province.

We need optimism in this country, we need optimism in Alberta, and I have a problem, again, with the attitude that seems to prevail among the media and among big city folks with the importance of agriculture and the significance of it to the country.

There's an easy way out. If you want to capture the enthusiasm and support of agriculture and rural Alberta, start thinking ahead. We all had to think ahead. Everything we do is based on ten years into the future. Our investments go that way, and I think it's time we started as a province to think that way.

This huge financial investment we have for this SR1 is good for something that might happen. I know this has been clearly identified, and it just -- it just sticks with me. Why wouldn't we put that huge investment and all our resources into a project that
will serve this province and this community for the next hundred years? Next thousand years?

You can't travel in a country in the world where water isn't a concern, and in places that are short of water, they sure look after the water. I've been to Italy and I see aqueducts that were built 2,000, 3,000 years ago to accommodate drought and water concerns, and those things are still working today, some of them.

What's wrong with us? Why are we worried about building a mud hole when we could build a resource that would enhance the lifestyle and the productivity of this province for a long, long time.

It just reminds of going back to the days of the prairie homestead acts and the settlements on the special areas, there was a government decision from Ottawa that no one had ever experienced or ever explored, and look at the damage that did to so many people and so many families that came out here with dreams and hopes. It was a flawed project from the beginning and we never got over it. In fact, the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act took over and did an excellent job, pride of the prairies, really, in terms of water conservation and how to perform agriculture.

I think that we need to give our thoughts forward
to this and I compliment some of the comments that were made before. There were some excellent presentations which I totally support.

And I really support some of the comments by Mr. Rae this morning for the Stoney Nakoda tribe. He mentioned agriculture, he mentioned food production, he mentioned farmers, he mentioned native people on their land. We don't get this from the government anymore, and I'm sorry about that.

At any rate, that's my submission, and thank you for the opportunity to present.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Copithorne.

THE CHAIR: And on behalf of the Pane1, Mr. Copithorne, thank you very much for that presentation. Much appreciated.
Q. MS. OKOYE: Lee Drewry. Are you there?
A. MR. DREWRY: I'm here.
Q. There we go. There has been evidence prepared and filed on your behalf in this matter, that being the SCLG Group submissions, Exhibit 247; your submissions, Exhibit 250, PDF 50 to 51.

Are these documents accurate, to the best of your knowledge and belief?
A. MR. DREWRY: Yes, they are.
Q. Do you adopt them as part of your evidence in this
proceeding?
A. MR. DREWRY: Yes, I do.
Q. So, on Exhibit 249 , did you see the map that was up before --
A. MR. DREWRY: Yes, I did --
Q. -- that showed all the land locations. Can you give the location -- I'm sorry.
A. MR. DREWRY: I saw the map. I'm very familiar.
Q. Is the location of your land on that exhibit correct?
A. MR. DREWRY: Yes, it is. We are the owners of the -- my wife Diana and I are the owners of the northeast and northwest quarters of section 26 that form the northeast boundary of this project area. We're about four and a half kilometres away from the Elbow River and the property has never flooded in...maybe geological time.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Can you provide the Panel with an overview of your concerns for this project?
A. MR. DREWRY: Yeah, I will. The concerns are entered into evidence as you have indicated, so $I$ won't go through all of them there. There are a couple I would like to highlight.

We're very concerned that, at the north end of the project area that we'll very likely potentially never flood, but if it does, it will be very rare. Even
though it's a very rare possibility that those lands will flood, according to the government's land use plan, it doesn't look like we'11 be able to continue to ranch it, so -- I don't know why that would be, but it doesn't appear that landowners and ranchers and people in the agricultural industry get much influence or consideration in that 1 and use plan.

We're also concerned that the fire risk of ungrazed land will be substantial as the, again, the land use plan proposed by the proponent doesn't allow for grazing leases, it might allow for grazing permits, but it's really not very clear on what will happen to the 1and. Land needs to be grazed in order to keep a fire risk down, particularly in that area.

We are concerned about the air quality and the ground quality. We don't live on the land, we live in Calgary, actually, but we're concerned that this project would keep us from ever building on the remnant 1and that we may keep, or our daughter who I think would probably like to live out there even more than we would.

We're very concerned about firearm hunting in an area that's currently bow hunting only, and we're concerned that property rights seem to have been abandoned by the proponent who could quite easily have
built a viable project on Crown land, but instead chose this -- chose this project. And I mean, let's be clear, this project does represent one of the largest land grabs in modern Alberta history.

The project essentially extinguishes our family ranching operations, the lifestyle, the history which goes back, similar to Mr. Copithorne, my wife Diana and Brian Copithorne are brother/sister, and so that history goes back to the 1800 s, and this project will essentially extinguish the ranching that has been continuous in our family for all of that time.

There are a couple of things, if I could, I'd like to comment on Exhibit 325. I don't think you need to bring it up, document manager, but $I$ will make reference to it, and I just don't think you need to bring it up.

The proponent in 325 in a couple of different locations references a "land acquisition plan" that was developed and shared with landowners in 2018. I'd just like to point out that that was requested by landowners in 2017, and it was six months later that it was provided to 1 andowners. So it was not the action of a benevolent proponent, but, rather, it was a very delayed response to a request from landowners. Again, from Appendix $C$ in the record of
consultation, there's a reference to a meeting, January 27th, 2020, with Alberta officials, Alberta Transportation officials and politicians.

My name is on the list of people who attended that meeting. I'd like to assure the Board that I did not attend that meeting. My name may have been on the presentation that may have been discussed in that meeting, but $I$ was not present. And that's again Appendix C record of consultation.

Interestingly -- and, again, in 325, the government makes a claim that sediment modelling has not changed since 2014. I found that fascinating and surprising because, in the early days of discussion about this project with landowners, the government -- I guess it would be Alberta Environment at the time, the story to our landowner group was, "Why are you so worried about this? As soon as the water goes down, you can put your cattle back on the 1 and and graze it, so why are you making such a big deal out of it?" And we continued to ask and ask, "Well, you know there's going to be sediment," and, finally, years later they admitted it.

So I'm kind of concerned and baffled by this claim that they haven't changed their story on sediment for the duration of this project. It was drastically
different in the early days.
And, finally, with regards to Appendix I of the proponent's rebuttal to interveners, I think Appendix I has to deal with air quality.

The maps that are displayed, there's green triangles on those maps that indicate residents, and looking at that, it was immediate to me that there are numerous residents that are not included in that - in that document, and I'm struggling to understand how these residents -- residences could have been missed during a simple mapping exercise. A simple look at Google Maps, or better yet, a drive around the area would show that these homes are in the area. It seems to me this is, at best, poor work, and at worst, a deliberate attempt to mislead.

So those are the concerns, I guess, a very quick summary form that $I$ have.

I do have some other thoughts on some things that I've heard so far in the proceedings --
Q. Thank you, Mr. Drewry. Do you want to --

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Drewry.
A. MR. DREWRY: Yeah, I would like to share a couple of comments. I think Ms. Hunter talked about the unequal protection that has been afforded to -- or would be afforded to people in Rocky View County
downstream from SR1 versus those in Calgary downstream from G1enmore Reservoir. And, again, I think she referenced a comment by the proponent about those people in Rocky View living close to the river, they get -- you know, that's what they get for living near the river.

So that, to me, is a theme throughout this whole seven- or eight-year debacle that the rural communities don't seem to matter as much as the -- as the urban communities, and not even all urban communities are treated equally. It seems the ones downstream from the Glenmore Reservoir are treated better than the rest.

With regards to the City of Calgary's
presentation, $I$ thought it was interesting that they indicated they attempted to monetize the cultural and historical values created within that flood zone area, and yet $I$ am not aware of any attempt by the proponent to monetize the loss of the family history and the agricultural history that would be decimated with the proposed project. So I found that a bit disconcerting that there's not an equal playing field in terms of valuing that historical resource.

I guess finally with the Calgary River Action Group, we all I think sympathize with the tragedy that occurred, not only in Calgary but in all
the communities in southern Alberta.
I was working in the downtown core in 2013. Part of my team's role was to support the people who were displaced, our company employees who were displaced by the floodwaters, finding them temporary accommodation and other support.

So I do have some direct experience with dealing with people in the aftermath of the 2013 flood, and I can say that $I$ do have a lot of empathy and sympathy with what people went through at that time.

It does seem to me that this solution that the proponent is proposing and sadly that the River Action Group is also championing, it's really a transference of all of that pain and suffering onto another community, and it just seems so senseless when there is an alternative that could be done at a location that doesn't have those same negative consequences for a community.

Finally, I'll make a couple of observations generally, and this has to do with the proponent's responses to key intervener witnesses. And I'm thinking specifically of Mr. Dowsett and Mr. K1epacki and probably others.

The proponent claims that these witnesses' testimony should be discounted because the proponent
feels they have a vested interest. We11, if that's the case, then who doesn't? Who doesn't have a vested interest?

Al1 the Stantec evidence, all the Alberta Transportation evidence has been submitted. It should be similarly discounted because people have put their careers, Stantec's company reputation will be severely impacted by the success or failure of this project; I can't imagine anybody more conflicted than them.

The Calgary River Action Group, they want to protect their lovely riverfront homes in Calgary, so they're conflicted.

We all have a vested interest, and that should not keep our expertise from being recognized, nor should it keep our voices from being heard and fairly considered.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Drewry.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Drewry, on behalf of the Panel, thank you.
A. MR. DREWRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Q. MS. OKOYE: Ms. Jan Erisman, are you there? Ms. Jan Erisman, are you there? Okay. I can see you, but I think you're on mute.
A. MS. ERISMAN: Sorry about that.
Q. There has been evidence prepared and filed on your behalf, that being the SCLG Group submissions,

Exhibit 247, and your submissions, Exhibit 250, PDF 233 to 234, and you also submitted an article on Owens Lake that was filed as Tab 21 of Exhibit 275. Are these documents accurate to the best of your knowledge and be1ief?
A. MS. ERISMAN: Yes.
Q. Do you adopt them as part of your direct evidence in this proceeding?
A. MS. ERISMAN: Yes.
Q. Can you provide the Panel with a brief overview of your concerns?
A. MS. ERISMAN: Yes, I can, thank you.

Thank you, Board and Chair, for taking the time to hear me speak.

Infrastructure should make Alberta bigger, stronger, and better. During the dirty 30 's, the Saskatchewan government put men to work digging a lake on Wascana Creek so that men could feed their families.

They also hired a world renowned landscaper to design Wascana Park.

Today Wascana Lake has increased the value of real estate in Regina and is one of the most used parks in Canada.

90 years ago, the government of Saskatchewan knew how to invest in the future and improve the quality of
life in Regina through thoughtful use of infrastructure dollars and to create flood mitigation.

So what is Alberta doing in 2021? Alberta with SR1 is deciding to create a dried lake bed full of silt on purpose in a windy, semi-arid land right next to a very large city where there's evidence that this will be a multimiliion-dollar maintenance bill for years to come and every time the diversion is used.

Owens Lake is a dried lake bed in California, the largest single source of dust pollution in the United States. I do not understand why Alberta would choose to create an Owens Lake dust issue, but create an Owens Lake ecological disaster on purpose.

California has already spent $\$ 2$ million on Owens Lake dust issues, and it appears the only solution is add water, costly water.

The fact that the silt -- and the fact that the silt will build up and the dust pumps have not been considered in the decision-making process for SR1 is appalling. Fugitive dust is invisible and goes into your lungs quickly. The dust plumes can travel 150 kilometres and puts even the city of Calgary at risk. The errors and omissions brought to light now at this hearing on the dust issue shows that this is an important health issue.

Erosion risks run from moderate to severe. The timing of mitigation cannot stop the dust. There is going to be fugitive dust created by this project.

A wet dam has one dust construction period; SR1 creates a whole new set of dust issues every time it is used, and the silt will build up over time. Bulldozing and moving the silt will be required for drainage.

I drove to Bragg Creek on March 13th. I counted 50 bikers along the drive, and the traffic was non-stop. So will we be biking with masks?

By the way, when you consult the new silt map remember that all of that lovely rolling land filled with brush and trees will have to be bulldozed to allow this diversion to drain after 8 to 40 inches of silt is left behind and to keep the dust down.

When does it make sense to bulldoze, create fugitive dust in the tourism and biking corridor? Please note the cost to recreational activities, biking, and hiking have not been considered or addressed by this government.

I did ask at the last Alberta Transportation presentation how much of the land would be bulldozed. He didn't know, but they said they'd get back to me and took my email. No one ever got back to me or answered the question.

But it appears from the new silt map that maybe 80 percent of the total footprint is going to be bulldozed and covered with silt, which is a big problem.

The silt crust is broken easily walking or driving. So how does the Indigenous walk in the salt and how does the garbage get picked up without releasing more dust?

Unacceptable levels of fugitive dust are in the picture if mitigation is not done in this timely fashion and it works. California has dumped milions on the dust issue. Will we?

An acquaintance of mine worked on a B.C. dam doing soil sampling; he's now on disability due to lung damage cause by fugitive dust from working closely with silt.

Fugitive dust is a growing issue for the construction site safety and also for the diversion's long-term maintenance and health and safety, yet it is not mentioned by Stantec or Alberta Transportation as a cost or a consequence of this project.

I must thank the NRCB for restoring my faith in democracy. Had you not given our group the funds to double-check the facts that were given from Alberta Transportation and Stantec, our community, our bikers,
our hikers, our tourists, Calgary and Alberta would have unknowingly been submitted to dust plumes that travel hundreds of kilometres. Now we know the dangers of the fugitive dust that must be addressed for the health and safety of Albertans.

The heritage book Chaps and Chinooks states it best: (as read)
"Since 1883, such records have been kept
up by the Meteorological Society of
Canada, and they indicate a regular alternation of wet or dry years."

That was written in 1976.
So why is the province of Alberta choosing to build infrastructure that's only used in wet years in 2021? In the seven years that Stantec and Transportation have tried to figure out how to make this project work, many things have changed. New water design concepts by Bil1 Gates and Nute1 (phonetic) Energy have opened the door to harnessing the extraordinary power of rivers in a way that replenishes ecosystems rather than harming wildiffe.

Alberta should be embracing the latest technology with waterfalls for power generation, wetlands for groundwater recharging, and a deepwater lake with no silt flats exposed for fire and drought mitigation.

There's a reason no one is building dry silt beds, but they will be building wet dams with new technology and theory that a wet dam has multiple uses and meets climate change criteria.

Mitigation for dust must be included in the cost of this project as an ongoing and unending cost to taxpayers. ATCO dug up my yard for a new gas line, put down new topsoil and seeded. I got water. I got 80 percent weeds that $I$ had to pull by hand. Three years later, I have swatches of grass.

The cost weed and dust control but be borne by the Alberta taxpayer, not Rocky View.

We have public land by my home. Public land close to the city is very subject to trespassing and partying, creating a high fire hazard. This will be public land, and they say there's not going to be a whole lot of supervision.

My home just about burned down a few years ago. A water bomber full of water just happened to be at the Springbank Airport, and they watered down the houses. We lost the barns, and we fought with brooms, and we got the fire out one house away from mine. Without that water bomber at the airport, we would have lost many homes.

This project is creating a fire hazard on two main
tourism highways, and it is not helping us to fight the next grass fire.

We could be building infrastructure projects that give Alberta a Wascana that makes Alberta bigger, stronger, better. We could be building infrastructure projects that are part of solving climate change, creating clean water for Indigenous people, building tourism, building our tax base, and creating water storage and fire suppression. But we're not. SR1 creates degradation of our beautiful tourism corridor, and the health of a large area of Alberta will be inhaling dust.

The people of Alberta need to know the truth. The misleading advertising of the Springbank reservoir must stop.

People believe they're get their getting a Glenmore Reservoir, a lake with lovely walking paths. Instead, we're getting a very costly industrial park full of silt, garbage, and a fire hazard in front of a multimillion-dollar Rocky Mountain vista.

We request the name "Springbank" and "reservoir" be removed from the name and request a name changed to the "Elbow River diversion." Our community doesn't want our name associated with this project, and it is not a reservoir. And I do feel it's very misleading that they
advertise it as such. As matter of fact, they sent out a newsletter, and the last one calls it just "Springbank reservoir"; they're not even adding the other part in. Thank you for your time. Thank you in advance for the experts that need to give Alberta a Wascana. More than ever, Alberta needs diversity and forward-thinking economics for infrastructure that makes money and does not create a tax burden for Albertans.

I believe as a Canadian. It is our duty to make sure we're leaving Canada a better, bigger, stronger country for our future generations. This project does not.

And lastly, just from hearing all of the reports, $I$ was very concerned to hear Alberta Transportation constantly say that all of the costs would be borne by the local municipalities. And so it's very concerning that the total cost of this project is way higher and that they are passing the cost on. In reality, it's all coming out of the same pot.
Q. Thank you, Ms. Erisman.
A. MS. ERISMAN: Just two more things. I just wanted to say on recreation, because I was on the -- I've been on the Rocky View West Rec Board, that the number one request is river access. And we would need it for the fire department, but also for public
access, and that has not been considered in this.
And secondly, on a historical note, because I'm also on the Springbank Historical Society, 14 historical structures are being destroyed, and when they did their original analysis, it was like there weren't any. And there are 22 archeological sites that are compromised. So I just wanted to bring those to your attention.

And lastly, my last thing, 30 percent of Alberta is private land. So I really don't understand why we're using private 1 and that makes us money, rather than Crown land when we have the bulk of Crown 1 and.

Thank you very much for your time. I agree, I think there's been some really good presentations and we've all learned a lot. Thank you.
Q. Thank you, Ms. Erisman.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Erisman.
MS. OKOYE: Mr. Chairman, we are 7 minutes to 5:00. Do you want us to continue? We've got two more people left.

THE CHAIR:
You have two more people.
Just a quick question on potential cross, length of cross, Alberta Transportation, do you have an idea, if you're going to cross, how long that might take.

MR. FITCH:
Mr. Chairman, good afternoon, it's
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Gavin Fitch. We are still -- I'm not certain how long we'll be. I think we indicated we would want up to, was it 90 minutes? I don't see us using all that time, but we're not certain. But we don't think it will be all that long, to be honest.

THE CHAIR:
I think, yeah, the request may have came as well, we did a little rejigging in terms of when landowners were presenting versus some that are expert testimony later on, so that might have changed your numbers as well.

But it looks like we're going to be tight for time, you know, for today, to complete SCLG, I think that might run us a little bit too late, Ms. Okoye.

But why don't we get one more and see how that goes. Do you know how long your other two folks will be?

Because I think the Board will have some questions. Mr. Kennedy has indicated he has some questions. So we'11 likely do the questioning tomorrow morning, but perhaps we might be able to complete your last two, Ms. Teghtmeyer and Ms. Massey; right?

MS. OKOYE:
THE CHAIR:
wil1 take?
MS. OKOYE:

That's correct.
And how long do you think those

I think Ms. Massey will take about
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20 minutes; Ms. Teghtmeyer probably less than
10 minutes. Am I correct, Ms. Teghtmeyer?
I see she says yes. So that would be less than
10 minutes for her, and 20 probably for Ms. Massey.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. Any objections from parties
if we can see if we can get Ms. Teghtmeyer and
Ms. Massey done before we close today? Any objections?
MR. FITCH: No objections from
Alberta Transportation, Mr. Chairman.
THE CHAIR: Okay. Hearing none others, please proceed. Let's see if we can get these done before close today, then.

MS. OKOYE:
Okay. Perfect.
Q. Ms. Teghtmeyer, referring you to your submissions Exhibit 247 and 250, at PDF 81 to 88 , are the documents accurate to the best of your knowledge and belief?
A. MS. TEGHTMEYER: Yes, they are.
Q. And do you that adopt them as part of your direct evidence in these proceedings?
A. MS. TEGHTMEYER: Yes. Excuse me. I haven't used my voice for such a long time now.
Q. Can you please provide a Board with an overview of your concerns?
A. MS. TEGHTMEYER: All right. I am from Bragg Creek. I live right along beside the river, and as you see,
sometimes in the river. I grew up here, and have spent most of my adult life. So $I$ do have experiences with the river.

Mr. Chairman and Board members, I really appreciate the opportunity of speaking to you today. I have to tell you that I'm speaking from my heart with my -- some observations and some experiences that I've had through the years.

We live, as I said, right beside the river. So any time there's high water, we are inundated with groundwater as is all of Bragg Creek.

Furthermore, 80 percent of the runoff comes from the headwaters, and we're the closest ones to the headwaters. So, of course, we get it first. And when we start pumping, then the other neighbours think, okay, in so many more hours, they're going to have be pumping, and the neighbours below them, the same thing. So groundwater is our nemesis.

The worst of the floods that I've experienced, of course, was 2013, and I noticed that someone in the City of Calgary said that there were no floods between the ' 30 s and '90s to speak of. We11, I remember lots of big floods in those years, and whether Calgary didn't get them or we just got them or what, but 1948 , '63, '67, '68, '95 were all significant floods in our
area.
So the flood of 2013 certainly impacted us the worst, and it was exacerbated by the fact that a berm built previously gave out, which directed the water head-on into the berm in front of us, and, of course, it ultimately gave out which affected the dynamics of the flow downstream from us and did terrible damage to businesses and homes in Bragg Creek.

Adding to that was that there is a gravel bar which was allowed to build up in the centre of the river in front of us, which, of course, gave no room for the river.

And just -- so many of the points that the previous presenters have given, I totally agree with, so no need to go into that again, but if you don't mind I will just show you some images of our place following the 2013 flood.

So I'm wondering if you can bring up those pictures for me.
Q. Sure, Ms. Teghtmeyer, 250, PDF 82. Perhaps she wants to start with PDF 87. Perfect. Thank you.
A. MS. TEGHTMEYER: Yes, I just put this picture in because this is the picture of our store and our home attached to the back the day before the flood.

So now, the flood happens, and can you have the
other side, please?
Q. Please go to PDF 82.
A. MS. TEGHTMEYER: Yes, please.
Q. Is that the page you're looking for?
A. MS. TEGHTMEYER: Yes, that will be fine. This is looking down the river, the red in the background of the picture is our place, and this is later on in the flood because the brand has already been taken off, it was taken off in one piece and floated down the river, and the roof, we found the roof, sure enough, it was hung up on a tree somewhere.

Next slide, please.
This is what we saw when we came into the store.
The river had no problem lifting a thousand pound fridge and turning it around, and, of course, you see that the front of it is completely gone.

Next slide.
This is -- I just wanted to show this one because debris is so damaging. It's unbelievable the strength and the force that debris can deliver.

My dad for 30 years built foot bridges across the river, and it was never the volume of the water that took it out. It was the big uprooted trees floating down hitting the piers. Like battleships, actually. Next slide.

And this is the west side -- yeah, this was just shovelling out silt, and there's -- I understand all about silt. It is very hard to work with.

Next slide.
And this was the west side of the store. I'm showing you the damage.

And another slide.
This is the repair process in which we had to have movers come in and lift the -- put beams under and put it up in blocks so that we could commence repairs.

Next slide.
And, again, this is more beams at the front of the store, and you see where the river had been in the bottom there, it's all riverbed at this point in time.

And I think there's one more slide that is maybe missed. No. Go back. Sorry, take up your time. This one -- no. Go up.
Q. You mean down.
A. Down. Down one more. Down one more. Okay.

This is inside our house, and the log, it was just debris, came through our window, it swirled around, came through the window there and went across the room and smashed through the cupboard doors with such force that it created a hole, a nice round hole, through the solid oak cupboard door.

And all these things on the counter and the shelf there had come from the bedroom. And the thing with the water, in our situation, it came in and it acted like a washing machine because it couldn't get out, and that's what caused so much damage.

Thank you. So that's all the slides I think I have.

We were out of our house for over two years, and out of the store for probably three years, fully operational. For the first while we camped, and then we lived in a rental house next door and, of course, there was no electricity, no heat, no Internet, and a port-a-potty for quite some time, and that's how we got through the flood.

And now, of course, we have dikes, and people say, well, everything is going to be fine with the dikes. Of course, no matter how high the dikes are built, the groundwater is still going to invade us, and we will always need to pump during high water table.

And it's noteworthy to note that the dikes were rejected by the Calgary communities because, true enough, they are ugly, destructive prevent access to the river, and unenvironmental as far as $I$ can see when building of these dikes in Bragg Creek, and in the case of our dikes, extremely costly.

And one other of my observations through the years, through the many years that I've been here is that the river flow is decreasing dramatically, and I don't understand why consideration of future water source wouldn't be part of the decision on flood mitigation as well. And I think the reduced water flow is very consistent with all of southern Alberta and in the South Saskatchewan River Basin, and I would say something like as serious as that would be strong enough reason to have an upstream mitigation.

And just to be quick here, I have one more story, and that's about dust and silt, and I certainly know all about how to live through that, but after the flood of 2013, the Bragg Creek Community Centre was turned into a response centre, which was absolutely a remarkable response centre.

The lady handling the meals in very short time frame put out 7,000 meals, and as you can appreciate, the kitchen was very crowded, and so they decided to set up barbecues and cook outside.

That didn't last very long because Alberta Health came along and said, you are not too cook outside because of wind borne spores contaminating the food, and I think Springbank SR1 has a very serious consideration there with dust and wind-blown particles.
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Then my conclusion is that the Alberta government -- the Alberta people, wherever they are, will be asked to pay for this costly and unusual and dubious project, and I ask why it wouldn't be in the best interest to serve as many taxpayers as possible, and I think MC1 serving five communities with multiple benefits, I think even as I hear what the Calgary people say, they want tax -- they want flood mitigation. So does it matter if it's flood mitigation at SR1 or MC1? They're going to get protection, and I think that's what they're after.

And I guess that's why I'm speaking to you today, because in terms of today, we're all in this together, so I'm asking that we please do not leave out any communities. Serve us all. Thank you.
Q. Thank you, Ms. Teghtmeyer.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you on behalf of the Pane1, Ms. Teghtmeyer.
Q. The last one is Dr. Karen Massey.

Dr. Massey, you have evidence filed on your behalf, SCLG Group submissions, Exhibit 247, your submissions; Exhibit 250, PDF 128 to 232; your previously filed submission Exhibit 151; your CV, Exhibit 328 are the documents, and also an opening statement that you want to use in your presentation.

Are the documents accurate to the best of your knowledge and belief?
A. MS. MASSEY: Yes.
Q. And do you adopt them as part of your direct evidence?
A. MS. MASSEY: Yes, please.
Q. Okay. If I may have you go ahead with your presentation, please.
A. MS. MASSEY: Okay. So I'm cutting this down because I really appreciate everybody staying on a little bit later so that I get my chance today. It's much appreciated.

So, first of all, I'm just going to give a bit of an introduction about myself because I think it also helps understand why I chose what I've chose to speak. So leaving the screen up is great at the start of the overheads.

So, first of all, I'll just introduce myself. I'm a registered psychologist. I work out of my home in Redwood Meadows and have done so for 17 years along with part time in Calgary as well. So I feel I'm part of the Calgary business. It's just part of me. And so I work with typically people aged 12 and over, adults, and a lot of trauma.

And I must also say that, right now, I'm experiencing my own trauma, because over the last three
days, we've got a family trauma happening, and so you might notice in some of my references, I mix up 133 and Exhibit 151, it's because my right brain, the traumatized side of the brain, the emotional side, hi-jacks my left-hand side of the brain, which is trying to think things through, and that's what's happening right now, actually.

So I'll settle here.
So I also wanted to bring up that $I$ was a former employee of the federal and provincial governments for quite a number of years and, interestingly, for seven years, I was a human resources manager at Alberta Transportation, worked in the Twin Atria, which is still there. So I have quite an understanding of bureaucracy as well.

So I just wanted to add that we bought our home in Redwood Meadows in the summer of 2004 , having no idea it was an floodplain. I think back then it wasn't on anybody's radar to mention, oh, by the way, you're buying on a floodplain, you might want to think about that.

Fortunately, we bought a house that doesn't have a basement. It on1y has about a 3-foot craw1 space and we've never flooded. You know, it was built in 1979, never flooded, because it was properly built for the
floodplain.
So, very thankful about that, but most of the other people around here in Redwood Meadows, the 350 homes, most of them or a lot of them, I should say, have full basements, and they didn't realize they were buying on aquifers, and even in this house, they tried to build a basement, a big hole under the kitchen area, when they discovered oh, I think we have an aquifer under our kitchen area, and they quickly redesigned the home. So that was very smart.

So if we could just start with the slide, if I could just say "next" and we'11 roll through them as quickly as we can. There we go.

So $I$ chose, first of all, to look at what is the truth about what is SR1 going to resolve and is it going to cause us more problems, and we're looking at those three aspects from the NRCB of: Environmental, economic, and social.

So I'm going to try and cover all of these, and the whole of the concept is for all the public.

Next please.
And so I picked out the definition of truth. It's a quality, a state, a fact, a reality, or a belief. So I encourage the NRCB to kind of look at that broader picture of what is the truth here. We've heard a lot
of presenters from our group here say, what about this, what about that, does it make sense? It's not adding up, we're not getting the information, and there's a whole lot going behind the scenes that we'd like to know what is the truth.

Next, please.
So I also just want to emphasize this, and as the final speaker for our group, is that we're all in total agreement, folks. We all want flood control, we want flood mitigation if we look at it a bit broader, and -but what we do want is flood management even more, if I can make that point. We're all in this together.

Next please.
And I also want to emphasized the vision statement here of foresight, and I think a lot of our speakers today, in our group in particular, are saying, we're kind of missing some of the foresight by the proponent of what is going on. We're still focused on the 2013 need for a flood control, and now we've got all these other things that have developed that have to be looked at with foresight. Please.

Next, please.
So, then, look at the definition of foresight. It's the ability to predict what will happen and what is needed in the future. And all of our speakers
before me are covering all these long lists of things that's needed in the future.

Next please.
And so I wanted to highlight a few things for Redwood Meadows, because we haven't really been heard separately, and a lot of what I say pertains to Bragg Creek as well, both of us upstream folks.

And both of us feel we're forgotten by the proponent in the decision of due process, probably because, initially, the proponent thought, oh, hey, we're only looking at 17 people in these homes, in this footprint; and then once they announced it, there was that big surge and public opinion, and I believe that just really focused that, yeah, we're right, this is only 17 people.

And so then that's one issue, and then the other thing is they alluvial aquifers, and Barbara has mentioned it big time, and also the Copithornes because -- I mean, there's a reason Springbank is called "Spring bank." It's just full of these all intertwined springs and aquifers that come off the Elbow River and meander around.

So I think there's a lot to be said and we experience that here -- I mean, pretty soon, once it warms up a little bit, our pumps will be ready for
those of us that have basements because already the aquifers here and there will be starting to fill up because spring runoff will be happening, and that also pertains to Bragg Creek.

What else here?
So it's just all in all -- all our group is looking at is, the SR1 doesn't make common sense when you add up all of the problems that haven't been really fully considered.

And also we want to remind you that Calgary is planning some things for the upcoming problem with water. It's been studied since the 1930s that the flow of the Elbow River is declining, we know that the size of the Calgary city is just continually growing, and it reaches that gridlock in about 2035, ' 36 , Mary said at the latest 2040, somewhere in there, it's pretty well guaranteed this gridlock is going to happen.

So Calgary is doing some preparation, but what about us? We're upstream, we're going to be impacted as well by that lower flow. Once again, are we being forgotten? MC1 would be the answer.

And last one, then, is really a concern because over these last seven, eight, nine years, there's always been these rumours, and they aren't dying, of the developers are waiting for the proponent to say,
yay, to SR1 because it's not going to be temporary, it's going to be permanent. It's like, how is that good?

We've heard about all of these problems with the silt and, well, diseases, lots of things, and we just kind of wonder, and I ask that maybe we do some enquiry with the proponent of why is this rumour continuing on.

Next, please.
And, here, speaking of silt, I took a picture last summer in preparation for this presentation of the Redwood Meadows forest. This is kind of later spring, and this used to be a beautiful trail, it used to have some flowers down by the river here, and I didn't capture the dandelions and all the other weeds that Mary is talking about, but they're all there, it's all new, it's terrible. And this is quite a shocking thing.

Next, please.
And so now I'11 give you a short history of SR1. A really condensed version. So August 26, 2014, it was chosen and in the newspapers: The reason is it's faster, cheaper, easier. Thought it was only 17 ranchers, hey?

And then as time went on, people like myself, more in the Springbank community became aware and joined the
ranchers for the "Don't Dam Springbank," which was starting to develop.

And then we had these petitions done, we've got the residents signing the document $I$ wrote on behalf of our voices.

And then things started happening that I really question. The proponent then bought out our leader, our leader of Don't Dam Springbank, amazing man, Mr. Robinson. And, of course, he accepted, probably in the -- least -- you know, into the range of millions, and who wouldn't? I mean, it's a logical, good business move. That's okay. And we just honour him for being our leader for as long as he was there.

And then what happened was, we were so strong by then, we were rolling and then, fortunately, Karin Hunter became our leader, and she's amazing as you can see.

So then the second buy-out was Tsuut'ina Nation. Behind the scenes, obviously, negotiations were going on, and then 32 million was done for the buyout. In fact, it even said in the paper the next day, Tsuut'ina Nation is bought out.

And then the next one, a few months later, again, there was a behind the scenes, during in-camera vote, Rocky View County of all things, I mean, kind of they
double-crossed the residents, and they sold out to the proponent for $29.9-$ we'll $^{\text {- }} \mathbf{~ j u s t ~ c a l l ~ i t ~} 30 \mathrm{million}$, and an additional undisclosed amount of money.

So it's very questionable about these buyouts, because it questions then the merit of the whole SR1.

And then by that time, I was also -- I'd been working on this document, this one - let's see if I get it right -- 151, I think it's the number, my brain -- and so I wanted our Redwood Meadows and also an influence that Bragg Creek was experiencing to have our list of concerns.

So about six months later, I wrote and, of course, I had the help of numerous residents here, pretty smart community, fortunately, and so I --

MS. OKOYE: Dr. Massey, if I may interrupt.
Just to let you know you've got, if we stick to the time, less than ten minutes left.
A. MS. MASSEY: No, I think I can pretty well do it. I'11 talk faster, then.

So, then, sometime on September 15, I put it in, the document; September 16, I get a phone call from our townsite. They're saying proponent is livid, that I went ahead and --

MR. SECORD:
Dr. Massey.
A. MS. MASSEY: Yes.

MR. SECORD:
A. MS. MASSEY:

MR. SECORD: been a long day for her, so don't speak faster and take the time you need, okay? So, breathe. Thank you.
A. MS. MASSEY: Okay. Thank you, Richard. A11 right. Appreciate that and appreciate being able to slow it down a bit.

So then with the pressures that $I$ was receiving on those three days of discussion into what was happening with the proponent and the nation and our townsite, I'd given information that was being told to me about how unhappy the proponent was, I chose to then -- I guess you call it "go silent" for a while as requested.

And then, fortunately, the lease for our
Redwood Meadows got signed in February, and then I immediately started to say, oh. Well, then I can get in on being able to speak here today. And it's like nine years of quietly -- it means a lot to me -- of finally having my voice heard of how much this beautiful land means to us and to be living on Redwood Meadows, and you heard that from everybody else who spoke today.

That's part of the trauma of this week, so -- but it's very, very emotional. And so what I look at as a
psychologist hat what's going on here with all of these buyouts and pressure on me to go silent, I was so thankful that our townsite said back to the proponent, back to Tsuut'ina, "Canada has a freedom of speech." And I have really speech to be here and tell our story as best $I$ can and so thankful.

But the part that really is a big concern for me is what I would call -- I was doing some psychology work and had my psychology view of things is that this is bullying behaviour. This is like a bully in the playground. This is like a bully in the workplace, "Do what I say or else."

And I would also question from the taxpayers' perspective of where is the accountability. I feel that the other speakers in my group has mentioned this, what's the truth about how much is really being spent? And I think there's a real key concept here of speaking to cost of construction of SR1 versus the total cost of al1 moving parts of SR1. Moving parts like the two bridges, moving parts like what everybody else is saying about the maintenance, moving parts like what about these elk and what's going on.

So I ask then that from the perspective of truth that the NRCB look at the social, environmental, and economic effects and get to full disclosure.

And going forward I also suggest that the buyouts of government that are probably going on and have for many years for presentations, projects like this, that there be full disclosure now. I mean, this is what we expect and want as taxpayers is we're paying this money, and there's social media is becoming more powerful and we're more well informed. Freedom of speech.

Next please. And so they we move into the mental health. And I'll touch on a little bit here of how the emotions from the right brain will hijack. And when there's emotion going on like with the flood, it overrides all the logic in the world. And I think maybe that's part of the bleed-over, I don't know, but I just put it out there, as well, as another factor of everybody that was involved in the SR1 project are thinking, We have known friends and family that were impacted because it was a huge impact as you know to everybody.

And so there might be some sort of unusual thing going on of a vicarious trauma, just put that out there. Emotions override.

Next please. And also there was a Bragg Creek hamlet survey and the Redwood Meadows survey. I got the Bragg Creek one entered frankly because it wasn't
technology enough to get the Red one off the PDF to actually get it put through. But that's another side. So both of them are basically saying that both Bragg Creek and Redwood Meadows residents were surveyed in a separate reports. We both agreed that safety is paramount, safety for ourselves as an individual, for our families and for our groups. We want to know that they're going to be there after the next flood because berms are kind of questionable.

And so we asked them in our CV to have that foresight to prevent the social crisis that is being recognized that the mental health is part of a social crisis. And we kind of asked to forget about ourselves and the importance of our own mental and emotional health. We must be more aware of that going forward.

Next please. And so that leaves me to what one of my neighbours told me about because I'm not a left-brain person. He said, "There's not thinking about the sunk cost balancing. There's this concept where people tend to invest money, and they throw good money after bad and refusing to look at cutting one's 1osses."

And that is -- the best example is where the whole country, England, the parliament and that of France joined forces and said, "Yeah, the Concord's best thing
ever for what we're assessing is the best option type of plane to be built."

And so wants once they got building the Concord, they started hearing, "That's not going to work, that's not going to work." But they never listened.

So now it's become one of the big references in universities and financing of the Concord fallacy.

So do we want that to become the SR1 fallacy and then there's a subcategory of a planned continuation bias?

Next please. And so I've alluded to the berms because that's a really big issue for us here, that there's total reliance on just the berms. And we know that 1995, 2005 should have been sort of held, but all the riprap and thousands of dollars that's been spent on in some kind of poof for the most part down the river.

And particularly in the case of 2005 because we happen to have big riprap. We were one of the first to get the delivery, and these huge, huge boulders. Then when 2013 flood came, just tossed down the river and probably contributed considerably to why the west side of the Highway 22 was -- the bridge was closed down for repairs.

And of course, then more thousands of dollars had
to be spent creating more riprap. And also in both ' 05 flood and ' 13 flood, it impacted our water treatment plant quite a lot and quite expensively as well.

So then it comes to this AMEC. This is fascinating. So this to me is the truth because AMEC is a proponent's consultant at the time and they're saying berms are an incomplete solution. And they go on to say on a residual flood risk, we shouldn't consider ourselves safe because of a one-line defence such as dikes.

And they go on to say why does this matter? Because there's always a risk. We've seen that in the 1995 flood, the -- the 2005 flood and the 2013. There's always a risk.

And of course, with the 2013 here in Redwood, the berms started to be breached. And next slide, please.

THE CHAIR:
Excuse me, Ms. Okoye and
Mr. Secord, you know from my rough guess, you're just about halfway through on the slide presentations if it is S1ide 14 out of 23 , and we are at 5:30.

So I really do want to give everybody, the landowners, their chance to speak, but I also want to be respectful that we've already gone late, and we are keeping everybody late.

So, you know, I guess I'm wondering how much
longer or should we complete this tomorrow morning?
A. MS. MASSEY: I'd say give me how about five minutes?

THE CHAIR:
That would be great, okay, thank you, Ms. Massey.
A. MS. MASSEY: Thank you for asking.

Yeah. So then I also want to make the point that berms are useful because they have annual erosion going on, and the money is well spent. So we thank you for the continuing support of berms.

Next please. And so then the key is here upstream velocity and the volume is what is impacting us so when that is not managed upstream, we get hit by a downstream.

And I happen to be actually walking our dog, and -- Tamminga -- and he's the author of this research for 2013. And they happened to be on the berm shortly after the 2013 flood and gathering the data. And they said they do that every year as part of that monitoring it by Cenovus. And so that's when he then wrote as part of his PhD dissertation that there was catastrophic erosion.

Next please. So we're losing our berm every year because of catastrophic erosion because we have no volume control. And it's not only just the floods;
it's spring runoffs that happens. And spring runoff pressure, it goes and hits our aquifers. And then more and more people have to pump or have flood damage.

Next please. Pardon me, can you just hold on one sec? Mary Robinson actually -- I think she forgot to say this is that she reports that hundreds of metres of their ancestral lands since the 1880s has been eroded due to annual floods because they've been on the lands since the 1880s.

So we ask that there be foresight in looking at more bigger picture.

Next please. And here's the after-erosion from the 2013 flood. We used to be a able to walk out there, it's kind of nice gradual walk out. And now look it, that's about an 8- to 10 -foot drop to the river now.

And see all those 70-foot trees; you can't see them because of the picture. But those are 70-foot trees, many of which were then -- and Mary actually said this something else interesting. She figures because she's down by the intake and obviously looked at it, looked at the size of the 70 -foot trees, "It's probably going to take five of those to start plugging up the intake." Just putting that out there.

Next please. And our mayor at the time said we're
within one hour of losing everything. One hour. The berms didn't hold, there were three parts where it's breaching, and we're so thankful to Calgary for over 200 volunteers that came out that Friday morning and sandbagged like crazy. Thank you.

Next please. And here's a little bit of an insurance loss, and you can see that the -- as mentioned by other speakers, it's getting bigger and more expensive. There's things that happen with climate change, I think so.

Next please. Oh, what's happened?
THE CHAIR: I think that's right.
A. MS. MASSEY: Al1 right. Al1 right. And these notes on the screen are just a request that we have for Redwood Meadows that we be included with the proponents please for the groundwater monitoring mitigation plan.

Next please. And also the water quality monitoring, as well, I think that is only fair that we be included in that and maybe consider Bragg Creek. I'm not too sure.

Next please. And then just to conclude, this is the fabulous elk herd that you've heard about, and this is where I'm sitting on the Springbank Road. It's getting my grandson to hockey, and all of a sudden over the highway, everybody is stopping and thundering
ahead. And then there's a ditch, and the elk jump that, and then they head up to see about two-thirds which is just the normal.

Last one, please. This is our little guy who's very busy looking for some food, and I hope there's not muck instead.

And thank you so much for letting me speak. Thank you.

MS. OKOYE:
Thank you, Dr. Massey. Thank you, SCLG members. And thank you, Pane1, for the opportunity for the extra time given.

Just to remind you that you still have to come back tomorrow morning for questions, I believe, Mr. Chair.

THE CHAIR: Yes, that's correct. And thank you, Ms. Massey, and thanks for accommodating and speeding that up a little bit at the end there to gain some time, much appreciated.

You know what, on behalf of the Pane1, I would like to say that, you know, the presentations, the time committed by all landowners, those of the Calgary River Communities Action Group, those of the SCLG, SR1 Concerned Landowner Group, very well done. You can feel the emotion by all landowners. The Board empathizes with that. We understand where you're
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coming from, but we also appreciate the time that you've committed to very professional, well-organized presentations. So a big thanks to all of you.

So tomorrow morning, I think we can adjourn for the day, tomorrow morning 8:30 start. We'11 get at the cross-examination, so yes, the landowners on SCLG for tomorrow morning for any questions that folks may have. Sign on is 7:45, and start time is 8:30.

Any other housekeeping or any other matters anyone wants to raise prior to the close?

MS. OKOYE: Yes, Mr. Chair, just three things: The presentations that were used, I think it might be best to mark them as exhibits so that if there are questions, it's easier to refer to them.

THE CHAIR:
Yes, and perhaps, let's see, who do we have? Do you want to submit those or do you want to do those now?

MS. OKOYE:
They are submitted to Ms. Friend, so we have the first one as presentation by Ms. Karin Hunter.

THE CHAIR:
Okay, so that is No. -Ms. Friend? Where is my last number here?

MR. KRUHLAK:
352 it will be, I believe.
MS. FRIEND: Actually, no, if you can give me a minute, more items came in this afternoon. So I'm just
calling up my list. It will be 354.
EXHIBIT 354 - PRESENTATION BY
KARIN HUNTER
MS. OKOYE:
354. Okay. Presentation by Mary Robinson.

THE CHAIR:
And excuse me, just before we proceed. Do I hear any objections to entering these as exhibits, the presentations made by SCLG members?

Hearing none, let's proceed. Sorry, go ahead.
MS. OKOYE:
Mary Robinson presentation, perhaps we mark that as Exhibit 355.

MS. FRIEND:
Yes.
EXHIBIT 355 - PRESENTATION BY
MARY ROBINSON
MS. OKOYE:
Presentation by Dr. Massey that we just heard 356.

MS. FRIEND:
Yes.
EXHIBIT 356 - PRESENTATION BY DR. MASSEY

MS. OKOYE:
Thank you. That's all,
Mr. Chairman.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you. Have a good evening everyone, thank you, and see you tomorrow morning.

PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED TO 8:30 A.M., MARCH 24, 2021
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