

Questions	Greg Clark – Alberta Party	Gordon Dirks – Progressive Conservative	John Fletcher – Wildrose	Susan Wright – Alberta Liberals	Stephanie McLean - NDP
<p>1. ELBOW RIVER</p>					
<p>a. What is your understanding of the upstream flood mitigation infrastructure projects and their current status?</p>	<p>There are currently three major flood mitigation projects proposed for the Elbow River Basin. All mitigation projects need to be assessed in concert with one another. While the priority remains protecting residents and property from future floods and FAST, we also need to take into account the level of investment as well as the impacts to the residents and the natural environment. There are also non-structural mitigation projects underway to use wetlands and improved riparian health as part of the solution to mitigating flood levels on the Elbow River.</p> <p>Below is a list of the current projects, their status and my comments:</p> <p><i>Springbank Road Dry Dam:</i> <i>Current Status:</i> The provincial government recently</p>	<p>Premier Prentice announced flood mitigation action will begin immediately:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A dry reservoir will be built in Springbank to protect against future flooding - A long-term agreement will be negotiated with TransAlta to ensure the Ghost Reservoir, situated west of Cochrane along the Bow River, would be able to accommodate flood waters on the Bow River, further protecting the City of Calgary - We will construct a south diversion of the Highwood River to protect the Town of High River from future flooding. - The Disaster Recovery Program (DRP) appeals staff will be tripled with the goal of clearing outstanding appeals by December 2014. - We will also continue long-term assessment of the McLean Creek and Glenmore Reservoir Tunnel options. 	<p>There are currently three projects under consideration for upstream mitigation on the Elbow River: McLean Creek (MC-1), Springbank Dry Dam (SR-1) and the diversion tunnel from the Glenmore Reservoir to the Bow River.</p> <p>On the eve of the by-election in Calgary-Elbow, Jim Prentice announced that SR-1 will proceed, despite intense resistance from impacted land-owners in Springbank and with no engineering documents to support his claims around environmental impact, cost or effectiveness.</p> <p>Given that the Government of Alberta has been unable to provide any proof of its claims that this is the single best mitigation option to protect impacted communities and businesses in Calgary, it seems as though this is an example of the PCs playing politics with the very</p>	<p>With regards to the Elbow River, there are three viable mitigation options that have been proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - McLean Creek Dry Dam (MCDD): This project is probably the best example of the Government of Alberta’s failure to act on flood mitigation over the last several decades, as the site for the MCDD was first identified and investigated as part of the 1986 Elbow River Floodplain Management Study. However, this plan still needs to be modified, as it was initially proposed and costed to meet a 1:100 year flood (instantaneous peak flow of 930m³/s). As we all know the 2013 flood exceeded this rate (1,260m³/s), and it is my opinion all options explored should be graded closer to a 1:500 year flood event (1,625m³/s). - Glenmore Reservoir 	<p>It’s our understanding that the three initial projects proposed (Springbank diversion and storage, McLean Creek dry dam, and Glenmore Reservoir Tunnel) have been placed aside in favour of the newly proposed Springbank dam. While studies have been completed on the first two projects mentioned above, there is still need to study both the reservoir tunnel as well as the new project proposed by the new premier. Studies on each of these proposals, as well as their synergy, need to be completed as soon as possible so that construction may begin.</p>

	<p>announced that it would be proceeding with this project. According the Government of Alberta’s website, the preliminary design work, the environmental review and community consultation have begun.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This project has an estimated completion timeline of three years. However, with the requirement for expropriation of private land and / or the requirement to flood---fortify homes in Springbank there is significant risk this project will be delayed. The approximate cost of this project is \$160 to \$200 million to provide 1 in 100 flood mitigation (according to the numbers provided at the April 2013 flood symposium; although it is possible Springbank dry dam will be larger than as presented in April). The public consultation process assumes the Springbank project could retain water permanently to provide additional flood</p>		<p>real emotions of residents of Calgary-Elbow, who rightfully want action on flood mitigation, in an attempt to secure votes.</p>	<p>Diversion Tunnel (GRDT): An independent study – conducted on behalf of the City of Calgary and the Government of Alberta– deemed the GRDT to be a feasible mitigation option for protecting the area between the Glenmore Dam and Anderson Road. The obvious limitations of this proposal are that it would be the most expensive mitigation project (compared to the McLean Creek dry dam, and the Springbank storage site), and that it only protects a small – but critical– section of the river way. Considering the limitations, I believe this project should be pursued in combination with the other mitigation options, not as a solo project.</p> <p>- Springbank Off-Stream Storage: The Springbank proposal is the first mitigation project that the Government of Alberta has attempted to act on, however Premier Prentice’s haste to announce this decision prior to the upcoming by-elections has</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

	<p>mitigation and / or additional water for the City of Calgary. However, indications from the Premier are that this project will be built as a dry dam, although specific details about the scale or exact nature of the Springbank project do not seem to be publicly available.</p> <p><i>Glenmore Diversion Tunnel:</i> <i>Current status:</i> This project is the only shovel---ready project. The City of Calgary has completed a feasibility study of a tunnel that would take water from the Glenmore Reservoir underneath Heritage Drive and deposit it in the Bow River, downstream of the city. The City of Calgary’s flood experts are recommending that the province move forward with its construction. The proposed next steps on this project are to complete a preliminary design, including assessing environmental impacts, public consultation and initiation of the regulatory approval process.</p>			<p>alienated residents of Springbank, strained the relationship between the Premier’s office and Mayor Nenshi, and ultimately hindered the possibility of this and other critical mitigation projects going forward. Though I believe this plan has merit, it will require a great deal of consultation, seeing as the construction of the dam will displace ranchers and property owners who otherwise would not be impacted by flood events.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>The provincial government has not committed to building this project but has not ruled it out either.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> This project is essentially “shovel---ready” project and does not require the expropriation of land. This project would cost approx. \$460 million to protect against a 1:100 year flood and \$500 million to protect against a 1:200 year flood. A cost/benefit analysis of this project showed a positive return on investment from this project of \$850 million. This analysis does not take into account the billions of dollars of private infrastructure that the tunnel would protect so the benefits of the tunnel far exceed \$850 million.</p> <p><i>McLean Creek Dry Dam</i> <i>Current status:</i> This project has not yet been approved and remains in the planning stages. According the government’s website, a conceptual design has been</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>approved, community consultation is now underway and due at the end of 2014. A decision on this project will be withheld until the province conducts its own analysis on the Glenmore diversion project, despite the City's own feasibility study which recommends proceeding with the tunnel.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i> Like the Springbank dry dam proposal, McLean Creek dry dam would serve Albertans much better if were approached as a total water management solution. Given the lack feasibility study available for Springbank, it is difficult to determine how McLean Creek would serve to protect Albertans in concert with the other options. Generally speaking, however, I am supportive of all three options to provide maximum flood mitigation to communities along the Elbow River and downtown Calgary.</p>				
<p>b. Are you supportive of building upstream flood mitigation infrastructure for</p>	<p>Yes. I am very supportive.</p>	<p>Absolutely. This is a priority for me and a commitment that I am making to the</p>	<p>Absolutely. There is no question that the Government of Alberta has a</p>	<p>Yes. The 2013 flood was one of the most damaging weather events both</p>	<p>Alberta's NDP believes that in order to prevent future catastrophic floods and the</p>

<p>the Elbow River?</p>		<p>residents of Calgary-Elbow.</p>	<p>responsibility to protect the communities and businesses impacted by the 2013 flood. Wildrose has long felt that decisions around mitigation should be made based on sound scientific evidence, finding value for taxpayer dollars, and in consultation with impacted stakeholders.</p>	<p>economically and psychologically in the history of our province, and as an MLA for Calgary-Elbow I will work to ensure that this emotional and material damage is never repeated. The most critical step in ensuring this is to implement an effective mitigation strategy as soon as possible.</p>	<p>immense human suffering that would accompany such events, our cities need to be prepared beyond the 1:100 standard, especially given the consequences of climate change and the increasingly extreme weather events that accompany it. Thus, Alberta's NDP would support any projects including the three initially proposed projects (Springbank diversion and storage, McLean Creek, and Glenmore Reservoir Tunnel), assuming that the development of these plans were respectful of communities around them, were environmentally safe, and would properly raise the flood protection standard for Calgary and its surrounding area. Further, any project approved for flood mitigation would preferably be useful in times of drought as well, in order to better ensure hydrological security for Albertans in the Calgary region, and would include proper consultation with the cities, municipalities, and</p>
-------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--	--	---

					<p>communities involved. Recently announced plans by the current government simply do not meet these standards.</p>
<p>c. If yes to (b), then as Calgary-Elbow’s MLA, what actions (if any) do you intend to take to ensure upstream flood mitigation projects are completed as soon as possible?</p>	<p>I have personally advocated for flood mitigation since shortly after the flood of 2013. This gives me a deep insight into the work done to date and connections with the individuals involved from impacted communities, the Alberta government and elected officials.</p> <p>As the MLA for Calgary-Elbow I will continue this work. I have a track record of working collaboratively with government and all political parties to advocate for flood mitigation. In the immediate term, as a non---government MLA I have the advantage of standing up for the interests of Calgary---Elbow and not being constrained by a requirement to follow the dictates of party discipline. As a lifelong resident of Calgary--Elbow I understand the impact the flood has had on</p>	<p>I will be a passionate voice for my constituents and call for robust flood mitigation infrastructure. I am moved by the powerful stories of Calgary- Elbow residents and I can assure you that I am listening. I am committed to helping those still in need, and working to make sure this doesn’t happen again. As I have been door-knocking through the flood-impacted communities, my eyes and heart were opened to the depth and breadth of the impacts and to the ongoing need for a champion for this important cause.</p> <p>I have already held meetings with community leaders and the Calgary River Communities Action Group in order to fully understand the impacts of flooding, the outstanding issues and the infrastructure needs to</p>	<p>Step one is to insist on the public disclosure of all engineering reports and cost estimates to ensure the decisions being made around mitigation are completely transparent.</p> <p>Step two is to engage and consult with impacted stakeholders. This was a major oversight with regards to SR-1. Mayor Nenshi’s letter that highlighted how the PCs neglected to even consult with the City of Calgary demonstrates how poorly this process was managed.</p> <p>Further impacted are the landowners in Springbank, who were not consulted at all prior to the announcement being made that the project will go ahead. This is a pattern with this government that needs to be corrected.</p>	<p>I will not only work with the other Liberal MLAs in the Legislature, but also reach across the aisle to members of any and all parties – whether they are Wildrose, Progressive Conservative, or NDP– to form a coalition of concerned MLAs, who can use their collective strength to fight on behalf of concerned communities (there are a lot of MLAs who favour mitigation, in addition to Calgary, the communities of Drumheller, Medicine Hat, Red Deer County, and the Town of High River have all requested mitigation projects/funding. There is no reason representatives from these communities should not work together to secure funding from the federal and provincial governments).</p> <p>The possibility of another extreme flood impacts not</p>	<p>We need to ensure that our provincial government is working with communities affected by the 2013 floods in the most cooperative way possible. This means that rather than expediting plans of our own, Alberta’s NDP would work hand-in-hand with the City of Calgary and other municipalities to ensure that the mitigation projects chosen are appropriate for the communities and environments that they serve.</p>

	<p>my community and will fight hard for mitigation.</p> <p>As the MLA for Calgary-Elbow, I will do three things:</p> <p>i. I will work with other MLAs to enact a bi--partisan River Communities Caucus to ensure that the MLAs representing river communities are working together to ensure that the government doesn't lose sight of the importance of flood mitigation projects and flood--related development policies.</p> <p>ii. Continue to push for the construction of the Glenmore tunnel as a first priority. It is shovel ready and well worth the investment. The estimated costs of \$460 million for 1:100 year protection and \$500 million for 1:200 year protection would easily be eclipsed by the potential loss of billions of dollars in damage to public and private property.</p>	<p>mitigate future events. I have already met with Premier Jim Prentice and the Minister of Infrastructure to review flood mitigation options for Elbow River and recommended immediate action on pushing to move forward on mitigation projects. I am committed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hold the government's feet to the fire to expedite implementing the Springbank Reservoir solution - Work with all 3 levels of government to move forward other flood mitigation plans - Continue a dialogue with constituents and provide regular updates. - Set up regular and ongoing meetings with the Calgary River Communities Action Group, your elected Member of Parliament and the City of Calgary. - Hold government to its commitment to do whatever it can to help us put this disaster behind us as quickly as possible. 	<p>Step three is to put pressure on the ministers responsible (Kyle Fawcett in ESRD and Robin Campbell in Finance) to ensure the appropriate funding is allocated to the projects in the budget, and keep the pressure on until the project(s) required are financed and built.</p>	<p>just a portion of our riding, but many of our province's rural communities, and of course downtown Calgary, the central economic hub of our province. In many ways the flood brought members of our community and province together, I want to make sure that the search for solutions does not tear us apart. I will do this by working collaboratively across party lines, and emphasizing consultation, so as not to alienate those Albertans who will be impacted negatively by the construction of mitigation projects.</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--

	<p>iii. I will continue to support the completion of the Springbank dry dam.</p>				
<p>d. Are you supportive of acquiring the Springbank land required for the Springbank road off-stream reservoir? What time frame do you believe is reasonable to commence building of this infrastructure? Completion of this infrastructure?</p>	<p>I support acquiring the land required for the Springbank off-stream reservoir. I believe construction should start as soon as possible; however, the requirement for environmental impact assessments, consultations and land acquisition mean construction is not likely to start for some time. The terms of reference for the Environmental Impact Assessment issued on July 17, 2014 do not include a completion timeline.</p> <p>I believe it is reasonable to expect Springbank to be built in three years from a purely engineering perspective, although as noted above there are significant landowner and potentially environmental concerns that may delay the project. Regardless, the residents and businesses near the Elbow River cannot expect mitigation from Springbank</p>	<p>Yes. The project has already been announced and planning for implementation will begin immediately. This is a quick and effective first step in upstream flood mitigation. As your MLA I will be committed to ensuring our government follows through on this project in a timely matter.</p>	<p>I support completion of the mitigation infrastructure project(s) that make the most sense and are supported by engineering reports, environmental impact studies and scientific evidence, none of which has been provided at this time. I also believe our objectives should include minimizing the disruption to existing landowners.</p>	<p>Before any decision is made to acquire private property in Springbank, the government needs to engage the impacted residents in a meaningful and transparent consultation process. The timelines will depend on the results of the consultative process.</p>	<p>The Alberta NDP prefers the initial projects proposed by the expert panel on river flood mitigation. These projects together would offer Calgary a much higher degree of protection, and two of the three of them would serve the region in both flood and drought scenarios – important considerations for the area given the reality of climate change.</p>

	<p>before the spring of 2018 at the earliest.</p> <p>There is also a concern about the budget for this project. The government of Alberta has budgeted a total of \$150 million for the Highwood and Elbow projects in the budget years 2014/15 and 2015/16, with zero dollars budgeted in 2016/17. This is cause for concern because there simply is not enough money budgeted to complete the Highwood diversion and Springbank dry dam projects announced by the Premier, let alone the Glenmore Diversion Tunnel or McLean Creek</p>				
<p>e. Do you believe that more than one upstream mitigation infrastructure project is needed to fully protect Calgary? If not, why not? If yes, then:</p>	<p>Yes, I support more than one mitigation project. Ideally, all three projects are considered in aggregate and are seen as a cumulative approach to providing significant flood mitigation for the City of Calgary.</p>	<p>Yes, we need to consider multiple options for upstream mitigation – nothing should be off the table. After I met with Premier Prentice on this issue he announced flood mitigation action will begin immediately. (See answer 1 a above).</p> <p>Also we will continue to study other solutions, like the</p>	<p>If the evidence supports a single mitigation project being enough to restrict flows and positively impact our river communities and downtown core in the event of a flood event than I would support a single project. Likewise, if the evidence supports a combination of the three projects I would be advocating for the</p>	<p>Yes, I think in the end protecting our city and province from future floods will be achieved by investing in a combination of all three proposed mitigation projects. We won't know to what extent until the analysis of the remaining two projects (Glenmore & McLean) is completed. However, I think more focus needs to be paid</p>	<p>In order to answer this question, the ANDP would like to see the results of current studies dedicated to finding out the ways in which each of these projects impact one another, but it would seem that Calgary does need more than one mitigation project to offer it protection against increasingly extreme weather events. While</p>

		<p>under-ground diversion tunnel in Calgary. Nothing is off the table. Our priority is to get the Springbank solution in place, conduct appropriate flood mapping and then come up with science-based solutions that will work together to protect the City of Calgary, including the residents of Calgary-Elbow.</p>	<p>combination of projects.</p>	<p>to long-term planning and the impact of ecological changes – such as the influence of clear-cutting at headways, and increasing human development along waterways. I also think that the agreement with TransAlta to pre-emptively drain the Glenmore Reservoir in advance of potential flood events will go a long way in ensuring that 1:100 year floods or smaller are sufficiently dealt with using existing infrastructure.</p>	<p>security of life, well-being, communities, and property are top-of-mind for us, we want to more fully understand how these projects complement one another so that we can offer the greatest degree of protection for the city with the least ecological interference.</p>
<p>i. Do you support the completion of the McLean Creek dry dam? If so, on what time frame?</p>	<p>I support the McLean Creek dry dam in principle because I believe multiple layers of mitigation are required. It also provides flood mitigation for communities upstream of Calgary and has the potential to provide long term water retention to mitigate against drought.</p> <p>However, environmental and detailed engineering reviews have yet to be completed and it is too early to say definitively that the project should go ahead. Should no major concerns arise from the</p>	<p>Government will conduct a 3-month environmental review of the prospects for building a dry dam on McLean Creek. This will be completed by the end of 2014.</p>	<p>See above.</p>	<p>See above.</p>	<p>Pending the input of independent experts in the field, the NDP would support the completion of the McLean Creek dam. Mitigation projects should move forward as soon as the proper ecological, social, and safety impacts have been properly studied and planned for.</p>

	reviews, I would support this project on the basis that its position of being further upstream than other major mitigation projects, it would offer protection to all communities downstream. I would support whatever timeframe was recommended by flood and construction efforts.				
ii. Do you support an underground diversion tunnel from the Glenmore reservoir to the Bow River?	Yes. The Glenmore Diversion Tunnel is closest to being “shovel ready”. I support moving quickly to preliminary design, including assessing environmental impacts, public consultation and initiation of the regulatory approval process. The Diversion Tunnel a compelling option because there is more timeline certainty.	We need to conduct a full assessment of this possible solution before we know if it is viable. As stated above, I support a multi-pronged solution that will protect Calgarians and our city. Lives were devastated by this event and our city core was threatened. We must seriously look at a number of possible solutions and implement the best flood mitigation infrastructure possible.	See above.	See above.	Again, pending the input of independent experts in the field surrounding the degree of protection offered to the region by multiple options, the NDP would support this measure assuming that it would be part of a larger project to properly prepare the region for another catastrophic event.
2. BOW RIVER					
a. As MLA for Calgary-Elbow, what do you see as your role in ensuring that all measures for flood mitigation within the City of Calgary are undertaken, e.g., necessary	The floods of 2013 reinforced the notion that Albertans are much more powerful when we work together. MLAs and MPs should work together to deliver results for the	I will be a passionate voice for my constituents and call for robust flood mitigation infrastructure and I will work with all 3 levels of government to move forward	As a provincial MLA, I would start by saying how much I respect the City of Calgary and their role in making decisions that impact the city. The Mayor and Council have	Collaboration is key. As this question rightly implies many of the necessary mitigation upgrades will be the responsibility of the City of Calgary. I will work to ensure	We need to ensure that the Province is properly supporting the City of Calgary in its efforts to properly upgrade and repair its existing flood mitigation

<p>upgrades to catch basins and storm sewers, e.g., at Sunnyside, Bridgeland, etc?</p>	<p>Albertans whom they represent. As the MLA for Calgary-Elbow, my first priority will always be fighting for the river communities along the Elbow. The provincial government should provide the same support and ensure the same level of protection to all Albertans living in the floodway and flood fringes of Alberta's rivers.</p> <p>As the MLA for Calgary-Elbow, I will work with my municipal and federal counterparts to ensure that the funds for major capital upgrades to municipal infrastructure are available. I will work with other MLAs to enact a bi-partisan River Communities Caucus to ensure that the MLAs representing river communities are working together to ensure that the government doesn't lose sight of the importance of flood mitigation projects and flood-related development policies. This River</p>	<p>appropriate flood mitigation plans. I pledge to continue a dialogue with constituents and provide regular updates as well as set up regular and ongoing meetings with the Calgary River Communities Action Group, your elected Member of Parliament and the City of Calgary. I will hold my own government's feet to the fire to ensure the right solutions are put in place.</p>	<p>a role that they take very seriously, and that is to allocate funding for infrastructure projects as per their local priorities, and they are held accountable for their decisions by the electorate just as our provincial politicians are.</p> <p>I would also suggest that there is a reason Mayor Nenshi has said the Wildrose 10-10 Community Infrastructure Transfer is a preferable funding model when compared to the PC government grant model. Our model would see more money flow directly to the municipality in iron clad, block funding with no strings attached. This would allow the city the flexibility to complete necessary upgrades to the storm sewer system on the north side of the Bow that negatively impacted the communities of Brideland and Sunnyside.</p>	<p>that the Government of Alberta makes no decisions without first talking with Mayor Nenshi, his staff, and his advisors. Furthermore, if projects are studied and deemed viable by both the City of Calgary and the province, I will work to ensure that adequate provincial funding is provided for municipal mitigation projects.</p>	<p>resources. Thus, Alberta's NDP would encourage and pressure the Government to provide stable, predictable funding for these projects, and working with industry experts to develop long-term planning that acknowledges the need for further development and maintenance of flood mitigation infrastructure.</p>
--	---	--	---	---	---

	<p>Communities Caucus can work with their federal counterparts to ensure that the federal government is adequately supporting residents in these communities.</p> <p>I will also bring my unique perspective as a homeowner affected by the floods and offer my advice and support to other MLAs so they can better support their constituents who are still recovering from the floods.</p>				
<p>b. As MLA for Calgary-Elbow, what do you see as your role in ensuring that infrastructure already existing on the Bow River is used as effectively as possibly for flood mitigation purposes, such as by appropriate contractual means with TransAlta?</p>	<p>I feel strongly that our Provincial government has let down residents near the Bow River and people and businesses in downtown Calgary by not yet having a long term agreement in place with TransAlta to use their extensive network of dam infrastructure for purposes of flood mitigation. This agreement should have been in place before the 2014 flood season, and it is unacceptable that there is still no agreement in place. I support any effort to come to such an</p>	<p>My role is to be a strong leader for the community and I am committed to working to ensure we are protected against future flood possibilities. As a senior member of the Jim Prentice Cabinet I will be an active participant in securing the plan to put an agreement in place with TransAlta. The plan is to secure a long-term use-of-works operational agreement for TransAlta infrastructure on the Bow River and to consider expanding the study of</p>	<p>Clear evidence has been presented by organizations such as Alberta WaterSmart that indicates that water flows can be managed along the Bow River with current infrastructure. It is incumbent upon us as leaders to lead, and pursuing a long-term agreement with TransAlta should be a major priority for the government, regardless of which party is in power. I would support the team responsible for negotiating the deal with TransAlta in any way I could,</p>	<p>My position is that corporations that control existing infrastructure should be contractually obliged to respond to warnings from upstream monitors.</p>	<p>Alberta's NDP would support ongoing cooperation between TransAlta and the Province to increase flood storage on the Bow River through existing TransAlta facilities. This arrangement would be revisited as public mitigation infrastructure around the region is developed and constructed.</p>

	<p>agreement, but worry the 2015 flood season will be upon us before a long term plan is in place.</p> <p>The River Communities Caucus can lend its voice for the province to negotiate for a long---term deal between the provincial government and Transalta as soon as possible. There is way too much at stake for either party to not to want to come to a long---term agreement.</p>	<p>applications of Room for the River concepts to accommodate flooding. Stakeholders, including recreational users, will be considered in this planning.</p>	<p>understanding that sometimes that means advocating behind the scenes as opposed to in the public eye as the latter approach can be counterproductive to achieving a positive result.</p>		
3. POLICY					
Floodway Development Regulations					
a. What is your current understanding of the status of the Floodway Development Regulations?	<p>In December 2013, the Government of Alberta passed Bill 27, Floodway Development Regulation Consultation which amended the Municipal Government Act to put new controls for future development in the floodways of Alberta. Earlier this year, Alberta Municipal Affairs established a task force comprised of municipal and industry officials to look at the issue of establishing new Floodway Development</p>	<p>The Alberta Government enacted Bill 27, Flood Recovery and Reconstruction Act, in December 2013, which amends the Municipal Government Act. The Act allows the Cabinet of the Alberta Government to make specific regulations to limit development in a floodway ("Floodway Regulation"). The stated purpose of the Floodway Regulation will be to ensure a consistent minimum level of land use</p>	<p>It is my understanding that the Wildrose Caucus attempted repeatedly to insert specific definitions around floodway and flood fringe in the Municipal Government Act (MGA) when this was debated in the Legislature, and the PC's routinely rejected calls for clarity in the act allowing them the opportunity to insert regulations (not subject to the legislative process) after the bill had passed.</p>	<p>They are a set of amendments to the <i>Municipal Government Act</i> which set-out what <i>areas</i> will and will not be developed/redeveloped in the aftermath of the 2013 flood, and <i>who</i> will and will not be eligible for compensation in the event of another catastrophic flood.</p>	<p>Current flood hazard maps for the City of Calgary, and the development regulations that follow from them are woefully outdated when compared to the rest of the province. The ANDP believes these maps, which have not been updated completely since the 1980s, need to be rethought.</p>

	<p>Regulations. In August, the task force issued a draft discussion paper which outlined its views on the various approaches to regulate future and existing development on Alberta's floodways. The discussion paper provided the basis for public consultation. The results of the public consultation are pending public release.</p> <p>Regulations introduced as a result of this process will apply to municipalities that have been assessed and mapped for flood hazards as per the Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development (ESRD). While these regulations will assure a minimum standard of land-use permissions, municipalities can put in place their own, more stringent land-use regulations.</p>	<p>control in flood hazard areas is applied across the Province.</p>			
<p>b. What do you believe ought to be achieved with such regulations, and what measures would you support to achieve those goals?</p>	<p>Any provincial regulations that limit/inhibit future growth needs to take into account the large-scale mitigation projects that are</p>	<p>I believe regulations like these should help protect homes, property and infrastructure and apply the same appropriate standards</p>	<p>Wildrose pushed for the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Updated flood maps ASAP 	<p>These regulations need to protect infrastructure, property and peoples personal safety. If mitigation projects do not protect</p>	<p>In order to mitigate risk, Alberta's NDP believes that the flood hazard maps for the City of Calgary should be redrawn using updated</p>

	<p>currently being considered. If the appropriate upstream mitigation is put in place the less strenuous the regulations need to be. The City of Calgary is built at the confluence of two rivers and much of its inner city is built along them. Future development opportunities need not to be a casualty to these regulations. I would propose that a commitment to review the regulations after an appropriate amount of time be included in the final regulations to ensure that they balance protection from future floods with the benefits of future development.</p> <p>I would also ensure that the maps upon which the regulations will apply need to be updated regularly so they remain fair and legitimate.</p>	<p>across Alberta.</p> <p>I believe we need to work towards this, but to achieve these goals I think we need to work directly with those affected and the Calgary River Communities Action Group to make sure that we don't jump to solutions before applying appropriate study.</p> <p>Indeed I have met with CRCAG and read through information on your website, and agree with your position on this topic, as outlined on September 25:</p> <p><i>"... all responses to flood mitigation, including infrastructure, policy, education or otherwise, should proceed in as holistic and sensibly sequential fashion as possible. If proclaimed into force prematurely, a Floodway Regulation could place undue restrictions on current properties designated to be in the floodway and could lead to further sweeping</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Design, approve and build mitigation infrastructure 3. Re-do flood maps based on the mitigation infrastructure 4. Only once the floodway and flood fringe have been defined post mitigation infrastructure should buy outs be offered. 	<p>certain areas to a sufficient degree, those areas should not be developed; this is the simplest way to prevent the damage –both emotional and material– that we saw in 2013. However if an area is already significantly developed, my priority as an MLA will be to invest in mitigation projects to protect those areas and residents, not relocate them.</p>	<p>definitions used throughout the rest of the province, with the city's land-use bylaws being brought in line with any changes that this would bring.</p>
--	--	---	---	--	--

		<i>restrictions to developments in the flood fringe and overland flow areas. Moreover, such a Floodway Regulation could well ignore the impact that upstream mitigation infrastructure and management will have on attenuating flood waters from reaching Calgary's downtown core and inner-city communities, and the impacts from changes to the Government's flood hazard mapping scheme, which is out of date and currently undergoing revision."</i>			
c. Do you believe that the Floodway Development Regulations should be made independent of considering the impact of upstream flood mitigation infrastructure?	Absolutely not. See answer for 3b.	No, I agree with CRCAG that we need to look at the big picture before making important policy decisions.	There is no independence, these items are intrinsically linked.	No, assessments should be made based on the protection mitigation projects <i>will</i> provide once completed.	Yes. We feel as though this would offer a second level of property protection when faced with a potential flood event.
d. Do you believe that Calgary should have the same exemption as Fort McMurray and Drumheller?	I think a full or partial exemption for Calgary should be considered as the unintended consequences of the regulations will be felt more in Calgary than anywhere else. Calgary will also be protected by future upstream mitigation so the regulations	I understand CRCAG's concern that policies created following the 2013 flood "have not been applied equally to all communities". As stated above, I plan to be a champion for Calgary-Elbow and will hold my own government's feet to the fire to ensure all flood policies	There is a strong case to be made that parts of Calgary, such as the majority of the downtown core and our established river communities, with proper localized community-based mitigation, should be exempt from the floodway regulations.	The exemptions granted to Drumheller and Fort McMurray are a result of the zoning restrictions those municipalities already have in place, whether Calgary should be granted the same exemption would depend on how the City changes its zoning policies.	This decision would have to be taken thoughtfully, pending the redrawing of flood hazard maps for the City by experts in the field.

	<p>may not even be necessary.</p>	<p>and regulations are fair to the people I represent.</p>			
<p>e. Do you have any concern that future flood hazard mapping may encompass much larger areas of Calgary within the floodway – particularly in the Calgary-Elbow riding – which may retroactively have a profound and significant impact on development within Calgary-Elbow, on account of the Floodway Development Regulations? If so, what do you intend to do as MLA to address these concerns?</p>	<p>I only have concerns if the updated mapping is used to further restrict development or otherwise disadvantage river communities. Thorough, up-to-date and accurate maps should always be in place. The likelihood that a much greater area than is currently identified as being within the floodway or flood fringe could lead to further poor policy decisions (e.g. an expansion of the floodway buyout program that would further hollow out our neighbourhoods, potential development restrictions, etc.) The best solution is to use the updated maps as further impetus for significant upstream flood mitigation.</p> <p>As the MLA for Calgary---Elbow I will advocate for flood mitigation and fight for rational, well-considered policy that recognizes the fact river communities have been in place for more than a century and must be allowed</p>	<p>I share CRCAG’s concerns on this issue. I will be your champion within the government. I agree in principle with your stated approach of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Holistically understand the hydrological dynamics of the watershed and the risks presented;</i> - <i>Build appropriate infrastructure to address those risks (such as the Springbank Diversion, McLean Creek Dry Dam and the Glenmore Bypass Tunnel on the Elbow River, and new or enhanced infrastructure on the Bow River);</i> - <i>Replace the outdated flood hazard maps based on these new infrastructure realities;</i> - <i>Develop sensible development policies and regulations, in consultation with those affected, based on all these new considerations.</i> <p>And I pledge to work through this issue with you and the</p>	<p>It is my belief that with proper flood mitigation infrastructure in place, and once the flood maps are updated to reflect this mitigation infrastructure, the river communities of Calgary-Elbow will be able to thrive and will not be profoundly or significantly impacted by the floodway development regulations.</p>	<p>No I am not concerned. If the flood mitigation projects I support are funded/planned/constructed, all future flood hazard mapping will encompass smaller not larger areas of Calgary. If we tirelessly pursue mitigation, this should <u>not</u> be a problem.</p>	<p>While changing the mapping should not be made to retroactively penalize property-owners who might find themselves re-zoned into the floodway, restrictions would be placed on new development in the floodway, including infills that could change the drainage of the area and exacerbate potential flooding.</p>

	to continue to thrive. I will work with other MLAs to ensure the government doesn't lose sight of the importance of flood mitigation projects and flood-related development policies.	residents of Calgary-Elbow and following the by-election commit to reviewing this with the Premier.			
Buy-Out Policy					
a. What are your thoughts on the Buy-out policy?	<p>I believe the floodway buyout policy is one of the worst public policy decisions in the 43 year history of the PC party.</p> <p>As of October 3rd, \$84 million of public money had been spent to buy out 75 homes in Calgary and High River. The fact that so few of the approximately 250 eligible homeowners took the buyout says a lot about the connection people have to these 'heart and soul' communities. The buyout program does not prevent future flood damage partly because there are so many homes remaining in the floodway, and partly because even if the floodway was cleared of homes, the mapping used to determine</p>	<p>The floods did not discriminate by postal code and neither can we. This is not the time or place to pit neighbour against neighbour. Money alone does not replace a home; we have to remember families across the economic spectrum lost their homes. The buy-out program was designed to reduce the impact to communities and cost of future property losses from future flood events.</p> <p>We can't change the agreements reached with these families to leave their homes, but what we can discuss is how we will appropriately integrate property that has been relinquished.</p>	They got it backwards, see answer 3 (b) above.	The buy-out policy has been a disaster; it has destroyed neighborhoods while at the same time doing nothing to address future flood events.	We believe that rebuilding and revitalizing affected communities should be the priority, but we acknowledge that in some cases, families and businesses will have suffered such a loss that they prefer to move and start over. A buyout and recovery plan needs to accommodate and be flexible to the needs of home and business owners experiencing a variety of problems and difficulties.

	<p>buyout eligibility is flawed to the point of irrelevance. A final insult is the fact that the money spent on buyouts is not eligible for federal reimbursement, as is a substantial portion of DRP.</p> <p>The \$84 million spent on ineffective buyouts would pay for more than half of the Springbank diversion, or could have been used to fund detailed engineering studies for the Glenmore Diversion Tunnel.</p> <p>The buyout program has led to patchwork communities, boarded up buildings and a loss of vibrancy in these neighbourhoods.</p>				
<p>b. Do you believe the Buy-out policy has achieved its stated goal?</p>	<p>Once substantial upstream flood mitigation is in place, the floodway should be re-mapped to reflect mitigated flows and the land should be sold back into the market to restore the integrity of riverfront communities and recover a portion of the money wasted on the buyout program.</p>	<p>While I believe the intent of the program was right, I think its planning and implementation were flawed. It was a decision made in the heat of the moment, mid-disaster, when neither Jim Prentice nor myself were at the table. I think now is the time for a thoughtful and thorough look at all of these</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No, Premier Redford stated that the aim of these projects was to “make Albertan’s whole again.” They have done the complete opposite by hollowing out previously vibrant communities.</p>	<p>There are cases where buy out is appropriate. However, the fact that the government is still relying on outdated, faulty maps means that we cannot adequately plan for future development or redevelopment in these communities or determine appropriate land uses. Alberta’s NDP would ensure</p>

		<p>policies going forward.</p>			<p>that all Albertans affected by the flood received adequate immediate assistance to begin rebuilding, but we believe that the first step to good long-term planning must include updating the flood maps. We also believe that lack of coordination and planning with the buy outs has left some priority cases languishing while others received much more rapid responses from the government. We would ensure that, with updated flood maps, a clear plan for assistance would make sure that the hardest hit families are priorities for government resources.</p>
<p>c. Do you believe the Buy-out policy as implemented (i.e., with only approximately 30% of eligible homeowners accepting the buy-out) has left our communities in worse position?</p>	<p>I do believe it has left them in a worse position. There is no evidence that removing the homes that have been bought out will reduce future flood damage in any way. At the same time, vibrant communities have been hollowed out.</p>	<p>As a government, I believe we need to make sure that this is not the end result of this Buy-Out policy. We need to evaluate the situation and move forward with a plan that will support our flood-torn areas. I can definitely say the flood left our communities in a worse position and we can't stop our work now. We must</p>	<p>While I wish that the PCs had gone a different direction here, the reality is that we have to deal with it and find the best way forward. I look forward to collaborating with the communities that have been impacted by this short-sighted decision and finding ways to benefit from it.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	

		continue to support homeowners and community leaders.			
d. What should be done with the vacant lots that have resulted from this policy?	Once substantial upstream flood mitigation is in place, the floodway should be re-mapped to reflect mitigated flows and the land should be sold back into the market to restore the integrity of riverfront communities and recover a portion of the money wasted on the buyout program.	In consultation with local residents we need to look at how these lands best serve the community and we need to ensure any plans are prudent and long-term solutions that benefit the communities.	See answer above.	Assuming appropriate flood mitigation efforts are put in place, they should be sold back to the public, with the buyers being made fully aware of the flood risk (which will be minimized as a result of new mitigation infrastructure), and on the understanding that a similar buyout package will not be executed in the event of another flood. Properties that are deemed too risky to be resold should be cleared and turned into community parkland along the rivers edge.	
4. DISASTER RECOVERY PROGRAM					
a. Do you believe the DRP funding has been appropriately and fairly allocated to flood-impacted residents and business owners?	The administration of the DRP program has been flawed from the very start. Promises were made by elected officials that set expectations which were very different from what the DRP program was intended to deliver. People made financial commitments based on these	There is no question that the government should have taken swifter action to ensure that all DRP claims were dealt with in the timeliest matter possible. As I noted earlier, my eyes and heart have been opened to the depth and breadth of the impacts and to the ongoing need for a	Absolutely not.	No, residents have told me that after months of fighting their way through the DRP bureaucracy they have received little or nothing in the way of payouts. One homeowner told me that although she suffered heavy flood damage she only received an \$800 cheque	We are concerned that the disaster recovery program funds are not reaching those who need it and that many are struggling with long delays and difficulties with the application process. It is good to see the PCs investing in additional employees to process applications, but the

	<p>promises and many are still struggling to this day as a result.</p> <p>The processing of DRP claims has been unacceptably slow and inconsistent. Cheques were mailed with confusing or no rational explanations, there was no centralized case management resulting in multiple calls from DRP claimants to get answers, and when answers were given very often the information provided was incorrect.</p> <p>More than a year later there are 2,600 Albertans who are still waiting to complete their claim. For these Albertans, bridging the gap often involves cleaning out their savings accounts, carrying costs on credit cards or simply not rebuilding.</p> <p>There are anecdotal stories of neighbours applying successfully for funds while their next-door neighbours who incurred the same level of damage from the flood had their claims rejected. This</p>	<p>champion for this important cause. I've sat in living rooms across the constituency and I've pledged to be that champion for the community.</p> <p>Out of more than 10,500 individual DRP applications, more than 8,000 have already been assessed, assisted, and closed, with the remainder still open to allow ongoing support to those most in need. In all southern Alberta communities, a total of 908 appeals have been received. Of that total, 231 have been resolved and 677 are currently at appeals for assessment. In Calgary, there are currently 120 files at appeal, with 42 having been resolved for a total of 162 appeals overall. We must work quickly to deal with those appeals still open, or appealed, and bring conclusion to these outstanding claims as soon as possible.</p>		<p>from the Government of Alberta. It did not even cover her "cleaning" costs. This woman and her family are remaining in the community in an attempt to rebuild and ensure it emerges stronger and more cohesive in the aftermath of the flood. When you compare these stories to the exorbitant buyout fees being paid to members of the community who simply pack-up and move-on, it's obvious that the DRP is a failure.</p>	<p>fact that it took over a year to do this shows the lack of planning and the lack of understanding toward the pressures facing the families in affected areas.</p>
--	---	--	--	--	--

	<p>unfair treatment from their own government in a time of great need is outrageous. Albertans expect fair treatment from their government. The government fell well short of these expectations.</p> <p>The plan to hire just 12 new staff will improve the situation but only marginally. For far too many Albertans the wait for relief will continue well into the new year - more than 18 months since the flood. If any of these applications are rejected and successfully appealed, the 6 month appeal process will mean that some Albertans will have to wait up to two years since the flood to receive financial assistance. This is completely unacceptable.</p>				
<p>b. If yes, why?</p>					
<p>c. If no, then what will you do in your role as MLA for Calgary-Elbow to ensure the appropriate allocation of funding in a timely manner?</p>	<p>As the MLA for Calgary---Elbow I will personally work with residents who continue to struggle with DRP. I will listen to their experiences</p>	<p>I have already met with Premier Prentice to demand that government fix the Disaster Recovery Program. The Premier responded and</p>	<p>I have proudly been watching from the sidelines as Danielle Smith put sustained, public pressure on the ministers of Municipal Affairs to make</p>	<p>First and foremost as an MLA I will work with the Liberal caucus and other opposition parties to ensure that an appropriate sum is allocated</p>	<p>Alberta's NDP would commit adequate resources to ensure that applications and relief funds are processed and distributed in a more timely</p>

	<p>and bring forward their concerns to the Minister and Municipal Affairs staff responsible for administering the DRP. No flood victim should have to suffer mistreatment from their own government after all they have been through.</p> <p>I will also work with other MLAs who have been helping their constituents with DRP claims. I have already had conversations with MLAs from other parties about DRP and I believe we can work together to speed the claims process.</p>	<p>agreed with my recommendation to triple the amount of appeals staff with the goal of clearing outstanding appeals by December 2014. I will continue to work hard on this issue and will do whatever I can to help families realize a fair and just conclusion to their appeals.</p>	<p>hold the government to account on this file. Simply put, this program in and of itself has been a disaster. Inconsistent decisions, no justification for the decisions being made, lost files, no single point of contact within the DRP are just some of the reasons we are still dealing with hundreds of open appeals.</p> <p>I would push for the following:</p> <p>Fire LandLink (private company operating the DRP)</p> <p>Bring the entire DRP into the government bureaucracy by cross training 100-200 civil servants in each of 10-20 government departments (goal of 2000 cross-trained civil servants) in disaster recovery and how to process claims. This would essentially allow the government to flip a switch and transition overnight a significant number of individuals to dealing with a future disaster.</p>	<p>for disaster relief every year. Furthermore, disaster funding that is not expended in any given year will accrue to the following year as a hedge against future disasters. The Government of Alberta are serial offenders when it comes to underestimating the required annual budget for disaster relief, by being more realistic about the likelihood disasters will occur, and recognizing that recovery is expensive, we can provide more efficient and sufficient aid to those in need.</p>	<p>manner and we would ensure that information and assistance is available to the public to aid them throughout the process.</p>
--	---	--	--	--	--

			<p>A major part of this training would be to understand that every case is not just a series of numbers, but real people and real families dealing with one of the most stressful events in their lives and we need to humanize the entire DRP process.</p> <p>Have a case-management system that ensures a single point of contact for each claimant, and provide transparent criteria for claims.</p> <p>Recognize that we need some sort of overland flood insurance program.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--