

Dear CEAA,

I am a Calgary resident who was significantly affected by the June 21, 2013 flood of the Elbow River. Cost to restore basement (8½ feet of water) \$175,000. Payment by provincial disaster relief program \$17,400.

The Springbank project has been sized to *completely eliminate* flooding from a flood of the 2013 size. It is most important that construction should proceed as rapidly as possible to avoid a repeat that cost some \$6B according to Alberta Transportation.

The flood season being May 15 to July 15, construction should be sufficiently advanced by May 1<sup>st</sup> of the earliest year that it can *safely operate*, ignoring cosmetic completion.

May 1<sup>st</sup> 2018 is definitely out of the question as the engineering will not be complete until end Jan, 2017 and contract letting plus construction needs roughly 22 months.

May 1<sup>st</sup> 2019 is attainable if NRCB approval can be given in June, 2017, 13 months from today.

May 1<sup>st</sup> 2020 is a slam dunk.

How then, exactly, to achieve May 1<sup>st</sup>, 2019 as the earliest date for safe operation?

The Alberta EIA falls into two parts: engineering and hydrological matters and issues to do with nature. Since dam failures can be catastrophic, the check on engineering by the NRCB is most important. In discussions with the counsel for NRCB I got the impression that they could be flexible and could begin their review of the engineering work as soon as it became available, i.e., Feb 1<sup>st</sup>, 2017. This would allow the attainment of a May/June decision date.

For the nature side of the EIA, Stantec Consultants are talking in terms of 12 months of study followed by 3 months to write up the results. Most of the items in the proposed EIA are inconsequential such as the effect on air quality (of water on the prairie for 10/25 days say 3 times a century) or the effect on fish habitat (only positive since the flood rush completely upsets the river bed and all its weeds and insects and that rush would be prevented downstream of the project). Furthermore, to insist on a four seasons study for an event that will only occur May 15 – July 15 makes no sense – why study flood effects at a time of year when everything is frozen solid?

My suggestion is that Stantec should be asked to pass to NRCB sections of their study completed in, say, 6 months (by Nov 1<sup>st</sup>). Let NRCB review this work and get back to Stantec if they, the NRCB who are the ultimate judge, deem it to be incomplete.

I gather you, the CEAA, are trying to decide whether you, and to what extent, should get involved in supplying material to NRCB.

May I respectfully suggest that your aim, as the senior environmental assessment agency, should be to use you good offices to force the appropriate completion of both the serious (engineering) and inconsequential (nature) EIA work in time for the NRCB to reach its conclusion in early June, 2017. Then we, all the potentially affected residents and businesses, will not be exposed to an additional year's risk of disaster.

I am suggesting ***you should help*** the whole regulatory approvals process to proceed in a timely yet thorough manner.

Yours sincerely,

James Cran,  
<Personal  
Information  
Removed>

