



WHAT WE HEARD ABOUT REACH 6 FLOOD MITIGATION

*Engineering Department
September 15 – October 16, 2022*



By Will Collins | will.collins@rmwb.ca
December 23, 2022

CONTENTS

CONTENTS	2
ABOUT THE PROJECT	3
ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY	4
<i>STAKEHOLDERS</i>	4
<i>COMMUNICATION CHANNELS</i>	4
<i>ENGAGEMENT TACTICS</i>	4
ENGAGEMENT HIGHLIGHTS	5
QUICK POLL: OVERVIEW	5
<i>TOP FIVE THEMES FROM QUICK POLL</i>	5
<i>QUICK POLL RESULTS</i>	6
ONLINE SURVEY: OVERVIEW	7
<i>DEMOGRAPHICS OF RESPONDENTS</i>	7
<i>ABOUT THE DESIGN OPTIONS</i>	8
<i>OVERVIEW OF KEY CONSIDERATIONS</i>	9
<i>TOP 5 CONSIDERATIONS</i>	9
<i>SURVEY RESPONSES</i>	10
SURVEY COMMENTS: OVERVIEW	12
IN-PERSON AND VIRTUAL SESSIONS	13
NEXT STEPS	13



We humbly acknowledge that the land on which we live, learn, work and play is Treaty 8 territory, the traditional and ancestral lands of the Cree, Dene, and unceded territory of the Métis.

ABOUT THE PROJECT

Reach 6 is one of the largest and most public-facing portions of permanent flood mitigation. This reach runs along Clearwater Drive from Riedel Street up to Franklin Avenue beside Longboat Landing.

Throughout the preliminary design discussions, Administration reviewed three conceptual design options (with variations) but narrowed down the feasible designs to two main concepts. Before deciding which design should be constructed, Administration committed to engaging with the public to get feedback on flood mitigation for Reach 6.

Two design concepts were presented for public feedback – including a third design concept (twinning Clearwater Drive) which was *not* recommended due to cost, maintenance challenges, and accessibility limitations to the riverfront area.

For this engagement, residents were not asked to vote on which of the two design options they prefer. Rather, residents were asked to highlight what they feel are the most important key considerations for each design option.

Residents' feedback will provide the Engineering Department with well-rounded information that can be presented to Council to get their guidance on which design option should be constructed for Reach 6 flood mitigation.




ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY

STAKEHOLDERS

1. Council-Appointed Committees
2. Downtown Businesses
3. Downtown Residents
4. Downtown Non-Profit and Social Profit Organizations
5. Fort McMurray Heritage Society
6. Fort McMurray Wood Buffalo Economic Development & Tourism
7. Indigenous Partners
8. Mayor and Councillors
9. Residents, Businesses and Stakeholders at Large
10. RMWB Internal Stakeholders

COMMUNICATION CHANNELS

- ✓ Direct Contact with Stakeholders
- ✓ Electronic Message Boards
- ✓ Emails
- ✓ Mac Calendar
- ✓ McMurray Matters Podcast Interview
- ✓ Media Stories/Interviews
- ✓ News Release
- ✓ Participate Wood Buffalo (PWB)
- ✓ Post Card Mailouts
- ✓ Pulse
- ✓ PWB Newsletter
- ✓ Radio Ads
- ✓ Social Media



ENGAGEMENT TACTICS



- In-Person Engagement Sessions
- One-on-One Meetings
- Virtual Engagement Sessions
- Online Survey on PWB
 - (Available in print or through Pulse phone support)
- Quick Poll on PWB
- Questions Widget on PWB



ENGAGEMENT HIGHLIGHTS

19,872

Social Media Reach

10,999

Social Media Impressions

1.2K

Visits to Participate Wood Buffalo (Online Engagement Portal)

102

Survey Submissions

90

Quick Poll Responses

17

Engagement Session Participants

4

Stakeholder Meetings

4

Media Stories & Interviews

QUICK POLL: OVERVIEW

The following is a summary of responses to the Quick Poll, where respondents were asked to identify their **top priority for Reach 6 flood mitigation based on nine (9) key considerations**. While the design of flood mitigation is important for this engagement, the Quick Poll was designed to gauge residents' priorities for flood mitigation and not what the actual design could look like.

TOP FIVE THEMES FROM QUICK POLL

Out of the 90 responses received for the Quick Poll, the following highlights the top five themes identified by survey respondents. The top priority for respondents was the **"View of the River," with 30 responses, or 33%** of the responses submitted for the Quick Poll.

VIEW OF THE RIVER



THE LOOK OF FLOOD MITIGATION



SAFETY (ACCESS, VISIBILITY)



COST OF THE PROJECT



ACCESS TO THE RIVER




QUICK POLL RESULTS

The following is a summary of Quick Poll responses, where respondents were asked to select their **(1) top priority** for Reach 6 Flood Mitigation.

The **top five responses out of 90 submissions** were as follows:

- View of the River – 33%
- Aesthetics (the Look) of Flood Mitigation – 14%
- Safety (Access to the River, Pedestrian Visibility, etc.) – 14%
- Cost of the Project – 11%
- Access to the River – 8%




ONLINE SURVEY: OVERVIEW

DEMOGRAPHICS OF RESPONDENTS

Reach 6 runs along Clearwater Drive from Riedel Street to Longboat Landing in downtown Fort McMurray. While the subject area for this project is downtown, residents from across the region were invited to share feedback.

Survey respondents were asked where they live to see if they live in the vicinity of the project area. This question was designed to understand if this project is also important to residents who don't live close Reach 6. Based on the analytics in the figure below, almost **75% of respondents do not live in the vicinity of Reach 6**. This suggests that flood mitigation in this area is also important to people from other parts of the region and not just to those who live downtown.

75% of survey respondents do not live in the vicinity of Reach 6.



ABOUT THE DESIGN OPTIONS

The survey included information about three flood mitigation designs with an opportunity to share feedback on each of the designs.

The first design (**twinning Clearwater Drive**) was a **preliminary design** and was included in the survey as **information only**. This design is **not recommended** by our team; however, this design was shared as part of the survey, so respondents would be aware of all the designs that were considered.

We then asked respondents to share your feedback on key considerations for **Design Option 1 (raising Clearwater Drive)** and **Design Option 2 (placing a berm between Clearwater Drive and the river)**.

While three design options were presented, the first design was for information only, so respondents would be aware of all the designs that were considered.

To help clarify what the design options could look like, the survey included a gallery of sketch concepts, cross-section drawings, written descriptions, and nine key considerations for each of the design options.


CROSS-SECTION DRAWINGS

PRELIMINARY DESIGN - Twinning Clearwater Drive


(Not a recommended design. For information only.)



DESIGN OPTION 1 - Raising Clearwater Drive



DESIGN OPTION 2 – Berm Between Clearwater Drive and River



OVERVIEW OF KEY CONSIDERATIONS

For the survey, nine (9) key considerations were provided for each of the design options. Key considerations included topics such as cost of the project, view of the river, access, safety, park space, construction timelines, and more.

Survey respondents were asked to check the boxes beside what they feel are the **five (5) most important considerations for each design** – not necessarily good or bad, but important. Respondents were provided with additional space to comment on the designs and the key considerations.

These considerations were presented in the survey to help gauge what is most important to respondents with respect to flood mitigation. This information will help decision makers better understand residents' priorities when it comes to flood mitigation for the Reach 6 area.

TOP 5 CONSIDERATIONS

The following is a summary of responses to the survey. Out of the **203 responses received for the survey**, the top five (5) priorities for each design option are outlined in the below.

Top 5 - Key Considerations for Option 1 (Raise Clearwater Drive) Responses

Preserves the view of the river from the road – this is an aesthetic consideration	106
Leaves space between the mitigation and the river for potential future park	71
Landscaping beside the raised road would be simple with opportunities for future park development	68
Preserves the view of the river from the road – this is a safety consideration	65
Ability to expand Clearwater Drive to four lanes in the future	56

Top 5 - Key Considerations for Option 2 (Berm Between Clearwater Drive and River)

Responses

Cuts off the view of river from the road	75
This option has an estimated cost of \$35.9M	72
Construction would have less disruption on Clearwater Drive	56
The berm itself could be used as park space or trail	54
Berm would not take up the entire space between the road and river	50




SURVEY RESPONSES


The primary objective of this engagement was to **Consult** with residents in to gain a better understanding of their priorities for flood mitigation in the area, and to understand which of the key considerations for each of the design options are most important to residents. The secondary objective of this campaign was to **Inform** residents about flood mitigation in the Reach 6 area and provide a high-level progress update. The survey was designed to provide objective information as well as get public feedback.

When using the term **Consult** with respect to community engagement, we are following **IAP2** terminology. **IAP2 is the International Association of Public Participation**, and on their Spectrum of Engagement, **Consult** means “to gather public feedback.” The secondary objective was to Inform residents about this project, and according to **IAP2**, **Inform** means “to provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions.”

Survey Responses: Key Considerations for Option 1 – Raise Clearwater Drive



Survey Responses: Key Considerations for Option 2 – Berm Between Clearwater Drive and River



SURVEY COMMENTS: OVERVIEW

While the survey was focused on asking respondents to select from provided key considerations, respondents were also given the opportunity to add their comments. The following is a summary of comments submitted, and themes of feedback for each design:

Preliminary Design – 42 comments

- Cost of project - 11
- Expanding to four lanes - 6
- Miscellaneous - 6
- Noise and disturbance to area - 3
- Supportive of this design - 5
- Unsupportive of this design - 11

Option 1 (raise Clearwater Drive) – 77 comments

- Cost of project - 20
- Expanding to four lanes & raising road - 8
- Miscellaneous - 4
- Noise and disturbance to area - 2
- Preserving the natural beauty - 4
- Safety - 3
- Supportive of this design - 35
- Unsupportive of this design - 1

Option 2 (berm between Clearwater Drive and River) – 76 comments

- Cost of project - 22
- Culture and recreation - 6
- Existing berm and expanding to four lanes - 5
- Miscellaneous - 4
- Preserving the natural beauty - 22
- Safety - 5
- Supportive of this design - 3
- Unsupportive of this design - 9



IN-PERSON AND VIRTUAL SESSIONS

In addition to the online survey, in-person and virtual engagement sessions were offered for residents learn more about the project and share feedback.

We held three public engagement sessions (one virtual and two in person). In addition, Reach 6 was also a featured discussion topic at the Fall Trade Show, which was held over three days in September. During the Trade Show, we had 344 interactions with residents and discussed a variety of topics, including Reach 6. At all the sessions, we shared information to raise awareness about the project, answered questions, and showed residents how to participate in this engagement.

At the virtual engagement session, only one resident attended, but this meeting was recorded and posted on the Reach 6 project page on Participate Wood Buffalo. Throughout the engagement period, there were 48 views of the videos, which helped to share information so participants could provide informed feedback.

At the in-person sessions, we spoke with 16 residents and stakeholders. We were able to go over questions about the designs with the Flood Mitigation Program Manager from the Engineering Department. She was able answer more technical questions about the project, explain some of the rationale for the design, and discuss why twinning Clearwater Drive isn't a recommended option. She also provided detail about how Reach 6 will align with Reach 5. In addition, we were able to clarify that the Municipality is working closely with the Heritage Society to review impacts of the project to the Heritage Shipyard (which sits in the Reach 6 project area) and develop a long-term solution.

NEXT STEPS

We thank you for your input and ideas throughout the engagement process of this project. The Engineering Department will review all the comments and feedback provided. Once they have gathered all the information necessary, they will be presenting to Council for further direction on which design option will be constructed for Reach 6 flood mitigation.

To stay informed about the project, or to receive updates visit rmwb.ca/participate.

We encourage you to continue using your voice to make our region even better by learning about all current projects. Visit rmwb.ca/participate to stay connected.





**WHAT WE HEARD ABOUT
REACH 6 FLOOD MITIGATION**

Engineering Department

Insert September 15 – October 16, 2022

By Will Collins | will.collins@rmwb.ca

December 23, 2022