

Summary Report of Columbia River Treaty Review Fauquier Community Workshop

June 15, 2013

Approximately seventy-five people attended the June 15, 2013 all-day workshop in Fauquier, with many attendees coming from far outside the Burton-Fauquier-Edgewood area. The Columbia River Treaty Review team worked with the area residents to develop and deliver the Columbia River Treaty Review workshop that ran from 9:00 am to 4:00 pm. Lunch and mid-day refreshments were provided. The workshop agenda is as follows:

- Opening Remarks
- Overview of the Range of Impacts and Benefits of the Columbia River Treaty Report
- Summary of Issues Potentially Affecting Future Transboundary Water Management Paper
- Summary of Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program Dam Footprint Report and Update on Program Projects
- Future Columbia River Treaty Options and Update on the Treaty Review
- Lunch
- Discussion of Possible Arrow Lakes Reservoir Scenarios Post-2024
- Panel: Questions and Answers

The workshop began with a welcome by Karen Hamling as Vice-Chair of the Columbia River Treaty Local Governments' Committee. Also the current mayor of Nakusp, Hamling acted as master of ceremonies for the day-long event. Hamling acknowledged the nearly ten attendees who had gone through the events around 1964 that led to the formation of the Arrow Lakes Reservoir. She also provided a brief overview of the Local Governments' Committee and its activities.

Overview of the Range of Impacts and Benefits of the Columbia River Treaty Report

The first presentation was by George Penfold, former Selkirk College Regional Innovation Chair in Rural Economic Development. The presentation, entitled Review of the Range of Impacts and Benefits of the Columbia River Treaty on Basin Communities, the Region and the Province, was a summary of a much more fulsome report prepared by Penfold on behalf of the Ministry of Energy and Mines and with assistance from Columbia Basin Trust, Local Governments' Committee and BC Hydro. Penfold began his presentation by acknowledging that he was unable to get much information on communities affected by the creation of Lake Koocanusa Reservoir because the project was carried out by the provincial Department of Transportation and data was not kept. Penfold also acknowledged that the numbers he used to indicate impacts and benefits do not give the depth of emotional or ecological impact.

Penfold talked about the approximately 2000 people that had been displaced and the land that had been inundated with the building of Hugh L. Keenleyside dam, including about 50 hectares of orchards and 260 farmsteads (of which 6-10 were full time farms). He noted the loss of taxes from the private land and the grants in lieu of taxes that municipalities now receive. He noted that the smaller communities often did not have the capacity to adjust to changes brought and even now many not have the capacity to take advantage of the community funding provided by Columbia Basin Trust. Penfold's

PowerPoint presentation can be found at: [[link: blog.gov.bc.ca/columbiarivertreaty/community-sessions/](http://blog.gov.bc.ca/columbiarivertreaty/community-sessions/)]

Questions

Penfold responded to the following questions from the audience:

- Does any of the \$12 million received for the Non-Treaty Storage Agreement (NTSA) flow back to the Basin? Penfold responded “No”.
- Did the NTSA require further inundation? Did it change the area from what was originally intended? Penfold responded “No”.
- Was any meaningful ecosystem assessment done? Eichenberger responded that at the time Hugh L. Keenleyside dam was built there was no Environment Act or process in place for environmental assessments.
- What is the benefit of the Treaty? What is the benefit to the Province? Penfold responded that although not directly linked to the Treaty, funds and programming by Columbia Basin Trust flow to the region. The Arrow Generating Station and Brilliant Expansion would not be there without the Treaty. Benefits from these two facilities flow, through Columbia Basin Trust, to the region and, through Columbia Power Corporation, to the Province.
- An attendee commented that the only benefit from the Treaty was the Canadian Entitlement (CE) and that the US wanted to cut it to 10%. The attendee felt the future interests of industry, like BC Hydro, would be protected and that a disproportionate share of the benefits went to the Province.
- An attendee commented that whether or not there was a Treaty, the Province would still have built up the Columbia River.
- One attendee wanted to know if the structural debt created as a result of the Treaty matched the benefits. They wanted to know if the value of flooded agricultural land and wildlife loss was included. They noted that the U.S. had spent \$600 million on fisheries enhancement, an amount not matched in BC. They also noted that First Nations issues had not been resolved. Penfold responded that there had been no assessment of the value of the land at the time of inundation.
- An attendee wanted to know what BC Hydro’s long range plan for the Columbia River, noting the Columbia River hydro system was exempt under the Clean Energy Act. They felt money would never compensate for what had happened with the implementation of the Columbia River Treaty.

Water Governance and Issues Affecting Future Transboundary Water Management

Richard Paisley, UBC’s Director, Global Transboundary International Waters Research Initiative, followed with a talk about water governance, using examples from throughout the world. He also touched on issues, such as climate change, that potentially affect transboundary water management and could negatively impact Upper Columbia River salmon restoration projects. Paisley noted that regulations under the Environmental Species Act cause some U.S. dams to operate less for power optimization and

more for fishery benefits with the result that, through Canadian Entitlement obligations, utilities and their rate payers pay the bill for fish enhancement rather than those responsible for fish and wildlife. Paisley also spoke about governance and public participation and whether alternate governance objectives, even though not directly Treaty related, could be incorporated into the Columbia River Treaty.

- One attendee noted the U.S. demand for water for fisheries, irrigation and navigation to inland ports. The attendee expressed concern about sediment behind Grand Coulee dam and Mica dam and wanted more information made available to the public about dam inspections and sedimentation.
- An attendee welcomed the suggestion of nesting governance objectives and ecosystem values, similar to those in the third leg discussions by U.S. Tribes, in the Treaty but cautioned about possibly invalidating the Treaty by making too many changes. In response to their query about whether the Columbia River Treaty Local Governments' Committee had a strong meaningful voice regarding Treaty negotiations, they were informed by Karen Hamling that the Committee was pushing for a voice at the negotiation table. Paisley noted that there were two kinds of voices that could be pursued, a voice in the Treaty overall and a voice in the ongoing management of operations. Beware, Paisley stated "of the tyranny of participation."
- One attendee noted that in the U.S. there were 15 Tribes that wanted to be at the table to determine future Treaty options and that they were almost there. They felt the U.S. Tribes concerned about the Columbia River Treaty review were able to together as a coalition and because of this they were able to get further along than First Nations in B.C. They gave the example of Lake Roosevelt and that it had been considered at one time to be an ecological disaster because there were no fish. The Colville and other tribes worked together and now the Lake has lots of fish.
- An attendee question Paisley regarding bulk water sales and he referred them to Bill C38. Another attendee stated bulk water sales from the Columbia were already occurring and asked whether Columbia River water could be diverted to the Fraser River. A question was raised regarding bulk water sales and NAFTA.
- An attendee stated that there were wind farms along the Columbia River and that BC Hydro had a mandate to use alternative energy. They noted that the construction of transmission lines was more troublesome than building the alternate energy generation and encouraged the conservation of energy so Site C was not needed. Paisley stated that the U.S. agreed to the Treaty because they thought they would wean themselves off hydroelectricity but that has not been the case. Kathy Eichenberger stated that there was a misconception that the US was moving towards alternative energy and didn't need hydroelectricity. She noted that wind and solar energy are not available when demand is high and need to be backstopped with hydroelectricity.
- A participant asked whether there had ever been a transboundary agreement over water that had been a success. Paisley described an agreement in Senegal where four countries own the dams. He noted the Columbia River Treaty was considered by many to be a successful agreement.

- Another attendee stated that BC Hydro shouldn't be the sole developer of hydroelectricity along the Columbia River and that management should include First Nations and should not focus just on power.

Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program Update

An update on the Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program was provided by Trevor Oussoren, Program Manager Columbia Region. Oussoren talked about 2013/14 projects; updates on local projects, including fisheries trends; dam impact assessment overview; current strategic plans; and how to apply for project funding.

- One attendee wanted to know where were the big marinas and boat launches they were promised.
- Another attendee noted that Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program (FWCP) money was being spent on places that had not been inundated such as Summit Lake and not at places like Burton. They felt the hatchery (not spawning channel) at Hill Creek had been closed suddenly with the contractor being given little notice. They recommended a spawning channel and hatchery project at Burton and thought the FWCP would have better results with the Arrow Lake nutrient program if nutrients were flushed into Arrow Lake after being added to a river from a bridge near Burton.
- An attendee felt that FWCP money was being spent in the wrong place - nothing was being done in Burton. They noted that the mule deer were gone because they had been pushed out of the area by white tail deer from the valley bottom.
- An attendee wanted to know about FWCP plans to deal with exotic fish, for example measures to control the spread of walleye.
- A number of attendees were concerned about the lack of fish in Arrow Lake and the five fish catch limit. They wanted to know why there were such restrictive limits on the number of fish that could be caught and suggested the Arrow Lakes fishery enhancement program had been a failure. They thought more should be done to increase fish populations.
- An attendee wanted to know whether triploid fish were still being released in Arrow Lakes since they have reportedly never been captured in any creel surveys.
- An attendee wanted more information on who could apply for project funding and was informed by Oussoren that it was open to all including contractors, community groups, government agencies and First Nations.
- One attendee was critical of the information provided, stating that their expectation was that the presentation would focus on a summary of the Dam Footprint report by Utzig and Schmidt. Subsequent to the presentation, a verbal and written apology was provided to Oussoren by the attendee who acknowledged that, on further investigation, the presented information matched the request of event organizers.

Future Columbia River Treaty Options and the Columbia River Treaty Review

Kathy Eichenberger, Executive Director, Columbia River Treaty Review at the Ministry of Energy and Mines provided an overview of the fall 2013 strategic decision and the results of the modelling work being undertaken by BC Hydro to help the Province and Basin residents understand the implications of the two key scenarios, Treaty Continue or Treaty Terminate.

- An attendee wanted to know if the public got to vote on the strategic Treaty decision. They also wanted to know how public input would go forward. Eichenberger responded that while the Local Governments Committee had some political sway, the decision would be made by Cabinet and that the recommendation made by the Treaty Review team would have the public consultation report in the appendix. The draft public consultation report would be posted for public comment.
- An attendee wanted to know if another political party could make changes later through how the decision was implemented.
- One attendee was concerned about what would happen to the ecosystem by 2024. Eichenberger responded that changes to operations under the Treaty could be made now if both sides agree.
- An attendee wanted to know why the First Nations consultation was separate from the public consultation. Eichenberger replied that the separate consultation streams had been requested by First Nations and that First Nations are invited to all the public meetings.
- One attendee, referring to Slide 15 of Eichenberger's presentation, asked about the components of recreation values. Heather Matthews (BC Hydro Treaty Review team) responded that for Kinbasket Reservoir it was shoreline and water-based recreation use while for Arrow Lakes Reservoir, BC Hydro talked to people about their preferred levels for recreation. She noted that the preferred level for people around Nakusp might be different for people elsewhere on the reservoir. Referring to the same slide another attendee wanted to know if the flows indicated by Alt Ref TC were "in the box" for 50% of the time. Matthews responded that the flows "in the box" represented the median value. She noted that 40% of the electricity in BC Hydro's Columbia Basin system could be attributed to Kinbasket.

Arrow Lakes Reservoir Option After 2024

Alan Thomson of Mountain Station Consultants ended the day's presentations with an overview of the area, the Columbia River Treaty and his analysis of Arrow Lakes Reservoir (Arrow) options after 2024. Thomson noted that although his presentation focused on Arrow, which was difficult to isolate, the Columbia River was a system and so changes to Arrow had impacts upstream and downstream. He also noted that prescribed flows under the Columbia River Treaty restricted options for Arrow and the rest of the system.

- One attendee wanted to know how high Arrow needed to be for power generation. Matthews responded that Arrow Generating Station generates power when Arrow Lakes Reservoir was at 1395-1446 feet elevation for a net annual income of around \$14 -16 million. The higher the water, the more revenue is generated. Matthews noted that although Arrow Generating Station was jointly owned by Columbia Power Corporation and Columbia Basin Trust, it was managed by BC Hydro and operated by Fortis. There is a purchase agreement with BC Hydro for the power generated and BC Hydro operates the generating station as efficiently as possible. An attendee commented that Arrow was being used for mortgage for Waneeta.
- A question was asked about who decided on the Rule Curves. Thomson responded that both countries developed the Rule Curves. Another attendee wondered about the timeline range for the flood control curves and was told that flood control is only an issue during the spring freshet.
- An attendee asked how releases get decided and why the U.S. have a say. Matthews responded that this is what the U.S. pays for with the Canadian Entitlement.
- A question was asked about what happens when a reservoir is full and, because of climate change, there are heavy flows in the summer? Matthews asked the audience to recall June 2012 and the surcharging that occurred at Libby and Arrow. She explained that BC Hydro tries to work with the local governments and residents to minimize impacts.
- One attendee commented that most of the Arrow impacts are linked to fluctuating water levels, unnatural drawdown and flood duration and timing. Another attendee noted that there is a two foot surge in water levels in the mornings and evenings and that the surge caused problems.
- An attendee noted that for the last 10 years the water levels at Arrow Lakes had been below 1427 feet 60% of the time and that at 1425 feet there would be no flooding.
- Referring to Alternatives 3 and 4 presented by Thomson, an attendee noted that in these scenarios Arrow Generating Station operated as a run of river project. They wanted to know whether BC Hydro wouldn't make sure that releases from Mica ensured sufficient water available to Arrow. Matthews thought Arrow Generating Station would not be a true run of river as it wasn't possible to talk about Arrow in isolation of the rest of the system, in particular Mica operations.
- One attendee stated they were in favour of operating Arrow Lakes at full pool but noted that this would not address flooding downstream such as in Portland. Eichenberger replied that the U.S. Entity was concerned about losing Arrow Lakes Reservoir for flood control purposes as this would require running Lake Roosevelt/Grand Coulee Dam really hard. An attendee wanted to know the economic impact on the US of keeping Arrow Lakes at full pool. Matthews explained that after 2024 flood control under the Columbia River Treaty changed to Called Upon which would require the US to make effective use of their reservoirs before calling upon extra storage in Canada and paying for this service. She noted that there was still a disagreement between Canada and the US on what Called Upon would look like. Matthews questioned whether the US would be able to provide the same level of protection using their own reservoirs.

- In response to audience discussion, Eichenberger committed the Province to commissioning BC Hydro to do modelling of Arrow Lakes at mid level elevation and a constant pool noting that BC Hydro has already done modelling of Arrow Lakes at high elevation and a constant pool.
- An attendee thought 20% of the land could be restored if Arrow Lakes Reservoir was operated at mid elevation and a constant pool and that timber could take over the reclaimed land. Another attendee thought there would be a problem because all the soil is gone.

Panel Assessment

Following the presentations was a two hour panel question and answer session. The panel included all the presenters along with Heather Mathews, BC Hydro Project Manager for the Columbia River Treaty Review. The presentations used during the June 15, 2013 workshop and a summary report is available on the Province's Columbia River Treaty Review website [link: blog.gov.bc.ca/columbiarivertreaty/community-sessions/]. Some of the comments and topics raised by audience members included:

- One attendee stated that in March there were beaches on Arrow Lakes for people to recreate but in June, when people really wanted to be on the beach, the water was too high and there were no beaches. The attendee questioned the levels used for recreation in the modelling work done by BC Hydro.
- An attendee, noting the small population around the Arrow Lakes, questioned whether politicians would listen. Eichenberger responded saying that there were a number of different voices in the Basin and that they were looking for different things. She noted that a consensus about what the Basin wanted to see going forward would be a strong message.
- An attendee wanted to know how willing BC Hydro, as a Crown corporation, would be to optimize operations for things other than power. Another attendee noted that BC Hydro operations on the Peace River system worked in lock-step with the Columbia River system and that on the Peace River system he believed BC Hydro had said they wouldn't change the operating system to mitigate downstream impacts on the Peace River. Why is it different here, they wanted to know. Eichenberger replied that water use planning began the process of moving from power only considerations to considering other values. In addition, she said, BC Hydro reports to Cabinet and it is Cabinet that will make the decision on its mandate.
- One attendee stated the flood control rule curve was carved in stone so that changes would only be possible if the Treaty were terminated. Mathews replied that whether the Treaty continued or the Treaty terminated, after 2024 the flood control rule curve wouldn't apply but power ones would.
- An attendee wondered if the seven million acre feet of storage in Arrow Lakes Reservoir could be distributed across the other dams in the Canadian Columbia Basin system. They also felt that a 60 year Treaty was ridiculous and that it would be better if a future agreement were for 10 to 20 years only. Mathews noted that the flood control storage in Arrow was three million acre feet and that to make up this amount in other reservoirs so that Arrow wouldn't fluctuate so

sharply would require a notification to the US Entity and if no agreement could be reached, it could trigger a Treaty termination. Eichenberger noted that if there were no agreement, BC Hydro could terminate the Treaty. If the Treaty were terminated, the Province would not get the Canadian Entitlement. BC, stated Eichenberger, would have to decide where the trigger was for the Canadian Entitlement and at what level it was not worth continuing the Treaty. She noted that U.S. power companies don't want to contribute to the Canadian Entitlement but they are also concerned about not knowing how to operate when they don't have certainty around flows. U.S. power companies were also concerned about what Called Upon would look like including drafting deeper and uncertainty around refill. U.S. power companies were not the only ones that could lose under a Treaty terminates scenario she told the audience: navigation planners were concerned about low water and the potential need for more dredging; ecosystem interests were concerned about having more augmented flows and losing the investment already made in ecosystem restoration; and water supply users are already experiencing shortages so they are concerned about maintaining water flows and even increasing them.

- Another attendee wanted to know what would happen if B.C. notified the US that they wanted to terminate the Treaty. Eichenberger stated that under the Canada-British Columbia Agreement Canada could not terminate the Treaty without BC's consent but that if BC wanted to terminate the Treaty, Canada had to support its decision.
- Referring to a mid elevation and stable pool option, an attendee noted that with a natural hydrograph the variation in pool level was about 10 to 20 feet and that this lasted for just a couple of weeks so that the cotton woods could survive the flooding. They felt this variation could be available for flood control if needed.
- One attendee stated that people in the Basin were just now feeling that they were beginning to understand the details around the future of the Treaty and that a decision to Cabinet now would colour the process, therefore, the decision should be delayed. Eichenberger replied that the Columbia River Treaty Review team had a mandate to provide recommendations to Cabinet this fall but that she did not know how long Cabinet would take to make a decision.
- An attendee questioned BC Hydro modelling using 1440-1444 ft as recreation targets. They felt this was not an ideal level as there were no beaches and there were wildlife, vegetation and bird impacts at this level. They questioned whether the Canadian Entitlement really helped noting the Province and BC Hydro still have huge debts. They noted that 1420-1424 ft could be considered mid level elevation for Arrow and that that level would result in a recovery of riparian areas and agriculture. Power should not be the focus and more attention should be paid to botany and biology, they stated. Another attendee supported the idea of a stable mid level elevation with operations in the range of 10 feet and with occasional flooding for a short enough time that allowed cottonwoods to recover. They also cautioned about no allowing any building on the flood plain other than building access to the water and for boat ramps and docks. They noted that Trail and Castlegar have built on the flood plain and they will have to build a strategy into their city planning on how to handle increased frequency of water inundating the flood plain.

- One attendee wanted to know when the modelling the Province was requesting BC Hydro to do to examine mid-level stable elevations in Arrow would be available. Eichenberger thought the information could be available in a month or so, noting BC Hydro was also doing an ecosystem modelling run for First Nations. Eichenberger stated the Province was seeking to find out where there were gaps in the technical studies, stating that more modelling runs would be done in the future but that the Province wanted to identify key ones now. A member of the panel asked whether the modelling of a stable Arrow show the impact on Kinbasket and was assured it would.
- One attendee was concerned about negotiating with the “hard-nosed” U.S. negotiators, recommending terminating the Treaty and in 2024 having a contract with repercussion in it that let Canada deal with issues right away.
- Another attendee recommended reducing the requirements for 15 million acre feet of storage in Canadian and to get the U.S. to take on more water storage themselves so Arrow could have more stable water levels. They felt flooding once in awhile was acceptable. They also felt water was becoming an important resource and would become more important to the U.S. than power. As a result, BC negotiators needed to be sensitive to requests from the U.S. for increased volumes of water. Don’t get into a situation, they cautioned, where we can’t meet our own needs; what happens if there isn’t enough. Terminate the Treaty and let the U.S. pay fee for service for flood control. Eichenberger replied that domestic use of water was covered in the Treaty and that each country was free to make use of the water for domestic purposes and that the U.S. had its own ability to regulate flows. She noted that the NTSA was an agreement to provide water for low flow periods and dry water years.
- An attendee stated that irrigation is a big reason why the U.S. wanted more water and that the fluctuating water levels in Arrow Lakes Reservoir to meet this need was causing problems with the highway between Fauquier and Burton. Eichenberger replied that the Columbia River Treaty Review team was talking to the Ministry of Transportation about road issues and asked the audience to let the team know about specific areas the Ministry of Transportation should investigate.
- One attendee noted agriculture was a huge interest in the U.S. Without late summer and late fall irrigation, they stated, the high value crops would not be available in the U.S. Columbia Basin. The leachate from Hanford is getting into wells and causing a problem, they continued, so fee for service makes sense.
- An attendee wanted to know if Ottawa and Washington DC were involved in the Treaty review processes. Eichenberger informed the audience that the US Entity was made up of the US Army Corp of Engineers and the Bonneville Power Administration, both of which were national organizations, and that they would make their recommendations to the US Department of State. Once the Columbia River Treaty Review team knows what the US intentions are and the recommendations for the future of the Treaty, Eichenberger stated, the we will know what First Nation and public consultation will be needed. Canada, she continued, is supporting BC’s lead in the process.

- An attendee noted that in the past BC had sold power to California and had not been paid for the power. They wanted to know the status of this issue. Eichenberger told them that the case was in the courts now but that BC had been paid the majority of the amount owed. The California situation impacted a lot of other power utilities, she stated, not just BC Hydro.
- One attendee felt B.C. was providing more water storage than they should, stating that the Province was providing 80% of the storage and we shouldn't provide more. Eichenberger informed the audience that the US didn't want more storage from BC, just different shaping of the flows. She reminded the audience that the Treaty was the result of WAC Bennett's dream to build dams to power BC and that with the new turbines at Revelstoke and Mica, the Columbia Basin will provide 50% of the Province's power.
- An attendee commented that under international law we were only required to provide a reasonable and equitable share/use of the water. Paisley responded that British Columbians didn't care what the US used the water for when they got it, they just wanted the US to pay British Columbia for releasing the water when the US wanted it. Another attendee wanted to know how BC could motivate the US to do things that benefit Canada. Paisley responded with a question asking how all the parties could better manage the whole Basin to meet sustainability objectives. Eichenberger noted that both parties to the Treaty had to look at what were the true benefits of the Treaty today and what other improvements could be made on both sides of the border.
- One attendee felt the Treaty in its present form wasn't likely to give British Columbia the benefits it wanted. They asked the audience for a show of hands. Two-thirds of the audience was in favour of terminating the Treaty and one third didn't know.
- An attendee felt that telling the US that BC wanted to terminate the Treaty showed that BC was serious about what they were seeking and would encourage the US to negotiate. The attendee also felt that the government in power would change and the 10 years notice to terminate would keep getting put off. Another attendee was concerned about liability issues if the US made investments in infrastructure between giving notice to terminate and rescinding the notice. Paisley agreed that BC may be libel in such a scenario. An attendee felt that the US would not consider Option 1 and 4 unless they were forced to come to the table under a potential Treaty terminate scenario. Then, they stated, everything is on the table for negotiation. They noted that lots of BC interests would be at the table: forest, agriculture, fisheries, tourism, transportation (no fluctuations would prevent roads from falling into the reservoir). An attendee visiting the region also felt that the only chance of getting something better under the Treaty would come if the Treaty was terminated.
- Another attendee wanted to know if it was possible to get Option 1 (status quo) and Option 4 (mid level and constant elevation) described by Thomson. That way, they suggested, levels would be down but both the US and BC would have to accommodate a bit and BC would still get the Canadian Entitlement. Eichenberger reiterated that the Province was going to commission BC Hydro to do a modelling run of Option 4 without the Treaty and allowing for 10 feet of fluctuation.

- An attendee asked if changing the levels and the storage as dramatically as was called for in Option 4 wasn't essentially terminating the Treaty? Eichenberger pointed out that there was lots of flexibility within the Treaty.
- One attendee urged the audience to get their priorities straight and put a healthy ecosystem on par with flood control. They felt the value of Canadian Entitlement in the future had become a bureaucratic game. They listed a number of concerns including that local ecosystems were on a downward spiral and there was still a lot of pain for people who had been displaced. They felt the system needed to be managed differently and that terminating the Treaty was the obvious solution. We want a solution to come out of this meeting, they stated. Mayor Karen Hamling responded saying that there will be meetings in Nakusp.
- One panel member, noting that this was an historic opportunity to look at a new regime on Arrow Lakes, cautioned about the impacts to the whole system. Another panel member pointed out that this was a moment in time when residents had government's attention.
- Another panel member also urged caution saying that while residents may view a Treaty terminate scenario as a win with the Canadian Columbia River system now being "ours", there was a need for residents to think about a process for negotiating a new operating regime with the Province and BC Hydro that also met the needs of Golden and Valemount residents and those living around Lake Koochanusa. There was also a need, they continued, to consider what provincial land around Arrow Lakes is rehabilitated and to ensure that things that benefit Basin residents don't dis-benefit neighbours. Eichenberger noted that the recommendation to Cabinet was just the first step of many and there was time to consider details. She noted that the Province would continue to work with the Columbia River Treaty Local Governments' Committee.
- Two attendees closed the meeting by urging decision makers not to be timid if terminating the Treaty was the way to go. Columbia Basin Trust, Columbia Power Corporation, BC Hydro and the Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program would all still continue, they said, and they could feel like they were no longer living in a land occupied by Bonneville Power Administration and the US Army Corps of Engineers.