



Columbia River Treaty Review

Province of British Columbia
Public consultation - Phase 1

Spring 2012



Ministry of
Energy and Mines

Overview – CRT 2014 Review Process

- Key provisions of the Treaty
- BC and Canada roles
- Key elements of the CRT Review
- Key partners and stakeholders
- Public consultation process
- Decision making process

Key Provisions of the Treaty

- Treaty ratified by Canada and the US in 1964
- Canada constructed 3 dams (Duncan, Arrow, Mica)
- Canada made land available (42 miles) for US Libby dam
- Canada and US share equally in added power potential
- Assured Flood Control ends in 2024 – replaced by Called Upon (not well defined)
- Treaty does not have an end date – can be terminated after 2024 with minimum 10 year notice



Why is BC leading the CRT Review

- Canada transferred to BC most of the obligations and benefits prior to ratifying the CRT in 1963
Canada-BC Agreement
“Canada shall...obtain the concurrence of BC before terminating the Treaty”
(Article 4.2)
“Canada shall...endeavour to obtain the agreement of the US on any proposal...which Canada and BC agree is in the public interest”
- Substance of Treaty deals largely with matters of provincial jurisdiction (natural resources management, hydro facilities)



Key Elements of Columbia River Treaty Review

MEM is lead agency for the CRT 2014 Review, including:

- Economic, environmental, social, financial, aboriginal, legal and hydrological analyses
- Coordination of input from provincial ministries
- Collaboration with Canada to identify issues and federal interests



Key Elements of Columbia River Treaty Review

- Engagement of Basin residents to identify regional concerns, interests, and expectations
- Consultation with First Nations to meet legal duty of the Crown and identify opportunities for aboriginal interests
- Analysis of US interests and positions
- Recommendation(s) to Provincial Government



Key Partners and Stakeholders

STAKEHOLDER	ROLE
Provincial ministries	Benefits and risks to environmental, social, regulatory and financial interests Advice on FN consultation, legal interpretations, intergovernmental relations
Federal Agencies:	Identify federal interests and collaborate on technical studies Regular communication with Ottawa Coordinate FN consultation
Columbia Basin Trust	Created in response to CRT impacts Awareness and education of Basin residents
Local Governments	Represent constituents' issues and perspectives
BC Hydro	Technical studies, engagement with US entities, strategic advice



Public Consultation

Objective: public satisfied it has been adequately consulted

Phase	Dates	Objective
Education (CBT)	Fall 2011/2012	Improve understanding of Treaty
Interest Scoping	End May-June 2012	Provide in-depth information on the Treaty and the review and decision making process. Facilitate discussion of values, interests.
Input on Options	October-November 2012	Present trade-offs associated with different operating scenarios and seek public input on potential decision options
Feedback	Spring 2013	Provide feedback to public on how input was considered



Decision making process

- BC aims to conclude CRT Review in Fall 2013, provide recommendations to provincial Cabinet
- Depending on BC Cabinet decision, a corollary federal decision may be required
- This may trigger a requirement for:
 - A diplomatic exchange of notes to implement the recommendation
 - A negotiating mandate to pursue Treaty protocol or amendment
 - A notification to terminate

Overview - Treaty Review Scenarios

Key Questions in 2014 Review

- Terminate or not?
- Value of US downstream benefits?
- Flood Control?
- Management for other interests?

Technical Work Plans

Potential Future Treaty Scenarios

Treaty Terminate

- Called Upon Flood Control
- 2 opposing views (requires effective use of US reservoirs)
- No coordination

Treaty Continue

- Called Upon or Coordinated Flood Risk Management (CFRM)
- (Called Upon not resolved)
- Coordination (same as existing)

Treaty Continue Plus

- Coordinated Flood Risk Management
- Coordination Plus (enhance for other interests)

Key Question – Terminate or not?

Canadian Implications:

- Arrow could be operated with higher levels / steadier outflows
- Mica and Duncan operations may not change substantially
- Loss of the Canadian Entitlement

Key Question – Terminate or not?

Reality Check

- Still face similar regional tradeoffs in operation of Arrow
- Arrow operation is the most critical for US flood control and therefore is most impacted by Called upon.

Technical Work plan

- Investigate Coordinated Flood Risk Management option
- Check if tradeoffs made in WUP would change substantially if Treaty terminated
- Analyze impacts on interests in Canadian reservoirs

Key Question – Value of Downstream Benefits

US believes it's paying too much for value received

- Re-regulation of flows for US fish reduces US power benefit

Canada interested in total value for coordination provided

- Seasonal value (high and low flows)
- Flood control value, power value, fisheries, navigation, irrigation and recreation interests

Key Question – Value of Downstream Benefits

Ways of Valuing Total Downstream Benefits provided by coordination

- US cost of alternatives to using Canadian storage
- US benefits achieved through coordination
- BC cost of providing service

Technical Work plan

- Estimate US alternatives to relying on Canadian storage for Flood Control
- Improve modelling tools for simulating US operations in the Columbia
- Estimate value of all downstream benefits to the US

Key Questions – Flood Control Post 2024

Two different views of Called Upon Flood Control:

- US white paper implies Called Upon similar to Assured
- Canadian view – first operate US dams for flood control before calling on BC

Differences:

- Target flows at the Dalles (600 kcfs vs 450 kcfs)
- Effective use – redevelop US Storage Reservation Curves
- Use of only “authorized” dams

Key Questions – Flood Control Post 2024

Technical work plan

- Canadian view of Called Upon (conceptual & detailed procedures)
- Estimate capability of US “effective” space
- Called Upon impact on Canadian and US power & other interests
- Investigate Coordinated Flood Risk Management

Key Questions – Management for other interests

US interests

- Desire to add Ecosystem Function interests to be covered by the Treaty
- Include irrigation, recreation and navigation in their scenario modeling

Canada

- Ecosystem, fish & wildlife, recreation, heritage, agriculture, transportation interests identified in Water Use Plan
- Koozanusa and Kootenay system interests

Technical Work plan

- Develop operating alternatives that improve other non-power interests (i.e. fisheries, wildlife, heritage, agriculture, recreation) in Canada and/or the US



BC website:
www.gov.bc.ca/columbiarivertreaty

