

**EXCERPT FROM**

**SUMMARY REPORT: COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY REVIEW**

**NOVEMBER 2013 COMMUNITY CONSULTATIONS**

***CASTLEGAR FEEDBACK***

**Introduction**

The information contained in this excerpt<sup>1</sup> is the direct feedback received by the Columbia River Treaty Review Team from attendees at the November 2013 Columbia River Treaty Review community consultation sessions.

**Background**

The Columbia River Treaty Review provided an opportunity to increase the Province's understanding of Basin residents' interests and values. The Province wants to ensure the implications of Treaty options on those interests are communicated to, and well understood by, Basin residents, and that those residents have full opportunity to provide input to help inform Provincial recommendations on the Treaty.

**Castlegar Community Session**

The evening session held on November 7, 2013 at the Sandman Inn Castlegar was attended by just over 70 people, with an additional 12 joining the discussion via the Internet as the session was live-streamed. Over one-third of the attendees were under 30 years of age, many of them

---

<sup>1</sup> The full Summary Report for the November 2013 Community Consultation can be found at <https://engage.gov.bc.ca/app/uploads/sites/6/2012/07/Columbia-River-Treaty-Review-November-2013-Community-Consultation-Summary-Report.pdf>

students at Selkirk College. This was the highest attendance by young adults of any of the sessions.

Although most attendees were in favour of a more constant pool at Arrow Lakes Reservoir for ecosystem, social and recreation reasons, many attendees were concerned about what the water level should be. Some were concerned about a mid-level constant pool scenario possibly leading to increased flooding downstream. Some attendees were concerned about the impact on power production and on recreation. A few attendees felt a higher water level - around 1435 ft – was preferable while others felt more work was needed to find the “sweet spot”. Many attendees felt it was important to optimize the ecosystem health of the whole Basin. Some attendees felt that while each area wanted more stable reservoirs, it was important to avoid pitting one reservoir against another.

Many attendees feel that in the future the benefits of the Treaty will be about water supply and its increasing value and about managing flows for drought, floods and climate change impacts. A few attendees felt agricultural impacts needed to be evaluated. While a few attendees wanted to see salmon runs restored and Hugh Keenleyside and Duncan Dams removed, a number of attendees wanted to see more focus on what they felt were more viable fish species than salmon.

Many attendees feel the region impacted by the Treaty should receive more benefits and that some of those benefits should go to environmental restoration. Many attendees wanted to see dollar values attached to the benefits to the U.S. and the impacts in B.C. Some attendees felt the Sinixt should be involved in the Treaty Review process. A few attendees wanted to see no further development on flood plains.

Most attendees were very concerned that B.C. is well prepared and well supported for a tough negotiation and that regional interests, including those around Libby Dam operations, are considered. Many attendees would like to see both B.C. and the U.S. achieving improvements under the Treaty framework through the same spirit of cooperation that has brought about modifications to the Treaty in the past. Attendees wanted to continue to be kept informed of the process and a number of attendees wanted to see more youth educated about and involved in the review of the Treaty.