Columbia River Treaty
Information Session Summary
Nakusp
This report, compiled by Columbia Basin Trust (CBT), provides background information and summarizes the format and discussion that took place at a 2011 Columbia River Treaty (CRT) information session. The purpose of the information session was to raise Basin residents’ understanding and awareness around the CRT. Consultation on the CRT is a provincial responsibility. CBT is not consulting or gathering views and values on the CRT; therefore, this document is not a consultation summary, nor a summary of views and values. The discussion themes summarized in this document originated with Basin residents attending the information session and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of CBT staff and management and, where applicable, have not been reviewed for accuracy.
BACKGROUND

The 1964 Columbia River Treaty (CRT) is an international agreement between Canada and the U.S. to coordinate flood control and optimize hydroelectric energy production on both sides of the border.

The CRT has no official expiry date, but has a minimum length of 60 years, which is met in September 2024. Either Canada or the U.S. can terminate many of the provisions of the agreement effective any time after September 2024, provided written notice is filed at least 10 years in advance (2014).

While no decision has been made by either Canada or the U.S. on the future of the CRT, given the importance of the issues, and the approaching date of 2014, both countries are now conducting studies and exploring future options for the CRT.

In 1995, Columbia Basin Trust (CBT) was created to benefit the areas most adversely affected by the CRT. CBT’s primary role in regard to the CRT is to act as an information resource for Basin residents and local governments. CBT is not a decision maker on the future of the CRT, and CBT’s role is not to consult with Basin residents on the future of the CRT—consultation is a provincial responsibility.

In anticipation of a potential decision in 2014 regarding the future of the CRT, CBT is engaging Basin residents with the objective of increasing their understanding of the basic framework (content and structure) of the CRT and helping them prepare to effectively engage in any provincial CRT
consultation processes. To reach this goal, CBT, in partnership with local governments and the CRT Local Governments’ Committee, hosted a series of 11 face-to-face information sessions (an open house and dinner followed by a presentation and discussion), one school-based open house, 12 small-group presentations and three online information sessions between June 2011 and November 2011 to:

- increase the level of understanding and awareness of Basin residents around what the CRT is and how it works;
- update Basin residents on potential changes to the CRT currently being considered by Canada and the U.S.; and
- provide an opportunity for residents to have a conversation and share their perspectives around the future of the CRT.

Local knowledge and community networks were essential to successful planning and delivery of the CRT information sessions. For each session, a Local Organizing Committee (LOC) was formed and included representatives from local governments, chambers of commerce, groups and organizations. The LOCs helped refine local publicity tactics and ensured the session was tailored to meet its community’s needs. CBT thanks the LOC volunteers for helping to plan, organize and advertise the CRT information sessions.

**Nakusp Information Session**

The information session in Nakusp took place on November 15, 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afternoon</th>
<th>Open house staffed by CBT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Displays: CRT overview, downstream power benefits, flood control, key CRT dates, future of the CRT, changes in water management, pre- and post-dam images, historical photos depicting lifestyles, landmarks and landscapes prior to the CRT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documents: fact sheets and brochures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multimedia: video on CRT basics, Google Earth flyover of local dam/reservoir, DVDs of CBT-produced CRT videos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maps: local community map and 3-D map of entire Basin in Canada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speakers’ Corner: residents were encouraged to record their CRT thoughts on video to share across the Basin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Free dinner and ongoing open house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>Presentation and discussion with residents, CBT and resource people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approximately 124 people attended the open house and evening session, hosted by Ron Oszust, CBT Board Member, and Director, Columbia Shuswap Regional District. Oszust emphasized the purpose of the session was to educate and inform people about the CRT. He noted that this was not a consultation; that is a responsibility of the provincial government.

Karen Hamling, Nakusp Mayor and Co-Chair of the CRT Local Governments’ Committee, noted that local governments from across the Canadian portion of the Basin have formed a committee to help Basin residents and elected officials build their understanding of the CRT and bring forward regional views, values and interests to provincial and federal agencies.

Paul Peterson, CBT Board Member and Director, Regional District of Central Kootenay, thanked people for coming to the information session.

Kindy Gosal, CBT Director, Water and Environment, led the presentation, acknowledging the past and encouraging people to think about building a better future. During the presentation, Gosal emphasized the following:

1. The purpose of the CRT is to coordinate flood control and optimize hydroelectric energy production in the Basin on both sides of the border.
2. The CRT has no official expiry date, but 2024 is the earliest some provisions can be terminated by either Canada or the U.S. (provided either country gives a minimum of 10 years’ written notice).
3. In 2024 the Assured Annual Flood Control provision expires and the current On Call Flood Control provision changes to a Called Upon operation, if and when requested by the U.S.
4. The Canadian Entitlement—$150 – 300 million US/year—stays in place as long as the CRT is in place. However, if the CRT is terminated, the Canadian Entitlement ends.
5. At this time no decision has been made by either country to terminate, renegotiate or modify the terms of the current CRT. Given the importance of CRT issues, both the Canadian and U.S. entities are completing ongoing studies.
6. CBT’s primary role in regard to the CRT is to act as an information resource for Basin residents and local governments.

The following three resources, which can be found at www.cbt.org/crt/resources.html, summarize much of the information presented:

- Video: Columbia River Treaty: Learn About Our Past and Think About Our Future
- Video: Columbia River Treaty: The Basics
- PowerPoint: Columbia River Treaty Overview Presentation

It was also noted that the completion of the Grand Coulee Dam in 1941 eliminated salmon in the upper Columbia River, long before construction of the CRT dams. The loss of salmon was both a cultural and spiritual loss to local First Nations, which remain committed to returning salmon into the river.
Nakusp Discussion and Top-of-mind Themes

Following the presentation, Gosal and CBT’s Water Advisory Panel member Ken Hall answered questions from Basin residents.

The discussion, along with top-of-mind comments provided by participants on sticky notes before leaving the information session, focused on the themes shown below. The themes are organized alphabetically. No ranking is intended and themes do not necessarily reflect consensus. For a list of all the themes that emerged, visit this document’s Appendix.

Based on post-session participant surveys, 59 per cent learned a lot about the CRT, and another 38 per cent learned a few things. This is in light of the fact that 70 per cent of participants considered themselves somewhat knowledgeable about the CRT prior to attending the session.
FOR MORE INFORMATION

Further discussion of themes is available in CBT’s *Columbia River Treaty 2011 Engagement and Education Summary Report*, located at www.cbt.org/2011CRTSummaryReport. Answers to frequently asked questions are posted at www.cbt.org/crt, along with the Speakers’ Corner video “Voices from Arrow Lakes Reservoir,” which captures CRT ideas and comments from Basin residents.

To learn more about the CRT, visit www.cbt.org/crt. Also visit the site to subscribe to CRT email updates.
Appendix: Nakusp Themes

Each information session had written and oral opportunities for residents to share opinions and ideas and ask questions. In all, CBT was able to collect over 1,000 pieces of input. The Nakusp themes are summarized below, while the themes from all communities are summarized in the separate document “CRT Information Sessions Summary Appendix: Residents Share Ideas,” located online at www.cbt.org/2011CRTSummaryReportAppendix.

Alternative Energy: Harness geothermal energy in the region. Continuing the CRT may limit interest in exploring other options. Alternative energies should be explored.

CBT: Could delivery of benefits from CBT change after 2024? If the CRT were terminated, what would happen to CBT? CBT should fund projects based on the level of CRT impacts.

Compensation: This area has not benefited from power sales to the U.S. More downstream benefits/$ should come to the Basin. Compensation must be adequate and relative to the benefits to the U.S. Need to be compensated for loss of arable land/impact to fruit growers. What is the true value of water storage and is Canada being compensated adequately?

Dams and Operations: If terminated, how would dams be operated? How do you find out if levels will change? What is the lifespan of a dam?

Downstream Power Benefits: If Canada loses the Canadian Entitlement, what would happen to power produced in the U.S.? Does Canada get power or money? How are downstream power benefits calculated?

Environmental Impacts: If the CRT were terminated, what would the impact be on ecosystems?

First Nations: Lack of Sinixt presence at the info session. Will the Sinixt claim ever be resolved?

Fisheries: Why are there no hatcheries on Arrow? Fish hatcheries on Arrow would support recreational anglers and tourism. Need fish ladders on dams. Bring salmon back.

Impacts: What were the CRT impacts on Kootenay Lake, and the agricultural impact to fruit growers?

Information Need: Map of lost communities (who lost what house, farm, ranch, orchard, etc., and pinpoint it on the map, with dates): e.g., Beaton.

Kootenay Diversion: What are the details?

Negotiating Issues: What parts of the CRT can be changed or not changed? What aspects could be renegotiated? Is it possible to negotiate more stable reservoir levels? What are the pros and cons of keeping and terminating the CRT from a Canadian point of view? Compensation must be adequate and relative to the benefits to the U.S. (e.g., power, flood control, irrigation, other?). What
benefits, aside from flood control, accrue to the U.S.? What could the impact be on the ecosystem if the CRT were terminated? What are the tradeoffs/impacts in one community if the reservoir level is changed in another community?

**Negotiating Position:** What clout will BC have if Ottawa is signatory? What is the federal government’s role? What would BC and Canada want to change in any new/renegotiated CRT? Can Canada end the CRT?

**Negotiating Team:** Who is on the negotiating team? Who makes decisions? What ministry negotiates with the U.S.? Who arbitrates in the case of an impasse?

**Power Generation:** Does current generating capacity meet future power needs? Are more dams needed in the future?

**Power Rates:** If terminated, would rates increase?

**Roles and Responsibilities:** What role will the American military have in Canada for protecting U.S. best interests? Who protects our Canadian interests? Why is BC Hydro the lone Canadian entity?

**Sinixt:** Shut out of process, thousands of years of history, no mention.

**Water Levels:** How can you find out if levels will change? Negotiate more stable reservoir levels. Would water levels stabilize if the CRT were terminated? Are there any other agreements/management plans that impact Arrow levels?