Stakeholder Listening Sessions Autumn 2011 Comments and Responses
January 2012

Where and How Comments will be Addressed

Stakeholder Comment	Alternatives Iteration 2[1]	Alternatives Iteration 3[2]	Impact Assessment[3]	Policy[4]	Process[5]	Outside Treaty Review [6]	Response
Overall Program: Iteration 3 is very important, need to ensure the schedule allows for this Iteration.		X			X		We agree – a key goal of Treaty Review is to be as comprehensive as possible in evaluating alternatives and impacts, and to do so through three iterations.
Overall Program: There is a desire for more Canadian coordination in the studies.		X		X	X		U.S. and Canadian entities are working together on key issues related to the Treaty alternatives. Iteration 3 includes conceptual alternatives that consider Canadian Treaty perspectives. The U.S. Entity hopes to develop these in coordination with the Canadian Entity.
Overall Program: Need to communicate decision-making process regarding alternatives to regional stakeholders.					X		Additional listening sessions will be scheduled at key points in the process, including Iteration 2 & 3 alternative formulation and evaluation. Stakeholders can also provide input through their Sovereign representatives.
Climate Change: Can Climate Change be integrated into the studies earlier than Iteration 3?	X	X	X				The Sovereign Technical Team (STT) has formed a climate change work group that will recommend appropriate timing and approach for integration of climate change scenarios into alternatives evaluation. Currently it is assumed that will occur in iteration 3 but may be considered earlier in the process.

[1] At least one alternative will be included in Iteration 2 that will address this concern
[2] At least one alternative will be included in Iteration 3 that will address this concern
[3] This concern will be addressed through assessment of impacts of alternatives
[4] This concern is related to a policy question that may need to be addressed before a Treaty recommendation can be finalized
[5] This concern is related to the Treaty Review Process; procedures may need to be developed to address it
[6] This concern is considered outside of the Treaty Review as defined by the sideboards established by the Sovereign Review Team

Where and How Comments will be Addressed

Stakeholder Comment	Alternatives Iteration 2[1]	Alternatives Iteration 3[2]	Impact Assessment[3]	Policy[4]	Process[5]	Outside Treaty Review [6]	Response
Ecosystem-Based Function (EbF): Stakeholders are pleased that EbF was included as a Primary Driving Purpose of Treaty Review.				X			The Treaty Review studies are attempting to evaluate the extent to which ecosystem objectives can be achieved within the framework of the existing Treaty, or may be better met if the Treaty is terminated or amended. To that extent, EbF is an equal driver in formulation and evaluation of Treaty alternatives.
EbF: The Columbia Basin Management Plan needs to be fully incorporated in the Review.	X	X	X	X			The STT is considering the development of an alternative or component of an alternative that would incorporate additional water supply consistent with the Columbia Basin Water Management Plan in the State of Washington and for other possible instream and out-of-stream uses in the basin.
EbF: Need to consider effects to the estuary rearing and function.			X				Impacts of Treaty alternatives to the Columbia river estuary will be assessed. STT is currently defining the scope of that analysis.
EbF: Need a balanced approach to evaluating Flood Risk from an EbF standpoint (flooding flood plains have ecological benefits.) Need to consider floodplain function.			X			X	The studies will include a range of alternatives that test flood risk under different operational scenarios and will consider different ways to mitigate for flooding. Impact assessment will also consider the trade-offs of EbF and other outputs of the system.
EbF: What is included in the EbF analysis? Need to consider all habitat functions of the Columbia River, not just anadromous fish			X	X			The EbF analysis will include headwater river and reservoirs; wildlife; estuary; and anadromous fish impacts. The studies will look at key indicators of habitat function will be included.

Where and How Comments will be Addressed

Stakeholder Comment	Alternatives Iteration 2[1]	Alternatives Iteration 3[2]	Impact Assessment[3]	Policy[4]	Process[5]	Outside Treaty Review [6]	Response
EbF: There is concern over using the Endangered Species Act Biological Opinion (BiOp) operations as an objective for EbF due to litigation, future changes, and possible Treaty Outcomes that may improve operations.			X	X	X		The Federal agencies operating the Columbia River System have a responsibility to operate the projects in ways that don't jeopardize the continued existence of ESA listed species and, if possible, help them recover to healthy populations. Although it is not clear what BiOp requirements may be in place after 2024, the STT assumed that the U.S. would need to continue to operate the projects in similar manner to meet the needs of those species. Therefore, the current BiOp operating requirements have been included in the first iteration of alternatives. Other changes to system operations to improve ecosystem function will be included in iterations 2 and 3.
EbF: Concern was raised over transparency of inputs used in Hydroregulation modeling.			X		X		The STT will prepare documentation of the hydroregulation modeling used to evaluate the Treaty Review alternatives. The documentation will provide information concerning model inputs and outputs.
EbF: There is concern over how EbF operations would be paid for.				X		X?	This addresses the restoration of benefits of a fully functioning river system. This question is valid for each of the primary drivers. There are costs and benefits to the three primary drivers associated with how the system is operated. The ultimate question about how to pay for Canadian storage may be outside the scope of the treaty review and will need to be addressed during treaty negotiations.
EbF: Do the EbF alternatives take into account a historical view of the river? There should be an expansion of goals beyond the current condition.						X	"Baseline" is the current configuration of the system and the 2024 operation. We will evaluate a range of alternatives, but these will not include an unregulated, pre-dam condition.

Where and How Comments will be Addressed

Stakeholder Comment	Alternatives Iteration 2[1]	Alternatives Iteration 3[2]	Impact Assessment[3]	Policy[4]	Process[5]	Outside Treaty Review [6]	Response
Flood Risk: Who determines the appropriate level of flood risk?				X			The Corps, in collaboration with other regional flood risk managers in the basin. The first step in the process is to develop the tools and collect the data needed to accurately define flood risk under current operations. The Corps is undertaking that work through their ongoing Treaty Review Flood Risk Assessment studies. That information will inform possible changes to flood risk after 2024 under the Treaty alternatives.
Flood Risk: Concern was raised over funding for flood prevention infrastructure as a result of the Treaty Recommendation.						X	The Treaty Review studies will evaluate at a very high level the potential trade-offs between treaty alternatives and other infrastructure measures. This will include some preliminary estimates of the rough order of magnitude of costs associated with levee upgrades and other possible flood measures as an alternative to Canadian storage under the Treaty. Much more detailed benefit cost analysis would be required after Treaty Review to implement such measures.
Flood Risk: Stakeholders are interested in the Canadian perspective of controlling flows to 450 kcfs or 600 kcfs at The Dalles		X	X	X			U.S. and Canadian entities are working together on key issues related to the Treaty alternatives and will work together to consider Canadian perspectives on Treaty flood control provisions, including those pertaining to system flood flow objectives, effective flood control use of U.S. reservoirs, and other related issues.
Flood Risk: Need to know the effects of Effective Use operations on Reservoirs.	X	X	X				Several alternatives in iterations 1, 2 and 3 are designed to better understand implications of treaty provisions relating to effective flood control use of U.S. reservoirs.
Flood Risk: Need to determine effects of 600 kcfs flows at The Dalles to all river functions (navigation, recreation, etc.)	X	X	X				Several alternatives in iterations 1, 2 and 3 are designed to better understand implications of treaty provisions relating to effective flood control use of U.S. reservoirs. Impact assessment of those alternatives will address tradeoffs between flood risk management and other river functions.

Where and How Comments will be Addressed

Stakeholder Comment	Alternatives Iteration 2[1]	Alternatives Iteration 3[2]	Impact Assessment[3]	Policy[4]	Process[5]	Outside Treaty Review [6]	Response
Flood Risk: Need to identify payment for potential increases in cost of U.S. Flood Control.			X	X		X	The Treaty Review will attempt to estimate the potential future cost of Called Upon flood storage in Canada and consider some options for the U.S. for paying for Called Upon storage after 2024, but the ultimate decision is beyond the sideboards of the Treaty Review.
Flood Risk: Is an improvement in the ability to forecast flood risk, as well as adaptive management, part of the alternatives?	X	X				X	The U.S. Entity is currently looking to improve forecast procedures outside of Treaty Review. Forecast uncertainties are part of the Corps' Flood Risk Assessment studies. Adaptive management is not specifically considered, but the range of alternatives may inform future adaptive management strategies.
Flood Risk: Need to determine if further flood control projects are needed.	X	X	X				Alternatives will consider the potential for additional storage, local flood improvements, and other measures as a possible offset to Canadian storage after 2024.
Hydropower: There is a need to understand the interaction between flood and power in relation to the Treaty decision.		X	X				Agreed. We need to understand the interaction between the three primary driving purposes.
Hydropower: Need to determine who pays for the changes in operations due to a Treaty decision				X		X	Much more detailed benefit cost analysis would be required after Treaty Review to implement such measures. The analysis will inform ultimate question about how a change in operation will be funded is outside the scope of the Treaty Review.
Hydropower: Need to have a deeper understanding of Canadian operations, including how they may or may not market power depending on the Treaty decision.	X	X	X				The alternatives in Iteration 1, 2 and 3 will test a variety of assumptions regarding future Canadian operations. For the Treaty Terminates alternatives under evaluation in Iteration 1, we will include 2-3 different scenarios for how Canada might operate their reservoirs if the Treaty is terminated, including different assumptions about power markets.

Where and How Comments will be Addressed

Stakeholder Comment	Alternatives Iteration 2[1]	Alternatives Iteration 3[2]	Impact Assessment[3]	Policy[4]	Process[5]	Outside Treaty Review [6]	Response
Hydropower: Need to include renewables and population change into the studies.	X	X					An important element of the Treaty Review studies will be forecasts of future power loads (demands) and resources (sources of generation). Renewables are included in the Loads and Resources estimates, which also assumes population forecasts.
Hydropower: Need more coordination between the Treaty Review, legislative branches and energy committees in all of the States.				X	X		We recognize the need to both communicate and coordinate on Treaty Review issues, and are doing so as often, and in as many forums, as possible.
Hydropower: Need to consider the value and calculation of Canadian Entitlement, including who pays.			X	X			Agreed. An alternative will assess the value of Canadian Entitlement. NW rate payers currently pay this.
Hydropower: Will ratepayers bear the cost of including EbF in Treaty operations?				X		X	Ecosystem-Based Function is one of the three primary driving purposes of the Treaty Review process. While costs and benefits will certainly be analyzed, the question of ultimately "who pays" this is not an issue that will likely be determined between now and 2013. That will come after the regional recommendation has been developed.
Water Supply: Would like to see Water Supply included as one of the Primary Operating Purposes.				X		X	As noted earlier, water supply is certainly an important area of consideration, and will be looked at carefully under the impact assessment.
Water Supply: Need to consider timing for irrigation needs.	X	X	X				This will be accounted for in the alternatives and through the impact assessment process.
Water Supply: Need to consider additional storage and coordination for water supply from Canada.		X	X				Agreed. This is an important consideration throughout Treaty Review.

Where and How Comments will be Addressed

Stakeholder Comment	Alternatives Iteration 2[1]	Alternatives Iteration 3[2]	Impact Assessment[3]	Policy[4]	Process[5]	Outside Treaty Review [6]	Response
Water Supply: Water Supply covers more than simply irrigation, STT needs to cover all aspects.	X	X	X				Agreed. The focus of the Treaty Review is the relative availability of water from Canadian storage for all project purposes.
Water Supply: Need to consider increased diversions due to population growth.						X	If additional water is secured from Canada, this issue may be considered during the operational studies completed post- 2013.
Water Supply: Need to consider the Water Supply studies taking place in Washington State.	X	X					Look at previous answer in relation to Columbia Basin studies (Washington)
Water Quality: Need to identify effects of higher flows on sediment transport, especially in areas like the Hanford Reach and Lake Roosevelt.			X				Agreed.