

**ANNUAL REPORT**  
**to the**  
**GOVERNMENTS**  
**of**  
**THE UNITED STATES and CANADA**

**COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY**  
**PERMANENT ENGINEERING BOARD**

**Washington, D.C.**

**Ottawa, Ontario**

**30 September 2009**





**COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY PERMANENT ENGINEERING BOARD**

C A N A D A • U N I T E D S T A T E S

**CANADIAN SECTION**  
T. WALLACE, Chair  
T. Newton, Member

**UNITED STATES SECTION**  
S.L. STOCKTON, Chair  
E. Sienkiewicz, Member

10 February 2010

The Honorable Hillary Clinton  
Secretary of State  
Washington, D.C.

The Honourable Christian Paradis  
Minister of Natural Resources  
Ottawa, Ontario

Dear Secretary Clinton and Minister Paradis:

We refer you to the Treaty between the United States of America and Canada relating to cooperative development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin, signed at Washington, D.C., on 17 January 1961.

In accordance with the provisions of Article XV, paragraph 2(e), we are submitting the forty-fifth Annual Report of the Permanent Engineering Board, dated 30 September 2009. The report documents the results achieved under the Treaty for the period from 1 October 2008 to 30 September 2009.

The Board is pleased to report that, for this reporting period, the objectives of the Treaty were met.

Respectfully submitted:

For the United States

Steven Stockton, Chair


For Canada

Tom Wallace, Chair

Ed Sienkiewicz

Tim Newton







ANNUAL REPORT  
to the  
GOVERNMENTS  
of  
THE UNITED STATES and CANADA

COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY  
PERMANENT ENGINEERING BOARD

Washington, D.C.

Ottawa, Ontario

30 September 2009



---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The forty-fifth Annual Report of the Permanent Engineering Board is submitted to the governments of Canada and the United States in compliance with Article XV of the Columbia River Treaty of 17 January 1961. This report describes Treaty projects, storage operations, and the resulting benefits achieved by each country for the period from 1 October 2008 to 30 September 2009.

During the reporting period, the Canadian Treaty projects – Mica, Duncan, and Arrow – were operated according to the 2008–2009 and 2009–2010 Detailed Operating Plans, the 2003 Flood Control Operating Plan (FCOP), and several supplemental operating agreements. Treaty storage in the United States at the Libby project was operated by the U.S. Entity according to the 2003 FCOP, the 2000 Libby Coordination Agreement (LCA), U.S. requirements for power, and the guidelines set forth in the 2000 Biological Opinion (BiOp) by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the 2004 BiOp by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), and strict application of the eight-step variable discharge flood control (VarQ) operating procedures. As reported in this document, the objectives of the Treaty have been met for the reporting period.

The Canadian entitlement to the downstream power benefits for the reporting period was determined, according to the procedures set out in the Treaty and Protocol. From 1 August 2008 through 31 July 2009, the U.S. Entity delivery of the Canadian Entitlement to downstream power benefits was 464.9 megawatts of average energy at rates up to 1,245 megawatts. From 1 August 2009 to 30 September 2009, the U.S. Entity delivery of the Canadian Entitlement to downstream power benefits was 567.1 megawatts of average energy at rates up to 1,352 megawatts. The Canadian Entitlement obligation was determined by the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 Assured Operating Plan and Determination of Downstream Power Benefits.

The U.S. Entity delivered the Canadian entitlement to the Canadian Entity at existing points of interconnection on the Canada-U.S. border according to the *Entity Agreement on Aspects of the Delivery of the Canadian Entitlement for 1 April 1998 through 15 September 2024*, dated 29 March 1999. There were no curtailments of Canadian Entitlement deliveries during the 2008-2009 operating year.

Canadian Treaty storage began the operating year on 1 August 2008 at 91.8 percent full, and ended the year on 31 July 2008 at 82.0 percent full. Seasonal flow volume above The Dalles was 84.1 percent of average for January through July 2009. The operating year 2008-2009 was characterized by below average precipitation in most parts of the Columbia River Basin.

The 2008 BiOp concluded that the continued operation of the Federal Columbia River Power System (FCRPS) is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of endangered salmon and steelhead in the Columbia River basin. Numerous parties immediately challenged the BiOp upon release. Judge James Redden of the U.S. District Court of Oregon held hearings on the legal adequacy of the BiOp in March 2009. Also, because the 2008 BiOp was completed under the previous administration, the Obama Administration agreed to review the BiOp. In a September 2009 report to the court, the Administration endorsed the BiOp and added a new Adaptive Management Implementation Plan with enhanced measures and additional contingency plans. By mid-December 2009 Judge Redden had not made a decision on the adequacy of the 2008 BiOp and the Adaptive Management Implementation Plan.

The Columbia River Treaty Hydrometeorological Committee (CRTHMC) continued to work with agencies to maintain climate and hydrometric data monitoring stations. Working with other water managers, CRTHMC is working with the Natural Resources Conservation Service to rescind a proposal to close nine snow stations in Washington and Oregon. A work plan to recommend additional hydrometeorological and snow monitoring stations in the Canadian Columbia is being prepared and will be reviewed by Columbia River Treaty Operating Committee (CRTOC).

The Entities have made progress on Phase 1 technical studies as part of the Columbia River Treaty 2014/2024 Review. These studies are intended to provide baseline information about post 2024 operating conditions, both with and without the Treaty, and from the point of view of power and flood control values only. They are not intended to establish future operating strategies or policies or alternatives to the Treaty. The studies are a joint effort between the Canada and US Entities and are intended as a first step in a broader review of the Treaty.

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Letter of Transmittal	
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	iii
<b>ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS</b>	viii
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	1
<b>THE COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY</b>	3
General	3
Features of the Treaty and Related Documents	3
Termination Provisions	4
<b>PERMANENT ENGINEERING BOARD</b>	5
General	5
Establishment of the Board	5
Duties and Responsibilities	5
<b>ENTITIES</b>	8
General	8
Establishment of the Entities	8
Powers and Duties of the Entities	8
<b>ACTIVITIES OF THE BOARD</b>	10
Meetings	10
Reports Received	10
Report to the Governments	11
<b>TREATY IMPLEMENTATION</b>	13
General	13
Treaty Projects	13
Duncan Project	13
Arrow Project	14
Mica Project	14
Libby Project in the United States	15
Libby Project in Canada	15
Hydrometeorological Network	15
Power Operating Plans and Calculation of Downstream Power Benefits	16
Transmission Developments	18
Flood Control Operating Plan	18
Flow Records	19
Non-Treaty Storage	19
Fisheries Operations	19

<b>OPERATIONS UNDER THE TREATY</b> .....	21
General .....	21
System Storage .....	25
Mica Reservoir .....	26
Arrow Reservoir .....	26
Duncan Reservoir .....	26
Libby Reservoir .....	26
Flood Control Operations .....	26
Duncan Reservoir Levels .....	27
Mica Reservoir Levels .....	28
Libby Reservoir Levels .....	29
Arrow Reservoir Level .....	30
Kootenai River at Libby Dam .....	31
Duncan River at Duncan Dam .....	32
Columbia River at Mica Dam .....	33
Columbia River at Hugh Keenleyside Dam .....	34
Columbia River at Birchbank .....	35
<b>TREATY BENEFITS</b> .....	36
Flood Control Benefits .....	36
Power Benefits .....	37
Other Benefits .....	37
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b> .....	39
<b>LIST OF PHOTOGRAPHS</b>	
Libby Dam .....	2
Hugh Keenleyside Dam .....	7
Duncan Dam .....	12
Mica Dam .....	20
Columbia River, Revelstoke Dam and Cora Linn Dam .....	38

*Photographs supplied by the British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers*

---

## LIST OF HYDROGRAPHS

Duncan Reservoir Levels .....	27
Mica Reservoir Levels .....	28
Libby Reservoir Levels .....	29
Arrow Reservoir Levels .....	30
Kootenai River at Libby Dam .....	31
Duncan River at Duncan Dam .....	32
Columbia River at Mica Dam .....	33
Columbia River at Hugh Keenleyside Dam .....	34
Columbia River at Birchbank .....	35

## APPENDICES

A: Columbia River Treaty Permanent Engineering Board .....	40
B: Columbia River Treaty Entities .....	45
C: Record of Flows at the International Boundary .....	49
D: Project Information .....	52

## ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS


AER	Actual Energy Regulation
aMW	Average Megawatts
AOP	Assured Operating Plan (from 1 August to 31 July)
BC Hydro	British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority
BiOp	Biological Opinion
BPA	Bonneville Power Administration
CEPA	Canadian Entitlement Purchase Agreement
CRTHMC	Columbia River Treaty Hydrometeorological Committee
cfs	Cubic feet per second
DDPB	Determination of Downstream Power Benefits
DOP	Detailed Operating Plan (from 1 August to 31 July)
FCOP	Flood Control Operating Plan
FCRPS	Federal Columbia River Power System
ft	Feet
hm <sup>3</sup>	Cubic hectometres
IJC	International Joint Commission
kaf	Thousand acre-feet
kcfs	Thousand cubic feet per second
km	Kilometres
km <sup>3</sup>	Cubic kilometres
kV	Kilovolts
LCA	Libby Coordination Agreement
m	Meters
m <sup>3</sup> /s	Cubic meters per second
Maf	Million acre-feet
mi	Miles
MW	Megawatts
MWh	Megawatt hour
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NTSA	Non-Treaty Storage Agreement
PEBCOM	Permanent Engineering Board Engineering Committee
PNCA	Pacific Northwest Coordination Agreement
PSANI	Puget Sound Area / Northern Intertie
TSR	Treaty Storage Regulation
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
VarQ	Variable discharge flood control

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Columbia River Treaty provides for the cooperative development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin. Article XV of the Treaty established a Permanent Engineering Board and specified that one of its duties is to “make reports to Canada and the United States of America at least once a year of the results being achieved under the Treaty.”

This annual report, which covers the period from 1 October 2008 through 30 September 2009, describes the activities of the Board, Treaty projects, storage operations, and the resulting benefits achieved by each country. It also presents summaries of the essential features of the Treaty and of the responsibilities of the Board and the Entities.

The report refers to items currently under review by the Entities; provides details on calculating flood control and power benefits and on operation of Treaty reservoirs and flow discharges at the border; and presents the conclusions of the Board.



Libby Dam – Kootenai River, Montana

# THE COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY

## General

The Columbia River Treaty was signed at Washington, D.C., on 17 January 1961, and was ratified by the United States Senate in March of that year. In Canada, ratification was delayed. Further negotiations between the two countries resulted, on 22 January 1964, in a formal agreement by an exchange of notes to a Protocol to the Treaty, and to an Attachment Relating to Terms of Sale. The Treaty and related documents were approved by the Canadian Parliament in June 1964.

The Canadian Entitlement Purchase Agreement (CEPA) was signed on 13 August 1964. Under the terms of this agreement, Canada's share of downstream power benefits resulting from the first 30 years of scheduled operation of each of the Canadian storage projects was sold to a group of electric utilities in the United States known as the Columbia Storage Power Exchange.

On 16 September 1964, the Treaty and Protocol were formally ratified by an exchange of notes between the two countries. The sum of US\$253.9 million was delivered to the Canadian representatives as payment in advance for the Canadian entitlement to downstream power benefits during the period of the Purchase Agreement. On the same date, at a ceremony at the Peace Arch Park on the International Boundary, the Treaty and its Protocol were proclaimed by President Johnson of the United States, Prime Minister Pearson of Canada, and Premier Bennett of British Columbia.

## Features of the Treaty and Related Documents

The essential undertakings of the Treaty are as follows:

- (a) Canada will provide 19.1 km<sup>3</sup> (15.5 Maf) of usable storage by constructing dams near Mica Creek, the outlet of Arrow Lakes, and Duncan Lake in British Columbia.
- (b) The United States will maintain and operate the hydroelectric power facilities included in the base system and any new main-stem projects to make the most effective use of improved streamflow resulting from operation of the Canadian storage. Canada will operate the storage in accordance with the procedures and operating plans specified in the Treaty.
- (c) The United States and Canada will share equally the additional power benefit available in the United States as a result of river regulation by upstream storage in Canada.
- (d) On commencement of the respective storage operations, the United States will make payments to Canada totalling US\$64.4 million for flood control provided by Canada.
- (e) The United States has the option of constructing a dam on the Kootenai River near Libby, Montana. The Libby Reservoir would extend some 67.6 km (42 miles) into Canada, and Canada would make the necessary Canadian land available for flooding.

(f) Both Canada and the United States have the right to make diversions of water for consumptive use and, in addition, after September 1984, Canada has the option of making specific diversions of the Kootenay River into the headwaters of the Columbia River for power purposes.

(g) Differences arising under the Treaty that cannot be resolved by the two countries may be referred by either country to the International Joint Commission or to arbitration by an appropriate tribunal as specified by the Treaty.

(h) The Treaty shall remain in force for at least 60 years from its date of ratification, 16 September 1964. The Protocol of January 1964 amplified and clarified certain terms of the Columbia River Treaty. The Attachment Relating to Terms of Sale signed on the same date established agreement that, under certain terms, Canada would sell in the United States its entitlement to downstream power benefits for a 30-year period. The Exchange of Notes and Attachment Relating to Terms of Sale of January 1964 and the CEPA of 13 August 1964 (the Sales Agreement) provided that the Treaty storage would be operative for power purposes on the following dates: Duncan storage on 1 April 1968; Arrow storage on 1 April 1969; and Mica storage on 1 April 1973. All sales under the Sales Agreement have now expired.

## **Termination Provisions**

Article XIX describes the period of the Treaty and provisions for its termination. While the Treaty has no official termination date, Canada or the United States may issue notice to terminate most of the provisions of the Treaty 60 years (at the earliest) from its date of ratification (that is, on September 16, 2024), provided they have given at least ten years' written notice. Certain provisions of Treaty change automatically in 2024, while others continue for the useful life of the Treaty facilities.

The Entities are currently engaged in technical studies aimed at establishing baseline conditions for power and flood control operations post-2024 with and without the Treaty. These studies, together with other work and public consultation, will help inform decision makers on matters affecting the future of the Treaty.

## **PERMANENT ENGINEERING BOARD**

### **General**

Article XV of the Columbia River Treaty establishes a Permanent Engineering Board consisting of two members to be appointed by Canada and two members to be appointed by the United States. Appointments to the Board were to be made within three months of the date of ratification. The duties and responsibilities of the Board are also stipulated in the Treaty and related documents.

### **Establishment of the Board**

On 7 December 1964, pursuant to Executive Order No. 11177 dated 16 September 1964, the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior each appointed a member and an alternate member to form the United States Section of the Permanent Engineering Board. Pursuant to the Department of Energy Organization Act of 4 August 1977, the appointments to the United States Section of the Board are now made by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Energy. The members of the Canadian Section of the Board were appointed by Order in Council P.C. 1964-1671 dated 29 October 1964. Each Canadian member was authorized to appoint an alternate member. On 11 December 1964, the two governments announced the composition of the Board.

The names of Board members, alternate members, and secretaries are shown in Appendix A, as are the names of the current members of the Board's Engineering Committee (PEBCOM).

### **Duties and Responsibilities**

The general duties and responsibilities of the Board to the governments, as set forth in Article XV(2) of the Treaty and related documents, include:

- (a) assembling records of the flows of the Columbia River and the Kootenay River at the Canada–United States of America boundary;
- (b) reporting to Canada and the United States of America whenever there is substantial deviation from the hydroelectric and flood control operating plans and, if appropriate, including in the report recommendations for remedial action and compensatory adjustments;
- (c) assisting in reconciling differences concerning technical or operational matters that may arise between the Entities;
- (d) making periodic inspections and requiring reports as necessary from the Entities, with a view to ensuring that the objectives of the Treaty are being met;

(e) making reports to Canada and the United States of America at least once a year of the results being achieved under the Treaty and making special reports concerning any matter that it considers should be brought to their attention;

(f) investigating and reporting with respect to any other matter coming within the scope of the Treaty at the request of either Canada or the United States of America; and

(g) consulting with the Entities on the establishment and operation of a hydrometeorological system as required by Annex A of the Treaty.



Hugh Keenleyside Dam (Arrow Lakes) – Columbia River, British Columbia  
Concrete spillway and discharge works with navigation locks and earthfill dam.  
The new 185-MW power plant is on the north abutment (right-hand side).

## **ENTITIES**

### **General**

Article XIV(1) of the Columbia River Treaty provides that Canada and the United States of America shall each designate one or more Entities to formulate and execute the operating arrangements necessary to implement the Treaty. The powers and duties of the Entities are specified in the Treaty and its related documents.

### **Establishment of the Entities**

Executive Order No. 11177, previously referred to, designated the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), the Department of the Interior (moved by a later Executive Order to the Department of Energy), and the Division Engineer, North Pacific (now Northwestern) Division, Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, as the United States Entity, with the Administrator to serve as Chair. Pursuant to the Department of Energy Organization Act of 4 August 1977, the BPA was transferred to the Department of Energy. Order in Council P.C. 1964-1407, dated 4 September 1964, designated the British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority (BC Hydro) as the Canadian Entity.

The names of the members of the Entities are shown in Appendix B.

### **Powers and Duties of the Entities**

In addition to the powers and duties specified elsewhere in the Treaty and related documents, Article XIV(2) of the Treaty requires that the Entities be responsible for the following:

- (a) coordination of plans and exchange of information relating to facilities to be used in producing and obtaining the benefits contemplated by the Treaty;
- (b) calculation of and arrangements for delivery of hydroelectric power to which Canada is entitled for providing flood control;
- (c) calculation of the amounts payable to the United States of America for standby transmission services;
- (d) consultation on requests for variations made pursuant to articles XII(5) and XIII(6);
- (e) establishment and operation of a hydrometeorological system as required by Annex A;
- (f) assisting and cooperating with the Permanent Engineering Board in the discharge of its functions;
- (g) periodic calculation of accounts;

- (h) preparation of the hydroelectric operating plans and flood control operating plans for the Canadian storage together with determination of the downstream power benefits to which Canada is entitled;
- (i) preparation of proposals to implement Article VIII, and carrying out of any disposal authorized or exchange provided for therein;
- (j) making appropriate arrangements for delivery to Canada of the downstream power benefits to which Canada is entitled, including such matters as load factors for delivery, times and points of delivery, and calculation of transmission loss; and
- (k) preparation and implementation of detailed operating plans that may produce results more advantageous to both countries than those that would arise from operation under the plans referred to in annexes A and B. Article XIV(4) of the Treaty provides that the two governments may, by an exchange of notes, empower or charge the Entities with any other matter coming within the scope of the Treaty.

## ACTIVITIES OF THE BOARD

### Meetings

The Board held its 76th meeting on 25 February 2009 in Vancouver, BC. In conjunction with this meeting, the Board also held its 57th joint meeting with the Entities.

The following topics were discussed at the meeting: the 2008 DOP and supplemental operating agreements; update to Libby Operating Plan; Canadian entitlement delivery; production of the 2013-2014 Assured Operating Plan and Determination of Downstream Power Benefits (AOP/DDPB) and development of future plans; prospects for a non-treaty storage agreement; Kootenay Lake IJC Board of Control activities; update on Hydromet Committee activities; status of 2008 FCRPS BiOp; status of Treaty websites; status of 2014/2024 planning initiatives; Canadian Water Use Plans and the Canadian Columbia River Forum.

### Reports Received

Throughout the reporting year, the Entities maintained contact with the Board and the Board's Engineering Committee (PEBCOM). Information pertinent to the operation of Treaty storage projects was made available to the Board.

Since the last Annual Report, the Board has received the following documents involving the operation of Columbia River Treaty storage:

- Columbia River Treaty Operating Committee Agreement on Operation of Treaty Storage for Non-power Uses from 15 December 2008 through 31 July 2009, signed 20 November 2008

*This agreement is similar to previous agreements implemented to utilize Treaty storage for non-power uses. These uses include the following: (1) providing flows for Canadian trout spawning for the April through June period; (2) enhancing the capability in the U.S. of providing spring and summer flow augmentation for salmon and steelhead by storing 1 Maf of water in Arrow by late April; (3) enhancing Arrow Lakes levels by ensuring progressive refill; (4) providing a minimum discharge objective at Arrow during January through March 2009 for the purpose of protecting eggs deposited on the streambed by Mountain Whitefish during December 2008 through January 2009; (5) improving the U.S. capability to meet flow objectives for salmon at Vernita Bar below Priest Rapids Dam during the period of December 2008 through early May 2009. This agreement supplements the 2008–2009 Detailed Operating Plan (DOP).*

- Columbia River Treaty Assured Operating Plan and Determination of Downstream Power Benefits for Operating Year 2013-2014, dated January 2009

*This document provides information on the operating plan for Columbia River Treaty storage and the resulting downstream power benefits for the period 1 August 2013 through 31 July 2014.*

- Columbia River Treaty Entity Agreement on the Assured Operating Plan and Determination of Downstream Power Benefits for the 2013-2014 Operating Year, signed 11 February 2009

*This document is the agreement to implement the AOP and DDPB that provide information on the operating plan for Columbia River Treaty storage and the resulting downstream power benefits for the period 1 August 2013 through 31 July 2014.*

- Detailed Operating Plan for Columbia River Storage for 1 August 2009 through 31 July 2010, dated June 2009

*This document provides the general guidelines, operating criteria, and reservoir rule curves for the operation of the three Treaty reservoirs (Mica, Arrow, and Duncan) in Canada for the operating year from 1 August 2009 through 31 July 2010.*

- Columbia River Treaty Entity Agreement on the Detailed Operating Plan for Columbia River Storage for 1 August 2009 through 31 July 2010, signed 1 July 2009

*This document is the agreement between the Entities to implement the DOP for Columbia River storage during the period 1 August 2009 through 31 July 2010.*

- Columbia River Treaty Operating Committee Agreement on Provisional Storage for the Period 1 September 2008 through 3 April 2009, signed 9 September 2008 and Columbia River Treaty Operating Committee Agreement on Provisional Storage for the Period 26 September 2009 through 3 April 2010, signed 28 September 2009

*These agreements are for the purpose of obtaining additional mutual benefits, both power and non-power, by shaping the discharge from the Arrow reservoir.*

- Annual Report of the Columbia River Treaty, Canadian and United States Entities, for the period 1 October 2008 through 30 September 2009

*This report summarizes the operation of Treaty projects and other activities of the Entities for the period 1 October 2008 through 30 September 2009.*

## **Report to the Governments**

The forty-fourth Annual Report of the Board, dated 30 September 2008, was submitted to the governments of Canada and the United States.



Duncan Dam – Duncan River, British Columbia  
The earthfill dam with discharge tunnels to the left and spillway to the right.

---

## TREATY IMPLEMENTATION

### General

Implementation of the Treaty resulted in the construction of the Treaty projects, development of the hydrometeorological network, annual preparation of power plans and flood control operating plans, and annual calculation of downstream power benefits. The three Treaty storage projects in British Columbia — the Duncan, Arrow, and Mica projects — produce flood control and power benefits in both Canada and the United States. The Libby storage project in the United States also provides flood control and power benefits in both countries.

In the United States, the increased flow regulation provided by Treaty projects facilitated the installation of additional generating capacity at existing plants on the Columbia River.

In Canada, completion of the Canal Plant on the Kootenay River in 1976, installation of generators at Mica Dam in 1976–1977, and completion of the Revelstoke project in 1984, all owned by BC Hydro, have resulted in additional power benefits. These benefits amount to some 4000 MW of generation capacity in British Columbia that might not have been installed without the Treaty. In addition, the construction of a two-unit, 185-MW hydropower plant adjacent to the Hugh Keenleyside Dam was completed in 2002. A fifth generating unit at Revelstoke is currently being installed, and additional generating units at Revelstoke and Mica dams in Canada are being considered for the near future.

The Treaty provides Canada with an option, which commenced in 1984, of diverting the Kootenay River at Canal Flats into the headwaters of the Columbia River. BC Hydro undertook certain engineering feasibility and environmental studies of the potential diversion. No further activities have occurred since that time.

Further to the expiration of the Sales Agreement in 1998, 1999 and 2003, the Board has monitored issues relating to the transmission and return of the Canadian entitlement, and the restructuring of electricity markets. It has also reviewed the impacts of U.S. resource agencies' biological opinions (BiOps) on Treaty operations.

The locations of the Treaty projects are shown in Appendix D, Plate No. 1.

### Treaty Projects

#### Duncan Project

Duncan Dam, the smallest Treaty project, was scheduled in the 30-year Sales Agreement for operation by 1 April 1968, and was the first of the Treaty projects to be completed. It became fully operational on 31 July 1967, well in advance of Treaty requirements. The Sales Agreement for Duncan expired 31 March 1998.

The earthfill dam is 39.6 m high (130 ft) and extends 792.5 m (2600 ft) across the Duncan River valley, 9.7 km (6 mi) north of Kootenay Lake. The reservoir behind the dam extends for as much as 43.5 km (27 mi) and provides 1.73 km<sup>3</sup> (1.4 Maf) of usable storage, which is all committed under the Treaty. No power facilities are included in this project.

The project is shown on page 12, and project data are provided in Appendix D, Table 1.

### Arrow Project

Hugh Keenleyside Dam, at the outlet of the Arrow Lakes, was the second Treaty project to be completed. It became operational on 10 October 1968, well ahead of 1 April 1969, the date scheduled in the 30-year Sales Agreement. The Sales Agreement for Arrow expired 31 March 1999.

The dam consists of two main components: a concrete gravity structure that extends 366 m (1200 ft) from the north bank of the river and includes the spillway, low-level outlets, and navigation lock; and an earthfill section that rises 52 m (170 ft) above the riverbed and extends 503 m (1650 ft) from the navigation lock to the south bank of the river. The reservoir, up to 233 km (145 mi) long when full, includes both the Upper and Lower Arrow lakes and provides 8.8 km<sup>3</sup> (7.1 Maf) of Treaty storage.

The new 185-MW power plant at the Arrow Project, completed in 2002 and owned by Arrow Lakes Power Corporation, is located on the north abutment (left bank). A 1493 m (4900 ft) intake approach channel runs along the north end of the concrete dam and diverts the water of the Arrow Reservoir through a powerhouse located in a rock outcrop 396 m (1300 ft) downstream. The generating facility contains two 92.5 MW Kaplan turbines. The facility is connected by a new 230 kV transmission line to the Selkirk substation for integration into BC Hydro's existing power grid. The power production at the new generating facility is incidental to releases for Treaty purposes. This new power plant will reduce spill at Keenleyside Dam and will provide environmental benefits by reducing entrained gases that are harmful to fish.

The project is shown on page 7, and project data are provided in Appendix D, Table 2.

### Mica Project

Mica Dam, the largest of the Treaty projects, was scheduled under the 30-year Sales Agreement for initial operation on 1 April 1973. The project was declared operational and commenced storing on 29 March 1973. The Sales Agreement for Mica expired on 31 March 2003. The dam is located on the Columbia River 137 km (85 mi) north of Revelstoke, British Columbia. The earthfill dam rises more than 244 m (800 ft) above its foundation and extends 793 m (2600 ft) across the Columbia River valley. It is one of the tallest dams in North America. It creates a reservoir, the Kinbasket Lake, that is up to 217 km (135 mi) long with a storage capacity of 24.7 km<sup>3</sup> (20 Maf). The project is operated within 14.8 km<sup>3</sup> (12 Maf) of live storage, of which 8.6 km<sup>3</sup> (7 Maf) are committed under the Treaty.

Although not required by the Treaty, BC Hydro added a powerhouse to the project. The underground powerhouse has space for six generating units. Four generators have been installed with a total capacity of 1805 MW.

The project is shown on page 20, and project data are provided in Appendix D, Table 3.

### Libby Project in the United States

Libby Dam is located on the Kootenai River, 27.4 km (17 mi) northeast of the town of Libby, Montana. Construction began in the spring of 1966, and storage has been fully operational since 17 April 1973. Commercial generation of power began on 24 August 1975, which coincided with the formal dedication of the project. The concrete gravity dam is 931 m (3055 ft) long, rises 113 m (370 ft) above the riverbed, and creates Lake Koocanusa, which is up to 145 km (90 mi) long and extends 67.6 km (42 mi) into Canada. Lake Koocanusa has a gross storage of 7.2 km<sup>3</sup> (5.9 Maf), of which 6.1 km<sup>3</sup> (5.0 Maf) is usable for flood control and power purposes. When completed in 1976, the Libby powerhouse had four units with a total installed capacity of 420 MW.

Construction of four additional generating units was initiated during fiscal year 1978, but Congressional restrictions imposed in the 1982 *Appropriations Act* provided for completion of only one of these units. That unit became available for service late in 1987. The total installed capacity for the five units is 600 MW. Recent U.S. legislation (*Public Law 104-303*, 12 Oct. 1996) authorizes the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to complete generating units six through eight. No action was taken in this regard during this reporting period.

The Libby project is shown on page 2, and project data are provided in Appendix D, Table 4.

### Libby Project in Canada

Canada has fulfilled its obligation to prepare the land required for the 68 km (42 mi) portion of Lake Koocanusa in Canada. British Columbia is responsible for reservoir debris clean-up on the Canadian side of the border.

## **Hydrometeorological Network**

One of the responsibilities assigned to the Entities by the Treaty is the establishment and operation, in consultation with the Permanent Engineering Board, of a hydrometeorological system to obtain data for the detailed programming of flood control and power operation. This system includes snow courses, meteorological stations, and streamflow gauges. The Columbia River Treaty Hydrometeorological Committee (CRTHMC), formed by the Entities in 1968, makes recommendations on further development of the Treaty Hydrometeorological System. An Annual Report is submitted to the CRT Operating Committee, which will include water supply forecast verification starting in 2009.

The CRTHMC continued to work with agencies to maintain climate and hydrometric data monitoring stations. Working with other water managers, CRTHMC is working with the Natural Resources Conservation Service to rescind a proposal to close nine snow stations in Washington and Oregon. A work plan to recommend additional hydrometeorological and snow monitoring stations in the Canadian Columbia is being prepared and will be reviewed by CRTOC.

In 2007, the CRTOC requested the Kootenay Lake Board of Control to provide more clarity on how the declaration of the spring rise on Kootenay Lake is determined and whether it could be a fixed date, as the declaration impacts the operation of Duncan and Libby upstream. The Board decided in January 2009 that the declaration of the spring freshet would not be on a fixed date, and would continue to be a Board judgment call, supported by hydrometeorological information and advice from the licence holder FortisBC. Subsequently, the CRTHMC prepared forecasting procedure which could be used to forecast the onset of spring freshet in the Kootenay Lake and submitted the procedure to the Kootenay Lake Board of Control for consideration. The Board appreciated the work done on the procedure, but will continue to use its educated judgement to make the declaration. The CRTHMC, through CRTOC, continue to work with the Board to improve the decision-support tools and to address constraints on Duncan and Libby operations.

The 2010 Modified Flows Update project has started and is cost-shared (\$140K) by the PNCA Parties, and Corps of Engineers through in-kind services. This update, which is done every 10 years, incorporates the latest estimates of consumptive uses from the river into the system operation models.

The Corps' Regional Water Control Data System is on track for deployment in 2010. It will use agency standard hardware and software. This is a new data collection and management framework used in watershed modeling to support operational decisions.

## **Power Operating Plans and Calculation of Downstream Power Benefits**

The Treaty and related documents require the Entities to develop and agree on an Assured Operating Plan (AOP) annually for the sixth succeeding year from the current year. This AOP, prepared five years in advance, represents the basic commitment of the Canadian Entity to operate the Treaty storage in Canada (Duncan, Arrow, and Mica) and provides the Entities with a basis for system planning. The calculation of downstream power benefits accrued to each country under the Treaty is also prepared five years in advance based on the Treaty operation criteria in the AOP. At the beginning of each operating year, a detailed operating plan (DOP) which includes the three Treaty projects in Canada, is prepared in consideration of projected resources and demands to obtain results that may be more advantageous to both countries than those obtained by operating in accordance with the AOP. To supplement the DOP, the Entities may enter into agreements throughout the year regarding the operations of Treaty storage that provide mutual benefits to both Entities. The operating plan for the Libby project in the United States has been prepared separately since 2000 and has not been included in the DOP thereafter. Details on Libby operations are discussed further below.

During the reporting year, the actual operations of the Treaty storage in Canada were regulated under the rule curves set out in the Entities' *Detailed Operating Plan for Columbia River Treaty Storage, 1 August 2008 through 31 July 2009*, dated June 2008, and the *Detailed Operating Plan for Columbia River Treaty Storage, 1 August 2009 through 31 July 2010*, dated July 2009, as well as in accordance with additional agreements between the Entities signed during the year. These documents were based on the operating criteria and hydro-regulation studies contained in the corresponding AOPs, together with any changes agreed to by the Entities.

The Libby operating criteria and expected operation of the Libby project are no longer included in the annual DOP beginning 2000-2001. Information on Libby operations is provided separately in the Libby Operating Plan prepared by the U.S. Entity. Operations at Libby take non-power considerations into account as required in the BiOps of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries Service. Compared to operations prior to 2000–2001, the BiOps requires increase in the release rate from Libby Dam in spring and summer flows and decrease in the fall and winter flow release rate. In January 2003, USACE adopted VarQ in determining operations at Libby on an interim basis. VarQ is the conditional use of reserved flood control storage to provide augmentation flows for fisheries during the spring period, and is used only when dry-to-moderate hydrologic runoff conditions are forecasted. In June 2008, USACE issued a Record of Decision for Libby Dam Flood Control and Fish Operations and incorporated VarQ Flood Control Procedures into the Libby Dam Water Control Manual. USACE will continue to coordinate with Canada on the operation of Libby Dam pursuant to the provisions of the Columbia River Treaty.

The Libby Coordination Agreement (LCA), signed on 16 February 2000, addressed some of the issues concerning salmon and white sturgeon fisheries operations at the Libby Project, and allowed the Entities to coordinate reservoir releases and agree to AOPs and DDPBs without having to fully resolve outstanding issues of disagreement. The LCA could be terminated by either Entity on 30 days' notice. Details of the LCA are presented later in this report under "Operations under the Treaty." The Entities have successfully implemented the LCA for the past eight years.

A lengthy dispute between the Entities during the early 1990s regarding the calculation of downstream power benefits was resolved by signing the *Entity Agreement on Resolving the Dispute on Critical Period Determination, the Capacity Entitlement for the 1998–1999, 1999–2000, and 2000–2001 AOP/DDPBs, and Operating Procedures for the 2001–2002 and Future AOPs*. If circumstances so require in the future, the Board will re-examine the matter by using its earlier recommendations as guidelines for the appropriate Treaty interpretation, and for the application of the critical streamflow period definition and the established operating procedures. A more detailed discussion of this issue is contained in the 1996 and 1997 annual reports of the Board.

The arrangements for returning the Canadian entitlement to British Columbia across existing transmission lines are based on the *Columbia River Treaty Entity Agreement on Aspects of the Delivery of the Canadian Entitlement for April 1, 1998 through September 15, 2024*, signed 29 March 1999. This agreement provides arrangements for the delivery of the Canadian entitlement, including the point of delivery, method of accounting for transmission losses, and guidelines for scheduling.

In addition to the delivery agreement referred to above, the terms and conditions for the disposal of portions of the Canadian entitlement within the United States are based on the *Agreement on Disposals of the Canadian Entitlement within the United States for April 1, 1998 through September 15, 2024 between Bonneville Power Administration, Acting on Behalf of the U.S. Entity, and the Province of British Columbia*, signed 29 March 1999. Both the delivery agreement and the disposal agreement became effective on 31 March 1999 through an exchange of diplomatic notes between Canada and the United States.

## **Transmission Developments**

During the reporting period the Canadian Entitlement was delivered as scheduled 100 percent of the time. The last curtailment of the Canadian Entitlement was in May, 2008.

Several transmission and generation projects have been proposed in the northeast. Of those, the 214 mile privately-owned 230-kV Alberta-Montana Ltd [“MATL”] line between Lethbridge, Alberta and Great Falls, Montana received approval. Construction is planned to start in December, 2009 with commercial operation expected by the end of 2010.

In May of 2009, the corporation Sea Breeze Pacific Juan de Fuca Cable, LP received the successful completion of the British Columbia Transmission Company’s Combined Interconnection Impact and Facility Study. A proposed undersea 550 MW high voltage direct current line between Vancouver Island B.C. and Washington’s Olympic peninsula, the line has completed most, if not all, of the necessary permitting and environmental processes prior to construction.

Work continues on the implementation of the North American Electric Reliability Corporation’s mandatory reliability standards, which are enforceable in the U.S. and most Canadian provinces. Reliability oversight in British Columbia and Alberta is coordinated with the North American Electric Reliability Corporation and the Western Electricity Coordinating Council.

Legislation was proposed in the U.S. in 2008 to amend the *Federal Power Act* to give the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission the authority to address known cybersecurity threats to the reliability of the bulk power system, and to provide emergency authority to address future cybersecurity threats. The legislation is currently being debated. Canadian governments have been in discussion with the U.S. regarding cybersecurity threats to reliability.

The Board will continue to keep governments informed of transmission developments that may impact Treaty implementation.

## **Flood Control Operating Plan**

The Treaty provides that Canadian storage reservoirs will be operated by the Canadian Entity in accordance with operating plans designed to minimize flood damage in the United States and Canada. The Columbia River Treaty Flood Control Operating Plan, dated October 1972, was received from the Entities and reviewed by the Board in the 1973 reporting year, and was in effect until October 1999. The revised plan, dated October 1999 and updated in May 2003, defines the flood control operations of the Duncan, Arrow, Mica, and Libby reservoirs during the period covered in this report.

## **Flow Records**

Article XV(2)(a) of the Treaty specifies that the Permanent Engineering Board shall assemble records of flows of the Columbia and Kootenai rivers at the Canada-U.S. boundary. Flows for this reporting year are tabulated in Appendix C for the Kootenai River at Porthill, Idaho, and for the Columbia River at Birchbank, British Columbia.

## **Non-Treaty Storage**

Since 1984, agreements have also been reached between BC Hydro and the BPA concerning the use of non-Treaty storage. These agreements do not interfere with operations under the Treaty. They do extend the concepts of the Treaty and benefit both BC Hydro and the BPA. As per contract terms, release rights under the Non-Treaty Storage Agreement (NTSA) terminated effective 30 June 2004. The extended provision of the agreement requires that active non-Treaty storage space in Mica be refilled within seven years (the deadline is 30 June 2011). At the end of September 2009, the BC Hydro account remained at 88 percent full, and the US parties' accounts stood at 88 percent full.

## **Fisheries Operations**

Many U.S. reservoirs are presently operated in accordance with BiOps issued by the USFWS and the NMFS under the Endangered Species Act. Treaty reservoirs in Canada are operated in accordance with the requirements of Fisheries and Oceans Canada. These efforts continue to evolve. In this regard, the Board notes that the AOP and DDPB are to be based on optimal operations for power and flood control in accordance with the requirements of the Treaty. The Board continues to maintain its long-standing position that the Treaty permits the Entities to develop DOPs to address fisheries' needs, to the extent that these actions do not conflict with Treaty objectives.

The 2008 BiOp concluded that the continued operation of the FCRPS is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of endangered salmon and steelhead in the Columbia River basin. Numerous parties immediately challenged the BiOp upon release. Judge James Redden of the U.S. District Court of Oregon held hearings on the legal adequacy of the BiOp in March 2009. Also, because the 2008 BiOp was completed under the previous administration, the Obama Administration agreed to review the BiOp. In a September 2009 report to the court, the Administration endorsed the BiOp and added a new Adaptive Management Implementation Plan with enhanced measures and additional contingency plans. By mid-December 2009 Judge Redden had not made a decision on the adequacy of the 2008 BiOp and the Adaptive Management Implementation Plan.



Mica Dam and Lake Kinbasket – Columbia River, British Columbia  
The spillway is on the right of the earthfill dam, and the underground powerhouse on the left.

## OPERATIONS UNDER THE TREATY

### General

The Columbia River Treaty Operating Committee was established by the Entities to develop operating plans for the Treaty storage, and to direct the operation of this storage in accordance with the terms of the Treaty and subsequent Entity agreements. These plans follow the operating year from August to July of the following year. Although the Permanent Engineering Board reporting period is 1 October 2008 to 30 September 2009, Treaty operations there under are based on the Treaty operating year of 1 August 2008 to 31 July 2009. Additional information for 1 August 2009 to 30 September 2009 is based on the Treaty operating year 1 August 2009 to 31 July 2010.

Treaty storage in Canada was operated by the Canadian Entity in accordance with the documents listed below. Treaty storage in the United States at the Libby project was operated by the U.S. Entity according to the 2003 FCOP, the 2000 LCA, U.S. requirements for power, and the guidelines set forth in the 2000 BiOp by the USFWS, the 2004 BiOp by the NMFS, and strict application of the eight-step VarQ operating procedures.

- *Columbia River Treaty Entity Agreement on Principles for Preparation of the Assured Operating Plan and Determination of Downstream Power Benefits*, dated July 1988

This agreement states the principles for changes to the preparation of the AOP and DDPB. These changes involve revisions to the information to be used in studies, such as the definition of the power loads and generating resources in the Pacific Northwest area, stream flows to be used, estimates of irrigation withdrawals and return flows, and other related information.

- *Columbia River Treaty Entity Agreement on Changes to Procedures for the Preparation of the Assured Operating Plan and Determination of Downstream Power Benefit Studies*, dated August 1988

This agreement states the specific procedures to be used in implementing the previous agreement on Principles for Preparation of the Assured Operating Plan and Determination of Downstream Power Benefits.

- *Agreement executed by the United States of America Department of Energy, acting by and through the Bonneville Power Administration, and the British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority relating to: (a) Use of Columbia River Non-Treaty Storage, (b) Mica and Arrow Refill Enhancement, and (c) Initial Filling of non-Treaty Reservoirs*, signed 9 July 1990

This agreement provides information relating to the initial filling of Revelstoke Reservoir, the coordinated use of some of the Columbia River non-Treaty storage, and actions taken to enhance the refill of the reservoirs impounded by the Mica and Arrow dams.

- *Columbia River Treaty Entity Agreement on Aspects of the Delivery of the Canadian Entitlement for 1 April 1998 through 15 September 2024*, signed 29 March 1999

This agreement provides arrangements for the delivery of the Canadian entitlement, including the point of delivery, method of accounting for transmission losses, and guidelines for scheduling. The Agreement became effective on 31 March 1999 through an exchange of diplomatic notes between the United States and Canada. Execution of this agreement supersedes and terminates the Columbia River Treaty Entity Agreement on Aspects of the Delivery of the Canadian Entitlement for 1 April 1998 through 15 September 2024 between the Canadian Entity and the United States Entity, dated 20 November 1996, and the Entity Agreement of the same name, dated 26 March 1998, which never reached its effective date.

- *Agreement on Disposals of the Canadian Entitlement Within the United States for 1 April 1998 through 15 September 2024 between the Bonneville Power Administration, Acting on Behalf of the U.S. Entity, and the Province of British Columbia*, signed 29 March 1999

This agreement describes the arrangements by which the Province of British Columbia may dispose of the Canadian entitlement in the United States.

- *Columbia River Treaty Assured Operating Plan and Determination of Downstream Power Benefits for Operating Year 2008–2009*, dated January 2004

This document provides information on the operating plan for Columbia River Treaty storage and the resulting downstream power benefits for the period 1 August 2008 through 31 July 2009.

- *Columbia River Treaty Entity Agreement Coordinating the Operation of the Libby Project with the Operation of Hydroelectric Plans on the Kootenay River and Elsewhere in Canada*, signed 16 February 2000

The LCA addresses issues concerning the operation of the Libby project and allows the Entities to coordinate reservoir operations and agree to AOPs and DDPBs without having to alter their respective positions on the validity of the Libby fisheries operations under the Treaty.

- *Columbia River Treaty Flood Control Operating Plan*, updated May 2003

This plan prescribes the criteria and procedures by which the Canadian Entity will operate the Mica, Duncan, and Arrow reservoirs to achieve desired flood control objectives in the United States and Canada. Criteria for the Libby Reservoir were included in the plan to meet the Treaty requirement to coordinate its operation for flood control protection in Canada. The plan was originally prepared in October 1972. The 1999 plan provides current information, incorporates new storage reservation diagrams, and clarifies procedures. The plan was updated in May 2003.

- *U.S. Entity Approval Relating to Amendatory Agreement No. 1 to the 1997 Pacific Northwest Coordination Agreement*, signed 13 June 2003

This agreement amends the 1997 Pacific Northwest Coordination Agreement to include definitions; adds text related to previously received interchange energy; and replaces text related to interchange pricing, accounting, and review of charges.

- *Columbia River Treaty Principles and Procedures for Preparation and Use of Hydroelectric Operating Plans for Operation of Canadian Treaty Storage*, dated 16 December 2003

This document serves as a guide for the preparation and use of hydroelectric operating plans, such as the AOP and DOP, for operation of the Columbia River Treaty storage.

- *Columbia River Treaty Assured Operating Plan and Determination of Downstream Power Benefits for Operating Year 2009–2010*, dated November 2004

This document provides information on the operating plan for Columbia River Treaty storage and the resulting downstream power benefits for the period 1 August 2009 through 31 July 2010.

- *Detailed Operating Plan for Columbia River Storage for 1 August 2008 through 31 July 2009*, dated June 2008

This document provides the general guidelines, operating criteria, and reservoir rule curves for the operation of the three Treaty reservoirs (Mica, Arrow, and Duncan) in Canada for the operating year from 1 August 2008 through 31 July 2009.

- *Columbia River Treaty Entity Agreement on the 2009 Summer Storage Agreement (Not Treaty) for 6 June 2009 through 4 September 2009*, signed 29 June 2009.

This agreement is for the purpose of reducing inflow to Grand Coulee during the peak freshet period, providing late-summer flow support for U.S. fisheries, enhancing Arrow Lakes summer reservoir levels, and providing energy benefits for both countries.

- *Columbia River Treaty Operating Committee Agreement on Provisional Storage for the Period 1 September 2008 through 3 April 2009*, signed 9 September 2008.

This agreement is for the purpose of obtaining additional mutual benefits, both for power and non-power, by shaping the discharge from the Arrow reservoir.

- *Columbia River Treaty Operating Committee Agreement on Operation of Treaty Storage for Non-power Uses from 15 December 2008 through 31 July 2009*, signed 20 November 2008

This agreement is similar to previous agreements implemented to utilize Treaty storage for non-power uses. These uses include: (1) providing flows for Canadian trout spawning for the April through June period; (2) enhancing the capability in the U.S. of providing spring and summer flow augmentation for salmon and steelhead by storing 1 Maf of water in Arrow by late April; (3) enhancing Arrow Lakes levels by ensuring progressive refill; and, (4) improving the U.S. capability to meet flow objectives for salmon at Vernita Bar below Priest Rapids Dam.

- *Columbia River Treaty Operating Committee Agreement on Changes to Attachment B to the Columbia River Treaty Entity Agreement on Aspects of the Delivery of the Canadian Entitlement for 1 April 1998 through 15 September 2024 between the Canadian Entity and the United States Entity, dated 29 March 1999, signed 19 December 2007*

This agreement amends the scheduling guidelines for delivery of the Canadian Entitlement contained in Attachment B in the Aspects of Delivery Agreement.

- *Detailed Operating Plan for Columbia River Storage for 1 August 2009 through 31 July 2010, dated July 2009*

This document provides the general guidelines, operating criteria, and reservoir rule curves for the operation of the three Treaty reservoirs (Mica, Arrow, and Duncan) in Canada for the operating year from 1 August 2009 through 31 July 2010.

- *Columbia River Treaty Operating Committee Agreement on the Operation of Canadian Treaty and Libby Storage Reservoirs for the period 2 August 2008 through 31 December 2008, signed on 12 August 2008.*

This agreement is similar to other agreements implementing the Libby Coordination Agreement. It allows the Canadian Entity to provisionally draft Arrow reservoir and exchange power with the U.S. Entity, and requires delivery to the U.S. Entity one (1) aMW, shaped flat, over the entire Operating Year.

- *Columbia River Treaty Operating Committee Agreement for Flow Shaping for the period 10 January 2009 through 3 April 2009, signed 12 January 2009.*

This agreement allows additional water storage in Canadian and U.S. reservoirs in January for release in the February-March period. It supports a reduction of the peak flows into Grand Coulee and provides additional Canadian whitefish benefits. This operation is for water shaping only. There are no energy transactions.

- *Columbia River Treaty Operating Committee Agreement on Provisional Storage for the Period 26 September 2009 through 3 April 2010, signed 28 September 2009.*

As above, this agreement is for the purposes of obtaining additional mutual benefits by shaping the discharge from the Arrow reservoir.

## System Storage

The 2008–2009 operating year began on 1 August 2008 with the Canadian Treaty storage at 17.6 km<sup>3</sup> (14.2 Maf) or 91.8 percent full. Canadian Treaty storage drafted to a minimum of 4.8 km<sup>3</sup> (3.8 Maf) on 20 April 2009 and refilled to 15.7 km<sup>3</sup> (12.7 Maf) or 82.0 percent full on 31 July 2009. Throughout the operating year, composite Canadian Treaty storage was very close to the TSR composite storage except for small deviations caused by inadvertent draft or storage. Inadvertent draft or storage occurs routinely due to updated forecasts or differences between forecast and actual inflows. Canadian storage began the operating year below the DOP levels by 105 cubic hectometres (hm<sup>3</sup>) or 85 kaf determined in the TSR study, primarily due to inadvertent draft. During the September through June timeframe there were larger differences between TSR and Canadian storage as a result of supplemental operating agreements that were implemented and resulted in mutual benefits for both the U.S. and Canada.

The 1 January 2009 water supply forecast for the Columbia River above The Dalles for January through July was 114.6 km<sup>3</sup> (92.9 Maf), or 86.6 percent of the 1971–2000 average. The water supply forecasts remained fairly steady at this level through the forecast period (January through early July). The actual January through July runoff at The Dalles was 111.3 km<sup>3</sup> (90.2 Maf), or 84.1 percent of average.

Operations of the three Canadian reservoirs — Mica, Arrow, and Duncan — and the Libby Reservoir in the United States, are illustrated on pages 27 to 30 for the 13-month period from 31 August 2008 to 30 September 2009. The hydrographs show actual reservoir levels (Storage Curve) and key rule curves that govern the operations of the Treaty storage. The Flood Control Rule Curve specifies maximum month-end reservoir levels which will permit evacuation of the reservoir to control precipitation and snowmelt events. The Critical Rule Curve shows minimum month-end reservoir levels, which should be maintained to enable the anticipated power demands to be met under the most adverse water supply conditions. The Variable Refill Curve shows the reservoir elevations necessary to ensure refilling of the reservoir by the end of July with a reasonable degree of confidence.

### Mica Reservoir

Mica (Kinbasket) reservoir reached a maximum elevation of 751.9 m (2,466.9 ft) on 15 September 2008, 2.47 m (8.1 ft) below full pool. The reservoir was drawn down during the fall and winter to meet electrical demands and to prepare for the spring runoff. It reached a minimum this year at 730.4 m (2396.2 ft) on May 9, 2009, a couple of weeks later than normal due to the delayed freshet. By comparison, in 2008, the minimum level was 718.14 m (2356.1 ft) on May 5. As is normal, reservoir releases were reduced in late May through early July in response to lower electrical demands and system constraints, and to achieve a high probability of reservoir refill. The reservoir reached a maximum elevation of 752.2 m (2467.7 ft), 2.2 m (7.3 ft) below full pool on 25 September 2009.

### Arrow Reservoir

Arrow reservoir reached a maximum elevation of 440.0 m (1,443.5 ft) on 5 July 2008, 0.15 m (0.5 ft) below full pool. Arrow reservoir drafted across fall and winter as is normal to meet Treaty firm loads. It reached a minimum level this year at 429.3 m (1408.6 ft) on March 30. By comparison, the Arrow Lakes Reservoir reached a minimum level of 430.76 m (1413.26 ft) on May 12, 2008. Influenced by relatively good starting conditions combined with the July 1990 Non-Treaty Storage Agreement (NTSA) and Treaty Flex operations, the reservoir refilled to its Treaty flood control level (maximum possible level) in May. The reservoir continued to refill across June through early July to reach a maximum elevation of 437.8 m (1435.6 ft) on June 30, 2.5 m (8.4 ft) below full.

### Duncan Reservoir

Duncan reservoir refilled to 576.53 m (1,891.5 ft), 0.15 m (0.5 ft) below full pool on 11 August 2008. From September 2008 through April 2009, Duncan discharge was used to supplement inflow into Kootenay Lake and to provide spawning and incubation flows for fish. B.C. Hydro sought and received variance for February flood control to 552.5 m (1,812.5 ft). This was reached on 28 February 2009, and 551.0 m (1,807.7 ft) was reached on 13 March 2009. The reservoir drafted to a minimum elevation of 547.09 m (1,794.9 ft) on 23 April 2009. Reservoir discharge was reduced to a minimum of 3.0 m<sup>3</sup>/s (0.1 kcfs) on 25 May 2009 to initiate reservoir refill. The reservoir refilled to a maximum elevation of 575.86 m (1,889.3 ft), 0.82 m (2.7 ft) below full pool on 21 August 2009.


### Libby Reservoir

Libby (Kookanusa) Reservoir began August 2008 at elevation 744.87 m (2,443.8 ft) and drafted through the fall and winter period. By 31 December, the reservoir was at elevation 734.84 m (2,410.9 ft) and operated during the winter to the VARQ storage reservation diagram. The reservoir drafted to its lowest elevation of 732.37 m (2,402.8 ft) on 9 April. During the refill period, Libby Dam operated in strict accordance to the VARQ operating procedures and provided 0.98 km<sup>3</sup> (0.8 Maf) of storage for sturgeon releases. The reservoir filled to its maximum elevation of 744.7 m (2,443.3 ft) on 25 August 2009, 4.8 m (15.7 ft) from full pool. The project drafted to elevation 744.63 m (2,443.0 ft) by 31 August.


## **Flood Control Operations**

Columbia River Basin projects were operated according to the May 2003 Flood Control Operating Plans. The 2009 water supply forecasts averaged below normal across the Columbia River Basin, Upper Columbia Basin, and the Snake River Basin. The Columbia River reservoir system, including the Columbia River Treaty projects, was required to draft for flood control in preparation for the spring freshet. The regulated peak flow at The Dalles, Oregon, was 9 894 m<sup>3</sup>/s (349.4 kcfs) on 29 May 2009, and the unregulated flow was estimated at 16 210 m<sup>3</sup>/s (572.5 kcfs) on 8 June 2009. The peak stage observed at Vancouver, Washington, was 3.33 m (10.9 ft.) on 9 June 2009, and the estimated unregulated stage was 6.30 m (20.7 ft.) on 8 June 2009.


# DUNCAN RESERVOIR




# MICA RESERVOIR




# LIBBY RESERVOIR



# ARROW RESERVOIR




KOOTNAI RIVER AT LIBBY DAM




Hydrograph: Observed and pre-project flows for the year ending September 30, 2009

### DUNCAN RIVER AT DUNCAN DAM




# COLUMBIA RIVER AT MICA DAM



Hydrograph: Observed and pre-project flows for the year ending September 30, 2009




### COLUMBIA RIVER AT HUGH KEENLEYSIDE DAM



Hydrograph: Observed and pre-project flows for the year ending September 30, 2009

— Pre-Project Flows      — Observed Flows

# COLUMBIA RIVER AT BIRCHBANK



Hydrograph: Observed and pre-project flows for the year ending September 30, 2009



## TREATY BENEFITS

### Flood Control Benefits

The Columbia River basin reservoir system, including the Columbia River Treaty projects, was drafted in the winter in preparation for the spring freshet. No major flooding occurred during the 2008-2009 operating year. Unregulated Columbia River runoff volume as measured at The Dalles was 85% of the 1971-2000 average (August-July). The peak regulated and unregulated flows, and river stages are shown in the following tables:

#### Columbia River Steam flow at The Dalles, Oregon

Date	Peak Regulated Flow m <sup>3</sup> /s (cfs)	Date	Peak Unregulated Flow m <sup>3</sup> /s (cfs)
29 May 2009	9,894 (349,400)	8 June 2009	16,210 (572,500)

#### Columbia River Stage at Vancouver, Washington Flood Stage is 4.9 meters (16.0 feet)

Date	Peak Regulated Stage meters (feet)	Date	Peak Unregulated Stage meters (feet)
9 June 2009	3.33 (10.9)	8 June 2009	6.3 (20.7)

Duncan and Libby projects limited the peak elevation of Kootenay Lake to elevation 532.74 meters (m) (1747.8 feet) on 19 June 2009. It is estimated that the Duncan and Libby projects reduced the peak stage on Kootenay Lake by about 2.04 m (6.7 feet). Duncan, Arrow, Mica and Libby projects limited the peak flow of the Columbia River at Trail, just upstream of Birchbank, British Columbia, to 2,727 m<sup>3</sup>/s or 96,300 cfs on 2 July 2009. This reflects a reduction in the peak river stage of approximately 5.52 m (18.1) feet. It should be noted that flood stage at Kootenay Lake is 534.92 m (1755.0) feet and the bankfull flow at Birchbank is 6,372 m<sup>3</sup>/s (225,000 cfs).

## Power Benefits

From 1 August 2008 through 31 July 2009, the U.S. Entity delivery of the Canadian Entitlement to downstream power benefits was 464.9 megawatts of average energy at rates up to 1,245 megawatts. From 1 August 2009 to 30 September 2009, the U.S. Entity delivery of the Canadian Entitlement to downstream power benefits was 567.1 megawatts of average energy at rates up to 1,352 megawatts. There were no curtailments of Canadian Entitlement deliveries during the 2008-2009 operating year.


Actual U.S. power benefits from the operation of CRT storage are unknown and can only be roughly estimated. Treaty storage has such a large impact on the U.S. system operation that its absence would significantly affect operating procedures, non-power requirements, loads and resources, and market conditions, thus making any benefit analysis highly speculative. A rough estimate of the increase in average annual U.S. power generation due to the operation of Canadian storage, as measured by the PNCA Actual Energy Regulation (AER), was 442 aMW. This value represents the last-added energy increase based on the current operation of the U.S. hydropower system (including significant constraints for fishery requirements) but does not represent all of the actual US benefits from Canadian Treaty regulation (including time-shaped power, non-power, and market-moderation and risk-reduction benefits). In contrast, the Canadian Entitlement calculation is based on the first-added energy increase for the 1961 hydropower system operated for optimum power and flood control (as required by Treaty provisions). The Entitlement is delivered to Canada in equal monthly increments.

## Other Benefits

Reservoirs were regulated for seasonal non-power purposes by agreement between the Entities in the 2009 operating year. A Libby/Arrow Swap agreement was done in July 2008 to improve late summer recreation levels at Lake Koocanusa. A Fall Storage Agreement was developed in September 2008 to store water into Arrow for winter releases to enhance power production and shape releases to benefit resident fish. The Nonpower Uses Agreement was signed in November 2008 to protect mountain whitefish spawning in winter and enhance rainbow trout spawning protection below Arrow Dam in spring. The Nonpower Uses Agreement also enables the US to store 1 MAF of water in Mica to augment flows in the United States to aid salmon migration. A January Flow Shaping Agreement allowed temporarily storage of high winter flows to provide additional Canadian whitefish protection. A variance to Duncan flood control approved by the Corps in February 2009. This increased the ability to maintain a minimum river flow  $73 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$  (2.6 kcfs) downstream for incubation of fish eggs during the March-April period. A Summer Storage Agreement (not Treaty) was done in June 2009 providing late summer flow support for U.S. fisheries and enhancing Arrow Lake summer reservoir levels.



Columbia River, British Columbia



Revelstoke Dam, Columbia River, B.C.



Cora Linn Dam (FortisBC) at the outflow of Kootenay Lake, British Columbia

---

## CONCLUSIONS

1. The Duncan, Arrow, and Mica projects were operated in compliance with the Treaty during the period covered by this report. Operations reflected the DOPs developed by the Entities, the FCOP for Treaty reservoirs, and other agreements between the Entities. Treaty storage in the United States at the Libby project was operated by the U.S. Entity according to the 2003 FCOP, the 2000 LCA, U.S. requirements for power, and the guidelines set forth in the 2000 BiOp by the USFWS, the 2004 BiOp by the NMFS, and strict application of the eight-step VarQ operating procedures.
2. The Canadian entitlement to the downstream power benefits for the reporting period was determined, according to the procedures set out in the Treaty and Protocol. From 1 August 2008 through 31 July 2009, the U.S. Entity delivery of the Canadian Entitlement to downstream power benefits was 464.9 megawatts of average energy at rates up to 1,245 megawatts. From 1 August 2009 to 30 September 2009, the U.S. Entity delivery of the Canadian Entitlement to downstream power benefits was 567.1 megawatts of average energy at rates up to 1,352 megawatts. There were no curtailments of Canadian Entitlement deliveries during the 2008-2009 operating year.
3. The 2008–2009 operating year began on 1 August 2008 with the Canadian Treaty storage at 17.6 km<sup>3</sup> (14.2 Maf) or 91.8 percent full. Canadian Treaty storage drafted to a minimum of 4.8 km<sup>3</sup> (3.8 Maf) on 20 April 2009 and refilled to 15.7 km<sup>3</sup> (12.7 Maf) or 82.0 percent full on 31 July 2009. The 1 January 2009 water supply forecast for the Columbia River above The Dalles for January through July was 114.6 km<sup>3</sup> (92.9 Maf), or 86.6 percent of the 1971–2000 average. The water supply forecasts remained fairly steady at this level through the forecast period (January through early July). The actual January through July runoff at The Dalles was 111.3 km<sup>3</sup> (90.2 Maf), or 84.1 percent of average.
4. The 2008 BiOp concluded that the continued operation of the FCRPS is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of endangered salmon and steelhead in the Columbia River basin. Numerous parties immediately challenged the BiOp upon release. Judge James Redden of the U.S. District Court of Oregon held hearings on the legal adequacy of the BiOp in March 2009. Also, because the 2008 BiOp was completed under the previous administration, the Obama Administration agreed to review the BiOp. In a September 2009 report to the court, the Administration endorsed the BiOp and added a new Adaptive Management Implementation Plan with enhanced measures and additional contingency plans. By mid-December 2009 Judge Redden had not made a decision on the adequacy of the 2008 BiOp and the Adaptive Management Implementation Plan.
5. The Columbia River Treaty Hydrometeorological Committee (CRTHMC) continued to work with agencies to maintain climate and hydrometric data monitoring stations. Working with other water managers, CRTHMC is working with the Natural Resources Conservation Service to rescind a proposal to close nine snow stations in Washington and Oregon. A work plan to recommend additional hydrometeorological and snow monitoring stations in the Canadian Columbia is being prepared and will be reviewed by CRTOC
6. The Board concludes that the objectives of the Treaty have been met for the reporting period.

**APPENDIX A**

**COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY  
PERMANENT ENGINEERING BOARD**

## **COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY PERMANENT ENGINEERING BOARD**

### **United States**

#### Members

Mr. Steven Stockton, P.E., Chair  
Director  
Civil Works  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Washington, DC

Mr. Ed Sienkiewicz  
Consultant  
Newberg, Oregon

#### Alternates

Mr. Robert A. Pietrowsky  
Director  
Institute for Water Resources  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Alexandria, Virginia

Mr. George Bell  
Consultant  
Lake Oswego, Oregon

#### Secretaries

Mr. Jerry W. Webb, P.E., D.WRE  
Principal Hydrologic & Hydraulic Engineer  
Engineering & Construction CoP  
Directorate of Civil Works  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Washington, DC

### **Canada**

Mr. Tom Wallace, Chair  
Director General  
Electricity Resources Branch  
Natural Resources Canada  
Ottawa, Ontario

Mr. Tim Newton, P.Eng.  
Consultant  
Vancouver, British Columbia

Mr. Glen Davidson, P.Eng.  
Comptroller of Water Rights  
Water Stewardship Division  
B.C. Ministry of Environment  
Victoria, British Columbia

Mr. Ivan Harvie, P.Eng.  
Consultant  
Calgary, Alberta

Mr. Darcy Blais  
Economist  
Renewable and Electrical Energy Division  
Electricity Resources Branch  
Natural Resources Canada  
Ottawa, Ontario

## COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY PERMANENT ENGINEERING BOARD

### RECORD OF MEMBERSHIP

#### United States

##### Members

Mr. Wendell Johnson\* 1964–1970  
Mr. Morgan Dubrow 1964–1970  
Mr. John Neuberger 1970–1973  
Mr. Joseph Caldwell\* 1971–1973  
Mr. Homer Willis\* 1973–1979  
Mr. King Mallory 1973–1975  
Mr. Raymond Peck, Jr. 1976–1977  
Mr. Emerson Harper 1978–1988  
Mr. Lloyd Duscha\* 1979–1990  
Mr. Ronald Wilkerson 1988–2005  
Mr. Herbert Kennon\* 1990–1994  
Mr. John Elmore\* 1994–1996  
Mr. Steven Stockton\* 1996–  
Mr. Ed Sienkiewicz 2005–

##### Alternates

Mr. Fred Thrall 1964–1974  
Mr. Emerson Harper 1964–1978  
Mr. Alex Shwaiko 1974–1987  
Mr. Herbert Kennon 1987–1990  
Mr. Thomas Weaver 1979–1997  
Mr. John Elmore 1990–1994  
Mr. Paul Barber 1994–1995  
Mr. Daniel Burns 1995–1997  
Mr. George Bell 1997–  
Mr. Earl Eiker 2000–2004  
Mr. Robert Pietrowsky 2004–

##### Secretaries

Mr. John Roche 1965–1969  
Mr. Verle Farrow 1969–1972  
Mr. Walter Duncan 1972–1978  
Mr. Shapur Zanganeh 1978–1995  
Mr. Richard DiBuono 1995–2000  
Mr. Robert Bank 2000–2004  
Mr. Jerry Webb 2004–

\*Chair

#### Canada

Mr. Gordon McNabb\* 1964–1991  
Mr. Arthur Paget 1964–1973  
Mr. Valter Raudsepp 1973–1974  
Mr. Ben Marr 1974–1987  
Mr. Tom Johnson 1987–1988  
Mr. Douglas Horswill 1989–1991  
Mr. John Allan 1991–1999  
Mr. David Oulton\* 1991–1996  
Mr. Daniel Whelan\* 1996–2002  
Mr. Charles Kang 1999–2001  
Mr. Jack Ebbels 2001–2003  
Mr. Tim Newton 2003–  
Mr. Tom Wallace\* 2004–

Mr. Mac Clark 1964–1992  
Mr. Jim Rothwell 1964–1965  
Mr. Hugh Hunt 1966–1988  
Dr. Donald Kasianchuk 1988–1996  
Mr. Vic Niemela 1992–1994  
Mr. David Burpee 1994–2007  
Mr. Jack Farrell 1996–1997  
Mr. Prad Kharé 1997–1999  
Mr. James Mattison 1999–2009  
Mr. Ivan Harvie 2007–  
Mr. Glen Davidson 2009–

Mr. Mac Clark 1964–1992  
Mr. David Burpee 1992–2003  
Ms. Eve Jasmin 2003–2007  
Mr. Darcy Blais 2007–

**COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY  
PERMANENT ENGINEERING BOARD  
ENGINEERING COMMITTEE**

**CURRENT MEMBERSHIP**

**United States**

Members

Mr. Jerry W. Webb, P.E., D.WRE, Chair  
Principal Hydrologic & Hydraulic Engineer  
Engineering & Construction CoP  
Directorate of Civil Works  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Washington, DC

Mr. Kamau Sadiki  
Manager  
National Hydropower Program Business Line  
Operations Community of Practice  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Washington, DC

Mr. Michael Cowan, P.E.  
Technical Services Manager  
Corporate Services Office  
Western Area Power Administration  
Lakewood, Colorado

Mr. Patrick McGrane, P.E.  
Manager  
River and Reservoir Operations Group  
Pacific Northwest Regional Office  
Bureau of Reclamation  
Boise, Idaho

**Canada**

Mr. Ivan Harvie, Chair  
Consultant  
Calgary, Alberta

Mr. Darcy Blais  
Economist  
Renewable and Electrical Energy Division  
Electricity Resources Branch  
Natural Resources Canada  
Ottawa, Ontario

Mr. K.T. Shum  
Head, Licensing  
Water Stewardship Division  
B.C. Ministry of Environment  
Victoria, British Columbia

**COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY  
PERMANENT ENGINEERING BOARD  
ENGINEERING COMMITTEE**

**RECORD OF MEMBERSHIP**

**United States**

**Canada**

Members

Mr. Shapur Zanganeh\* 1990-1995  
Mr. Gary Fuqua 1990-1996  
Mr. Earl Eiker 1990-2000  
Mr. Steve Wright 1990-1996  
Mr. Larry Eilts 1991-1995  
Mr. Richard Mittelstadt 1991-1996  
Mr. Richard DiBuono\* 1995-2000  
Mr. James Barton 1996-2001  
Mr. Robert Johnson 1996-1998  
Mr. James Fodrea 1997-2009  
Mr. Michael Cowan 1998-  
Mr. Robert Bank\* 2000-2004  
Mr. Kamau Sadiki 2001-  
Mr. Jerry Webb\* 2003-  
Mr. Patrick McGrane 2009-

Mr. Neill Lyons\* 1990-1996  
Mr. Dave McCauley 1990-1992  
Mr. B. Stipdonk 1990-1991  
Mr. Roger McLaughlin\* 1991-2009  
Mr. Robin Round 1991-1993  
Mr. David Burpee\* 1992-2000  
Dr. Bala Balachandran 1993-2008  
Mr. Bruno Gobeil 1995-1997  
Mr. Larry Adamache 1996-2001  
Ms. Myriam Boudreault 1997-2001  
Ms. Donna Clarke 2001-2003  
Mr. Ivan Harvie\* 2002-  
Ms. Eve Jasmin 2003-2007  
Mr. Darcy Blais 2007-  
Mr. K.T. Shum 2008-

\*Chair

## **APPENDIX B**

### **COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY ENTITIES**

## COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY ENTITIES

### United States

#### Members

Mr. Steven J. Wright, Chair  
Administrator and Chief Executive Officer  
Bonneville Power Administration  
Department of Energy  
Portland, Oregon

BG William E. Rapp, Member  
Division Engineer  
U.S. Army Engineer Division  
Northwestern  
Portland, Oregon

#### Coordinators

Mr. Stephen R. Oliver, BPA Coordinator  
Vice President  
Generation Supply  
Bonneville Power Administration  
Department of Energy  
Portland, Oregon

Mr. David Ponganis, USACE Coordinator  
Acting Director  
Programs Directorate  
U.S. Army Engineer Division  
Northwestern  
Portland, Oregon

#### Secretaries

Dr. Anthony G. White, Secretary  
Public Utility Specialist  
Regional Coordination  
Bonneville Power Administration  
Department of Energy  
Portland, Oregon

### Canada

Mr. Robert Elton, Chair  
President and CEO  
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority  
Vancouver, British Columbia

Mr. Christopher K. O'Riley, Deputy Chair  
Executive Vice President  
Engineering, Aboriginal Relations and Generation  
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority  
Vancouver, British Columbia

Ms. Renata Kurschner, Coordinator  
Director  
Generation Resource Management  
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority  
Burnaby, British Columbia

Mr. Douglas A. Robinson, Secretary  
Specialist Engineer  
Generation Resource Management  
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority  
Burnaby, British Columbia

## COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY ENTITIES OPERATING COMMITTEE

### CURRENT MEMBERSHIP

#### United States

##### Members

Mr. Richard M. Pendergrass, Alternating Chair  
Manager  
Power and Operations Planning  
Bonneville Power Administration  
Department of Energy  
Portland, Oregon

Mr. John M. Hyde, Member  
Treaty Team Coordinator  
Regional Coordination  
Bonneville Power Administration  
Department of Energy  
Portland, Oregon

Mr. James D. Barton, Alternating Chair  
Chief  
Columbia Basin Water Management Division  
U.S. Army Engineer Division  
Northwestern  
Portland, Oregon

Mr. Steven Barton, Member  
Hydraulic Engineer  
U.S. Army Engineer Division  
Northwestern  
Portland, Oregon

#### Canada

Mr. Kelvin J. Ketchum, Chair  
Manager  
System Optimization  
Generation Resource Management  
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority  
Burnaby, British Columbia

Dr. Thomas K. Siu, Member  
Principal Engineer  
Generation Resource Management  
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority  
Burnaby, British Columbia

Ms. Gillian Kong, Member  
Senior Engineer  
Generation Resource Management  
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority  
Burnaby, British Columbia

Mr. Herbert Louie, Member  
Specialist Engineer  
Generation Resource Management  
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority  
Burnaby, British Columbia

## COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY ENTITIES HYDROMETEOROLOGICAL COMMITTEE

### CURRENT MEMBERSHIP

#### United States

##### Members

Mr. David Bright, Co-chair  
Supervisory Meteorologist  
Bonneville Power Administration  
Department of Energy  
Portland, Oregon

Mr. Peter F. Brooks, Co-chair  
Chief  
Hydrologic Engineering Branch  
U.S. Army Engineer Division  
Northwestern  
Portland, Oregon

#### Canada

Ms. Stephanie Smith, Chair  
Senior Hydrologist  
Generation Resource Management  
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority  
Burnaby, British Columbia

Mr. Frank Weber, Member  
Runoff Forecasting Team Lead  
Hydrology and Technical Services  
Generation Resource Management  
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority  
Burnaby, British Columbia

## **APPENDIX C**

### **RECORD OF FLOWS AT THE INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY**

**KOOTENAI RIVER AT PORTHILL, IDAHO**

Daily discharges (in thousands of cubic feet per second) for the year ending 30 September 2009

<b>Day</b>	<b>Oct</b>	<b>Nov</b>	<b>Dec</b>	<b>Jan</b>	<b>Feb</b>	<b>Mar</b>	<b>Apr</b>	<b>May</b>	<b>Jun</b>	<b>Jul</b>	<b>Aug</b>	<b>Sep</b>
1	6.66	5.32	9.89	5.89	5.10	5.26	6.79	10.20	35.20	16.50	8.26	7.71
2	5.87	5.33	14.80	5.70	5.06	5.34	6.23	10.90	32.50	15.70	8.21	6.80
3	5.72	5.43	20.00	5.20	5.03	5.81	6.31	12.90	30.40	14.70	8.16	6.75
4	5.67	5.65	16.40	5.00	5.00	6.01	6.35	13.90	29.40	13.20	8.20	6.75
5	5.67	5.45	17.20	5.03	5.05	5.89	6.33	15.00	28.60	12.90	8.15	6.72
6	5.71	5.42	23.20	5.03	5.04	5.70	6.49	16.00	27.90	12.60	8.18	6.80
7	5.74	5.39	23.80	5.13	5.07	5.53	6.70	17.40	27.00	12.10	8.25	6.91
8	5.80	5.64	24.00	6.27	5.05	5.47	7.39	18.90	25.00	11.90	8.18	6.90
9	5.65	5.77	23.80	7.64	5.01	5.47	8.07	19.90	24.20	11.40	8.15	6.88
10	5.60	5.88	23.60	7.22	4.94	5.42	9.01	19.30	22.40	11.00	8.10	6.80
11	5.58	5.86	21.30	6.55	4.92	5.27	10.20	20.40	26.10	10.60	8.04	6.80
12	5.56	6.05	21.20	6.00	4.96	5.17	10.30	22.60	33.70	10.50	8.12	6.78
13	5.61	6.88	21.10	5.80	4.98	5.26	11.00	22.80	34.30	9.82	8.25	6.78
14	5.69	10.30	21.10	5.77	5.01	5.26	12.20	22.00	35.30	9.81	8.52	6.77
15	5.65	13.60	24.50	5.70	4.99	5.39	11.80	20.80	35.30	9.82	8.35	6.81
16	5.62	14.10	25.60	5.60	4.96	5.53	10.60	20.30	35.40	9.66	8.30	6.80
17	5.65	13.00	25.70	5.51	4.98	5.46	10.50	20.80	35.40	9.29	8.19	6.80
18	5.65	17.10	26.40	5.40	4.97	5.35	10.00	23.90	33.50	9.12	8.12	6.78
19	5.64	18.90	25.30	5.31	4.99	5.47	10.60	31.10	30.00	8.87	8.03	6.78
20	5.59	22.50	24.10	5.21	5.01	5.48	11.50	35.80	27.40	8.87	8.01	6.82
21	5.59	23.10	23.80	5.17	4.98	5.53	13.10	33.60	26.20	8.82	7.99	6.79
22	5.67	19.60	23.90	5.12	4.97	6.21	17.50	31.00	26.50	8.69	7.96	6.78
23	5.57	15.20	23.80	5.11	5.04	6.74	21.00	30.50	26.40	8.71	7.88	6.79
24	5.62	11.40	23.70	5.17	5.12	6.89	20.60	31.60	24.70	8.66	7.86	6.78
25	5.57	10.80	23.20	5.15	5.29	6.88	17.70	32.80	23.40	8.59	7.86	6.78
26	5.54	10.00	16.40	5.00	5.65	6.80	15.60	34.00	22.20	8.52	7.89	6.79
27	5.39	6.64	15.40	4.98	5.44	6.62	14.10	34.60	22.40	8.55	7.90	6.73
28	5.32	6.10	13.90	5.13	5.42	6.55	13.40	34.90	20.30	8.67	7.88	6.69
29	5.37	6.04	11.10	5.20		6.80	12.30	34.80	20.10	8.59	7.82	6.69
30	5.36	6.11	9.96	5.20		6.60	11.00	35.80	18.50	8.44	7.85	6.77
31	5.32		7.16	5.18		6.52		36.40		8.35	7.89	
<b>Mean</b>	<b>5.63</b>	<b>9.95</b>	<b>20.17</b>	<b>5.53</b>	<b>5.07</b>	<b>5.86</b>	<b>11.16</b>	<b>24.67</b>	<b>27.99</b>	<b>10.42</b>	<b>8.08</b>	<b>6.82</b>

## COLUMBIA RIVER AT BIRCHBANK, BRITISH COLUMBIA

Daily discharges in thousands of cubic feet per second for the year ending 30 September 2009

Day	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep
1	46.80	40.65	55.61	77.64	59.86	49.26	33.97	42.06	94.61	95.78	69.93	49.02
2	44.62	40.63	55.96	77.45	59.95	48.84	33.83	41.56	95.28	96.34	67.92	49.04
3	42.47	41.13	55.93	78.25	61.03	48.29	33.53	41.81	94.04	92.66	67.82	49.15
4	41.29	41.80	61.12	78.89	60.37	46.69	33.38	41.96	92.66	91.64	67.78	49.14
5	41.36	41.79	64.24	79.05	59.81	46.42	33.30	42.12	91.73	91.78	67.78	49.52
6	41.48	41.79	64.91	79.23	59.98	46.35	33.29	43.67	91.69	91.77	67.87	50.14
7	41.47	41.81	63.88	79.26	61.46	45.12	33.30	43.87	89.32	92.45	66.64	50.20
8	41.42	41.82	66.92	78.04	62.28	43.55	33.31	43.62	84.62	92.17	59.00	50.23
9	41.20	41.82	72.05	74.91	62.00	40.74	33.40	44.62	77.24	91.02	55.05	50.34
10	41.23	42.26	75.68	72.73	61.66	38.01	33.39	45.26	74.28	90.83	54.50	50.58
11	41.22	42.91	83.30	72.71	62.45	38.02	33.53	45.71	74.20	87.24	53.57	50.37
12	41.31	43.53	81.99	72.76	64.26	38.30	33.59	46.69	76.81	88.03	65.37	50.53
13	41.45	44.38	81.46	72.81	64.02	38.92	33.74	47.86	79.05	87.91	67.55	50.59
14	41.52	45.67	83.49	72.82	63.88	40.55	35.24	48.18	79.92	88.52	56.89	50.70
15	40.97	45.94	83.71	72.87	63.36	41.51	38.03	48.99	82.64	88.62	52.36	50.78
16	40.53	46.49	85.73	72.86	62.86	41.52	38.48	49.15	84.49	86.09	48.85	50.68
17	40.57	47.00	86.90	70.84	62.68	42.39	38.40	49.97	85.38	78.74	48.77	50.82
18	40.48	47.43	87.01	68.75	62.69	43.29	38.55	51.95	86.98	78.31	48.78	50.97
19	40.57	47.29	89.91	68.73	62.45	43.21	38.25	55.74	86.62	73.19	48.86	53.61
20	40.53	47.31	81.45	68.77	62.27	43.46	38.57	58.60	86.45	73.91	48.81	56.58
21	40.49	47.51	79.74	71.02	60.05	43.52	38.87	58.97	85.21	73.36	48.89	56.39
22	40.51	47.61	81.14	68.93	57.32	43.50	40.13	60.20	82.35	73.30	48.73	55.94
23	40.60	47.46	81.89	68.87	57.22	45.99	41.17	65.19	81.07	69.49	48.76	56.14
24	40.62	47.41	81.04	70.95	57.38	46.83	41.10	70.99	79.55	69.49	48.70	56.14
25	40.57	46.47	83.62	72.65	58.99	44.65	41.25	74.40	77.74	70.14	48.73	56.09
26	40.50	44.40	84.58	73.24	62.21	44.69	41.36	77.77	75.92	73.98	48.31	57.03
27	40.51	44.49	81.63	73.76	61.17	44.17	42.50	79.45	76.53	75.12	47.43	57.86
28	40.59	43.85	84.41	73.76	54.95	43.80	43.05	81.70	78.94	75.07	48.93	57.87
29	40.64	48.68	85.36	73.61		43.64	42.07	84.51	84.02	74.52	48.90	57.96
30	40.58	53.72	78.43	72.69		40.97	41.97	89.34	90.03	73.15	49.03	57.91
31	40.50		77.95	65.69		35.77		93.01		71.25	49.03	
<b>Mean</b>	<b>41.24</b>	<b>44.83</b>	<b>76.81</b>	<b>73.37</b>	<b>61.02</b>	<b>43.29</b>	<b>37.15</b>	<b>57.06</b>	<b>83.98</b>	<b>82.45</b>	<b>55.47</b>	<b>52.74</b>

## APPENDIX D

### PROJECT INFORMATION

#### Power and Storage Projects

Northern Columbia Basin	Plate No. 1
-------------------------	-------------


#### Project Data

Duncan Project	Table No. 1
----------------	-------------

Arrow Project	Table No. 2
---------------	-------------

Mica Project	Table No. 3
--------------	-------------

Libby Project	Table No. 4
---------------	-------------



## TABLE 1

### DUNCAN PROJECT

#### Duncan Dam and Duncan Lake

##### Storage Project

Construction began	17 September 1964
Storage became fully operational	31 July 1967

##### Reservoir

Normal full pool elevation	577 m (1892 ft.)
Normal minimum pool elevation	547 m (1794.2 ft.)
Surface area at full pool	7290 hectares (18 000 acres)
Total storage capacity	1.77 km <sup>3</sup> (1.43 Maf)
Usable storage capacity	1.73 km <sup>3</sup> (1.40 Maf)
Treaty storage commitment	1.73 km <sup>3</sup> (1.40 Maf)

##### Dam, Earthfill

Crest elevation	581 m (1907 ft.)
Length	792.5 m (2600 ft.)
Approximate height above riverbed	39.6 m (130 ft.)
Spillway – Maximum capacity	1350 m <sup>3</sup> /sec (47.70 kcfs)
Discharge tunnels – Maximum capacity	570 m <sup>3</sup> /sec (20.0 kcfs)

##### Power Facilities

None

**TABLE 2****ARROW PROJECT****Hugh Keenleyside Dam and Arrow Lakes****Storage Project**

Construction began	March 1965
Storage became fully operational	10 October 1968

**Reservoir**

Normal full pool elevation	440 m (1444 ft.)
Normal minimum pool elevation	420 m (1377.9 ft.)
Surface area at full pool	52 650 hectares (130 000 acres)
Total storage capacity	10.3 km <sup>3</sup> (8.34 Maf)
Usable storage capacity	8.8 km <sup>3</sup> (7.10 Maf)
Treaty storage commitment	8.8 km <sup>3</sup> (7.10 Maf)

**Dam, Concrete Gravity and Earthfill**

Crest elevation	445 m (1459 ft.)
Length	869 m (2850 ft.)
Approximate height above riverbed	52 m (170 ft.)
Spillway – Maximum capacity	6700 m <sup>3</sup> /sec (240 kcfs)
Low-level outlets – Maximum capacity	3740 m <sup>3</sup> /sec (132 kcfs)

**Power Facilities**

Currently installed:	
2 units at 92.5 MW	185 MW
Power commercially available	2002
Head at full pool (Gross maximum head)	23.6 m (77 ft.)
Maximum turbine discharge	1200 m <sup>3</sup> /sec (42.40 kcfs)

## TABLE 3

### MICA PROJECT

#### Mica Dam and Kinbasket Lake

##### Storage Project

Construction began	September 1965
Storage became fully operational	29 March 1973

##### Reservoir

Normal full pool elevation	754.4 m (2475 ft.)
Normal minimum pool elevation	707.1 m (2320 ft.)
Surface area at full pool	42 930 hectares (106 000 acres)
Total storage capacity	24.7 km <sup>3</sup> (20 Maf)
Usable storage capacity	14.8 km <sup>3</sup> (12 Maf)
Treaty storage commitment	8.6 km <sup>3</sup> (7 Maf)

##### Dam, Earthfill

Crest elevation	762.0 m (2500 ft.)
Length	792.5 m (2600 ft.)
Approximate height above foundation	244 m (800 ft.)
Spillway – Maximum capacity	2250 m <sup>3</sup> /sec (150 kcfs)
Outlet works – Maximum capacity	1060 m <sup>3</sup> /sec (37.40 kcfs)

##### Power Facilities

Designed ultimate installation:	
6 units at 450 MW	2700 MW
Currently installed:	
4 units at 451 MW	1805 MW
Power commercially available	1976
Head at full pool	183 m (600 ft.)
Maximum turbine discharge of 4 units at full pool	1080 m <sup>3</sup> /sec (38.14 kcfs)
Currently planned:	
2 units at 500 MW	1000 MW

**TABLE 4****LIBBY PROJECT****Libby Dam and Lake Koocanusa****Storage Project**

Construction began	June 1966
Storage became fully operational	17 April 1973

**Reservoir**

Normal full pool elevation	749.5 m (2459 ft.)
Normal minimum pool elevation	697.0 m (2287 ft.)
Surface area at full pool	18 830 hectares (46 500 acres)
Total storage capacity	7.2 km <sup>3</sup> (5.87 Maf)
Usable storage capacity	6.1 km <sup>3</sup> (4.98 Maf)

**Dam, Concrete Gravity**

Deck elevation	753.5 m (2472 ft.)
Length	916.0 m (3055 ft.)
Approximate height above riverbed	112.8 m (370 ft.)
Spillway – Maximum capacity	4106 m <sup>3</sup> /sec (145 kcfs)
Low-level outlets – Maximum capacity	1730 m <sup>3</sup> /sec (61 kcfs)

**Power Facilities**

Designed ultimate installation: 8 units at 105 MW	840 MW
Currently installed: 5 units at 120 MW	600 MW
Power commercially available	1975
Head at full pool	107.0 m (352 ft.)
Maximum turbine discharge of 5 units at full pool	745.6 m <sup>3</sup> /sec (26.50 kcfs)