

Transmitted Electronically
treatyreview@bpa.gov

(503) 397-1844
FAX (503) 397-5215
<http://www.crpud.net>

October 23, 2013

CRT Review (DKE)
P.O. Box 14428
Portland, Oregon 97293

U.S. Entity Coordinators, Columbia River Treaty:

Mr. Stephen Oliver
Bonneville Power Administration

Mr. David Ponganis
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Northwestern Division

Gentlemen,

I am writing on behalf of Columbia River PUD (PUD) regarding your September 20, 2013
"Columbia River Treaty Review Draft Regional Recommendation."

The PUD is a customer-owned utility providing electric service to over 18,000 customers in Columbia County and northern Multnomah County, Oregon. We are a public preference customer of BPA that relies upon the generation assets of the Federal Columbia River Power System (FCRPS) as the primary source of federal power supply. Because roughly 90% of this power comes from the FCRPS dams and other related generating facilities, the PUD has a vested interest in the future of the Columbia River Treaty with Canada.

The PUD is also a member of the trade association Northwest Requirements Utilities (NRU). We support the more detailed comments submitted by NRU, as well as the comments of the broader based Power Group representing the interests of a diverse group of customers that have a stake in Treaty related FCRPS operations. Given the critical impact the Columbia River Treaty could have on the value of our future power supply and related local economic health, we wanted to share our general concerns with the September 20th draft as stated below. A number of changes are necessary before our utility could support the document.

While the September 20, 2013 draft is the last formal document issued by the U.S. Entity, we recognize the Entity has conducted a number of public meetings and has engaged in more detailed discussions with the Power Group to try to incorporate concerns public preference customers have expressed about the draft. We strongly encourage those discussions to continue in the weeks ahead. We also support the U.S. Entity keeping the process on schedule so a regional recommendation can be developed later this fall. In that context, we will rely on NRU and the Power Group to represent our interests in negotiating the specific wording of the document. However, based on your request for comments, we believe it is important to

**Board of
Directors**

David Baker
Jake Carter
Carol Everman
Richard Simpson
Loren Tarbell

General Manager
Kevin P. Owens, P.E.

Columbia River Treaty Review
US Entity Coordinators
October 23, 2013

highlight at a summary level some of our key concerns about the September 20th draft recommendations.

- The document contains a set of "General Principles." It is important to stress that the General Principles be taken together as a group such that they are collectively satisfied. In particular the implementation of any ecosystem-based functions should not prevent the region from achieving the primary objective of reducing U.S. power costs.
- Any payments for flood risk management should be consistent with the national flood risk funding policy of federal funding with applicable local beneficiaries sharing costs as appropriate. We should maintain the current level of flood risk for people in the basin.
- A revised treaty needs to incorporate the best available science and other important documents such as the FCRPS Biological Opinion. There is no stated justification in the draft for increasing flow augmentation in the spring and summer at the expense of fall and winter power generation. Significant changes in seasonal flow augmentation can have an adverse impact on customers. Any modifications to flow must have a scientific basis and not undermine the rebalancing of economic interests we are trying to achieve.
- We are concerned the eco-system based functions create an impression that the region is going to undertake a process to examine reintroduction of anadromous fish on the main stem of the Columbia to Canadian spawning grounds. We believe this issue is outside of the scope of treaty negotiations and requires much more regional discussion.
- If the U.S. and Canada are unable to achieve agreement on key aspects of a modernized treaty by 2015, other options should be evaluated.

Thank you for considering our views. Please let me know if you have any questions regarding these comments, I can be contacted direct at (503) 366-3260.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kevin P. Owens', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Kevin P. Owens, PE
General Manager

CC: John Saven, CEO, NRU