The Reauthorization of The Columbia River Treaty In A New Era of Climate Change, Tribal Rights and Water Scarcity

by Raelene Gold and Denise D. Smith

The Columbia River has been an ongoing League interest since at least 1959, when the Leagues of Washington, Idaho, Oregon and Montana published, “The Great River of the West,” an extensive study of the Columbia River basin. That study was done as the U.S. and Canada deliberated over what eventually became the 1964 Columbia River Treaty.

Fifty years later, the 2014-2024 Treaty Review process to determine the future of the Treaty has been completed. This was an opportunity for both countries to notify the other whether they wished to renew, terminate or modify the existing Treaty. Since 1964 a number of significant new issues have emerged that were not addressed in the original Treaty. New challenges include tribal and First Nation rights, fish and wildlife issues, (specifically the steep declines in salmon populations), recreation, the increasing demand for water, especially for irrigation, and climate change.

Recent climate projections for the Northwest forecast higher temperatures, reduced snowpack, melting glaciers, earlier spring run-off, and summer droughts. Together, these changes will further impact the river through diminishing instream flows, higher water temperature, and increased demand for water.

League’s 1959 study purpose was to establish a set of guidelines to use when planning for effective and desirable water resource development in the Columbia Basin. The League’s Study Committee believed, “it was unlikely our section of the country would have to decide between fish or power.” At the time, it was thought that water was available for power, flood control, commerce and industrial use as well as clean water for humans, fish, crops and forests, and those competing water needs could be met while maintaining unspoiled streams for aesthetic appreciation and water for recreation. In hindsight, that scenario proved to be optimistic.

Continued on page 6

“The Pacific Northwest depends on a healthy Columbia River system to provide environmental sustainability, national energy independence, protection of public safety and infrastructure, and economic well-being.”

TOAST! To Our Diverse Heritage

Join us on April 18 for an evening of wine, hors d’oeuvres, museum tours and fun!

6:00 p.m. at the Wing Luke Museum

See page 32 for details.
Connecting with the Leadership

Well, it’s April and spring is definitely here. Sometimes during the long, dark winter months I doubt that spring will ever return, but here it is, right on time. I look outside to my backyard and enjoy the daffodils and tulips blooming. I don’t know why, but I’m always surprised to see tulips coming up where I don’t recall planting them.

Fundraising
With spring comes…fundraising! This spring we are planning a fun, non-political event at the Wing Luke Museum in Seattle’s historic International District. Attendees will be able to tour the museum at their own pace, there will be hors d’oeuvres and wine and a special dessert treat. We are looking for event sponsors. If you know of any businesses or individuals who might be interested in becoming a sponsor, please contact Allison at the office at 206-329-4848.

At this event, we will be giving a “Champion of New Americans Community Service Award” to honor people making significant contributions to their community through their time, actions, talents and dedication, in areas of encouraging and/or facilitating civic engagement, especially relating to elections and good government. Honoree(s) selected should serve as a role model for compassion, inclusion and progress, striving to make the world a better place as well as having a passion for civic engagement and helping others in our community. If you have any suggestions for award recipients, please leave a message for Julie Anne Kempf at the office.

Leadership Circle
The Leadership Circle program has been very successful, helping provide us with predictable income to support our programs. We would love to have you join; all you need to do is make a three-year commitment of at least $20 per month. It is fully tax-deductible and easy to participate in. Having a reliable source of funds frees up our board to do things we are really good at: educating voters and advocating positions. Please consider becoming part of our Leadership Circle program; you can find information on this program in this Voter, as well as by contacting Allison at the League office.

Membership Dues
We are considering raising the membership dues from $60 to $75 starting in 2016. While it may sound like a large increase, our dues haven’t changed since 2008. As you may know, most of our dues do not remain at the local level; $51 is paid to the State and National Leagues. With this increase we will be better able to meet our budget for the coming year. We will vote on this at our Annual Meeting, so please plan to attend. The meeting will be Thursday, May 21 at the Seattle First Baptist Church on First Hill.

Programs
We have just one forum left this year; it’s on April 2, 2015 on the Columbia River Treaty renewal. It should be both interesting and informative.

We will have a new list of forum topics and some possible study proposals for you to discuss and approve at the Annual Meeting. Potential forum topics include climate change and the media’s role in government. I look forward to a continuation of our vibrant and well-attended forums next year!

Ellen Barton, President
# April

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forum: Columbia River Treaty 7:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Board Meeting 9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR Committee 12:45 p.m.</td>
<td>The Voter Deadline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Climate Change Comm. 10:00 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Comm. 10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Education Comm. 10:00 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Econ &amp; Tax Comm. 11:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Board Meeting 9:00 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Units meet during shaded period*

**APRIL**
- **Forum: Columbia River Treaty**
  - Thursday, April 2
  - 7:00 p.m.
  - Seattle First Baptist Church
- **Board Meeting**
  - Saturday, April 4
  - 9:00 a.m.
  - League Office
- **The Voter Deadline**
  - Monday, April 6
- **International Relations Committee**
  - Monday, April 6
  - 12:45 p.m.
  - League Office
- **Climate Change Committee**
  - Thursday, April 16
  - 10:00 a.m.
  - League Office
- **Transportation Committee**
  - Tuesday, April 21
  - 10:00 a.m.
  - League Office
- **Toast! To Our Diverse Heritage**
  - Saturday, April 18
  - 6:00 p.m.
  - Wing Luke Museum
- **Education Committee**
  - Thursday, April 23
  - 10:00 a.m.
  - League Office
- **Econ & Tax Committee**
  - Saturday, April 25
  - 11:30 a.m.
  - 909 E. Newton #D-9, Seattle

**MAY**
- **NO FORUM**
- **Board Meeting**
  - Saturday, May 2
  - 9:00 a.m.
  - League Office
- **No June Voter**
  - Deadline for Summer Voter: June 15
The League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County (LWVS-KC) presents a public forum most months between September and May, generally on the first Thursday of the month at 7:00 p.m. Most forums are held at the Seattle First Baptist Church, but occasionally they are scheduled at other locations and times. The schedule of forums for 2015 appears at left; check The Voter each month or the LWVS-KC website, seattlelwv.org, for up-to-date information. Past forums are frequently televised and can be accessed from the resources page of the website.

The Board discussed the draft budget for next year, looking closely at our income and expenses. Even though we have a funds cushion, we have not met the expected budgeted income with some of our fundraisers and the TRY, so one discussion was the need to raise more money. Our League has two organizations, the c4 and the c3 (Education Fund), with all fundraising done by the c3.

One funding idea is to raise dues, which has not happened since 2008 (see Membership Chair Paneen Davidson’s article on how dues are allocated), but there would still be help for those unable to pay the full amount. Another idea is to invest our assets in funds that pay more; the Treasurer is looking at various options. And, we need to do more development and fundraising, developing long-term relationships with companies and organizations to be sustaining partners with us. The Board will vote on the proposed budget at the April meeting, and present it to members at the Annual Meeting on May 21.

Planning for the April 18 fundraiser at the Wing Luke Museum continues. We are trying to develop sponsorships to help defray costs, but good event attendance is also important. The planning committee reported that attendees will be able to tour the Museum’s exhibit, there will be a raffle for prizes, awards for community leaders, and wine and hors’ d’oeuvres.

Joanna Cullen, Program Chair, reported that program planning for next year has begun and unit results will be presented at the Annual Meeting. The March forum on human trafficking was well attended with about 90 people. We hope the April forum on the Columbia River Treaty is as well attended since water rights are of primary importance—and disagreements—in our state.

Two ballot issues may be placed before the voters in the fall, one on public financing of elections (Seattle) and one on family leave (King

Continued on next page
Board Briefs continued:

County).

Finally, Voter Services held a successful voter registration drive at the low-income Josephinium Apartments. The committee is also gearing up for summer and fall candidate forums; interest from potential candidates in the new Seattle City Council district elections is high, so there may be more forums than usual.

Cover Article continued:

The study contributed to the LWVWA’s position statement on the Columbia River:

“In order to meet present and future water needs within the Columbia River Basin, comprehensive basin-wide planning must occur for optimum utilization, conservation, development and management of water resources.”

The 1964 Columbia River Treaty (CRT) between the U.S. and Canada addressed two important elements, flood control and power. Since its ratification, the Treaty and its Protocol have been considered a model for international cooperation. It also established two Entities responsible for implementing and administering the Treaty terms: The U.S. Entity is comprised of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Canadian Entity is B.C. Hydro. Under the Treaty, September 16, 2014 was the first opportunity for either country to give notice to the other of their intent to terminate part or all of the Treaty. The two U.S. agencies are also responsible for the 2014-2024 CRT Review to determine post-2024 Treaty provisions, and have conducted stakeholder meetings and listening sessions for that review process, which provided a valuable opportunity to address current Columbia River management issues.

In preparation for our April Forum and unit meetings, please see the information in the Program section, which will help us to understand the complicated issues in the upcoming negotiations between the U.S. and Canada.

References:

- Great River of the West - Columbia River, LWV’s of WA, ID, OR and MT, 1959
- Know Your Columbia River Basin, LWV of Seattle, 1959
- Water Use Efficiency, LWVWA, 1989-91

All three of the above papers can be accessed at the following site: http://www.lwvwa.org/issues.html#water

LWVWA Comment letter regarding draft U.S. Entity Regional Recommendation, October 22, 2013.
Committees

Climate Change Committee
DATE: Thursday, April 16
TIME: 10:00 a.m.
PLACE: League Office

Economics and Taxation Committee
DATE: Saturday, April 25
TIME: 11:30 a.m.
PLACE: 909 E. Newton #D-9, Seattle

Education Committee
DATE: Thursday, April 23
TIME: 10:00 a.m.
PLACE: League Office

See article on page 13.

International Relations Committee
DATE: Monday, April 6
TIME: 12:45 – 2:45 p.m.
PLACE: League Office

Transportation Committee
DATE: Tuesday, April 21
TIME: 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
PLACE: League Office

We encourage participation in our committees by all interested members. It's a great opportunity to meet and talk to community leaders, stakeholder organizations, and experts where you can have direct input on local issues that affect you.

Don’t see a committee that covers your issue? Call the office and let us know. Sometimes people are working more informally without regularly scheduled meetings. If so, we may be able to help connect you with them or help you start your own.

Diversity Policy

The League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County (LWVS-KC), in both its values and practices, affirms its beliefs and commitment to diversity and pluralism, which means there shall be no barriers to participation in any activity of the League on the basis of gender, race, creed, age, sexual orientation, national origin or disability.

LWVS-KC recognizes that diverse perspectives are important and necessary for responsible and representative decision-making. LWVS-KC subscribes to the belief that diversity and pluralism are fundamental to the values it upholds and that this inclusiveness enhances the organization’s ability to respond more effectively to changing conditions and needs.

LWVS-KC affirms its commitment to reflecting the diversity of Americans in its membership, board, staff and programs.
Action

WATERFRONT UPDATE:
In response to statements made in the March VOTER, the League received a letter from Robert W. Davidson, the President/CEO of the Seattle Aquarium stating that the article was in error, specifically that it stated that the Aquarium “to date … has not sought any public involvement” regarding its plan for future expansion. Excerpts from his letter:

“We have in fact met with the LWV’s Waterfront Committee on two occasions to communicate our process, consider their questions and concerns, and to encourage further input. We continue to meet with other community stakeholders as well. Looking back to the Central Waterfront Committee’s efforts leading up to the submittal of its Strategic Plan for Realizing the Waterfront Seattle Vision in 2012, the Seattle Aquarium participated in extensive dialogue and public presentations including a variety of concept design ideas for future Aquarium planning within the new Waterfront. In April of this year, after our design and engineering team has evaluated three site alternatives now under consideration, we will embark on a more extensive outreach program. Ultimately we will submit our proposed Master Plan to the Seattle City Council for its review and approval.

In addition, through our collaborative planning process with the Seattle Office of the Waterfront, we will identify other opportunities for the public to review the analysis completed by our design and engineering team. This will include a posting of the draft plan on our website prior to any decision by the Seattle City Council.”

We replied to Mr. Davidson inviting him or his staff to present their plan for public participation to the Board on April 4, 2015. Excerpts from our response:

“In your letter you state that the VOTER article, “...erroneously summarized the process the Seattle Aquarium is using to develop a Master Plan for its future expansion project” and in particular the statement that, “[t]o date, SEAS has not sought any public involvement.” It is our position that the statement is correct.

So far, the only public notice that SEAS has provided of its intention to expand in front of Waterfront Park were included in 1) its “Strategic Plan 2011-2030” posted on its website, which states on p. 8: “This plan provides for … an expansion to the south of Pier 59 using overwater coverage now utilized by Waterfront Park”; and 2) a four-sided box in the City’s Framework Plan maps labeled “Aquarium Expansion Area.” However, the Framework Plan does not mention in its text anything about Aquarium expansion. The other public involvement described in your letter were two meetings with the LWVS-KC Waterfront Committee, at its request. While we appreciate your meeting with our Waterfront Committee, we believe more robust public involvement is necessary considering the significant impact to the public that would result if the Aquarium expands in front of the park.

The only other public involvement you mention is your meetings with “other community stakeholders” without stating who the other stakeholders are.

…

The League of Women Voters recognizes that the Seattle Aquarium is an asset to our City, as both an entertainment and educational resource for our community. We are not opposed to its expansion. However, as made clear in the VOTER article the League does oppose expansion of the Aquarium to the south of Pier 59, directly in front of Waterfront Park. The park is one of the few places on the waterfront where the public has been able to enjoy expansive views, and the City’s adopted Waterfront Seattle Framework Plan (2012) calls for Waterfront Park to have “unobstructed views of the bay…” (Design Summary, p 1:32).
We are pleased with the Aquarium’s plan for broad public participation in the expansion project as outlined in Mr. Davidson’s letter and will continue to keep our membership advised of the process.”

Voter Service

We have officially begun voter registration for 2015. We had our first voter registration drive at the beginning of March at the Josephinum apartments, where 20 voters were registered. The group was enthusiastic when reaching out to the League, and determined to set up an event. A big thank you to Dianne Ramsey and Connie Hellyer for stepping up and volunteering their time!

The majority of our voter registration events do not take place until summer and fall, but it is never too early to learn the ropes or refresh your memory. I am looking to gather more volunteers and allow plenty of time for training so come June we will have a strong and steady force of volunteers ready to send out into the community to register voters. This will be a busy year and I want to make sure that we have the volunteers needed to meet the demand.

Along with voter registration, we will also be in need of moderators and speakers for our speaker’s bureau events that will occur in the fall. These are both excellent ways to be involved in the League and to interact with members of the community. You will also be providing a great service to voters by informing them of what to expect on the ballot. We are able to provide great training for all of these volunteer opportunities as well as give you resources to learn more on your own.

If this interests YOU, or you think of someone who would be interested please contact Amelia Woolley at voterservice@seattlelwv.org or leave her a message by calling the office at 206-329-4848.

SPECIAL ELECTION
APRIL 28

There will be a special election on April 28 regarding a special levy for King County to fund replacement of the existing Emergency Radio System. We plan to have additional information about the measure on the website next week. Call the office if you need a print version.

There is also:
- a proposed Klahanie/Sammamish annexation and initiative issue on the ballot for residents of those areas;
- a sales tax proposal for the Covington Transportation Benefit District;
- a bond measure for Enumclaw School District No. 216;
- a bond measure for South King Fire & Rescue; and
- a levy for Vashon-Maury Island Park and Recreation District.

For more about the current election go to kingcounty.gov/elections and click on April Election.

Ballots will be mailed as usual to eligible voters. Voter registration must be done online or mailed by March 30; new-to-Washington registrations can be done in person through April 20.
Getting Connected  
Membership News

While writing this, I am still thinking about our wonderful, though sobering, February Forum on Local and State Hospital Mergers. This is an issue that affects residents of Washington State and indeed, the whole country. I was unable to attend our March forum on Human Trafficking but from all reports it was quite informative – and sobering – as well. If you were not able to attend either forum, Allison has posted videos of the excellent speaker presentations and the question and answers afterward; check on our website to see them.

At a recent author reading, I sat next to a Roman Catholic nun and learned that she is the human trafficking representative at the local diocese. She shared that, in addition to sex trafficking with victims as young as 13, workers in nail salons are also victims of human trafficking. That brought the issue home to me in a personal way that I never considered before: is my occasional pedicure at one of these salons? These are the types of “hidden” victims that the Forum exposed and made us aware of.

Coming up next, the April 2 forum topic will be the Reauthorization of the Columbia River Treaty. This may be a new topic to you, and it would be another excellent forum to invite a neighbor, friend, or a new member, to your unit. I really believe that our consistently excellent forums are a perfect way to get potential members “hooked on League.”

At the end of January, we take a count of our current membership and calculate our annual Per Member Payment (PMP) to State (LWVWA) and to National Leagues (LWVUS.) As accurate a count as possible is important; in addition to determining the PMP, it is also used to calculate the number of delegates we may send to state and national conventions. If your dues reminder got lost on your desk (or the kitchen counter, in my case), then perhaps you received a reminder call or a voice mail.

Our annual individual membership dues are $60; last raised in 2008. Out of this $60, currently $32 goes to National and $19 goes to State (this may increase after the June convention), leaving us just $9 per member per year to support our mission. That is why members able to contribute at Booster ($100), Contributing ($250), Supporting ($500), or Sustaining ($1,000) levels are so vital to the continuing operation of our League. THANK YOU to all of the following who have done so in the last few months: booster members Nancy Abercrombie, Karen Duval, Eleanor Laxdall, Sue Papcun, Lucy Steers, Lorna Stern, Ellyn Swanson, Tjitske van der Meulen, Elizabeth Waddell, Cyndi Woods, and Jane Wortthen; supporting member Linda Snider; sustaining member Nancy Alvord; as well as Susan Baird-Joshi, Helen Brumbach, Kris Bushley, Alice Chew, Zita Cook, Nancy Debaste, Genevra Gerhart, Margaret Hall, Florabelle Key, Gunbjorg Ladstein, Sue Papcun, Roberta Riley, Lorna Stern, Betty Sullivan, Connie Voget, Joella Werlin, and Boots Winterstein who included donations with their dues.

Also, a special “Thank You” to Allison Feher and Joan O’Reilly for all the extra work they’ve done to ensure our membership database matches both the state and national databases. Our end-of-January member count stands at 604, plus 8 members pending renewal, for a total of 612.

I am now coming up near the end of my first year as a board member of this League and wanted to report that money-raising discussions with the board have been a major topic at our monthly meetings. I was, perhaps naively, not expecting this. Because the remaining $9 from member dues does not begin to cover the costs of doing the work we do to fulfill our mission statement, raising additional funds is crucial.

However, 12 or 13 board members out of 600+ members cannot do it alone. How can members help? One way is by paying more than your ba-
sic dues as outlined above; other ways you can help:

- Make a donation honoring someone’s birthday, anniversary or other special occasion, or giving a memorial gift;
- Join our Leadership Circle by committing at least $240 a year for three years;
- Name the League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County Education Fund as a beneficiary in your will;
- Attend our fundraising events – ideally, inviting a non-member or two as well to enjoy and learn about League; and
- Share the contact names of local businesses and organizations you know who could be asked to support the work of the League. Introductions are always helpful and much appreciated!

Saturday, April 18 is our spring fundraising event – which also promises to be a lot of fun in a unique and interesting location; see the flyer in this Voter for details. If every member attends, makes a contribution or buys a ticket, we will be able to make major inroads into our fundraising goals for this year. Thanks for doing all you can – and I hope to see you on April 18 at the Wing Luke Museum.

Features

**Climate Change and Transportation Committees Joint Report**
by Janet Winans, Trans. Committee Chair

The committees met in combined session February 19 to host Charles Knutson, the Senior Policy Advisor for Transportation and Land Use in the Governor’s office. He spoke about Governor Inslee’s carbon pollution fee proposal for large emitters, with generated funds going to transportation, climate change and education.

The Governor’s proposal was presented in December to also stimulate much-needed conversation between stakeholders and state legislators before the legislative session began, and he did succeed. By the time we met, the Senate Transportation Committee had provided a first draft of the proposed budget: [http://leg.wa.gov/Senate/Committees/TRAN/Pages/default.aspx](http://leg.wa.gov/Senate/Committees/TRAN/Pages/default.aspx).

Our committees are very interested in the contrast between the Governor’s proposal, the 2014 House Transportation Budget and the current budget presented by the Republican Senate Transportation Committee leaders. The Senate budget proposal includes gas tax increases of 5 cents per gallon in 2016, another 4.2 cents in 2017, and a final 2.5 cents increase in 2018 (our current gas tax is 37.5 cents/gallon.) The Governor’s plan to assess large emitters of carbon is that the assessment will increase annually in tandem with the requirement for annual decreases in carbon emissions through 2027. The Governor’s plan can raise as much as $1 billion annually for the next 12 years, of which $400 million will go to transportation projects annually, another $380 million to schools, and the rest to other purposes.

The Governor’s plan is an effort to confront the problem of reducing carbon emissions and of finding new sources of revenue. Transportation poses one of the greatest needs for new invest-
ment in and by the state, along with the State Supreme Court McCleary decision requiring adequate funding for public schools. The Governor’s plan predicts that the funds raised can be allocated as above, while creating a method to reduce carbon emissions overall. His plan is similar to proposals in California, Oregon and British Columbia, which would provide a carbon reduction corridor along the west coast. Senate leadership, however, and the fossil fuel industry argue that any such “tax,” “fee,” or “surcharge” will harm the economy and cost jobs.

The Senate budget proposal contains many items that failed in 2014, such as transferring funds intended to fund toxic waste disposal to building roadway culverts and eliminating sales taxes charged on highway construction materials. However, money collected from that sales tax has been an important source of General Fund revenue for many years, therefore that transfer would be a loss to the General Fund’s Budget. The Senate proposals directly counter the Governor’s efforts. The Senate budget contains SB5987 which would remove all multimodal transportation resources from the transportation budget if Governor Inslee uses executive power to require lower carbon gasoline fuels. Mr. Knutson called it a “poison pill.”

The Governor’s transportation budget plans a 12-year cycle. One problem it will alleviate is the practice of funding design/build projects in segments, as the SR520 bridge replacement epitomizes. His plan focuses on:

- Completing the 520 bridge with $1.4 billion in state dollars.
- Spending another $1.3 billion on I-405 between Bellevue and Renton.
- $2 million for work on State highways 509 and 167 and I-90 over Snoqualmie Pass.
- $278 million for I-5 improvements near Joint Base Lewis-McChord.
- About $432 million for work on U.S. 395 from Francis to the Spokane River.

The governor says more than half the State transportation dollars will go toward new construction and economic development, 25 percent will be aimed at maintenance, operations and preservation, and 20 percent towards clean energy projects and public transportation.

After our joint meeting, Judy Bevington and I communicated with Mary Moore, LWVWA lobbyist for Energy, Climate Change and Toxics, and Cynthia Stewart, LWVWA lobbyist for Transportation. State League supports implementation of a carbon pollution market program to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Those funds can be used for broad-based transportation funding, fuel standards and education.

The Senate package not only prohibits the pollution control and associated fees, but also weakens the State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) and fails to provide transit funding. The Sound Transit proposal to place a measure for additional funding on the ballot within their service area was limited to an amount below what was requested.

The Senate proposal targets particular projects for particular constituencies and can weaken state wide efforts for projects in the Governor’s proposal. It is important to understand the depth of the plans in each of the Senate bills, particularly bills SB5990-5997. Bills SB 5987-5989 set up taxing, spending, and bonding legislation. There is a question about whether SB5989 will require a super majority because it does bond the state’s credit.

Cynthia Stewart at State League recommends that we read their weekly Legislative Newsletter, and that we:

- support the Governor’s request along with new gas tax revenue,
- support funding for transit,
- oppose sales tax transfer from highway construction into the Transportation Fund from the Operating Budget (because of McCleary),
- oppose the transfer of environmental re-
mediation funding into the Transportation budget for storm water projects associated with highway construction (this should be part of the construction project’s budget), and

• support full authority for Sound Transit to put additional funding on the ballot.

**Education Committee Report**

by Joanna Cullen, Chair

After noticing that sometimes League does not have positions that allow us to be part of some education conversations, we have been exploring the possibility of a study. One example of this lack of positions is the issue of testing in schools. As tests continue to change and their usefulness is questioned, resources are devoted to developing them, purchasing materials and staff training. But this can also result in disruption of the school climate. The committee has been discussing what would be involved in doing a study that would enlighten us about the type and amount of standardized testing that is appropriate in schools. Please join us at our next committee meeting on April 23 for these important conversations.

League co-sponsored a legislative town hall on state funding for education with the Seattle Council PTSA and the Seattle Education Association.

Looking forward, in May our committee meeting will feature a guest from King County on the new proposed First Starts.
BOOK REVIEW by Vicky Downs

A RIVER LOST: THE LIFE AND DEATH OF THE COLUMBIA
By Blaine Harden

Although shorter than the Mississippi River, the Columbia River is much more powerful. Its energy comes from its “astoundingly steep drop” between its origins in Canada and its entry into the Pacific Ocean on the Washington-Oregon border. That energy attracted engineers and politicians eager to produce hydroelectric power.

In this updated 2012 edition of his 1996 book, Harden shows us how engineers built dams, transforming the raging river into a series of lakes and locks enabling barges to carry produce and industrial products all the way from Lewiston, Idaho to Portland, Oregon. The dams also produced, “vast quantities of low-cost electricity [and] more than half of all the power consumed in the Pacific Northwest.” In addition, “No other part of America has such a monstrous, renewable, nonpolluting and highly efficient power source already in operation.”

Wonderful as such energy is for those who live in the Pacific Northwest, Harden bluntly states, “The river was killed more than sixty years ago and was reborn as plumbing”, with both winners and losers. In this book, we see the author go back to his childhood home near Moses Lake to interview engineers, farmers, bargers, Native Americans and others who are affected by both the controlled river and the government subsidies that come with it.

Many people, though proud of their work, have no knowledge of how dependent they are on the river or the federal government that controls it, and many seem unwilling to consider their dependence. Jeff Korth, a biologist at Washington State University, says that people who live in the Columbia basin, “don’t know where they are. They are utterly unfamiliar with why they are able to live in the desert. They don’t know where [their] water comes from.”

Inevitably, “in stark contrast to the grand scope and vision of the [dams’] benefits, [there are] the hard realities of the trade-offs for such aspiring dreams.” For example, “The Grand Coulee [dam] wiped out more salmon than any single structure in American history,” with fishermen and tribes suffering as a result. Harden writes that the dam, “flooded more than 21,000 acres of prime bottom land, where Indians had been living for perhaps as long as ten thousand years.” In 1983, the Bureau of Reclamation stated, “Tribal members paid with their homes, their lifestyles, their foodstuffs, so that others could have jobs, incomes and wealth.” However, virtually none of the people the author interviewed seemed to realize how much Native Americans had given up in order that people like themselves could survive.

All Columbia Basin farmers need irrigation from the river and know how hard they work for income made off of the land, but are uneasy with references to the Bureau of Reclamation, “[which] calculated that every 960-acre farm [using river water] had been blessed with at least $2.1 million in federal infrastructure subsidies.” And that, “The government lifted water out of the river, pumped it…to the farmers and guaranteed them the right to buy electricity from the federal government at a price much cheaper than wholesale.”

In addition, workers at Hanford, “have a long history of being misled about the risk of radiation in their work place,” which helps explain their resentment toward the government. When Harden interviewed engineers there, he concluded, “Like irrigators with their cheap water

Continued on page 27
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UNIT MEETINGS

Welcome and Introductions
Announcements/Volunteer Sign Ups

Discussion Questions:

1. What do you think are the most important benefits of the Columbia River to you and to the State of Washington?

2. What do you think are the most important benefits of the Columbia River Treaty to the state and region?

3. Do you think the 1964 Columbia River Treaty should be renewed, terminated or modified?

4. What issues do you think should be addressed in the treaty renewal process?

5. What do you think are the most important Columbia River issues to be addressed after the Treaty negotiation process is over?
The Columbia River Treaty ("the Treaty") between the U.S. and Canada is regarded as a model of international cooperation. Ratified in 1964 after years of negotiations, it is focused on cooperative management of the Columbia River primarily for flood protection and power generation. Hydropower from the Columbia’s dams supply an international power grid that energizes the Western U.S. states and parts of Canada. Energy-intensive industry and manufacturing, from aluminum smelters to computer server farms, have developed in the Columbia basin for easy access to power from these dams. Managing the mighty Columbia has also allowed irrigation infrastructure, developed under the Federal Reclamation program which enabled development of a multi-billion dollar agricultural industry. The dams also provide an invaluable transportation system, allowing oceangoing ships to navigate 106 miles upriver and barge traffic to reach Lewiston, Idaho, 359 river miles from the Pacific.\(^1\)^2\(^\text{1}^2\)

The Treaty successfully met its two objectives of flood control and power generation, but other aspects and interests of the river have not fared as well. Native American tribes and Canadian First Nations have lost both home lands and major parts of their cultural heritage. Subsistence hunters, small farmers and fishermen have lost their livelihood, and the environment has been dramatically altered.

This 1964 treaty is up for renewal in 2024. One or both signatories, Canada or the U.S., can cancel all or part of the Treaty or offer recommendations for a post-2024 agreement with 10 years’ notice. Modernization of the Treaty offers an opportunity to address issues not included in the 1964 agreement. It also affords a chance to address issues not contemplated in 1964, such as endangered species listings and climate change.

The original Treaty called for two entities, one from each country, to carry out treaty obligations. Both the U.S. and Canadian entities have engaged in Treaty review processes. They have developed formal recommendations for amendments after extensive consultations. These recommendations were submitted to the federal agencies negotiating on behalf of each country, the U.S. Department of State and the Canadian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, with agreement from the Province of British Columbia.\(^3\)

**THE 1964 COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY: DIVIDING THE WATERS**

The Columbia River is a shared resource of both the U.S. and Canada. Although only 15% of the Columbia River Basin is within Canada, that portion of the watershed accounts for over one-third of the average annual volume and up to 50% of the annual peak flood waters monitored at the Dalles Dam, which is 80 miles east of Portland. The two countries have recognized that each country is affected by the other’s actions and that they must cooperate to manage these waters wisely and to protect them for the benefit of today’s citizens and future generations.

The original Columbia River treaty, the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 between the U.S. and Canada established principles and mechanisms to help prevent and resolve disputes along the boundary. It was under this treaty that the International Joint Commission (IJC) was formed by the two countries as the judicial body to address mutual use of shared waters and specific water issues that might arise. The IJC is made up of three commissioners from each country, and their decisions are based on the principle of equal and similar rights to the use of boundary waters. In the 1940’s and 1950’s, the IJC studied the potential of the river system as a resource for development of seven key factors: domestic water supply, navigation, hydro power, flood control, irrigation, reclamation of the wetlands, and conservation of fish and wildlife, plus oth-
er beneficial public purposes. This study also established principles for sharing flood control and electric power benefits, which helped the two federal governments, negotiate the Columbia River Treaty.

After a series of severe Columbia River floods that affected both countries in the 1940’s, the IJC established the International Columbia River Engineering Board. A major study by this Board set the stage for the coordinated development of water resources in the Columbia River basin. British Columbia had the best water storage sites due to sparsely-populated deep valleys and a vast geographic expanse. The U.S., on the other hand, had sites for hydro power generation due to less-steep terrain and proximity to markets, thus a trans-boundary collaboration for mutual benefit was a logical move.⁴

The 1930’s and 1940’s were a time of massive public works projects in the U.S. Hydroelectric power was seen as a key component of industrial and economic development during and after World War II. Encouraged by new industry, a growing economy, a reliable workforce of returning GI’s and maturing war bonds this development was seen as a priority.⁵

The final push came from a devastating flood in 1948 that caused major damage in Trail, B.C., also destroying the shipyard city of Vanport, Oregon, its second-largest city at the time. The Vanport flood displaced tens of thousands of residents whose homes were built on or near the floodplain and reportedly caused more than 50 deaths. These floods added urgency to negotiations between the two countries and highlighted the need for additional storage to regulate the extreme spring runoff of this powerful river.

The Treaty was signed Jan 17, 1961 by President Dwight Eisenhower and Prime Minister John Diefenbaker. However, international negotiations and intra-national negotiations between the Canadian Government and the province of British Columbia continued for several years, resulting in Treaty Protocol, which clarified certain terms and amplified aspects of it. The Treaty was formally ratified by Prime Minister Lester Pearson, Premier W.A.C. Bennett of British Columbia and President Lyndon Johnson at the international boundary at Blaine, WA and Douglas, B.C. on September 16, 1964.⁶

Although the IJC had identified seven key factors for development of the river, only the primary issues of flooding and power supply were chosen to guide the treaty. To address these two objectives, additional reservoir storage was needed. The Treaty required construction of three dams in B.C. and one in the U.S., also requiring coordinated management of reservoirs and water flows.

The Treaty assigned two entities to oversee the operations. B.C. Hydro was named the Canadian entity responsible for managing the daily operations of the reservoirs and hydroelectric facilities, and the Bonneville Power Administration and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers were jointly named the U.S. entities. To meet the reservoir storage requirement, B.C. Hydro constructed a combined 15.5 million acre-feet (MAF) of reservoir storage behind the Mica, Keenleyside and Duncan Dams in southeast B.C. The U.S. constructed 5.8 MAF of reservoir storage behind the Libby Dam in Montana. These four dams are collectively called the Treaty Dams. Under treaty provisions, British Columbia would receive a $64.4 million payment from the U.S., which was used to help build dams on the upper Columbia to provide 8.45 MAF of flood storage as well as extra storage on an on-call basis. That $64.4 million was determined to be 50% of the projected flood damage prevented for the duration of the Treaty; that is, between the years 1968 and 2024.⁷

THE CANADIAN ENTITLEMENT

The Treaty also specified that Canada, at the direction of the U.S., would manage the operation of these three dams for optimum power generation as well as flood control downstream in B.C. and the U.S. For their cooperative management, Canada was entitled to one-half (50%) of the estimated downstream power produced
in the U.S., known as the Canadian Entitlement. Since 50% of the power generated by massive hydro power projects such as Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams was not needed by Canada then, 37 public and 4 private utilities in the U.S. agreed to pay a total of $254 million to purchase the Canadian Entitlement for a 30-year period. When that period ended in 2003, those utilities could continue purchasing the same power at the then-current market rate, which is now estimated to be closer to $254 million annually. Since the early years of the Treaty, the Canadian Entitlement power has become part of the Pacific Northwest-Southwest Intertie, the largest single electrical transmission program in the U.S. and a vital component of the western power grid enhancing reliability in western U.S. and western Canada.\(^8\)

**MODERNIZING THE TREATY**

The original terms of the Treaty were that either country could terminate most provisions of the treaty after September 16, 2024. Any change or termination would require a minimum of 10 years’ advance written notice; hence September 16, 2014 was the first opportunity. Unless terminated, most Treaty provisions will continue indefinitely.

However, the important flood control provisions of the Treaty will change in 2024 when the 60 years of pre-paid 8.45 MAF storage for flood control protection that the U.S. purchased expires. Under the new arrangement, the U.S. will be able to call upon Canada for assistance with flood storage only after it has drawn down its own storage reservoirs to allow room for the anticipated floodwaters. Specifically, the U.S. will have to use its storage reservoirs for flood control before calling upon help from Canada to use its three storage reservoirs. There is disagreement in interpretation of this aspect of the Treaty. Canada insists the Treaty means all U.S. Columbia River storage reservoirs must be utilized, whereas the U.S. insists that only mainstem reservoirs are to be utilized.\(^9\)

B.C. Hydro, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Bonneville Power Administration were responsible for implementing the original Treaty. They were asked to make recommendations for the post-2024 management of the river to the Canadian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, and the U.S. Department of State, respectively, who will conduct the government-to-government negotiations. These recommendations were developed via technical studies utilizing extensive consultations with affected states, tribes, utilities and other stakeholders concurrently. This effort is called the 2014-2024 Columbia River Treaty Review Process. The U.S. Entity Regional Recommendation for the future of the Columbia River Treaty After 2024 was submitted December 13, 2013 and the Canadian Entity’s British Columbia Decision was submitted March 13, 2013. Both these recommendations are discussed later in this document.\(^10,11,12\)

Once the U.S. Department of State completes negotiations, it will make recommendations to the President and the Senate, who have constitutional authority over international treaties. A new treaty would need to be ratified by the Senate, but a modified or modernized one would not.

**THE COLUMBIA RIVER: A MIGHTY DRAINAGE**

To understand the Treaty, it is helpful to understand the immensity of the river itself and the diversity of the Columbia River Basin. The Columbia is the fourth-largest river in North America, exceeded in size by only the Mississippi, the Mackenzie and the St. Lawrence. There are 14 major tributaries comprising the Columbia River system; some are the Snake, Yakima, Okanogan, Kootenay, Lewis, Cowlitz, Deschutes, Willamette, and Spokane rivers. The Columbia and its tributaries drain 259,000 square miles, an area the size of France. 15% of this basin area (39,500 square miles) is in British Columbia. 40% of the river’s 1,240 miles lie within Canada, between the headwaters at Columbia Lake in southeastern British Columbia and the U.S. border just north of the Grand Coulee Dam reservoir’s Lake Roosevelt. Within the U.S. the Co-
lumbia drains more than two-thirds of the Pacific Northwest, including most of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho as well as parts of Montana, Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada. The basin also includes 13 federally-recognized Native American reservations, three Canadian First Nations homelands, and one Canadian province.

The River loses 2,600 feet of altitude along its 1,240 mile course. This drop in altitude influences the annual average flow, which is more than 10 times larger than the Colorado River’s. Another influence is the generous snow pack at the mountainous headwaters and the rainy climate in British Columbia, which explain why the Canadian portion of the river contributes 30% to 35% of the entire flow and flood potential. In volume, the average annual flow of the Columbia at The Dalles, Oregon is approximately 190,000 cubic feet per second (cfs). The Columbia’s annual flow fluctuates with precipitation, and ranges from 120,000 cfs in low water years to 260,000 cfs in high water years, according to the U.S. Department of Ecology (DOE).¹³

The velocity of the water moving down the river was also significantly greater before dam construction began in the 1930’s. Those dams have since made the Columbia one of the world’s greatest sources of hydroelectric power and, with its tributaries, represents a third of the potential hydropower of the United States. The dams have also facilitated barge transportation throughout the flow-regulated reaches.

The Columbia River Basin comprises an area of dramatic geography: Glaciers cover peaks of the Rocky Mountain belt including the Tetons, Centennial, Sawtooth, Bitterroot, Cabinet and Selkirk ranges to the east. The Blue Mountains divide the great basaltic plateaus west of the Rockies, the Snake River Plain and the Columbia Plateau. And, the Cascade Range divides the western border of the Columbia plateau from the southern part of the Puget Trough just to the east of the Coastal Range.

The Columbia and its tributaries are major recreation resources with world-renowned wind surfing, swimming, boating and fishing. The river is also a source for fish and aquatic foods for humans and wildlife. It also has a significant place in Northwest history and development; it was and still is a cultural center for Native American and First Nation communities whose lives revolve around its resources, particularly the return of the salmon. It was also the final route taken by Lewis and Clark on their expedition to the Pacific.

The river also provides the irrigation water necessary for agricultural industries in Canada, Washington, Idaho and Oregon and augments municipal water supplies throughout the Columbia River Basin. This great river of the west is the Northwest’s life blood.
Map of the Columbia River Basin Showing Locations of Dams
CLIMATE CHANGE: IMPACT ON THE COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

The Basin climate is strongly affected by the mountain region influence; it varies from the humid marine climate west of the Cascades to the drier continental climate of the interior. Temperature and precipitation vary greatly with elevation, but in the central basin summers are typically hot and dry with only occasional thundershowers; winters are moderately cold and dry with occasional snow or even rain. Winter snow in the mountains serves as a reservoir for augmented summer flow through snow and ice melt.\(^{15}\)

Current research on the future Northwest climate by the University of Washington Climate Impact Group predicts that air temperatures will warm, reducing annual snow pack and glacial mass, affecting seasonal runoff patterns. The Columbia River Basin is bordered by the Rocky and Cascade mountain ranges, which capture snowfall-feeding glaciers. Temperatures and seasonal precipitation changes will have significant impact on the flooding of the river and its tributaries, both in the amount of flood waters as snow and glacial melt and the timing of this increased flow.\(^{16}\)

The Washington State Department of Ecology (WSDOE) reports that climate modeling indicates extreme weather events will become more common, due to the variable climate system caused by rising average temperatures. This climate variation will cause higher winter stream flows and more floods. With warming temperatures, there will be less winter snow accumulation and earlier spring runoff. Snow acts as an important natural part of water infrastructure. Indeed, the WSDOE refers to the mountain snowpack as one of the water reservoirs for Basin planning. When more winter precipitation falls as rain rather than snow, there is less runoff in the growing season and the runoff that does occur will be at higher temperatures.\(^{17}\)

In the near future, glacial melting will mask the changes to flows and water temperature, but as the glaciers continue to recede, temperature levels in the river could rise to levels inhospitable to the fish and aquatic animal species native to the Columbia River. The high spring flow also feeds the alluvial groundwater systems across the floodplains. These flood plain aquifers slowly release water back to the river to provide base flows during low-flow season. Groundwater upwelling into the river system provides important cold water recharge that helps salmon migration through lower elevations and arid reaches. A warming climate that alters the timing and intensity of winter storms will therefore alter the hydrology of the Columbia River.\(^{18,19,20,21}\)

COLUMBIA RIVER TRIBES AND CANADIAN FIRST NATIONS: AN OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS PAST WRONGS

For Columbia River tribes and First Nations, the reauthorization of the Columbia River Treaty provides a unique opportunity to work together to reverse the wrongs and injustices of the 1964 Treaty, a process in which they were neither included nor consulted. The Treaty’s dual focus, proving hydropower and flood control, omitted consideration of fish and wildlife and their importance to tribal subsistence as well as cultural and spiritual needs. Before the 1964 Treaty, the 1940 Grand Coulee Dam inundated the historic Kettle Falls tribal fishery; later the 1957 Dalles Dam inundated the treasured Celilo Falls fishery. Grand Coulee and the four new Treaty dams were built without fish passage, eliminating about 700 miles of salmon habitat and spawning grounds. As a result, by the 1990’s there were 13 Columbia River salmon runs listed under the Endangered Species Act.

Treaties signed in the mid- to late 1800’s between the U.S. and Columbia River tribes reserved to the Tribes the right to fish at traditional sites along the Columbia and its tributaries. U.S. court decisions in the 1960’s and 1970’s interpreted these rights as reserving half of the fisheries for the Treaty tribes, as well as the right to environmental conditions to insure healthy fisheries. In Canada, the government is required under
statute to consult First Nations on projects that impact them. The Tribes and First Nations understand the connection between the management of the Columbia and maintaining healthy fish runs, believing tribes have an interest in and a right to be a part of the future as co-managers of the fishery in order to prevent further degradation of the rivers and natural resources.

In 2009, a tribal coalition of 15 tribes and three intertribal organizations developed recommendations titled, “Common Views on the Future of the Columbia River Treaty” and “their Goals and Objectives” for future river management. This document established consensus among the Columbia River tribes for involvement in the Treaty review process. In 2011, the coalition reached out to 11 First Nations in British Columbia that had been severely impacted by the Treaty dams in their territory and six other First Nations with interests in the Treaty to forge a united voice.22,23

The tribal coalition identified the following “Goals in the Columbia River Treaty Process” in 2012:

- Governance: A seat at the table to review negotiations and implementation.
- Flood risk management: Restore spring freshet, while balancing tribal needs in upper reservoirs.
- Restore salmon passage: Restore and protect salmon passage at historic locations (above Grand Coulee, Chief Joseph, Hells Canyon Complex and Dworshak Dams).
- Share in the benefits of a coordinated system.24

The united Tribes urged the inclusion of ecosystem-based functioning, an integrated approach to resource management that considers the entire ecosystem, including humans, and the elements that are integral to ecosystem functions, ensuring a more natural river and reservoir flow regime as a third, co-equal goal of a revised Treaty. This received the support of many regional environmental and fishing organizations and was included in the final U.S. Entity Recommendations. The tribes also advocated for an additional entity to join Bonneville Power Administration and the Bureau of Reclamation in the management of the Treaty.25,26

CRT POWER GROUP DEMANDS A DECREASE IN THE CANADIAN ENTITLEMENT

A strong and vocal stakeholder in the review process has been the Columbia River Treaty Power Group (CRTPG), comprised of over 80 U.S. electric utilities and industry associations that depend on the power produced by the Columbia River hydropower generating plants. The group, representing 6.4 million electric customers in four Northwestern U.S. states, said their goal was to lower the electric utility rates of their customers. The Power Group demanded that the U.S. Entity make the renegotiation of the Canadian Entitlement payment to Canada a top priority to be resolved in the Treaty negotiations between the U.S. and Canada. As discussed earlier about the Canadian entitlement, Canada sold their 50% share of generated hydro power to a group of public and private utilities for a lump-sum price for 30 years. Since that 30-year term expired, utilities represented by the CRTPG have had to purchase power from Canada at current rates under a specified formula dictated by the Treaty. CRTPG claims that the current Canadian Entitlement formula far exceeds the actual power benefit received.27

In a news release, the CRTPG claimed that the U.S. was vastly overpaying Canada for power and that the Canadian Entitlement should be cut to 10% of the current amount, or the Treaty should be terminated. They urged the U.S. Entity to focus on a new methodology for determining the Canadian Entitlement as soon as possible, stating, “The primary objective for the State Department in any Treaty negotiation should be to
ensure that after 2024, the U.S. pay Canada only one-half of the actual downstream power benefits of ongoing coordinated operations.”28,29,30

The CRTPG also opposes the inclusion of “ecosystem-based function” as a third goal of the Treaty. In their written response to the draft Regional Recommendations, they insist the U.S. Entity “fully account for the efforts already being undertaken outside the Treaty under existing federal and state programs to protect fish and wildlife resources in the Columbia River Basin and its tributaries.” They also believe that, “fish passage at the Grand Coulee and Chief Joseph Dams is outside the scope of any renegotiated Treaty.”31

AGRICULTURAL IRRIGATORS: OVERLOOKED

The 1964 Treaty ignored consumptive water uses such as out-of-stream uses including municipal, industrial and irrigation water. These uses, especially irrigation water for agriculture, have grown over the years. Under the Bureau of Reclamation programs, Columbia River Basin agriculture has flourished. When the draft of the U.S. Regional Recommendation failed to specifically mention water for irrigation or water for agriculture as a key issue, irrigators were irate. Irrigators in Eastern Washington, Eastern Oregon, and Idaho are now calling for more water from the Columbia to be made available for an expanding agricultural economy. Also, Washington and Oregon have demanded that a renewed treaty allocate an additional 2 MAF of water for future agricultural irrigation and other out-of-stream uses. Currently, approximately 7.1 million acres of land are under irrigation in the Columbia River Basin and nine percent of the Columbia’s flow measured at The Dalles is diverted for agriculture.32,33

U.S. ENTITY REGIONAL RECOMMENDATION FOR A POST-2024 TREATY

On December 13, 2013, the BPA and the Army Corps of Engineers’ Northwestern Division Engineer jointly issued the final post-2024 Treaty Regional Recommendation and sent it to the State Department and the Obama Administration. The recommendation attempted to reconcile the diverse opinions of the sovereign states, federally-recognized tribes and regional stakeholders into a broad consensus as stated in the cover letter:

“It is important to achieve a modernized framework for the Treaty that balances power production, flood risk management, and ecosystem-based function as the primary purposes addressed in the Treaty, while also meeting other congressionally authorized purposes of the U.S. projects, such as irrigation and navigation.”34

The recommendation further emphasizes the goal of improving the Treaty for the benefit of all interests in the region and ensuring the modernized Treaty is fair, balanced, and sustainable. Specifically, the U.S. Entity recommended modernizing the 1964 Treaty built on nine key principles to be taken together with the intent that all interests addressed be approved. The U.S. entities acknowledged that the recommendation is an important first step, but further review will be carried out by the State Department in consultation with the Obama Administration. They emphasize the U.S. Entity, regional sovereigns and stakeholders remain very interested in participating in the State Department’s future review and any subsequent related actions or decisions.35

See Appendix A (page 28) for the nine principles underlying the recommendations and recommendation details.

BRITISH COLUMBIA’S PERSPECTIVE AND RECOMMENDATION

The residents of British Columbia, particularly those within the Canadian portion of the Columbia River basin, have a different perspective on the Treaty and its impacts. Unappreciated by most Americans was extensive damage to southeast B.C. that resulted from the 1964 Treaty agreement to build four dams for flood control at the upper reaches of the Columbia. Three
dams were built in Canada and one in Libby, Montana, whose Koochana reservoir extended up into the Canadian Kootenay Valley. To build these, four river valleys totaling 135,000 acres of farm and forest lands were flooded and 2,500 residents were displaced from the area.

Canadian First Nations were also affected by Treaty dams when cultural sites and traditional lands were submerged and lost. There was also extensive ecological damage to fish and wildlife. Additional insults to the valleys come with the annual drawdown of reservoirs in preparation for spring rains, which severely degrade views of the landscape. The area’s grievances resulted in the B.C. government creating the Columbia Basin Trust and Columbia Power Corporation in 1994 with a $295 million endowment for mitigation projects and compensation to those affected.36

The B.C. Government issued “U.S. Benefits from the Columbia River Treaty - Past, Present and Future: A Province of British Columbia Perspective” on June 25, 2013.37 This document makes clear that B.C. believes the treaty should be continued and warns of the consequences of termination, especially, “in face of adapting to the climate change challenges that threaten salmon recovery, water supply and energy reliability.”38 The B.C. document refutes the proposed lowering of the Canadian entitlement proposed by the Columbia River Treaty Power Group. Indeed, B.C. argues the entitlement should stay the same or be increased.

The document then describes how B.C. manages its dams for the many benefits provided to the U.S. beyond hydropower and flood control, including ecosystem function, irrigation, fisheries, recreation and navigation. It claims that Canada receives no benefit from the Treaty except the Canadian Entitlement and without the Treaty B.C. would manage the dams for its own interests alone.39,40

The British Columbia Decision presented in the draft recommendation to the Canadian government was submitted in May 2013. It advised continuing the Treaty with improvements and established a set of principles to guide changes. Improvements would be made with an understanding of how the Treaty is beneficial, how further cooperation can enhance or create new benefits, and what is at risk of being lost if the Treaty is terminated. Their recommendation opposed the inclusion of ecosystem function as a third goal of the Treaty, stating, “We don’t need to change the Treaty to work towards improving ecosystems.”41 They contend ecosystem values are currently an important value and are addressed with available mechanisms inside and outside the Treaty. They also hold the opinion that fish passage issues should be addressed outside of the Treaty negotiations.42,43

THE COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY: PRESENT AND FUTURE

The Treaty’s future is now in the hands of the U.S. State Department and the Canadian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, which will have to negotiate a resolution between the two countries’ Recommendations. There are several issues of disagreement between the U.S. and Canada and between the different stakeholders.

One major hurdle is the amount of the Canadian Entitlement to be paid by U.S. interests. This payment is compensation for coordinated dam operations which enhance hydropower production and is determined by a set formula and paid for by power (or the monetary value of that power). The U.S. and individual stakeholders benefit from this coordination in other ways including flood control, irrigation, municipal and industrial water, navigation, recreation and ecosystem functioning. These other U.S. beneficiaries do not directly pay for the benefits received by coordinated Treaty operations, an issue emphasized by the CRTPG.44

Also potentially contentious is the 1964 Treaty provision that calls for a Post-2024 Treaty change to a model of “called upon” flood control. After 2024 the U.S. must make “effective use” of its own storage reservoir capacity to hold back flood waters before it can “call upon” Cana-
da for assistance. Canada insists that this means all U.S. Columbia River storage reservoirs, while the U.S. maintains that only mainstem Columbia River reservoirs are to be utilized. So this will need to be clearly defined in the post-2024 Treaty. Canada may be open to continue utilizing their treaty dam reservoirs for flood control if they are fairly compensated.  

Other issues, such as the formal inclusion of ecosystem-based management and enabling fish passage above Grand Coulee dam in the Treaty rather than keeping those issues outside the Treaty process will be points of negotiation. Whether ecosystem-based management is formally included in the Treaty or not, flexibility to adjust to climate fluctuations, extreme weather events, and unanticipated environmental changes must also be addressed in the post-2024 Columbia River Treaty.  
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Book review continued:

and bargers with their bloated river, Hanford's technicians had come to be totally dependent on federal cash and deeply resentful of federal control,” as they work to clean up toxic material.

This is a thoughtful, hard-hitting book about an amazingly powerful river and the vast number of people in many fields of work who are dependent on it, and on the federal government that manages it. I found it both eye-opening and riveting.

Opinions in this review are personal and do not represent those of the League.
General Principles:

Nine key principles underlie this recommendation and a modern approach to the Columbia River Treaty. These General Principles are to be taken together with the intent that all of the interests addressed herein be improved.

1. Treaty provisions should enable the greatest possible shared benefits in the United States and Canada from the coordinated operation of Treaty reservoirs for ecosystem, hydropower, and flood risk management, as well as water supply, recreation, navigation, and other pertinent benefits and uses, as compared to no longer coordinating Treaty storage operations.

2. The health of the Columbia River ecosystem should be a shared benefit and cost of the United States and Canada.

3. The minimum duration of the Treaty post-2024 should be long enough to allow each country to rely on the Treaty’s planned operations and benefits for purposes of managing their long-range budgets, resource plans, and investments, but adaptable enough to allow responses to new information and changing conditions.

4. All operations of the Treaty should be based on the best available science, and, to the extent practicable, measurable outcomes.

5. U.S. federal reservoirs/projects will continue to meet authorized uses consistent with applicable legislation, Indian treaties and tribal rights, the U.S. Government’s trust responsibility to the tribes, and other U.S. laws such as the Clean Water Act and the Endangered Species Act. Non-federal U.S. projects will continue to meet their responsibilities pursuant to their Federal Energy Regulatory Commission licenses.

6. The United States and Canada should pursue a more coordinated use of Treaty and Canadian non-Treaty storage under the Treaty to increase the flexibility to, and benefits of, meeting ecosystem-based function, power, flood risk management, and other authorized water management purposes in both countries.

7. The region anticipates impacts from climate change to all of the elements described in this document. The strategy for adapting the Treaty to future changes in climate should be resilient, adaptable, flexible, and timely as conditions warrant.

8. It is recognized that modifications to the Treaty could result in new benefits and/or costs to both Canada and the United States. U.S. interests should ensure that costs associated with any Treaty operation are aligned with the appropriate party.

9. Implementation of ecosystem-based functions in the Treaty should be compatible with rebalancing the entitlement and reducing U.S. power costs.

Recommendation Details:

Hydropower

In order to maintain coordinated hydropower operations and a reliable, economically sustainable hydropower system in a modernized Treaty, the region recommends the following:

1. The United States should pursue rebalancing the power benefits between the two countries to reflect the actual value of coordinated operations. This rebalancing is necessary because the present Treaty power benefits are not equitably shared and Canada is deriving substantially greater value from coordinated power operations than the United States. Accordingly, for the Treaty to be sustainable after 2024, the United States should only provide benefits to Canada equivalent to one-half of the actual U.S. downstream capacity and energy benefits received from coordinated operations as compared to a non-coordinated operation.
2. The United States should renegotiate for the replacement of the present “Aspects of Delivery Agreement” to create the least-cost transmission strategy for both countries to return the Canadian Entitlement to Canada. This includes reconsidering the flexibility of the return.

3. A modernized Treaty should retain the ability for both the United States and Canada to maintain an economical and reliable power supply post-2024. This requires consideration of the implications of any reductions in generation capability for either country, including lost revenue, system reliability, and substantial increases in loss-of-load probability, carbon emissions, renewable resource integration, energy efficiency and conservation, and shifts in streamflow quantity and timing due to climate change.

4. A modernized Treaty should avoid substantial changes in hydropower generation during peak load periods that result in lower system reliability or flexibility.

Flood Risk Management

In order to maintain coordinated flood risk management, and to protect public safety and the region’s economy, the region recommends the following:

1. The United States should pursue post-2024 Treaty flood risk management through a coordinated operation plan that provides for an acceptable level of flood risk. Unless modified based upon future review of flood risk management policy for the Columbia River, the level of risk will be similar to the level of risk existing prior to 2024 (see Domestic Matters to be Addressed Post-2013 section.)

2. The United States should pursue an assessment with Canada of potential alternatives for post-2024 operations to meet flood risk management objectives, including the possibility of using planned or assured Canadian Storage.

3. The United States and Canada should establish a common understanding of the methods and procedures for post-2024 Called Upon, which should reflect the following principles based on the U.S. Entity White Paper: Columbia River Post-2024 Flood Risk Management Procedure, September 2011:

A. Called Upon should be considered only if coordinated Canadian power, flood control, and other operations do not provide sufficient storage in conjunction with the use of U.S. system flood storage or when needed during refill season to modify planned Canadian releases.

B. Draft U.S. projects according to their storage reservation diagrams (SRDs). Future flood risk management studies may evaluate alternative SRDs to include incorporation of ecosystem-based function such as dry year operating strategies.

C. Define “effective use” as applying to the eight U.S. reservoirs authorized for system flood control.

4. The United States and Canada should identify reasonable compensation to Canada for economic losses and operating costs associated with Called Upon. Any payments for Columbia River flood risk management should be consistent with the national flood risk funding policy of federal funding with applicable local beneficiaries sharing those costs as appropriate.

5. A modernized Treaty should enable the necessary flexibility to adapt both to changing flood risk management objectives in the United States and Canada and climate change (such as the potential for more frequent and intense winter flood events) to avoid additional risks to authorized purposes.

Ecosystem-based Function

In order to achieve the goal of modernizing the Treaty to further ensure a more comprehensive ecosystem-based function approach throughout the Columbia River Basin watershed, the region recommends the following:

1. A modernized Treaty should provide stream-
flows from Canada with appropriate timing, quantity, and water quality to promote productive populations of anadromous and resident fish and provide reservoir conditions to promote productive populations of native fish and wildlife. While recognizing existing Treaty obligations, a modernized Treaty should: (a) incorporate existing Treaty flow augmentation operations and accommodate post-2024 modifications to flow augmentation; (b) incorporate a dry-year strategy; and (c) gain long-term assurance of ecosystem-based functions rather than negotiating for these functions on an annual basis.

2. A modernized Treaty should recognize and minimize adverse effects to tribal, First Nations, and other cultural resources in Canada and the United States. To the extent there are adverse effects to U.S. cultural resource interests, such changes should be addressed under the Federal Columbia River Power System (FCRPS) Cultural Resources Program. This Program has the ability to be amended and expanded as needed if there are effects on cultural resources resulting from changes due to future operations in a modernized Treaty.

3. A modernized Treaty should be designed to be adaptable to meeting ecosystem-based function requirements as new information becomes available or conditions change (e.g., climate change) based on the management priorities of both countries.

4. The United States should pursue a joint program with Canada, with shared costs, to investigate and, if warranted, implement restored fish passage and reintroduction of anadromous fish on the mainstem Columbia River to Canadian spawning grounds. This joint program would proceed on an incremental basis, beginning with a reconnaissance-level investigation, and continue with implementation actions. All such federal actions at the Chief Joseph and Grand Coulee projects are subject to congressional authorization and appropriation. Modernized Treaty operations should not interfere with other opportunities to restore fish passage and reintroduction of fish in other blocked areas of the Columbia River Basin.

5. The United States should continue to coordinate its operation of Libby Dam with Canada, with the goal of achieving mutually desirable ecosystem benefits on both sides of the border. VarQ* at Libby and Hungry Horse Dams, including any modifications to VarQ, balances the multiple uses of the dams and incorporates ecosystem-based function.

* VarQ stands for variable discharge, is a modern flood control standard, and was developed in the late 1990's for these two Montana dams. This modified flood control regulation was designed to improve the multi-purpose operation of the reservoirs by defining a more flexible flood control operation.

**Water Supply**

Treaty Review studies indicate the potential for a modernized Treaty to allow for additional storage of water in Canada during the fall and winter, and release in the spring and summer. The Treaty should allow the storage and release of water from Canada in the spring and summer for additional in-stream and out-of-stream uses, including irrigation and municipal/industrial uses.

Irrigation has a long and important history in the Columbia River Basin for crop production and other purposes. The need for irrigation will only increase as the region continues to grow and as food supply and security continue to grow in importance. Operations under a modernized Treaty should recognize irrigation as an important authorized purpose in the Basin.

Any future water supply allocation decisions associated with a modernized Treaty should be subject to the requirement that they not adversely affect the operation of upstream reservoirs such as VarQ, and be made through a future domestic process and be consistent with ecosystem-based function and water rights, including tribal reserved water rights (see Domestic Matters to be Addressed Post-2013 section.)
Navigation

Since Treaty ratification in 1964, the regional and national economic significance of Columbia River navigation has grown. Operations under a modernized Treaty should recognize navigation as an important authorized purpose in the Basin and provide river flows that do not undermine safe navigation, efficient cargo movement, or the ability of navigation infrastructure to be maintained. This will ensure the economic value of port and transportation facilities, including commercial import and export of agricultural, bulk and manufactured goods.

Recreation

The region recognizes and supports the recreational and cultural opportunities that are a significant outcome of the Columbia River watershed management processes. Operations under a modernized Treaty should strive toward the protection of these resources.

Climate Change

A modernized Treaty should consider impacts from climate change to all elements described above, and create new terms in the post-2024 Treaty to allow the adaptive management of coordinated Treaty operations to better mitigate any impacts associated with climate change. The United States and Canadian Entities’ Hydro-meteorological Team should continue to collaborate and share the best available climate change data and information.


League’s Present-Day Work with the Columbia River Water and Rivers Portfolio and Treaty Renewal

By Raelene Gold

As the Columbia River Treaty Review process began in 2011, the League of Women Voters of Washington joined the Leagues of Oregon and Idaho to participate in the review process. They attending listening sessions and conferences, conferring together, but with each one writing their individual comments at each point in the process, including final comments regarding the September 20, 2013 draft U.S. Entities Regional Recommendation. These were considered in the December 13, 2013 Final Regional Recommendation.

The Leagues of Washington and Idaho requested that the very technical listening sessions be more comprehensible, convenient and engaging to the general public. The League of Women Voters of Washington urged the acknowledgment of the “value of a cooperative relationship with Canada in the coordinated management of the Columbia River.” We advocated for the renewal of the Treaty with modifications and opposed Treaty termination. Additionally, we supported the, “inclusion of ecosystem functioning as a primary goal of a modernized Treaty,” and the restoration of fish passage to the upper Columbia. Also supported was, “flexibility of operations in the revised Treaty to adapt to the impacts of climate change” and the consideration of the inclusion of conservation, energy efficiency and renewable wind and solar energy to meet our power needs.

The Leagues of Washington and Idaho also have continued to participate in the Columbia River Treaty Roundtable, which includes organizations and citizens in the U.S. and Canada who support the restoration of the ecological health of the entire Columbia River ecosystem. The Roundtable also promotes cross-border understanding and collective action.
The League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County presents:

**Toast! To Our Diverse Heritage**

You are cordially invited to a League fundraiser honoring members of the community who have devoted significant effort to making democracy work for King County’s immigrant populations. It will also be a celebration of our multicultural past and present.

Saturday, April 18, 2015           6:00pm—8:30pm
The Wing Luke Museum
719 S King Street, Seattle’s International District

Register online or call the office.

The Champion of New Americans
Community Service Awards
- Lifetime Achievement
- Special Program

With Emcee State Representative Cindy Ryu

Buy raffle tickets for a chance to win a diamond necklace from Ben Bridge Jewelers, Sounders tickets, a signed cookbook and meal at your favorite Tom Douglas restaurant, and more!

Wine and Hors d’Oeuvres
Program from 7:15—8:30pm
Admission: $75 - attendees can visit the museum

VIP $95 - includes special tour of the Bruce Lee exhibit
Doors open at 5:30pm for VIP ticketholders only

All proceeds of this event go to support the League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County Education Fund - a 501c3 nonpartisan political organization which encourages informed and active participation in government and works to increase understanding of major public policy issues through education.

1620 18th Ave, Seattle, WA 98122 206-329-4848 www.seattlelwv.org
Unit Meetings

(Unit times and locations subject to change; please verify with unit leader.) Meetings are open to all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Leader email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hedgewolf@aol.com">hedgewolf@aol.com</a></td>
<td>206-763-9430</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Hostess: Marian Wolfe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:montoyaviv@gmail.com">montoyaviv@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>206-695-2620</td>
<td></td>
<td>4155 - 13th Ave S, Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>206-763-9430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:kbeck25@comcast.net">kbeck25@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>206-523-3127</td>
<td>12:45 p.m.</td>
<td>Brig Bldg. (6344) in Magnuson Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7400 Sand Point Way NE, Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:tgeokezas@msn.com">tgeokezas@msn.com</a></td>
<td>206-782-5036</td>
<td>7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Hostess: Bettina Holser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:elsiesimon@comcast.net">elsiesimon@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>206-283-6297</td>
<td></td>
<td>9516 - 2nd Ave NW, Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:howe.john@comcast.net">howe.john@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>206-236-0593</td>
<td>9:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Emmanuel Episcopal Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4400 86th Ave SE, Mercer Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:orlanre@aol.com">orlanre@aol.com</a></td>
<td>206-524-0936</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contact unit leader for meeting info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:joanvlawson@gmail.com">joanvlawson@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>206-382-3147</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Horizon House, Forum &amp; Social Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>900 University St, Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td>7:15 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hostess: Linnea Hirst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1602 E McGraw St, Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>206-322-3076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Unit times and locations subject to change; please verify with unit leader.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Leader email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday, April 14</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BELLEVUE/KIRKLAND/REDMOND</strong> – Bonnie Rimawi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bonnierim@aol.com">bonnierim@aol.com</a></td>
<td>425-820-7127</td>
<td>12:00 p.m. Bellevue Library, Room 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1111 110th Ave NE, Bellevue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEST SEATTLE</strong> – Ethel Williams</td>
<td><a href="mailto:etheljw1@q.com">etheljw1@q.com</a></td>
<td>206-932-7887</td>
<td>1:00 p.m. Daystar Retirement Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2615 SW Barton, Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday, April 15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTH KING COUNTY</strong> – Toni Potter/ Marjorie Hawkes</td>
<td><a href="mailto:antoniapotter@comcast.net">antoniapotter@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>206-365-8949</td>
<td>9:15 a.m. Third Place Commons Mtg Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mshawkesis@gmail.com">mshawkesis@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>425-582-2481</td>
<td>17171 Bothell Way NE, Lake Forest Pk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTHWEST KING COUNTY</strong> – Mary Ehlers and Kathy Jorgensen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:maryehlers@comcast.net">maryehlers@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>253-941-1930</td>
<td>7:00 p.m. Foundation House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:kjorgensen@juno.com">kjorgensen@juno.com</a></td>
<td>253-859-8349</td>
<td>32290 1st Ave S, Federal Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday, April 16</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIVERSITY HOUSE/WALLINGFORD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td>10:00 a.m. University House, Auditorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4400 Stone Way N, Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTHEAST KING COUNTY/ENUMCLAW</strong> – Cathy Dormaier</td>
<td><a href="mailto:clcathy@skynetbb.com">clcathy@skynetbb.com</a></td>
<td>360-802-6799</td>
<td>11:30 a.m. Big Daddy’s BBQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1324 Roosevelt Ave E, Enumclaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saturday, April 18</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALLARD/MAGNOLIA/QUEEN ANNE DAY</strong> – Alice Peterson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:peterson-alice-jack@msn.com">peterson-alice-jack@msn.com</a></td>
<td>206-524-5530</td>
<td>10:00 a.m. Hostess: Joan &amp; Kim Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6537 Dibble Ave. NW, Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday, April 30</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISSAQUAH</strong> – Margaret Austin</td>
<td><a href="mailto:margaret.austin@comcast.net">margaret.austin@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>425-392-5760</td>
<td>10:00 a.m. Echo Room, Issaquah City Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>130 East Sunset Way, Issaquah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Board & Committee Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Executive Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-15</td>
<td>President: Ellen Barton 206-329-4848 <a href="mailto:president@seattlelwv.org">president@seattlelwv.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-15</td>
<td>1st VP-Action: Janet Winans 206-323-4825 <a href="mailto:janetwinans@earthlink.net">janetwinans@earthlink.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>2nd VP: Mary Jo Vigil 206-783-8485 <a href="mailto:maryjovigil@icloud.com">maryjovigil@icloud.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-15</td>
<td>Secretary: Amanda Clark 206-236-0517 <a href="mailto:amandac5@comcast.net">amandac5@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-16</td>
<td>Treasurer: Cindy Piennett 206-329-4848 <a href="mailto:cindypiennett@gmail.com">cindypiennett@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-15</td>
<td>Program/Outreach: Joanna Cullen 206-329-8514 <a href="mailto:jfoxcullen@gmail.com">jfoxcullen@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-16</td>
<td>Membership: Paneen Davidson 206-329-4848 <a href="mailto:membership@seattlelwv.org">membership@seattlelwv.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-15</td>
<td>Social Justice: Jayne Freitag 425-223-5827 <a href="mailto:mjafreitag@comcast.net">mjafreitag@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-16</td>
<td>Action: Pat Griffith 206-285-2452 <a href="mailto:pgseattle@q.com">pgseattle@q.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-16</td>
<td>Voter Services: Julie Anne Kempf 206-329-4848 <a href="mailto:julie@kempf.com">julie@kempf.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-16</td>
<td>Program: Joan Lawson 206-329-4848 <a href="mailto:joanlawson@gmail.com">joanlawson@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>Voter Editor: Lisa Peterson 206-329-4848 <a href="mailto:votereditor@seattlelwv.org">votereditor@seattlelwv.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-16</td>
<td>Voter Services: Amelia Woolley 206-329-4848 <a href="mailto:voterservice@seattlelwv.org">voterservice@seattlelwv.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All board members listed above are also members of the Education Fund Board.

### Education Fund Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Executive Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-15</td>
<td>President: Ellen Barton 206-329-4848 <a href="mailto:president@seattlelwv.org">president@seattlelwv.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>1st VP: Janet Winans 206-323-4825 <a href="mailto:janetwinans@earthlink.net">janetwinans@earthlink.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>2nd VP: Julie Anne Kempf 206-329-4848 <a href="mailto:julie@kempf.com">julie@kempf.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-15</td>
<td>Secretary: Amanda Clark 206-236-0517 <a href="mailto:amandac5@comcast.net">amandac5@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>Treasurer: Katie Dudley 206-329-4848 <a href="mailto:eftreasurer@seattlelwv.org">eftreasurer@seattlelwv.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nominating Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Executive Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>Chair: Jeannette Kahlenberg 206-329-4848 <a href="mailto:kahlenb@gmail.com">kahlenb@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>Carol Goldenberg 206-329-4848 <a href="mailto:carolsamgo@q.com">carolsamgo@q.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>Jeanette Johnson 206-329-4848 <a href="mailto:jeanettejohnson10@msn.com">jeanettejohnson10@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Board members Amanda Clark and Amelia Woolley have been appointed to serve on the nominating committee.

### Off Board Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Executive</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campaign Finance</td>
<td>Jean Carlson</td>
<td>206-774-6649</td>
<td><a href="mailto:carlson.jean@gmail.com">carlson.jean@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KC South Liaison</td>
<td>Mary Ehlers</td>
<td>253-941-1930</td>
<td><a href="mailto:maryehlers@comcast.net">maryehlers@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS Coordinator</td>
<td>Cynthia Howe</td>
<td>206-236-0593</td>
<td><a href="mailto:howe.john@comcast.net">howe.john@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Committees

- **Climate Change**
  - Judy Bevington
  - gbeving@eskimo.com

- **Economics & Taxation**
  - see page 7

- **Education**
  - Joanna Cullen
  - 206-329-8514
  - jfoxcullen@gmail.com

- **International Relations**
  - see page 7

- **Social Justice**
  - Jayne Freitag
  - 425-223-5827
  - mjafreitag@comcast.net

- **Transportation**
  - Janet Winans
  - 206-323-4825
  - janetwinans@earthlink.net

- **Waterfront**
  - Nancy & Charles Bagley
  - 206-282-1578
  - candnbagley@comcast.net
LWV SEATTLE-KING COUNTY:

Reauthorization of the Columbia River Treaty
In A New Era of Climate Change, Tribal Rights and Water Scarcity

Thursday, April 2
6:15 p.m. - Doors open and briefing for discussion leaders
7:00 p.m. - Forum begins

Seattle First Baptist Church
1111 Harvard Ave (at Seneca)
Seattle, WA
Accessible entrance on Harvard

This forum is free and open to the public.

Panelists:

Paul Lumley, Executive Director, Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission.

Rachael Paschal Osborn, public interest water lawyer, Center for Environmental Law & Policy.

Scott Simms, Secretary to the U.S. Entity, Columbia River Treaty.
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