Lower Colorado River Basin Operations and Modeling







Lower Colorado River Basin Operations and Modeling

- Colorado River Operations Objectives
- Hierarchy of Operational Decisions
 - Long-term, mid-term, and short-term
 - Operation of the Lower Basin reservoirs
 - -"Special" operations
- Current state of the system
- Questions

Colorado River Basin

- 1,450 miles in length
- 15.1 million acre-feet average "natural flow" at Lee Ferry Az
- 16.5 maf allocated per year
- 14.5 maf current use per year
- 60 maf of storage
- Irrigates about 3 million acres
- Serves about 30 million people
- Generation capacity 4.2 GW
- 2002 generation 11000 GWH



NATURAL FLOW (AT LEE'S FERRY) 1906-2001



CALENDER YEARS

Colorado River Management Objectives

- Provide flood control and river regulation
- Provide water for consumptive use
- Generate hydropower
- Provide recreation
- Enhance and maintain ecosystem habitat
- Recover and protect endangered species





These objective are often in conflict We seek "equitable" balance of the objectives.



Considerations for Achieving an Equitable Balance in Decision-Making

- Legal and political constraints
- Community involvement and consensus-building
- Sound technical knowledge



"Law of the River"

- Colorado River Compact (1922)
- Boulder Canyon Project Act (1928)
- California Seven-Party Agreement (1932)
- Mexican Water Treaty (1944)
- Upper Colorado River Basin Compact (1948)
- Colorado River Project Storage Act (1956)
- Supreme Court Decree in Arizona vs. California (1964)
- Colorado River Basin Project Act (1968)
- National Environmental Policy Act (1970)
- Long-Range Operating Criteria (1970)
- Endangered Species Act (1973)
- Grand Canyon Protection Act (1992)

Operation of Lake Powell

- Three modes of operation governing the annual releases from Lake Powell
 - Minimum objective release 8.23 maf
 - Equalization (if Powell storage > Mead and "sufficient storage" in Upper Basin)
 - Spill avoidance

602(a) Storage

- Storage in Upper Basin necessary to assure deliveries to Lower Basin without impairment to consumptive use in the Upper Basin
- Equalization releases are not required in years when Upper Basin storage is less than 602(a) storage
- LROC defines "factors to be considered" but does not specify exactly how to calculate 602(a) storage

602(a) Storage



Operation of Lake Mead

- Two modes of operation governing the releases from Lake Mead
 - Meet the downstream demands (surplus, normal, or shortage)
 - Flood Control (releases in excess to downstream demands)
- Flood Control operation governed by Corps of Engineers regulations

Operation of Lake Mead Downstream Requirements

- Downstream demands include:
 - California 4.4 maf
 - Arizona 2.8 maf
 - Nevada 0.3 maf
 - Mexico 1.5 maf
 - Reservoir regulation of Lakes Mohave and Havasu
 - System gains and losses
- Deliveries can be larger or smaller under "surplus" or "shortage" conditions





Long-term Planning

- Primary purpose is to "negotiate" operating criteria
- Uncertainty in:
 - Future water supply
 - Future water demands
- Uncertainty in future water supply overwhelms differences in future demands or in policy

NATURAL FLOW (AT LEE'S FERRY) 1906-2001



CALENDER YEARS

Long-Term Planning Model ("CRSS")

- Used to project reservoir operations basin-wide for 50+ years
- "Law of the River" and other operating criteria (i.e., surplus alternatives) are expressed as rules
- Model is used for comparing different policy alternatives
- Uncertainty due to future inflows is quantified using multiple (85) simulations ("traces")



BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Analysis of Model Output

- 85 simulations @monthly time step for each variable of interest (approx. 300 MB file for each alternative analyzed)
- Post-processors filter output data files and produce Excel spreadsheets
- Excel-based analysis tool (GPAT) used to compare alternatives
 - Single trace output
 - e.g., Mead elevation over time for a particular inflow assumption
 - Statistical output (average, std. dev., percentiles, etc.)
 - e.g, 10th percentile Mead elevation at each time (elevation that was not exceeded by 10% of the traces)

Lake Mead Elevation



Probability of Surplus (of any level)





Mid-term Operations

- Development of the Annual Operating Plan (AOP)
- Several determinations are made (based on the most probable inflows)
 - 602(a) storage and release from Glen Canyon dam
 - Normal, Surplus, or Shortage for Lower Division States
 - Delivery to Mexico
 - Availability of unused apportionment Lower Division
- Plan is updated throughout the year

Mid-term Operations Model ("24 Month Study")

- Projects reservoir operations for the next 2 years
- Updated each month to:
 - Reflect changes in hydrology
 - Reflect changes in water demand
- Used to project energy generation for marketing purposes
- Coordination between multiple offices and agencies required





Water Supply Forecasting

- Unregulated reservoir inflow
 - April-July
 - Current month
 - Next two months
- Forecast team
 - NWS Colorado Basin River Forecast Center (CBRFC)
 - NRCS Water and Climate Center
 - BOR (CBRFC Liaison at UC Regional Office)
- Forecasts disseminated via e-mail list and published at www.cbrfc.gov

Lake Mead EOM Elevation





Lake Mead



Hoover Dam

Lower Colorado River Basin Reservoir Operations







Lake Havasu

Parker Dam

Yuma

Mexico

Lake Mohave

Davis Dam

573,000 acres

Irrigation District

U.S.A. MEXICO

Salton Sea

Salton

Whipple Mountains

untain

San Lu

urtle Mt

Danb

Ver

MAL PREASURE

Kofa Mountain:

182,000 acres

Muggins Mountains

Lechuguilla D

U.S.A.

Short-term Scheduling

- Schedule releases from Hoover, Davis and Parker Dams
- Ensure that water deliveries ("downstream demands") are met within existing constraints
 - Lake elevation targets
 - Energy targets
 - "Special" operation requests
- Schedules are determined for next 5 days and updated each day (while "looking out" 4-6 weeks)

Short-term Scheduling Model ("BHOPS")

- Projects reservoir operations for lakes Mead, Mohave, and Havasu on a daily basis for 4-6 weeks
- Updated each day to:
 - Reflect changes in water demand
 - Reflect changes in constraints
- Used to set energy generation target for Hoover Dam in the current month and for one month out
- Coordination between multiple offices and agencies required





Lake Mohave Operational Constraints



End of Month Target Elevation







Lake Havasu Operational Constraints



End of Month Target Elevation

2003 Nationals – Lake Havasu

129

13121

H

116

La Paz County Sheriff Department Boat Launch Facility

11-





Current Basin Reservoir Conditions (as of February 11, 2004)

Current Storage	Percent Full	1000 Ac-Ft	Elev. (Ft)
Lake Powell	44%	10,821	3590.00
Lake Mead	60%	15,437	1140.42
Total System Storage	55% *	32,400	NA

* Total system storage was 36,246 kaf or 61% this time last year



Lake Powell Water Surface Elevations 1980 through Present



Lake Mead End of Month Elevations



Four Years of Drought

Lake Powell Unregulated Inflow 2000-2003

- WY 2000
- WY 2001
- WY 2002
- WY 2003

62 percent of average59 percent of average25 percent of average53 percent of average



Colorado River Critical Periods (Periods with Low Flows) Average Natural Flow 15.0 maf

Years	Duration	Average Flow
• 1953-1964	12 years	11.6 maf
• 1953-1977	25 years	12.7 maf
• 1579-1595	17 years	10.5 maf
• 1988-1992	5 years	10.5 maf
 2000-2003* 	4 years	10.7 maf
* Estimated		



Hite Bay looking upstream Full Pool Elevation

Lake Powell 03/09/2003

the net

To Refill Colorado River Reservoirs

- More challenging than the 88-92 Drought
- Lake Powell water storage similar to 1993
 March 1993 53 percent of capacity
 - $\frac{-\text{April } 2003 50 \text{ percent of capacity}}{-\text{April } 2003 50 \text{ percent of capacity}}$
 - April 2005 50 percent of capacity
- Lake Mead much lower today than 1993

 April 1993 85 percent of capacity
 April 2003 63 percent of capacity
- Basin Demands are higher than 10 years ago
- Will likely take a number of years



What is the prognosis over the next 1-2 years?



Upper Colorado – Lake Powell Inflow



LaNina

ElNino

Each dot on the graph represents a runoff year.



When you hear 'ElNino' do not always assume high runoff in the Upper Colorado Basin Above Lake Powell. But... Extremely strong ElNino's are usually wetter and

Extremely strong LaNina's are usually dryer.



Information provided by CBRFC, Salt Lake City, UT.

Lower Colorado – Salt River Inflow



LaNina



Each dot on the graph represents a runoff year.



When you hear 'ElNino' it is usually wetter in the Lower Colorado Basin.When you hear 'LaNina' it is almost always dry In the Lower Colorado Basin.



Information provided by CBRFC, Salt Lake City, UT.

Current Inflow and Forecast (as of February 17, 2004)

- Current basin snowpack is 93% of average
- Water year-to-date precipitation is 88% of average
- From the Colorado Basin River Forecast Center (CBRFC):
 - Observed unregulated inflow into Lake Powell for January, 2004 was 75% of average (3.9 million acre-feet)
 - April through July unregulated inflow into Lake Powell is projected to be 76% of average (6.0 million acre-feet)
- For the Gila River Basin:
 - Current snowpack is 69% of average; precipitation to date is 75% of average



What is the prognosis over the long-run?



What is the Probability of refilling Colorado River reservoirs (with storage > 90 percent of capacity) by the year 2010?

15-20 percent



Some Current Issues in the Lower Basin

- Decreasing Lake Mead levels
- Surplus guidelines
- Shortage guidelines



What affects the elevation of a reservoir?



Why is Lake Mead Going Down?

= 9.0 maf • Inflow - release from Powell + side inflows • Outflow = - 9.7 maf – LB and Mexico apportionments + downstream regulation and losses Mead evaporation loss = - 0.7 maf = - 1.40 maf Balance (about 12 - 13 feet)



When All Else Fails





Upper Basin Depletions 1971-2050 No Reservoir Evaporation



Lower Basin States Use of Colorado River Water





Interim Surplus Guidelines Highlights

- Defines levels in Lake Mead to determine amount of surplus water available
- Guidelines are in effect through 2016
- Domestic surplus levels can be suspended due to:
 - failure to execute the Quantification Settlement Agreement (QSA)
- Colorado River Water Delivery Agreement ("new QSA")

Interim Surplus Guidelines Lake Mead Surplus Trigger Elevations



Water Delivery Agreement (Signed on October 16, 2003)

- California agrees to specific steps to reduce its use of Colorado River water through transfers from agricultural to urban use, canal linings, and other conservation measure
- Quantifies entitlements for Imperial Irrigation District and Coachella Valley Water District
- Re-instates Interim Surplus Guideline levels
- Provides framework for Salton Sea mitigation and restoration



Shortage in the Lower Basin

- Shortage as defined (by the Decree):
 - "if insufficient mainstream water is available for release ... to satisfy annual consumptive use of 7.5 maf ..., then the Secretary of the Interior ... may apportion the amount remaining available ... consistent with the Boulder Canyon Project Act ... and with other applicable federal statutes"
- Long Range Operating Criteria lists some "relevant factors" to consider including: Mexico Treaty obligations, reasonable use requirements in the Lower Basin; actual and forecast storage in Mead, estimate of net inflow to Mead, historic streamflows, etc.
- There are no shortage guidelines in effect today
- Certain modeling assumptions have been made for future, longterm simulation of the river basin

For further information: http://www.usbr.gov/lc/region