RECLANATION Managing Water in the West

Combining paleo-reconstructed variability with observed and projected future flows

The hydrologic sensitivity analyses in the recent Shortage FEIS and an ongoing study

Nevada TreeFlow Workshop James R. Prairie, PhD Nov 13, 2008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF RECLAMATION U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation

Discussion Topics

- Overview of the Basin
- Drought and Current System Conditions
- Hydrologic Sensitivity Analysis
- Incorporating Projected Climate



Colorado River Basin Hydrology

- 16.5 million acre-feet (maf) allocated annually
- 13 to 14.5 maf of consumptive use annually
- 60 maf of storage
- 15.1 maf average annual
 "natural" inflow into Lake Powell
 over past 100 years
- Inflows are highly variable year-to-year



Natural Flow Colorado River at Lees Ferry Gaging Station, Arizona Water Year 1906 to 2008



State of the System (1999-2008)

WY	Unregulated inflow into Powell % of Average	Powell and Mead Storage, maf	Powell and Mead % Capacity
1999	109	47.59	95
2000	62	43.38	86
2001	59	39.01	78
2002	25	31.56	63
2003	52	27.73	55
2004	49	23.11	46
2005	104	27.24	54
2006	72	25.80	51
2007	68	24.43	49
*2008	102	26.52	53

RECLAMATION

*Based on October 24 Month Study

Colorado River Drought

- 2000-2008 has been the driest 9-year period in the 100-year historical record (WY 2007 and WY 2008 data are estimated)
- Tree-ring reconstructions show more severe droughts have occurred over the past 1200 years (e.g., drought in the mid 1100's)
- Observed 2008 April through July runoff was 112% of average (as of Oct 6, 2008)
- Not unusual to have a few years of above average inflow during longer-term droughts (e.g., the 1950's)

Annual Natural Flow at Lees Ferry Tree-ring Reconstruction (Meko et al., 2007) 25-Year Running Mean



Interim Guidelines A Robust Solution

- Operations specified through the full range of operation for Lake Powell and Lake Mead
- Encourage efficient and flexible use and management of Colorado River water through the ICS mechanism
- Strategy for shortages in the Lower Basin, including a provision for additional shortages if warranted
- In place for an interim period (through 2026) to gain valuable operational experience

RECLAMA

Basin States agree to consult before resorting to litigation

Potential Impacts of Changing Climate

- Historical data shows slight change in mean annual flows over time and large variability year-to-year
- Potential for decreased mean annual flow as well as increased variability
- Recent publications project a wide range of potential impacts (from 0 to up to 45% decrease in the mean annual flow)
- Additional research needed to better quantify uncertainties and improve understanding of risks
- Research Efforts
 - Climate Technical Workgroup (NOAA, UCAR, CU, UNLV, UA, Reclamation, AMEC) advised recent EIS efforts
 - On-going research and development in order to use climate change scenarios in our decision-making
- Information in Section 4.2, Appendix N and U available at: <u>http://www.usbr.gov/lc/region/programs/strategies.html</u>

Hydrologic Sensitivity Runs

3 hydrologic inflow scenarios analyzed in FEIS Appendix N:

- Direct Natural Flow Record
 - ISM applied to natural flow record (1906-2005)
- Direct Paleo
 - ISM applied to Meko paleo flow (762-2005) (Meko et al., 2007)
- Nonparametric Paleo Conditioned
 - Meko paleo conditioned (Prairie, 2006)





Alternate Stochastic Techniques

Paleo conditioned

- Combines observed and paleo streamflows
- Generates
 - Observed flow magnitudes
 - Flow sequences similar to paleo record

🗖 MRM Configuration - nonparametric paleo conditioned No Action 🔤 🖬 🔀			
Configuration			
Policy Input			
Name: nonparametric paleo conditioned No Action None Input DMIs			
O Rules ✓ Index Seq.			
Constraints			
Description Output Run Parameters Policy Input Concurrent Runs			
Index Sequential			
Repeat DMI Number of Runs: 125			
D 125 PaleoCon Initial Offset: 0 🔤 🔿 Timesteps			
Interval: 1 💽 💿 Years			
Control File: "hydrologicIncrement.Rotate.control			
Index Sequential / DMI Mode: O Combinations			
OK Apply Reset Cancel			

Paleo Conditioned Modeling Framework

Streamflow Generation Combining Observed And Paleo Reconstructed Data



Decision Support System

Streamflow Generation

Nonhomogeneous Markov model

Generate system state (S_t)

i.e., wet or dry

RECLAMATION

Generate flow conditionally (K-NN resampling)

 $f(x_t | S_t, S_{t-1}, x_{t-1})$

Drought and Surplus Statistics



Histograms of Dry Periods



Histograms of Wet Periods



Paleo Conditioned Modeling Framework

Streamflow Generation Combining Observed And Paleo Reconstructed Data

> Nonparametric Space-Time Disaggregation

> > Decision Support System



Disaggregation scheme



Paleo Conditioned Modeling Framework



Colorado River Simulation System (CRSS)

- Requires realistic inflow scenarios
- Captures basin policy
- Long-term basin planning model
- Developed in RiverWare (Zagona et al. 2001)
- Run on a monthly time step





CRSS Modeling Assumptions – Alternate Hydrologic Sequences



- Index Sequential Method & Alternate Stochastic Techniques
- Alternate Hydrologic Sequences & Results

Comparison of Inflow Scenarios "Box Plots"



Lake Powell End-of-December Water Elevations Probability of Being Below Minimum Power Pool

(Percent of Values Less than or Equal to Elevation 3,490 feet msl)



Lake Mead End-of-December Water Elevations Probability of Being Below SNWA Intakes

(Percent of Values Less than or Equal to Elevation 1,000 feet msl)



Glen Canyon Dam 10-Year Release Volume *Water Years 2009-2060*



Comparison of Long-Term Planning Hydrologies based on Different Blends of Instrumental Record, Paleoclimate, and Projected Climate Information

(Brekke, Prairie, Pruitt, Rajagopalan, Woodhouse, 2008) (funded from S&T, UC, GP)

Research Questions

- 1. How can paleoclimate and projected climate information be jointly and rationally incorporated into planning assumptions for water supplies, hereafter referred to as planning hydrology?
- 2. How would such a planning hydrology be similar to or different from planning hydrology developed to individually reflect paleoclimate or projected climate?
- 3. What implementation realities might influence choice among climate information sets when defining water supply planning assumptions for Reclamation studies?

Combining paleo-reconstructed variability with projected future flows Extension of existing framework

- System State
 - Paleo- reconstruciton
 - Woodhouse et al.
- Magnitudes
 - Replace observed record with projected climate data
 - Runoff magnitudes generated with CBRFC rainfall runoff model
- Two Case Studies
 - 1. Missouri River at Touston
 - 2. Gunnison River at Grand Junction
- Four climate information sets
 - 1. Null state: observed magnitude: observed
 - 2. Alt 1 state: paleo magnitude: observed
 - 3. Alt 2 runoff projections direct from rainfall runoff model
 - 4. Alt 3 state: paleo

magnitude: runoff projections

Missouri River Basin - State

Reconstructed streamflow



Missouri River Basin - Magnitudes

Observed Record and Projected Runoff



1951-1999

- Alt 2
- Only projected climate



- Alt 3
- Projected climate coupled with paleo



RECLAMATION

2070-2099

- Alt 2
- Only projected climate



- Alt 3
- Projected climate coupled with paleo



RECLAMATION

Volume by spell length

- Blue observed
- Red paleo
- Orange Alt 2
- Purple Alt 3



Drought Length Histogram

- Blue observed
- Red paleo
- Orange Alt 2



Key Study Findings

- "How can paleoclimate and projected climate information be jointly and rationally incorporated into a planning assumptions for water supplies, hereafter referred to as planning hydrology?" The stochastic modeling approach used in this study illustrates one such framework. It was modified from previous demonstrations to incorporate projected runoff magnitudes rather than instrumental record magnitudes
- "How would such a planning hydrology be similar to or different from planning hydrology developed to individually reflect paleoclimate or projected climate?", Based on results summarized earlier, the Alternative 3 planning hydrology was found to exhibit similar annual runoff possibilities as Alternative 2. For the Upper Missouri, where the persistence in the reconstructed runoff record differed significantly from that in the climate projections, the longer-term drought possibilities portrayed in Alternative 3 differed accordingly from those in Alternative 2. This result was not found for the Gunnison.

Key Study Findings

 "What implementation realities might influence choice among climate information sets when defining water supply planning assumptions for Reclamation studies?" Efforts required to disaggregate these annual, single-location hydrologic datasets into monthly, multi-location datasets suitable for planning could have significant influence on scoping choice. In addition to disaggregation issues, the relative ease of introducing flow-impairments, specifying demand and constraint assumptions, and educating stakeholders and decision-makers on the new hydrology's characteristics may also be a scoping factor. It's notable that the complete data-development procedures necessary to support Alternative 2 must still be completed before Alternative 3 can be implemented.



Future Direction

- Blending climate projection data distribution with sequences generated from paleo and observed data
- Reconcile range of runoff reduction at Lees Ferry for many climate projections (Nov 14 workshop)
- Lower Basin focused paleo streamflow reconstruction
- Conditioning future scenarios on large scale climate features (i.e., ENSO, PDO)
- Colorado River Basin Hydrology Work Group

Combining paleo-reconstructed variability with observed and projected future flows

Questions

Combining paleo-reconstructed variability with observed and projected future flows

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