## **HYDROPOWER ANALYSIS CENTER**



#### The Corps and Hydropower

Corsp Hydro: 24% of US hydro; 3% of US Electrical Power. \$18 billion investment (75 plants; 375 generating units); \$450 million in annual revenues



#### **NWD-NP Hydropower**

65% of Corps Installed Capacity is in NWD-Columbia; 75% in NWD

#### CORPS HYDROPOWER CAPACITY BY DIVISIONS



Largest NWD-NP Hydropower Dams (by MW Install. Cap.) Chief Joseph (NWS) 2,460 John Day (NWP) 2,160 The Dalles (NWP) 1,800 Bonneville (NWP) 1,093 McNary (NWW) 980 LWG, LGS, LMN (NWW) 810 (each) IHR (NWW) 603 Libby (NWS) 525 Dworshak (NWW) 400 Total Willamette (NWP) 320

Bonneville Dam Second Powerhouse





#### **HAC Roles & Capabilities**

The HAC has over 40 years of experience in :

Powerplant sizing, upgrades, and rehabilitation
River system analysis
Cost allocation and reallocation
Power value and benefit computations
Environmental and other powerplant studies

Staff is cross-trained & familiar with stakeholders in all regions
Works closely with 16 districts, PMA's, HQUSACE
Helps the COE meet its hydropower functions efficiently
Maintains in-house hydropower expertise to ensure that Corps can continue to efficiently carry out its hydropower mission
Support US assistance to Third World countries (e.g., Chin Korea, Nigeria, Mozambique, etc.).





## **Organization and Affiliations**



man Com

### **Problems & Opportunities**

•Average age of powerplants: 35 years

- 349 turbines are due for replacement/rehab due to
  - ✓ Normal wear and tear
- New operating criteria for turbines operation
   Need to develop rehabilitation/upgrade plan for ALL Corps generation facilities
  - ✓ Investments to be systematically analyzed and prioritized on a system basis —rather than piece-meal.
  - ✓ Recognize regional differences
  - ✓ Adapt to new funding climate
  - ✓ Use uniform and consistent evaluation criteria





#### **Federal PMA Boundaries**



## **Summary of Corps Hydropower Authority**

Responsibility to consider hydropower in planning studies is clear

Congress has chosen to treat Federal hydropower development on a project by project basis

Nearly all Corps hydropower installations are at projects having flood control and/or navigation functions "Contributions to NED are increases in the net value of the national output of goods and services, expressed in monetary units."

**P&G**, p. 1, 1 March 1983

# TWO HYDROPOWER CENTERS OF EXPERTISE:

Hydropower Analysis Center (HAC): hydropower and water resource planning and analysis (originally established in 1949)

Hydroelectric Design Center (HDC): engineering and design (originally established in 1948)



# BRIEF HISTORY

Formed in 1949 as Hydropower Evaluation Section Purpose: Hydropower Economic Analysis to **Determine Feasibility of Proposed Hydropower Developments in Pacific Northwest** Later role expanded to cover all US Corps projects and Foreign Countries (e.g., China, South Korea, Nigeria and Others) Gained National Hydropower MCX Status in 1996

# ER 1110-1-8158

 Designates Hydropower System Analysis MCX
 Mandates all USACE elements to coordinate with and use MCX services.
 Requires MSC's to monitor and certify appropriate use of MCX's

Supports HDCServes Other Districts

## MAIN EXPERTISE AREAS

1. Hydropower Planning 2. Energy Studies 3. Capacity Studies 4. Economic Analysis Power Impact Studies **Turbine Performance Selection ERC** Licensing **Regional Planning Issues** 8. **Hydropower Manual** 9. **10. Treaty PEBCOM 11. Procedures Development** 

# MAJOR PLANT REHABILITATION

Alternatives Plan formulation Energy and Capacity Production ✓ Values **Benefits Risk Analysis Technical Review** 

## **Examples of Rehabilitation Projects**

#### **Under Construction:**

- Bonneville (Portland District)
- J. Strom Thurmond (Savannah District)
- Dardanelle (*Little Rock District*)
- John H. Kerr (*Wilmington District*)
- Garrison (Omaha District)
- Jim Woodruff (Mobile District)

#### **Under Design:**

- Whitney (*Ft. Worth District*)
- McNary (Walla Walla District)

#### **Under Planning:**

Garrison, Omaha
Denison, Tulsa
Chief Joseph, Seattle
Old Hickory, Nashville
Fort Randall, Omaha
Cougar, Portland
Center Hill, Nashville
Barkley, Nashville





Calculate Changes in Energy and Capacity
 Estimate Energy and Capacity Values
 Estimate Power Benefits
 Assess Other Related Impacts

### **Examples of River System Studies**

Columbia River System Operation Review

Alabama-Coosa-Tallapoosa and Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint systems (ACT-ACF)

Savannah River Basin Comprehensive Study

# COST ALLOCATION & WATER SUPPLY REALLOCATION

 Analysis of hydropower benefits for multi-purpose water resource projects.
 Identify power benefits and revenue foregone with storage reallocation for municipal and industrial uses (White River Minimum Flow Study, SWL and Lake Greeson, MVK)

# POWER VALUE COMPUTATION

## Compute Energy and Capacity Values Production Power Benefits (Values\* Production

Power production cost model (PROSYM) is maintained for power systems studies anywhere in the USA.

# MISCELLANEOUS POWER PLANT STUDIES

Environmental/Fishery Power Impacts from project features changes (The Dalles Sluiceway, NWP; Variable Q Flood Control, NWS).
Generator Rewind and Uprate (Narrows Generator Rewind, SWT; Garrison Uprate, MRR)
Plant Expansion (Expand/Add generation capabilities @ Libby, NWS).

## **SPECIAL PROCEDURE TO SUPPORT COE-BPA INVESTMENT DECISION**

Traditional COE Approach
Developing the CIDAG
Key details of CIDAG
Applications

### Water Supply Analysis

#### •Hydrologic Analysis & Modeling

- Generation Impacts
  Economic Impacts
- *Example:* White River Min Flow Water Supply Reallocation Study; 2001; Little Rock District. Reallocating power storage to provide a minimum flow for fish in the White River. All five White River basin projects are impacted (including Bull Shoals Dam).







