RECLANATION Managing Water in the West

Colorado River Basin Water Supply and Demand Study

Public Outreach Meeting July 17, 2012



U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation

Colorado River Basin Water Supply and Demand Study

- Welcome and Introductions
- Study Overview
- Summary of Water Demand Scenario Quantification
- Summary of Options and Strategies to Resolve Imbalances
- Updated Schedule
- Questions and Discussion





Colorado River Basin Water Supply and Demand Study

Study Objective

- Assess future water supply and demand imbalances over the next 50 years
- Develop and evaluate opportunities for resolving imbalances
- Study being conducted by Reclamation and the Basin States, in collaboration with stakeholders throughout the Basin
- Began in January 2010 and to be completed in September 2012
- A planning study will not result in any decisions, but will provide the technical foundation for future activities





Study Outreach



Study Phases and Tasks



Green denotes essentially complete

Study Reporting

June 2011	Interim Report No. 1
November 2011	Report to Solicit Input on Options and Strategies
February 2012	Technical Report B – Water Supply Assessmen
	Technical Report D – System Reliability Metrics
April 2012	Options posted to Study website
May 2012	Technical Memo C – Quantification of Water Demand Scenarios
September 2012	Final Study Report



Colorado River Basin Water Supply and Demand Study

Summary of Water Demand Scenario Quantification

Presenter: James Prairie





Objective of the Water Demand Assessment

- The objective of the Water Demand Assessment is to assess the quantity and location of current and future water demands in the Study Area¹ to meet the needs of Basin resources
- Basin resources include: municipal and industrial (M&I) use, hydropower generation, recreation, and fish and wildlife habitat

¹The Study Area is defined as the hydrologic boundaries of the Basin plus the adjacent areas of the Basin States that receive Colorado River water



Water Demand Assessment Approach

- The Study has taken a scenario planning approach to quantify the range of uncertainty associated with future water demand (and supply) through 2060
- Demand scenarios were originally published in narrative or "storyline" format in *Technical Report C – Water Demand Assessment*
- Demand scenarios have been "quantified" (put numbers to) and were published in a technical memo released in May 2012



Water Demand Scenarios

Storyline	Scenario	Theme
Current Projected	A	Continuation of growth, development patterns, and institutions follow long-term trends
Slow Growth	В	Slow growth with emphasis on economic efficiency
Rapid Growth	C1 and C2	Economic resurgence (population and energy) and current preferences toward human and environmental values
Enhanced Environment	D1 and D2	Expanded environmental awareness and stewardship with growing economy

Representation of Water Demands

- The Colorado River supports many important resources
 - Some resources necessitate the "depletion" of the water from the system (e.g., water is used by irrigated agriculture to grow crops)
 - Other resources need the presence of water that does not deplete the system (e.g., flow requirements for native fish)
- A complete representation of all resource needs is required to assess system reliability
 - Withdrawals are represented by demand scenarios
 - Other resource needs are represented through system targets and constraints via system reliability metrics
 - These are described in Technical Report D System Reliability Metrics
- The largest demands on the river system are for deliveries to agriculture, municipal, and industrial use



Representation of Water Demands

- Demands presented across category by state and planning area within a state
- Tribal demands developed in coordination with tribes through one-on-one outreach
- Projections for deliveries to Mexico in accordance with the 1944 Treaty with Mexico
- Losses such as those due to reservoir evaporation and phreatophytes are not included in the demand scenarios and will be represented through the system reliability modeling

Approach to Quantifying Demand Scenarios



Demand Categories

Demand Category	Definition
Agriculture	Water used to meet irrigation requirements of agricultural crops, maintain stock ponds, and sustain livestock
Municipal and Industrial	Water used to meet urban and rural population needs, and industrial needs within urban areas
Energy	Water used for energy services and development
Minerals	Water used for mineral extraction not related to energy services
Fish, Wildlife, Recreation	Water used to meet National Wildlife Refuge, National Recreation Area, state park, and off-stream wetland habitat needs
Tribal	Water used to meet tribal needs and settlement of tribal water rights claims

Water Demand Quantification Results

- Projected demands range between 13.8 and 16.2 maf by 2060 (including Mexico and losses 18.1 and 20.4 maf by 2060)
- Approximately a 20% spread between the lowest (Slow Growth) and highest (Rapid Growth – C1) demand scenarios

Colorado River Basin Historical Use and Future Projected Demand



Water Demand Quantification Results



- Parameters driving demands include population, per capita water use, and irrigated acreage and are projected to change from 2015 to 2060:
 - Population increase from about 40 million people by 23% (49 million) to 91% (77 million)
 - Per capita water use decrease by 7% to 19%
 - Irrigated acreage decrease from about 5.5 million acres by 6% (5.2 million) to15% (4.6 million)

TLAMA

Projected Changes in Demand Categories



Climate Change Effects on Water

- Potential ET is sensitive to warming with greater sensitivity at higher elevations
- Agricultural, outdoor M&I, phreatophyte, and reservoir evaporation demands are influenced
- Increase in demand:
 - ~250 kaf in 2015
 - ~800 kaf in 2060





Projected Future Colorado River Basin Water Supply and Demand

- Average supply-demand imbalances by 2060 are approximately 3.5 million acre-feet
- This imbalance may be more or less depending on the nature of the particular supply and demand scenario
- Imbalances have occurred in the past and deliveries have been met due to reservoir storage



Notes:

Water Supply represents natural flow as measured at the Colorado River above Imperial Dam, Arizona

Water Use and Demand include deliveries to Mexico in accordance with the 1944 Treaty with Mexico and losses such as those due to reservoir evaporation, native vegetation, and operational inefficiencies.

Projected Water Supply is computed as the average 10th, 50th (median), and 90th percentiles of the Study's 4 water supply scenarios. The average of the medians is indicated by the darker shading.

Projected Water Demand is represented by the Study's 6 water demand scenarios. The median of the scenarios is indicated by the darker shading.



103

CRBS

Next Steps

- Combine demand scenarios with supply scenarios to project future reliability of the system to meet the needs of Basin resources
- Measure system reliability through system reliability metrics
- Assess effectiveness of various options and strategies across demand and supply scenarios combinations

Colorado River Basin Water Supply and Demand Study

Summary of Options & Strategies to Resolve Imbalances

Presenter: Armin Munevar and David Groves



Objective of the Options and Strategies Phase

- The objective of the Options and Strategies phase is to identify, describe, and evaluate options and strategies that can be implemented to address the imbalances between supplies and demands
- The Study is intended to explore a broad range of options and will not result in the selection of a particular proposed option or set of options

Approach for Developing & Evaluating Options & Strategies

- Solicit and receive input
- Organize and group options
- Develop representative options
- Evaluate performance of representative options
- Package options into representative portfolios
- Evaluate performance and robustness of portfolios
- Identify key elements of robust portfolios
- Summary findings and future considerations



Increase Supply Options

Importation

- River imports to Front Range
- River imports to Green River
- Ocean imports to southern California

• Desalination

- Pacific Ocean
- Gulf of California
- Brackish groundwater
- Yuma area
- Salton Sea drainwater

Reuse

- Municipal wastewater
- Graywater recycling
- Industrial wastewater recycling

Local Supply

- Coalbed methane produced water
- Non-tributary groundwater
- Rainwater harvesting

Watershed Management

- Brush management
- Forest management
- Dust mitigation
- Tamarisk control
- Weather modification

Reduce Demand Options

M&I Conservation

- Indoor residential
- Outdoor residential
- Commercial, industrial, and institutional
- Parks and golf courses

Agricultural Water Conservation

- Conveyance system efficiency
- On-farm irrigation efficiency
- Improved irrigation management
- Controlled environment agriculture
- Reductions in consumptive use

- Energy Water Use Efficiency
 - Demand management at thermoelectric power plants

System Evaporation Reduction

- Covers for canals and lakes
- System reoperation for preferential storage

Modify Operations Options

- System Operation
 - Reservoir re-operation
 - Surface or groundwater storage
 - Hydropower optimization
- Water Banking
 - Upper Basin
 - Lower Basin
 - Individual state-based banks

- Transfers & Exchanges
 - Guided water markets
 - Agricultural-urban water transfers

Governance and Implementation Options

- Governance, Implementation, Finance
 - Growth control, new governing processes, funding of basin-wide programs

Data and Information

- Additional and enhanced monitoring of both streamflow and Upper Basin water use
- Tribal Water Use and Transfers
 - Resolution of water claims, increased tribal water use, participation in water programs

• Others

Reallocation of state apportionments, prohibit new large-scale diversions, dedicate water to specific interests

Option Characterization Approach

- Characterization done at an "appraisal" level
- Options characterized quantitatively or qualitatively
- Quantitative characterization entails
 - Evaluation of characterization criteria:
 - Assignment of A through E based on criteria assessment
- Qualitative characterization includes discussion of potential opportunities and constraints, including legal and regulatory constraints
 - Most Governance and Implementation options have been characterized qualitatively

Option Characterization Criteria and Assumptions

<u>Characterization Criteria</u> Include:

- Potential yield
- Timing of implementation
- Technical feasibility and reliability
- Cost
- Energy source and needs
- Permitting requirements
- Legal/public policy
- Implementation risk/uncertainty

Overarching Assumptions

- Applied Basin-wide approach, where possible
- Considered ultimate and phased implementations
- Timing and permitting considered
- Costs include capital, O&M, and life-cycle costs (\$/AF)
- Energy needs assessed (kWh/AF)
- Other impacts include qualitative assessment of impacts within and outside of basin

Example Characterization Results

					·. , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	:	Summary of	Characteriza	ation Criteria F	atings								Rating A
Tier2	Quantity of Yield	Timing	Cost	Techincal Feasibility	Implementation Risk	Long-Term Viability	Operational Flexibility	Energy Needs	Energy Source	Permitting	Other Environmental	Legal	Policy	Recreation	Water Quality	Hydropower	Socio-econom	_ В _ С _ D
Import																		_ E
Desalination																		
Reuse																		
Local Supply																		
Watershed Management																		
Energy Water Use Efficiency																		
Agricultural Conservation																		
M & I Conservation																		
System Evaporation Reduction																		
System Operation																		
									I	RI	EC	L	A	M	A	ΓΙ		N

Portfolio Development

- "Portfolios", or unique combinations of options, implement a particular strategy
- Characterization criteria drive inclusion of options
- Performance of portfolios assessed for all future supplydemand combined scenarios



A Portfolio Implements a Strategy by Defining the Order and Timing of Options

A) Which Options Are to Be Used?

List of options by priority:

- Ranked by costeffectiveness
- Adjusted by option characteristics

B) What Conditions Trigger Options?

Implementation rules:

 External conditions that trigger option implementation

Portfolio Development Tool Defines Portfolios Based on Strategy

• User:

- Define
 characteristics of
 options to include
- Tool:
 - List of options that meet userdefined characteristics, prioritized by cost effectiveness and availability

Tableau - CRBS_PDT-2012.07.05									22	
File Data Worksheet Dashboard Analysis Map	Format Server Window Help							/=/::/0/i	<u> </u>	
♦ → ■ •0 ₫ • ₫ • ₱ • 2 •	- 🖶 📴 👎 順 Abc 😾 📴 - Entir	re View 🔻	•] +≈ ∠ •	•	_			Show M	e	
	Define	Use	r Portfo	olio					Â	
Instructions: Set option characterist	ic requirements for inclusion in portfolio.		Option Type				-	▼ X		
Technical	Environmental		(Tier 1)	Tier 2		Number of Options	Sum	of Yield (AF/yr)		
Technical Feasibility	Permitting		Augment	Desalination		7		2,626K		
A, B, C, D, E	 A, B, C, D, E 	_	Supply							
Implementation Risks	Energy Needs			Import		5		1,883K		
A, B, C, D, E	 A, B, C, D, E 	-								
Reliability LT	Energy Source			Local Supply		2		110K		(arrelen al
A, B, C, D, E	 A, B, C, D, E 	•		Pouso		8		1 260K	7	** B / *
Reliability Operations	Other Environmental Factors			Reuse		0		1,2001		THORE IVIE
A, B, C, D, E	 A, B, C, D, E 	•		Watershed Mana	gement	5		2,650K		
Social	Others									*X
Pecreation	Hydronower			Total		27		8,529K		· · · · ·
A, B, C, D, E	✓ A, B, C, D, E	•				_			h	ility
0			Reduce Demand	Agricultural Con:	servation	5		1,945K		inty
A. B. C. D. E	▼ A B C D E	_		Energy Water Use				1071/		
	A, 0, 0, 0, 1			Efficiency		1		1076		
A, B, C, D, E	•			M & I Conservati	ion	2		1.700K		
Legal										
A, B, C, D, E	•			System Evapora Reduction	tion	2		218K		
H + N INTRODUCTION / Option Characterizati	ion Matrix / Ontions (cost and yield) / Ontions	s (characte	teristics) / St	rategy Portfolio Defi	nitions / Po	tfolio Option Banking	efine User Por	tfolio / Compare Po	+ rtfc ≑	
30 marks 15 rows by 2 columns SUM of Measure	Values: 12,779,047				X -	3 //-			æ	
De	sal-Gulf			E		1000	1.50	Coloring		
⊲Des	al-Pacific Ocean				Reduce	Agricultural	5 1	945K	Itural Co	onservati
Reu	ise-Municipal-CO				Demand	Conservation		Desal	Nation Water	Lico Effi
Reu	ise-Municipal-01					Energy Water Use	1 1	67K	y water	USE LIII
Reu	se-Municipal-NM					Efficiency		Local	Supply	
Reu	se-Municipal-WY					M & I Conservation	2 1.	700K M&IC	Conserv	ation
	port-Front Range							Reuse	-	-
	sOns-Reduce Evan					System Evaporation	2 2	18K Syster	n Evapo	oration R.
	esal-Pacific Ocean					Reduction		Tranef	ers and	Banking
	euse-Municipal-SoCal		10 10 ::			at the second		and a Mater		Canting
	A Option Characterization Matrix A Options (c	ost and yi	ieid) X Option	is (characteristics)	strategy Po	TTOILO Definitions > Portfo	bio Option Rar	King & Define User P	ortfolio X	Compare Port
										_

Portfolio Development Tool Defines Portfolios Based on Strategy

• User:

- Define
 characteristics of
 options to include
- Tool:
 - List of options that meet userdefined characteristics, prioritized by cost effectiveness and availability

Define User Portfolio Instructions: 3d option haadenistic requirements for inclution in potits. Technical Sum of Yield (AFyr) Construction Rate Sum of Yield (AFyr) A 0.0.0 Option Tyre Ter 2 Number of Options Sum of Yield (AFyr) Option Tyre Ter 2 Number of Options Sum of Yield (AFyr) Option Tyre Ter 2 Number of Options Sum of Yield (AFyr) Option Tyre Ter 2 Number of Options Sum of Yield (AFyr) Option Tyre Ter 2 Number of Options Ranking: Decalination 7 2,628K Note of the Watershed Hoshbard Analyse Map Formst Sever Window Help Option Tyre Ter 2 Number of Options Ranking: Decalination 7 2,628K Note of the Watershed Hosh Mod Watershed Hosh Mag Tyres Note of the Watershed Hosh Mag Tyres Note of the Watershed Hosh Mod<	→ ■ 40 6 [*] · 8 [*] • 1	調• 2 • 町 비 뒤 🔋 Abc 🖵 歸•	Entire View 🔹 斗	2 •					/ = [Show Me	
Notice of the standard point of the standard		De	fine User Po	ortfol	io.					<u> </u>	
Distance of the provided call registric integration of the provided call registric integration of the call registregistric integrating registric integration of the call registric	Instructions, Calentia			ortioi	0					▼ X	
Augment Stop Augment Supply Permitting Supply Augment Supply Permitting Supply Augment Supply 7 2.626K Import B C.D.E AB.C.O.E Import 5 1.883K B C.D.E Augment Supply Supply 1mport 5 1.883K B C.D.E Import 5 1.883K Import 5 1.883K B C.D.E Import Soc.D.E Import Soc.D.E Import Soc.D.E Babley Option Type Constraints Import Soc.D.E Import Soc.D.E Import Soc.D.E B C.D.E Import Soc.D.E Import <t< th=""><th>Technical</th><th>Environmental</th><th>Option (Tier 1</th><th>n Type . 1)</th><th>Tier 2</th><th></th><th>Number of Options</th><th>s</th><th>um of Yield</th><th>(AF/yr)</th><th></th></t<>	Technical	Environmental	Option (Tier 1	n Type . 1)	Tier 2		Number of Options	s	um of Yield	(AF/yr)	
ic. 0. E A. B. C. 0. E Supply Construction Import 1 Construction ic. 0. E Import 5 1.803K ic. 0. E A. B. C. 0. E Import 5 1.803K ic. 0. E A. B. C. 0. E Import 5 1.803K ic. 0. E A. B. C. 0. E Import 5 1.803K ic. 0. E A. B. C. 0. E Import 5 1.803K ic. 0. E Watershed-Weather Mod Import Import 5 1.803K ic. 0. E Watershed-Weather Mod Import 5 1.803K Import ic. 0. E Watershed-Tamarisk Ag Cons-Con-Farm Irig Impr Ag Cons-Red Cons Use Desal-Solidon Sea 1.115 years 6.10 years	nical Feasibility	Permitting	Augn	mont	Decalination		7		2.6268	<u> </u>	
Import 5 1.83X C.0.E A.B.C.D.E Difference Construction Difference Construction C.0.E Description Difference Construction C.0.E Description Difference Difference C.0.E Difference Difference Difference C.0.E Difference Difference Difference C.0.E Difference Difference Differ	C, D, E	✓ A, B, C, D, E	- Supp	bly	Jesaination		· · · ·		2,0201	`	
c.0.E A 8 c.0.E amay LT Tableau-CRBS_PDT-201207205 amay LT File Data C.0.E Portfolio Options Ranking: User created ation C.0.E C.0.E Options Ranking: User created Watershed-Tamarisk Ag Cons-Impt Img Mgmt C.0.E Cons-Impt Img Mgmt C.0.E Options Realization C.0.E Ag Cons-Impt Img Mgmt C.0.E Desal-Social groundwater Ag Cons-Impt Img Mgmt Local Supply Local Supply 1115 years Mall Cons-Ming Logressive Mall Cons-Ming Agressive Mall Cons-Mod Aggressive Desal-Social groundwater C.0.E Mall Cons-High Aggressive Mall Cons-Mod Aggressive Desal-Social groundwater C.0.E Conservation 5 C.0.E Mall Cons-High Aggressive Mall Cons-Mod Aggressive Desal-Slot Social groundwater C.0.E Conservation 5 C.0.E Mall Cons-Mod Aggressive Mall Conservation Sea Total 27 Mall Conservation Sea Total 27 M	mentation Risks	Energy Needs			mport		5		1,883k	<	
Iting LT Tableau - CRSS PDT-2012/05 Portfolio Options Ranking: User created Iting Operation Portfolio Options Ranking: User created Watershed-Weather Mod Watershed-Tamarisk Ag Cons-On-Farm Irig Inpr Ag Cons-Red Cons Use Desal-Social groundwater Option Type Time 1 Time 2 Number of Viet Sum of Viet C.0.E Option Skallowater Option Skallowater Options Availability 1-5 years C.0.E Banking-Upper Basin Desal-Social groundwater Desal-Social groundwater Desal-Social groundwater 0.88X 1-5 years C.0.E Mail Cons-High Aggressive Desal-Sallon Sea Mail Cons-High Aggressive Mail Cons-Mich Aggressive Note of Vieta (AF/yr) 1.5 years Vatershed Forest Is J5 rown Station Sea Total 27 8,000K Reuse-Municipal-AZ Reuse-Municipal-AZ Energy Water Use Efficiency 1 1.000K Reuse-Municipal-MX Reuse-Municipal-MX Energy Water Use System Zysporation 1 10K K Reuse-System Spreadou System Desardion 2 2 System Deparation System Desarvation System Deparation 2 System Deparation System Deparation	C, D, E	 A, B, C, D, E 	•								
C.D.E File Data Worksheit Dashbard Analysis Map Format Server Window Help Common Server Window Help Common Server Window Help C.D.E Portfolio Options Ranking: User created Portfolio Options Ranking: User created Portfolio Options Availability C.D.E Watershed-Tamansk Ag Cons-Impr Iring Mgmt Conservation 7 2,626K C.D.E Ag Cons-On-Farm Iring Impr Ag Cons-On-Farm Iring Impr Ag Cons-Nord Coreal Groundwater Aggment Desal-Sucial Groundwater Desalination 7 2,626K Desal-Sucial Groundwater Banking-Upper Basin Desal-Sucial Groundwater Desal-Sucial Groundwater Desal-Sucial Groundwater 0.15 years C.D.E Import Green River-Snake Watershed-Forest 3.140 years 1.15 years Kal Cons-Mod Aggressive Desal-Sucial Uring Aggressive Mal Cons-Mod Aggressive Banking-Upper Basin Decal-Gulf 5 1.960K 1.000K Keuse-Municipal-CO Reuse-Municipal-UT Reuse-Municipal-WM Watershed-Forest Strows Agricultural Consert Desal-Sucial Jankers System Dessel-Yumi 1 167K Reuse-Municipal-WM Watershed-Forest System Dessel-Yuma 1 167K 1 Desalination Desalination Energy Water Use Efficiency 1 167K Watershed-Efficiency 1 167K System Deseration 2<	Tableau - CRBS	PDT-2012.07.05								ļ	
With Operation C. 0. # Portfolio Options Ranking: User created watershed-Tamarisk Ag Cons. Agd Cons. Type Trace 2 Number of Strind (Argyr) C. 0. # Option Type Trace 2 Number of Strind (Argyr) Ag Cons. Agd Cons. Agd Cons. Agd Cons. Type Trace 2 Number of Strind (Argyr) Ag Cons. Agd Cons. Agd Cons. Agd Cons. Agd Cons. Agd Cons. Red Cons Use Desal-Stocal groundwater C. 0. # Desal-Stocal groundwater Ag Cons. Agd Cons. High Aggressive Desal-Stocal groundwater Desal-Stocal groundwater Consideration C. 0. # Desal-Stocal groundwater Banking. Upper Basin Desal-Stocal groundwater Desal-Stocal groundwater Stopply Desal-Stocal groundwater Stopply 2 Desal-Stocal groundwater Stopply 2 Desal-Stocal groundwater Stopply 2 Desal-Stoper Basin Local Supply 2 Desal-Stoper Basin Stoper Sto	C, D, E File Data Work	heet Dashboard Analysis Map Format Server	r Window Help								B
Watershed-Weather Mod Watershed-Tamarisk Sum of Options Portfolio Ag Cons-Ampr Irrig Mgmt Local-Groundwater Ag Cons-Ampr Irrig Mgmt Desal-SoCal groundwater Ag Cons-Ampr Irrig Mgmt Desal-SoCal groundwater Desalnation 7 2,2526K Banking-Upper Basin Desal-SoCal groundwater Banking-Upper Basin Desal-SoCal groundwater Desal-Nor High Aggressive Mat Cons-High Aggressive Import Green River-Snake Instantion 7 2,626K Options Availability 11-15 years 0-10 years C.0. E Desal-SoCal groundwater Banking-Upper Basin Desal-SoCal groundwater 11-15 years 1-63.0 years 3-14.0 years 3-14.0 years C.0. E Upport-Green River-Snake Watershed-Forest 2.650K 7/100K 2/100K 3-1.000K Watershed-Forest Ag Cons-Conv Sys Effic Desal-Guif Desal-Guif 5 1.945K 0-2610K 0-2610K Reuse-Municipal-UT Reuse-Municipal-UZ Reuse-Municipal-MZ Reuse-Municipal-AZ 1 167K 0-2618K 0-2618K <t< td=""><td>÷ 🖬 🔹</td><th>) 🖆 · 🖉 🖆 · 📴 · · · ·</th><td></td><td>+</td><td></td><td>2 -</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Show</td></t<>	÷ 🖬 🔹) 🖆 · 🖉 🖆 · 📴 · · · ·		+		2 -					Show
C.0.1 Portion Options Kariking, User created watershed-Watershed-Tamarisk Ag Cons-Import Ming Mgmt Local-Groundwater Ag Cons-On-Farm Irrig Impr Ag Cons-On-Farm Irrig Impr Ag Cons-On-Farm Irrig Impr Ag Cons-Net Cons Use Desal-Social Groundwater Portoino Portoino C.0.E Ag Cons-Red Cons Use Desal-Social Groundwater Desal-Social Group G	ility Operation:		Dertfelie On	tione	Donking	Lloor	reated				
watershed-Meather Mod Portention ation C.0.E C.0.E Ag Cons-Nerm Irrig Mgmt Local-Groundwater Ag Cons-Nerm Irrig Impr Ag Cons-Nerd Cons Use Desal-SoCal groundwater Desal-SoCal groundwater Banking-Upper Basin C.0.E Desal-Municipal-Vine C.0.E Banking-Upper Basin Desal-SoCal groundwater Local Supply Desal-SoCal groundwater Banking-Upper Basin Desal-SoCal groundwater Local Supply C.0.E M&I Cons-High Aggressive M&I Cons-Hord Kire Magressive M&I Cons-Conv Sys Effic Pesal-Suffic Ocean Desal-Gulf Desal-Gulf Desal-Gulf Desal-Agrific Ocean Reuse-Municipal-XZ Reuse-Municipal-XZ Reuse-Municipal-MX Reuse-Municipal-MX Reuse-Municipal-MX Reuse-Municipal-MX Import-Front Range Import-Front Range Import-Front Range System Import-Front Range System Import-Front Range System Coeneration Import-Front Range System Coeneration Reuse-Municipal-WY	C, D, L		-ortiolio Op	nons	Ranking	. User c	reated		-		+ x
Nume Watershed - Iamansk User created Ag Cons-Key Chorundwater Ag Cons-Mort Fing Mgmt Augment Desalination 7 2.626K Ag Cons-Son-Fam Irig Impr Ag Cons-Mort Fam Irig Impr Augment Desalination 7 2.626K Options Availability Import 5 1.883K 6-10 years C. 0. E Desal-SoCal groundwater 6-10 years 11-15 years Desal-Supply 2 110K 5-30 years C. 0. E Mat Cons-High Aggressive Reuse 8 1.260K Desal-Sation Sea Import-Green River-Snake Watershed-Forest 5 2.60K Matershed-Jorest Desal-Gulf 5 2.60K 1.000K Matershed-Jorest Pacific Ocean 5 1.945K 0.00K Matershed-Jorest Reuse-Municipal-XZ Reuse-Municipal-XZ 8 2.60K 1.000K Reuse-Municipal-WY Import-Front Range System Coerantaria 5 1.945K 0.001K Reuse-Municipal-WY Import-Front Range System Coerantaria 5 1.945K 0.001K Reuse-Municipal-WY Import-Front Range System Coerantaria 5 1.945K 0.001K Reuse-Municipal-WY Import-Front Range		Natershed-Weather Mod			-	Option Type	Tier 2	Number of	Sum of Vield	Portfolio	
total Ag Cons-Infinit Mighting CD.E Ag Cons-Infinit Mighting Consideration Ag Cons-Ch-Fam Ting Impr Ag Cons-Ch-Fam Ting Impr Import Desal-SoCal groundwater Banking-Upper Basin Desal-SoCal groundwater Import-Green River-Bear Import-Green River-Baa Import-Green River-Snake M&I Cons-Mod Aggressive Reuse-Municipal-CO Desal-Sation Sea Total 27 Matershed -Forest Socons-Conv Sys Effic Socons Desal-Guif Desal-Coarl Feduce Agricultural Reuse-Municipal-CO Reuse-Municipal-AZ Fergy Water Use 1 167K Reuse-Municipal-WY Reuse-Municipal-MZ 1 167K Desali Coarl Supply Reuse-Municipal-MU Reuse-Municipal-MZ System Evaporation 2 170K Reuse-Municipal-WY Import-Ford Range System System Evaporation	4 m	atersned-Lamansk				(Tier 1)	(Tier 1)		(AF/yr)	User created	
Ag Cons-On-Farm Irrig Impr Ag Cons-Red Cons Use Desal-SoCial groundwater Banking-Upper Basin Desal-Sufa Groundwater Besal-Salton Sea Import-Green River-Snake Watershed-Forest Ag Cons-Conv Sys Effic Desal-Sufa Cons Reuse-Municipal-CO Reuse-Municipal-UT Reuse-Municipal-MX Reuse-Municipal-MX Reuse-Municipal-MX Reuse-Municipal-WY Import-Front Range Import-Social-Tankers System Conservation Reuse Server Desal-Sufa Reuse-Municipal-WY System Server Desal-Tankers System Conservation Reuse Conserva	C. D. E	ccal-Groundwater				Augment	Desalination	7	2.626K	Orthogo Augustabili	
Ag Cons-Red Cons Use Desal-SoCal groundwater Desal-SoCal groundwater Desal-SuCal Supply Desal-Sucal Supply Desal-Sucal Supply Desal-Sucal Supply Desal-Sucal Supply Mal Cons-Ned Aggressive Watershed-Forest Ag Cons-Conv Sys Effic Desal-Suffic Ocean Reuse-Municipal-OC Reuse-Municipal-AZ Reuse-Municipal-WY Import-Front Range Import-Front Range Import-Socal Tankers System System System Carporation Desal-Succe Supply M & I Conservation Reuse Supply M & I Conservation Reuse System Supply M & I Conservation Reuse System System Conservation Reuse Supply M & I Conservation Re		Ag Cons-On-Farm Irrig Impr				Supply				Options Availabili	ty
C.D.E Desal-SoCal groundwater ID-15 years Consideration Desal-SoCal groundwater ID-15 years C.D.E Desal-Yuma ID-15 years C.D.E Desal-SoCal groundwater ID-15 years Mall Cons-High Aggressive Desal-Satton Sea ID-15 years Desal-Satton Sea Import-Green River-Snake Watershed -Forest Mac Cons-Corv Sys Effic Desal-Coulf 27 Desal-Guif Desal-Satton Sea 1,700K Reuse-Municipal-CO Reuse-Municipal-AZ Reuse-Municipal-NY Reuse-Municipal-NY Reuse-Municipal-AZ 1 Import-Socal-Tankers System 2 Import-Socal-Tankers System System System System 2	conomics Z	Ag Cons-Red Cons Use					Import	5	1,883K	 1-5 years 6 10 years 	
Consideration Banking-Upper Basin Local Supply 2 110K 16:30 years 2, 0.E Import-Green River-Bear M&I Cons-High Aggressive Status 31:40 years 31:40 years 2, 0.E M&I Cons-High Aggressive Meansing 2 10K 16:30 years M&I Cons-High Aggressive Desal-Satton Sea Timport-Green River-Snake 8 1,260K Yield (AF/yr) Watershed-Forest Ag Cons-Conv Sys Effic Desal-Pacific Ocean 8 2,650K 500K 1,000K Desal-Pacific Ocean Reuse-Municipal-CO Reuse-Municipal-AZ Reuse-Municipal-WY 1,700K Coloring Agricultural Conservation 5 1,945K Desaination Reuse-Municipal-Wirthout Participal-AZ Reuse-Municipal-MZ Energy Water Use 1 167K Import Import-Front Range M & 1 Conservation 2 1,700K Reuse System Evaporation 2 System Evaporation Watershed System Conservation 2 1,700K System Evaporation 2 System Conservation	5, D, E	Desal-SoCal groundwater					mpon			■ 0-10 years	
C.D.E C.	Consideration	Banking-Upper Basin					Local Supply	2	1101/	 ▶ 16-30 years ▲ 31-40 years 	
C. D. E M&I Cons-High Aggressive Desal-Salton Sea import-Green River-Snake Watershed-Forest Ag Cons-Conv Sys Effic Desal-Gulf Desal-Gulf Desal-Gulf Desal-Gulf Desal-Gulf Desal-Salton Reuse-Municipal-XZ Reuse-Munic	C, D, E	JDesal-Yuma					Local Supply	2	TION		
c. 0. E With Cons-Mod Aggressive Desal-Salton Sea Import.Green River-Snake Watershed-Forest A Cons-Corv Sys Effic Desal-Dacific Ocean Reuse-Municipal-CO Reuse-Municipal-UT Reuse-Municipal-WY Reuse-Municipal-Wy Reuse-Municipal-Wy Reuse-Municipal-Wy Reuse-Municipal-Wy Reuse-Municipal-Wy Reuse-Reuse-Reuse-Reuse Evap	1	M&I Cons. High Aggressive					Design	P 1 200K	Viold (A F.hrs)		
Desal-Salton Sea Desal-Salton Sea Import-Green River-Snake Marshed-Forest Ag Cons-Conv Sys Effic Desal-Gulf Desal-Pacific Ocean Reuse-Municipal-CO Reuse-Municipal-UT Reuse-Municipal-AZ Reuse-Municipal-WY Import-Front Range Import-Front Range System Import-Front Range System System Sockard System System System System System Coveration	C, D, E	rM&I Cons-Mod Aggressive					Reuse	0	1,200K		
Nutroc Management 2 2450K 1,000K ks 15 rows Ag Cons-Conv Sys Effic Total 27 8,529K Coloring Desal-Gulf Desal-Gulf Conservation 5 1,945K Coloring Reuse-Municipal-O Reuse-Municipal-NW Reuse-Municipal-NW 1 167K Local Supply Reuse-Municipal-NWY Import-Front Range Import-Front Range System System System System Vaporation System System Corearition 2 218K System Corearition System Corearition		Desal-Salton Sea					Watershed	-		500K	
ts 15 rows Watershed-Forest Ap Cons-Conv Sys Effic Desal-Gulf Desal-Gulf Desal-Gulf Desal-Gulf Desal-Gulf Desal-Agricultural Desal-Agricultural Desal-Agricultural Conservation Reuse-Municipal-AZ Reuse-Municipal-MC Reuse-Municipal-MC Reuse-MC Reuse-MC Reuse-MC Reuse-NC		Import-Green River-Snake					Management	5	2,650K	1.000K	
Act Const-Conv Sys Effic Desal-Pacific Ocean Reuse-Municipal-CO Reuse-Municipal-VT Reuse-Municipal-WY Reuse-Municipal-WY Import-Front Range Import-Front Range System Syst	ks 15 rows	Watershed-Forest					10.7.6			1,700K	
Desal-Pacific Ocean Agricultural 5 1.945K Agricultural Conservation Desal-Pacific Ocean Reuse-Municipal-CO Energy Water Use 1 1.95K Desalination Reuse-Municipal-UT Reuse-Municipal-AZ Energy Water Use 1 167K Import Reuse-Municipal-WY Import-Front Range M & I Conservation 2 1,70K M & I Conservation Reuse-Municipal-WY Import-Front SoCal-Tankers System System System Concertion 2 21KK System Concertion		Ac Cons-Conv Sys Effic			-		Total	27	8,529K	Coloring	
Reuse-Municipal-CO Reduce Dimand 5 1.945K Desalination Reuse-Municipal-CO Reuse-Municipal-UT Energy Water Use Energy Water Use Energy Water Use Reuse-Municipal-AZ Energy Water Use 1 167K Local Supply Reuse-Municipal-Torn Range M & I Conservation 2 1,70K M & I Conservation Import-Front Range System Reuse-Municipal-Social-Tankers System System Vaporation		Desal-Bacific Ocean				Course and	A minute and			Agricultural Cor	servati.
Reuse-Municipal-AZ Energy Water Use Import Energy Water Use Reuse-Municipal-MM Efficiency 1 16K Import-Front Range M & I Conservation 2 1,700K Import-Front Range System System System Vaporation System Sops-Reduce Evap Evaporation 2 218K		Reuse-Municipal-CO				Reduce	Conservation	5	1,945K	Desalination	
Reuse-Municipal-NZ Efficiency 1 167K Import Reuse-Municipal-NZ Reuse-Municipal-NZ Local Supply Local Supply Reuse-Municipal-NY M & I Conservation 2 1,70K M & I Conservation Import-Front Range M & I Conservation 2 1,70K Reuse Import-Front Range System 2 2,70K Reuse System System System Conservation 2 2,10K		Reuse-Municipal-UT				Demand	E			Energy Water U	lse Effi
Reuse-Municipal-NM Local Supply Reuse-Municipal-NY M & I Conservation Import-Front Range M & I Conservation Import-Social-Tankers System System System System System Vaporation		Reuse-Municipal-AZ					Efficiency	1	167K	Import Import	
Reuse-MUnicipal-WY M & I Conservation 2 1,70K M & I Conservation Import-Front Range Import-Social-Tankers System Reuse SysOps-Reduce Evap Evaporation 2 218K		Reuse-Municipal-NM								Local Supply	
Import-roll range Import-SoCal-Tankers SysCps-Reduce Evap 218K System 2 System Characteristics System 2 System System 2 System 2 Sy		Reuse-Municipal-WY						2	1,700K	M & I Conserva	tion
System Evaporation 2 218K System Evaporation 2 218K System Evaporation		Import-SoCal-Tankers					System			Reuse	ation D
OVSIELI UUERIUU	SvsOns-Reduce Evan						Evaporation	2	218K	System Operation	adult R.
Desal-Pacific Ocean Reduction Transfers and Bank		2			Reduction			- Oystern Operati	011		

Example Portfolio: Most Cost Effective Options

Options to be Used

- 1. Agricultural conservation
- 2. Local supply
- 3. M&I conservation
- 4. Desalination
- 5. Imports
- 6. Reuse
- 7. Watershed management

Conditions that Trigger Options

Low Reliability

- Low reservoir elevations
- Upper Basin shortages
- Lower Basin shortages

Portfolio options reflect location and amount of supply augmentation or demand reduction, based on submitted options.

Portfolios To Be Evaluated Across Scenarios and Compared

- How do portfolios improve the system reliability across the scenarios?
- What options are required and under which scenarios?
- Which options are common across scenarios and portfolio types?
- How much would it cost to implement needed options?
- What are the key tradeoffs between portfolios?

Colorado River Basin Water Supply and Demand Study

Updated Study Timeline & Questions



Study Completion

May - June	 Complete characterization of submitted options
July	Complete reliability analysis without and with operation and strategies
August	Evaluate portfolios and summarize findings
September	 Publish final Study report

Colorado River Basin Water Supply and Demand Study

QUESTIONS?

Study Contact Information

- Website: http://www.usbr.gov/lc/region/programs/crbstudy.html
- Email: ColoradoRiverBasinStudy@usbr.gov
- Telephone: 702-293-8500; Fax: 702-293-8418