THE FUTURE OF THE COLORADO RIVER PROJECT

Jack Schmidt (PI)

Beth Neilson, David Rosenberg, David Tarboton, Kevin Wheeler (co-Pls) Lindsay Bruckerhoff, Jian Wang (post-doctoral researchers) Eric Kuhn, Brad Udall, Charles Yackulic (collaborators)

https://qcnr.usu.edu/coloradoriver/



UtahStateUniversity

WATER BALANCE CONSULTING

science for a changing world









White Paper series

Exploring uncertainty in quantifying stream flow and losses of the Colorado River in the southern Colorado Plateau, including Lake Powell, the Grand Canyon, and Lake Mead







The Future Hydrology of the Colorado River

HOW DRY MIGHT FUTURE CONDITIONS IN THE COLORADO WATERSHED BECOME?



1906-2018 USBR Natural Flows	14.76 maf/yr	
1906-1929 USBR Natural Flows (Early 20 th century pluvial)	17.8 maf/yr	
1930-2018 USBR Natural Flows (Post-pluvial period)	13.9 maf/yr	
2000-2018 USBR Natural Flows	12.44 maf/yr	
1576-1600 Tree Ring Drought	11.76 maf/yr	

Using sequence average plots to characterize drought severity



First year and average flow over period with lowest multi-year average

. .. .

Length of		Mean flow		
sequence	First year	(maf/yr)		
(years)		(1101/91)		
1	1977	5.44		
2	2002	8.16		
3	2002	8.59		
4	2001	9.20		
5	2000	9.47		
6	1999	10.63		
7	2000	11.01		
8	2000	11.21		
9	2000	11.77		
10	2000	12.03		
11	2000	12.05		
12	1953	12.13		
13	2001	12.28		
14	2000	12.16		
15	2000	12.29		
16	2000	12.36		
17	2000	12.43		
18	2001	12.54		
19	2000	12.44		
20	1999	12.64		
21	1998	12.84		
22	1953	13.14		
23	1955	13.16		
24	1954	12.96		
25	1953	12.89		

Using sequence average plots to characterize drought severity

Annual water year total natural flow at Lees Ferry



Sequence-Average plot of the natural flow of the Colorado River at Lees Ferry, 1906-2018



Length of sequence (yrs)



Meko et al. 2017 (Most Skillful Model), Period: 1416-2015



Length of sequence (yrs)

DROUGHT SCENARIOS

- Defined based on historic natural and tree ring reconstructed flows
- 100 traces 42 years long resampled from each scenario and disaggregated to each CRSS input node to be used for CRSS modeling of potential drought impacts

Scenario	Flow data	Period	Duration	Mean flow (maf/yr)	Cumulative decreases below average (maf)
Millennium drought	USBR natural flow	2000- 2018	19 years	12.44	44.08
Mid-20 th century drought	USBR natural flow	1953- 1977	25 years	12.89	46.75
Paleo tree ring severe drought	Tree-ring reconstructed flow (Meko et al., 2017)	1576- 1600	25 years	11.76	75

These are defined in terms of water year annual flow at Lees Ferry

MINIMUM SEQUENCE AVERAGES FROM HISTORIC AND TREE RING DROUGHT AND CLIMATE SCENARIOS JUXTAPOSED ON HISTORIC AND TREE RING DATA



CONCLUSIONS

- Three severe and sustained drought scenarios were identified using the average of streamflow and cumulative decrease relative to the mean flow over varying sequence lengths.
- Drought scenario based resampling combined with block disaggregation partitions these throughout CRSS nodes to support modeling of water resources impacts.
- Scenarios are less extreme than some climate projections, and plausible because they are based on past flow estimates and what has happened in the past might happen again in the future
- Full white paper at https://qcnr.usu.edu/coloradoriver/news/WP4 Announce
- Data available at https://www.hydroshare.org/resource/6d351874f16947609eab585a81c3c60d







Stream flow and losses of the Colorado River in the southern Colorado Plateau



В R. 2 E. R. 1 E. R. 3 E. R. 1 W. R.4 E NO-FLOW BOUNDARY 1 1 1 1 1 1 MILES BOUNDARY BETWEEN UNCONFINED AND CONFINED CONDITIONS 8.5 E POWELL SHORELINE TIOMETRIC CONTOURis altitude of simulated netric surface. March 983. Contour interval, 100 eet, National Geodetic Vertica Datum of 1929. Surface was generated using recharge option of 10,440 acre-feet per year, specific yield equal to

Increase in Colorado River flow between Glen Canyon Dam and Lees Ferry gage (~15 miles)

Average (WY2005 – WY2020) = 150,000 af/yr 28,000 (WY2013) – 260,000 (WY2006) 170,000 af in WY2020

Estimated perturbations of ground-water flow near Glen Canyon Dam

Thomas, 1986





Lake Mead inflows and change in storage = 10.56 maf/yr

Colorado River (Diamond Creek) – 10.13 maf/yr (9.93-10.33) (2% uncertainty) All other sources – 0.18 maf/yr Change in Lake Mead storage – 0.25 maf/yr

Lake Mead outflows = 10.28 maf/yr

Hoover Dam releases – 9.49 maf/yr (9.40-9.58) (1% uncertainty) Evaporation – 0.56 maf/yr (0.54 – 0.58) Nevada – 0.23 maf/yr (0.23 – 0.24)

Measurements of inflow
at Diamond Creek are the
most likely source of
uncertainty and may be an
overestimate by ~200,000
af/yr (2% uncertainty)



March 2010 – February 2015

Lake Powell inflows and change in storage = 9.80 maf/yr Upper Colorado - 4.41 maf/yr (4.32-4.50) Green - 4.11 maf/yr (4.03 – 4.19) San Juan - 1.12 maf/yr (1.10 – 1.14 maf/yr)

All data 2015-2019

Lake Powell outflows = 9.99 maf/yr Colorado River at Lees Ferry – 9.17 maf/yr (9.08-9.26); note GCD releases – 9.00 maf/yr Gross evaporation – 0.57 maf/yr (0.41 – 0.78)

Other losses into sandstone – 0.02 maf/yr Increase in storage – 0.24 maf/yr

BUT –if one assumes net evaporation of 0.39 maf/yr (0.30-0.49), then water budget is balanced!!!

Total reservoir evaporation is the most likely source of uncertainty in the Lake Powell water budget. One should use measurements of outflow at the Lees Ferry gage, not reservoir releases



WY2016 – WY2019

Some recommendations

- Fund key gages and incorporate data into river basin modeling
 - Colorado River at Potash
 - Green River at Mineral Bottom
 - Little Colorado River at mouth
 - Colorado River above Diamond Creek
- Resolve uncertainties in evaporation at Powell
- Renew studies of seepage in the Glen Canyon Dam Lees Ferry area

Hoover Dam

Reclamation Hydrologic database and excellent new resource





The Future of the Colorado River project https://qcnr.usu.edu/coloradoriver/futures

WALTON FAMILY FOUNDATION



S



Janet Quinney Lawson endowed Chair in Colorado River Studies



104b grant through UWRL

Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center

David Bonderman

My Good Fund



Southwest Climate Adaptation Science Center