

# **Climate Change & America's Infrastructure**

# **Colorado River Water Resources**

January 29, 2013



- Basin Study's Climate Change Hydrology Planning for the Worst Case
- Southern Nevada Water Authority's Response to Drought/Climate Change

# **Projections of Natural Flow at Lees Ferry**



 The Downscaled GCM Projected scenario indicates higher variability and a mean less than other scenarios, ~ 9% less than the observed record by 2060.

# **Historical Lake Powell Annual Inflows**



10-Year Average (2003-2012): 80% of normal

Historical 13-Year Average Inflow: 73% of normal



# Future Colorado River Water Supply and Demand

- Median supply and demand imbalance in 2060 is 3.2 million acre-feet / year
- The range of supply and demand imbalances ranges from 0 to nearly 8 million acre-feet / year

# **Portfolio Profile**

#### **Resource Options and Volumes in Million Acre-Feet**



Portfolio B (5.608) Portfolio C (4.735)



# Lake Mead Pool Elevation Below 1,000 feet





#### Lake Mead Elevations





#### **INFRASTRUCTURE:**

Existing infrastructure required improvements to protect Southern Nevada from drought impact of lower Lake Mead water levels.

- Modifications were required to extend Intake No. 1 to maintain access to best water quality. (2004)
- An additional intake in Lake Mead was necessary to protect against potential loss of Intake No. 1. (2005)
- Additional capacity was needed at Intake No. 2's pumping station to temporarily defer construction of a third pumping station. (2006)



#### Lake Mead Intake Profile (2002)





#### **Intake Extension**





#### Intake Extension - 2004





# Higher capacity pumps were installed at Intake Pumping Station No. 2.



- Expanded Intake No. 2 pumping capacity
- Protected Southern Nevada from service interruptions for the short term in the event Intake Pumping Station No. 1 was unavailable due to low lake levels.



Drought was the catalyst for the SNWA to explore the need for an additional intake in Lake Mead.

#### Drought

- Lake Mead levels were continuing their rapid decline
- Access to best water quality deep in Lake Mead was impaired by declining lake levels

#### Demands

- Both intakes are needed to reliably satisfy water demands in the long term
- The pumping capacity of Intake No. 1 would have to be replaced to if lake levels continued to decline



#### Continued

**Regulations / Treatment** 

- Water quality regulations were becoming more difficult to meet, especially with declining lake levels
- Constructing water treatment process improvements could have been more expensive than constructing a new intake to avoid the need for treatment improvements
- Additional treatment process could cost \$85 million in annual operating costs on top of the capital cost



In 2005, the decision was made to construct a third intake.

- Meets both water quality and pumping capacity objectives
- Reduces treatment costs
- Preserves the ability to pump water at lower lake levels
- Provides operational flexibility for changing conditions
- Does not increase the total amount of water available to Southern Nevada











# Intake No. 3: Connector Tunnel





# Intake No. 3: Starter Tunnel





## Intake No. 3: Concrete Liners







# Intake No. 3: Intake Structure Fabrication





# Intake No. 3: Assembled Intake Structure





# Intake No. 3: Structure Lowering



# **Intake Structure** Installation February and March 2012

Total Tremie Concrete = 11,300 cy



# Intake No. 3: Tremie Concrete Placement





# Intake No. 3: Tremie Concrete Placement





## SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER AUTHORITY