

## Surface Water Availability Modeling UIF, Current Use, P&R, 2070 Moderate and 2070 High Demand Scenario Results

John Boyer

## **Surface Water Scenarios**

### **Base Scenarios**

- Current Surface Water Use Scenario
  - Uses most recent 10-yr average withdrawals (as reported by month) in most cases
- Permitted and Registered (P&R) Surface Water Use Scenario
  - Uses current fully-permitted and registered amounts
- Moderate Water Demand Projection Scenario
  - Future water demand projection based on moderate growth and normal climate
- High Water Demand Projection Scenario
  - Future water demand projection based on high growth and hot/dry climate

#### **Additional Scenarios**

- Unimpaired Flow (UIF) Scenario
  - Naturalized conditions (no surface water withdrawals, discharges, or reservoirs)

## Lower Savannah River Basin - Summary of Average Annual Surface Water Demands by Scenario

Surface Water Use Sector	Current Use	2070 Moderate Demand	2070 High Demand	Permitted and Registered (P&R)
Thermoelectric/Nuclear Power <sup>1</sup>	102.8	89.6	149.7	217.2
Public Water Supply	45.2	54.9	87.1	304.4
Industrial	18.7	21.0	47.0	881.6
Golf Courses	0.6	0.6	1.2	13.2
Agricultural	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00023
Mining	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
GA-Side Water Users	171	219	219	461
Total all Sectors*	338	385	504	1,877
Total without Thermoelectric/Nuclear Power	236	295	354	1,660

All values in million gallons per day

\* Rounded to nearest MGD

<sup>1</sup> Most of the power withdrawals are returned.

## Lower Savannah River Basin Current Use Scenario



#### Surface Water Shortage Table

Map ID	Water User	Max Shortage (MGD)	Frequency of Shortage
		rtage	;S
	NOSh	0110.0	
	140		



## Lower Savannah River Basin Permitted & Registered Scenario



#### Surface Water Shortage Table

Map ID	Water User	Minimum Available Supply (MGD)	Max Shortage (MGD)	Frequency of Shortage
1	GC: Woodside	2.7	1.1	78.7%
2	WS: Breezy Hill	3.8	29.5	99.6%
3	WS: Graniteville	9.1	0.2	4.9%

GA: Russel

WS: Abbeville

GA: Broad



## Lower Savannah River Basin 2070 Moderate Demand Scenario



#### Surface Water Shortage Table

Map ID	Water User	Max Shortage (MGD)	Frequency of Shortage
		rtage	;5
	NOSh	011010	
	140		



## Lower Savannah River Basin 2070 High Demand Scenario



#### Surface Water Shortage Table

Map ID	Water User	Minimum Available Supply (MGD)	Max Shortage (MGD)	Frequency of Shortage
1	WS: Graniteville	9.1	3.2	0.6%



## **WS: Graniteville**

Vaucluse Pond, Flat Rock Pond and Bridge Creek Pond are not represented in the SWAM model. They provide storage that would reduce or eliminate the frequency of simulated shortages.



## Salkehatchie River Basin - Summary of Average Annual Surface Water Demands by Scenario

Surface Water Use Sector	Current Use	Permitted and Registered (P&R)	2070 Moderate Demand	2070 High Demand
Agricultural	2.75	47.58	3.58	5.26
Thermoelectric Power	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Public Water Supply	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Industrial	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Golf Courses	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mining	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total all Sectors	2.75	47.58	3.58	5.26

#### All values in million gallons per day

## Salkehatchie River Basin Current Use Scenario



#### Surface Water Shortage Table

Map ID	Water User	Minimum Available Supply (MGD)	Max Shortage (MGD)	Frequency of Shortage
1	IR: Connelly (Miller)	0.003	1.6	11%
2	IR: Chappell	0.0	0.05	<b>6</b> %
3	IR: Sharp & Sharp	0.0	2.2	13%
4	IR: JCO Farms	0.0	0.07	7%
5	IR: Coosaw Farms	0.0	0.5	<b>6</b> %

User has an impoundment which was not included in the model and may eliminate the modeled shortage.



## IR: Connolly (Miller)







Physical Shortage

#### Surface Water Shortage Table

Map ID	Water User	Minimum Available Supply (MGD)	Max Shortage (MGD)	Frequency of Shortage
1	IR: Connelly (Miller)	0.003	1.7	12%
2	IR: Chappell	0.0	0.05	6%
3	IR: Sharp & Sharp	0.0	2.2	13%
4	IR: JCO Farms	0.0	0.1	13%
5	IR: Coosaw Farms	0.0	0.7	6%
6	HUC702 Future IR	0.03	0.4	0.1%
7	HUC802 Future IR	0.0	0.9	2%



User has an impoundment which was not included in the model and may eliminate the modeled shortage.

## Salkehatchie River Basin 2070 High Demand Scenario



Physical Shortage

#### Surface Water Shortage Table

Map ID	Water User	Minimum Available Supply (MGD)	Max Shortage (MGD)	Frequency of Shortage
1	IR: Connelly (Miller)	0.003	3.0	20%
2	IR: Chappell	0.0	0.1	6%
3	IR: Sharp & Sharp	0.0	2.2	13%
4	IR: JCO Farms	0.0	0.1	13%
5	IR: Coosaw Farms	0.0	0.7	8%
6	HUC702 Future IR	0.03	1.0	0.2%
7	HUC802 Future IR	0.0	1.2	2%
8	IR: Riddle Dairy Farm	0.7	0.01	0.1%
9	IR: Diem Aden	0.1	0.2	0.2%
10	HUC704 Future IR	0.4	0.1	0.1%



User has an impoundment which was not included in the model and may eliminate the modeled shortage.

# Extended Drought Analysis Results for the Savannah River Basin

John Boyer

Agenda Item 5c

<u>Methods</u>

- Supply-side investigation to quantify sensitivities to hydrologic non-stationarity (aka "the past may not be a good predictor of the future")
- Each scenario constructed with repeating sequences of monthly flows and reservoir evaporation rates extracted from historical hydrology
- Used 2070 High Demand Scenario projections
- Used current reservoir operation rules

<u>Methods</u>

Three (3) constructed scenarios:

- 1. Repeating 5-year drought constructed by splicing together the **five driest** water years in the hydrologic period of record with respect to mainstem total annual flow. These were **2001**, **2008**, **1981**, **1988**, and **2017**.
- 2. Repeating single year drought corresponding to the second driest water year (2008) and identified as the critical single year drought with respect to Lake Thurmond water supply availability.
- **3. Repeating synthetic drought year** constructed by splicing together the **twelve driest calendar month flows** in the hydrologic period of record.



## <u>Methods</u>



<u>Methods</u>

Scenario 3: 12 driest calendar months (Mainstem headwater flow)

Mean annual flow = 22.5 CFS

Jan 1956 Feb 2017 Mar 2017 Apr 1986 May 2001 Jun 2008 Jul 2008 Aug 2007 Sep 1954 Oct 1954 Nov 2016 Dec 1955





Scenario 1 Shortages



Scenario 2 Shortages



Scenario 3 Shortages



This graph plots Lake Thurmond storage and releases (monthly timestep)

#### 2070 High Demand Scenario For years 2000 – 2010



This graph plots Lake Thurmond storage and releases (monthly timestep)

2070 High Demand Scenario For years 2000 – 2010

**Drought Scenario 1** 



Lake Thurmond Outflow (Regulated Release + Additional Outflow) and Storage

Resequencing Historical Flows to Investigate Potential Future Droughts

This graph plots Lake Thurmond storage and releases (monthly timestep)

2070 High Demand Scenario For years 2000 – 2010

**Drought Scenario 1** 

**Drought Scenario 2** 



This graph plots Lake Thurmond storage and releases (monthly timestep)

2070 High Demand Scenario For years 2000 – 2010

**Drought Scenario 1** 

**Drought Scenario 2** 

**Drought Scenario 3** 



Lake Thurmond Outflow (Regulated Release + Additional Outflow) and Storage

Resequencing Historical Flows to Investigate Potential Future Droughts

This graph plots Lake Thurmond storage and releases (monthly timestep)

2070 High Demand Scenario For years 2000 – 2010

**Drought Scenario 1** 

**Drought Scenario 2** 

**Drought Scenario 3** 

45

## Lower Savannah River Basin Drought Scenario 1 (uses 2070 High Demand Scenario demands)



#### Surface Water Shortage Table

Map ID	Water User	Average Demand (MGD)	Max Shortage (MGD)	Frequency of Shortage
1	WS: Graniteville	19.5	3.2	0.6%

5



## Lower Savannah River Basin Drought Scenario 2 (uses 2070 High Demand Scenario demands)



#### Surface Water Shortage Table

Map ID	Water User	Average Demand (MGD)	Max Shortage (MGD)	Frequency of Shortage
1	WS: Graniteville	19.5	3.2	0.6%
2	PT: Dominion Urquhart Station	149.8	3.1	2.0%

5



## Lower Savannah River Basin Drought Scenario 3 (uses 2070 High Demand Scenario demands)



#### Surface Water Shortage Table

Map ID	Water User	Average Demand (MGD)	Max Shortage (MGD)	Frequency of Shortage
1	WS: Graniteville	19.5	3.2	0.6%
2	PT: Dominion Urquhart Station	149.8	122.5	21.0%

5



## **Discussion & Limitations**

- Reservoir operations play a role, primarily with respect to the *location* of shortages
  - Altered operational rules could, at least partially, mitigate shortages
- No attempts have been made to directly incorporate future hydrologic or climate projections (e.g. increased evap)
- Neglects changes in groundwater-surface water interactions (e.g. reduced baseflow due to aquifer depletions)

Discussion & Limitations

 USACE Drought Contingency Plan drought triggers conditioned upon flow in the Broad River (BR Index) would have some impact on the results, but the inability to meet release targets would still exist.

Trigger Level	Time of Year	Drought Response
1	Jan 1 - Dec 31	IF BR index >10%, Target 4200 cfs (daily average) release at Thurmond Dam IF BR index <10%, Target 4000 cfs (daily average) release at Thurmond Dam
2	Feb 1 - Oct 31	IF BR index >10%, Target 4000 cfs (daily average) release at Thurmond Dam IF BR index <10%, Target 3800 cfs (daily average) release at Thurmond Dam
	Nov 1 - Jan 31	Target 3600 cfs (daily average) release at Thurmond Dam
3	Feb 1 - Oct 31	Target 3800 cfs (daily average) release at Thurmond Dam
	Nov 1 - Jan 31 (Feb 1 – Feb 28 w/NMFS approval)	Target 3100 cfs (daily average) release at Thurmond Dam
4	Feb 1 - Oct 31	Target 3600 cfs (daily average) release at Thurmond Dam
	Nov 1 - Jan 31 (Feb 1 – Feb 28 w/NMFS approval)	Target 3100 cfs (daily average) release at Thurmond Dam